Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences

Jong-Hyeong Kim, J. R. Brent Ritchie and Bryan McCormick

Journal of Travel Research 2012 51: 12 originally published online 19 November 2010
DOI: 10.1177/0047287510385467

Journal of Travel Research
51(1) 12–25

DOI: 10.1177/0047287510385467
http://jtr.sagepub.com

Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences

Jong-Hyeong Kim[1], J. R. Brent Ritchie[1], and Bryan McCormick[2]

Abstract

The quality experiences provided to customers, which are indeed memorable, directly determine a business's ability to generate revenue (Pine and Gilmore 1999). However, the extant tourism literature has provided limited explanation of the factors that characterize memorable tourism experiences. Thus, the goal of the present study was to develop a valid and reliable measurement scale that will assist in understanding the concept and in improving the effective management of the memorable experience. Following Churchill's (1979) recommended process, we developed a 24-item memorable tourism experience scale that we believe is applicable to most destination areas. The scale comprises seven domains: hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, involvement, and novelty. The data support this dimensional structure of the memorable tourism experience as well as its internal consistency and validity (i.e., content, construct, convergent, and discriminant validity). Theoretical and managerial implications of the study results are discussed in detail.

Keywords

tourist experience, tourism experience, memorable experience, scale development

As Pine and Gilmore (1999) have convincingly argued, the world's economy has changed drastically in recent years, morphing from service-based to experience-based. It will continue to change as our needs and our societies evolve toward an emphasis on the consumption of experiences rather than products. Consistent with the trend of emphasizing the experience economy, a rich body of research has emerged that examines the outcomes of experiences and how to measure them (e.g., Brakus, Schmitt, and Zarantonello 2009; Oh, Fiore, and Jeong 2007). For example, Brakus, Schmitt, and Zarantonello (2009) developed a four-dimensional scale that taps into the following dimensions of brand experiences (sensory, affective, behavioral, and intellectual). They noted that individuals not only develop feelings and impressions toward a brand but also undertake related physical actions while searching for, shopping for, and consuming brands. In the tourism literature, Oh, Fiore, and Jeong (2007) developed a measurement instrument that applies Pine and Gilmore's (1999) four dimensions of experiences, namely aesthetic, education, entertainment, and escapism. They asserted that the four realms of experiences are valid in assessing tourist experiences.

All of these efforts to conceptualize and measure customer experiences are certainly worthwhile and have advanced our understanding of customer experiences. However, marketing literature that has reported a low causal effect of satisfactory experiences on loyalty behavior has increased the needs to extend customer experience studies by incorporating factors that significantly influence behavioral intentions. Researchers have found that more than 60% of customers who switch to another brand identified themselves as *satisfied* (Jones and Sasser 1995; Keiningham and Vavra 2001; Reichheld 1993). This percentage implies that customers want more than just a satisfactory purchase experience and that the existing customer experience measures are insufficient when attempting to understand the experiential factors that influence future behavioral intentions.

A review of the marketing literature provides a solution by which a business can become or remain competitive in the marketplace. Researchers have suggested that memory, which mediates behavioral intentions (Kozak 2001; Lehto, O'Leary, and Morrison 2004; Mazursky 1989; Wirtz et al. 2003), needs to be incorporated into the study of customer experiences. According to Hoch and Deighton (1989), remembered purchase experiences are important because (1) the level of motivation and involvement are high when information is drawn from individuals' past experiences; (2) individuals perceive their recalled past experiences as highly

[1]University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada
[2]Indiana University, Bloomington IN

Corresponding Author:
Jong-Hyeong Kim, Department of Tourism and Marketing, Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4
Email: jonkim@ucalgary.ca

credible; and (3) remembered experiences greatly influence future behavior. In the tourism setting, when deciding to travel and seeking information to be used to select a destination area, individuals first recall past experiences (Raju and Reilly 1979; Kerstetter and Cho 2004). Similarly, Wirtz et al. (2003) provided empirical evidence which illustrated that remembered experiences are the best predictors of an individual's desire to take a similar vacation in the future.

Therefore, in order to develop future behavioral intentions to revisit a destination, tourism businesses should seek to create conditions that facilitate the realization of positive memorable tourism experiences. A positive memorable tourism experience (MTE) has been operationally defined as "a tourism experience positively remembered and recalled after the event has occurred." Despite the importance and urgency of memorable experiences (ME), relatively few studies have explored the components of the experience that are most likely to be recalled from tourists' memories. In addition, they have been confined to only a few affective feelings, such as sociability, pleasure, happiness, irritation, guilt, sadness, and worry (Larsen and Jenssen 2004; Wirtz et al. 2003). As a consequence, to better understand the constituents of MTE, we believe that the theoretical underpinnings of the MTE need to be further investigated. The development and testing of MTE frameworks as well as the parallel development and testing of supporting measurement scales will assist in the creation of a better understanding of these frameworks, which, in turn, may help destination marketers to better meet the challenges that they face. With this concern in mind, the present study aimed to contribute to an increasing body of literature on the MTE by developing a measurement tool to assess the constituents of MTE. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable MTE scale. To first establish a conceptual framework for the study, we now provide a brief background review of MTE and the relevant constructs that were used when developing the MTE measurement scale.

Understanding Tourist Experiences

Our current interest in enhancing the understanding of the MTE represents a recent ongoing effort to improve our understanding of the fundamental "product" that tourism provides to its clients. As Ritchie and Hudson (2009) have documented, early research on the experience by pioneers such as Csikszentmihalyi (1975), Cohen (1979), Mannell and Iso-Ahola (1987), Berry (1981), Holbrook and Hirschman (1982), and Turner and Bruner (1986), as well as the more recent contributions of Ryan (1995), Aho (2001), Berry, Carbone, and Haeckel (2002), Jennings and Nickerson (2006), and the IACVB (2005) have advanced us to the point where satisfaction and quality alone are no longer adequate descriptions of the experience that today's tourists seek. Therefore, we believe that the MTE represents the new benchmark or standard, which we must seek to deliver. Before we can achieve this goal; however, we must better understand the MTE and be able to measure its components.

An MTE is selectively constructed from tourism experiences based on the individual's assessment of the experience. In other words, the tourist experience, which has been defined as the subjective mental state felt by participants during a service encounter (Otto and Ritchie 1996), does not necessarily translate into an MTE. Thus, there is significant incongruence between these two experiences, especially in terms of their constituents. Oh, Fiore, and Jeong (2007) supported this contention while testing the relationships between the experience dimensions and memory. They found that only one dimension (i.e., aesthetics) affected memory. Therefore, to successfully capture the components of tourism experiences that strongly affect individuals, we first reviewed the subjective nature of tourist experiences and previous research on the underlying dimensions of the tourism experience.

As Ooi (2005) reminded us, tourists' different interests and backgrounds lead to diverse interpretations of a single tourist product. Furthermore, tourists have different experiences even if they are doing the same thing in the same place, as their moods and personal feelings at a particular moment affect their interpretations of the experiences. Even if all tourists say that they enjoyed themselves during an experience, it does not necessarily mean that they all had the same existing and memorable experiences (Ooi 2005). As a consequence, research on the constructs underlying tourist experiences has shifted from the objects provided by tourism businesses to tourists' subjective interpretation of the meanings of those objects (Uriely 2005). By identifying these objects in the qualitatively different ways in which individuals experience tourism, researchers have conceptualized the tourist experience as subjective (Cohen 1979; Hjemdahl 2003; Larsen 2007; Neumann 1992; Ryan 1998, 2002). A review of the tourism and leisure literature indicates there are a variety of experiential components that various researchers have identified to help understand tourism experiences (see Table 1). The next step in identifying and understanding the components of the tourism experience that strongly affect individuals, and lead to memorability, necessitated an inquiry into these experiential components, while cross-referencing the literature on memory and memorable experiences. Accordingly, the following section discusses the experiential components that constitute MTE.

Components of MTEs

In the memory literature, researchers have found various factors that increase the memorability of an event. These include affective feelings, cognitive evaluations, and novel events. Brewer (1988) found that affective thoughts are an important part of memory, and that events that are related to emotions

Table 1. Components of the Tourist Experience

Factors	Relevant Literature
Involvement	Bloch and Richins 1983; Blodgett and Granbois 1992; Celsi and Olson 1988; Park and Hastak 1994; Sanbomatsu and Fazio 1990; Swinyard 1993
Hedonism	Dunman and Mattila 2005; Lee, Dattilo, and Howard 1994; Mannell and Kleiber 1997; Otto and Ritchie 1996
Happiness	Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991
Pleasure	Farber and Hall 2007; Floyd 1997; Gunter 1987
Relaxation	Howard et al. 1993; Mannell, Zuzanek, and Larson 1988
Stimulation	Arnould and Price 1993; Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991; Howard et al. 1993; Obenour et al. 2006; Samdahl 1991
Refreshment	Howard et al. 1993; Hull and Michael 1995; Samdahl 1991
Social interaction	Ap and Wong 2001; Arnould and Price 1993; Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991; Howard et al. 1993; Obenour et al. 2006; Samdahl 1991
Spontaneity	Gunter 1987
Meaningfulness	Bruner 1991; Jamal and Hollinshead 2001; Noy 2004; Wilson and Harris 2006
Knowledge	Blackshaw 2003; Otto and Ritchie 1996
Challenge	Lee, Dattilo, and Howard 1994; Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987
Sense of separation	Gunter 1987
Timelessness	Blackshaw 2003; Gunter 1987
Adventure	Gunter 1987
Personal relevance	Bloch and Richins 1983; Blodgett and Granbois 1992; Celsi and Olson 1988; Park and Hastak 1994; Sanbomatsu and Fazio 1990; Swinyard 1993
Novelty	Dunman and Mattila 2005; Farber and Hall 2007
Escaping pressure	Hull and Michael 1995; Lee, Dattilo, and Howard 1994
Intellectual cultivation	Blackshaw 2003

are more likely to be remembered. In another study examining the effectiveness of different prompts (i.e., object, activity, and affect words) in eliciting personal memory, Robinson (1976) found that object and activity words were limited to eliciting emotion-neutral or emotion-trivial memories. On the other hand, affect words were found to be an integral part of autobiographical memories, in that they appeared in all of the autobiographical reports. It was also found that an individual's cognitive evaluations, such as meaningfulness and challenge, enhanced the recollection of a memory.

By tracing how memory is formed, Craik and Lockhart (1972) contended that an association exists between the depth of cognitive processing and an individual's memory. They defined the depth of processing as the degree of semantic or cognitive analysis, which is a post hoc process that enriches or elaborates stimuli. Therefore, the mind processes stimuli, which are familiar and meaningful, at a deeper level and more rapidly. As well, it retains better than less important stimuli. Finally, unusual, atypical, or distinctive events are more likely to be remembered than typical events (Rajaram 1996; Reder, Donavos, and Erickson 2002; Schmidt 1991). According to Gardner (1983), products whose features are prominent affect customers' attitudes and increase their ability to be remembered. In supporting this notion, Alba, Hutchinson, and Lynch (1991) suggested that when some facts are particularly salient, they are continually and unavoidably retrieved during attempts to recall the remaining information (p. 19). In addition, while studying the influence of familiarity on memory, Brandt, Gardiner, and Macrae (2006) confirmed previous findings that consumers' preferences for novel or distinctive stimuli lead to better recognition and memory of these items (Schmidt 1991; Tulving et al. 1994). Using two sets of forenames, one familiar and the other unfamiliar, they measured the subjective experience of remembering and found that distinctive names are more likely to be remembered and correctly recognized than familiar names.

In corroborating the above discussion, tourism researchers, who studied MTE, found that affective feelings, such as being sociable, pleasant, happy, irritated, guilty, sad, and worried, are included in an individual's MTE (Larsen and Jenssen 2004; Wirtz et al. 2003). Researchers found that even though people could not vividly recall their experiences (i.e., where they went and when they returned home), they remembered both positive and negative emotions about a trip. Based on the foregoing theoretical insights, 16 experiential constructs are proposed as the components of MTE. Table 2 provides a list of these constructs and their definitions.

Scale Development

To develop a measurement instrument for MTE, a multistaged development study was conducted. Churchill's (1979) suggested procedure for developing measures of marketing constructs and Hinkins's (1995) recommendations for improving the scale development process provided guidance

Table 2. Potential Constructs of the Memorable Tourism Experience

Construct Domains	Construct Definition	Relevant Literature
Hedonism	Pleasurable feelings that excite oneself	Dunman and Mattila 2005; Mannell and Kleiber 1997; Otto and Ritchie 1996
Relaxation	A feeling of comfort and pleasure without involving physical activity	Howard et al. 1993; Mannell, Zuzanek, and Larson 1988
Stimulation	Arousal of feelings that heighten and/or invigorate oneself	Arnould and Price 1993; Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991; Howard et al. 1993; Obenour et al. 2006; Samdahl 1991
Refreshment	The state of being refreshed	Howard et al. 1993; Hull and Michael 1995; Samdahl 1991
Adverse feelings (e.g., anger and frustration)	Negative psychological feelings	Aziz 1995; Ryan 1991, 1993
Social interaction	A feeling of connection and group identity with travel partners and/or local people	Ap and Wong 2001; Arnould and Price 1993; Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991; Howard et al. 1993; Obenour et al. 2006; Samdahl 1991
Happiness	A feeling of joy that springs from the heart	Bolla, Dawson, and Harrington 1991
Meaningfulness	A sense of great value or significance	Bruner 1991; Jamal and Hollinshead 2001; Noy 2004; Wilson and Harris 2006
Knowledge	Information, facts, or experiences known by an individual	Blackshaw 2003; Otto and Ritchie 1996
Challenge	An experience that demands physical and/or mental ability	Lee, Dattilo, and Howard 1994; Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987
Assessment of value	Evaluation of a trip in terms of monetary value and its usefulness	Latour and Peat 1979; Ryan 2002; Yoon and Uysal 2005
Assessment of service	An individuals' perceived quality of service provided by tourism businesses	Bartlett and Einert 1992; Leiss 1979; Cliff and Ryan 1994
Unexpected happenings	An event or situation, which was not foreseeable, that one is faced with while traveling	Aziz 1995; Christianson 1992; Ryan 1991, 1993; Talarico and Rubin 2003
Personal relevance	The level of involvement of oneself with a tourism experience	Bloch and Richins 1983; Blodgett and Granbois 1992; Celsi and Olson 1988; Park and Hastak 1994; Sanbomatsu and Fazio 1990; Swinyard 1993
Novelty	A psychological feeling of newness resulted from having a new experience	Dunman and Mattila 2005; Farber and Hall 2007
Participation	A physical involvement with the tourism experience	Berry, Carbone, and Haeckel 2002; Pine and Gilmore 1999

for the research. In addition, Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) guidelines for establishing measurement reliabilities as well as previous scale development studies were referenced (e.g., Hung and Petrick 2010; Hosany and Gilbert 2009). The following sections describe the procedures carried out within the overall stages in the process of scale construction.

Specification of Construct Domains and Generation of Initial Items Pool

A set of 58 MTE items related to the 16 construct domains was initially generated from a review of tourism and leisure research pertaining to participants' experiences. As neither a measurement scale nor a conceptual model of the MTE to assist in developing the construct domains and the associated scale items was found in the existing literature, we conducted a supplementary exploratory study as a preliminary step toward developing MTE scale items. The researchers interviewed 62 individuals using open-ended questions (e.g., recall your most MTE and list five words to describe this experience). The main purposes of this study were to identify themes or construct dimensions that constituted one's MTE and to ensure the content validity of construct domains, which were predetermined from the literature review.

While conducting the content analysis on the responses, 62 different words were identified when describing MTE. In reviewing the answers, different words that could be categorized under one theme were merged together (e.g., fun, exciting, pleasant, and interesting were categorized under the hedonism component; exploration and educational were categorized under knowledge; cultural difference, newness, new culture, and exotic were categorized under novelty; bad luck, stressful, and tiring were categorized under adverse feelings). Through this process, the 62 words were reduced to nine themes (hedonism, social interaction, knowledge, novelty, happiness, relaxation, challenge, unexpected happenings, and

adverse feelings). By combining the items generated from two sources (the open-ended survey and literature review), a total of 84 items were developed as a basis for measuring MTE.

Refinement of Instrument

A jury of three experts reviewed the above set of 84 items to ensure content validity (Devellis 2003). These researchers have conducted prominent research on the tourism experience. Clear definitions of each construct domain were stated at the beginning of the expert evaluation sheet in order to avoid confusion. Based on the construct definitions, judges were asked to assess construct deficiency as well as construct contamination for each item, using a 5-point measurement scale, in which 1 represented *very unlikely* and 5 represented *very likely*. The experts were also asked to clarify the items and provide suggestions as to how to reinforce the representativeness of the developed construct domains. After the researchers received the experts' constructive comments on the scale, a consensus analysis was undertaken to compare the comments from the three experts. Decisions for refining the scale were made based on agreements between two or more experts. As a result of this process, it was concluded that a total of 85 items best measured MTE. To arrive at this number, three items were eliminated and four items were added to better represent the construct domains.

Data Collection

An empirical evaluation of the developed instrument was undertaken using data obtained from U.S. college students at a large Midwestern university. The students were enrolled in 12 classes spread across different academic majors. To encourage research participation, the researchers provided a small compensation to each participant. All respondents received a free bagel coupon when the surveys were handed out. As an additional incentive, five $50 gift cards were given via a random drawing from the pool of returned surveys.

The participants were first asked to recall MTE and to evaluate all 85 items on a 7-point Likert-type scale, on which 1 represented *I have not experienced at all* and 7 represented *I have experienced very much*. A total of 730 survey questionnaires were handed out and 536 (511 usable) copies were returned, representing an overall response rate of 73.4%. As reported in Table 3, the female participants outnumbered the male participants (56.8% vs. 43.2%). This statistic is consistent with the structure of the student body (female: 56.6% vs. males: 43.4%). As the sampling frame was designed to acquire data from college students, the respondents were generally in the same age range and 93.4% of the sample fell into the age range of 18 to 23 (see Table 3).

Regarding the travel history of the subjects, the majority of respondents have previously traveled for pleasure (64.4%).

Table 3. Sample Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Category	Distribution
Gender	Male	221 (43.2)
	Female	290 (56.8)
Age	Mean (standard deviation)	20.8 (1.71)
	Median	21
Purpose	Pleasure	329 (64.4)
	Visiting friends and relatives (VFR)	81 (15.9)
	Relaxing	36 (7.0)
	Volunteer	10 (2.0)
	Business	9 (1.8)
	Others	46 (9.0)
Type of accommodation	Luxury hotels (4 star/ diamond or above)	92 (18.0)
	Hotels	169 (33.1)
	Motels	11 (2.1)
	Cabins	25 (4.9)
	Camping	22 (4.3)
	Friends/family house	69 (13.5)
	Cruise ship	36 (7.0)
	Hostels	35 (7.0)
	Others	52 (10.2)
Mode of transportation	Airplane	291 (56.9)
	Own vehicle	123 (24.1)
	Rental vehicle	33 (6.5)
	Public transportation	64 (12.5)
Travel costs	<$1,001	199 (38.9)
	$1,001-$2,000	77 (15.1)
	$2,001-$3,000	63 (12.3)
	$3,001-$4,000	35 (6.8)
	$4,001-$5,000	14 (2.7)
	>$5,001	39 (7.6)
	Don't know	84 (16.4)

Note: The percentages were rounded up to one decimal point. Therefore, the percentage may not add to 100.0 because of rounding errors.

They had also traveled in order to visit friends and relatives (VFR, 15.9%), for other reasons (9.0%), and for relaxation (7.0%). Volunteer work (2.0%) and business (1.8%) were relatively minor travel motivations. A content analysis of the choice of "other reasons," indicated that educational opportunities (i.e., student exchange programs) and school-related events (i.e., training programs and field trips) were most common. The most frequent type of accommodation used was hotels below four stars (33.1%), followed by luxury hotels above four stars (18.0%) and the homes of friends and family (13.5%). Of the respondents who had used other types of accommodations (10.2%), more than half (55%) stayed in houses, condos, or apartments. Regarding travel budgets, the majority spent less than $1,000 (38.9%) followed by $1,001 to $2,000 (15.1%), and $2,001 to $3,000 (12.3%). As a number of respondents traveled with their parents and

their parents paid the expenses of the trip, those unaware of their travel budget formed a significant portion of respondents (16.4%).

Purification of Measurement Scale

Before assessing reliability and validity of the MTE scale, the descriptive statistics of the scale items were examined to eliminate those demonstrating inadequate psychometric properties. The skewness of six items had the opposite sign of those in the other items within the same constructs. In addition, one item exhibited elevated skewness. In summary, a total of seven items were deleted. To ensure that the deleted items did not contribute significantly to the MTE measurement scale, two statistical procedures were performed. The first was to examine the change in the Cronbach's α value when these items were removed. In this regard, Cronbach's α of the MTE scale increased only slightly from .86 to .87, supporting the idea that the deleted items accounted for only a small portion of the variance attributable to the true MTE score.

Following a process recommended by Churchill (1979), an iterative scale purification procedure was used to develop a parsimonious scale. Item-to-total correlations were computed for 78 of the items. This practice is a commonly accepted procedure when developing a scale (Choi and Sirakaya 2005; Chu and Murrmann 2006; Larsen, Brun, and Ogaard 2009; Wang et al. 2007). Each r value refers to the correlation of the respondents' scores on an item in relation to the sum of their scores on all of the items. To purify the scale, items that were poorly correlated ($r < .4$) with the total score were eliminated. This procedure resulted in 25 items, out of the original 78, being retained. Internal consistency reliability, the most widely used reliability method (Delamere 1998; Lankford and Howard 1994), was measured using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the 25-item scale is .91. Following the widely recognized rule of thumb of using a reliability level of .7, the analysis indicated that the 25-item MTE scale was highly reliable.

EFA was then conducted on the retained 25 items using both orthogonal (VARIMAX) and oblique (OBLIMIN) rotation methods to identify the dimensionality of MTE. One hundred eleven cases were randomly selected from the sample for the EFA. The appropriateness of the factor analysis was first determined by examining the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 1,590 ($p < .001$), indicating that the factor analysis was appropriate. In addition, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy for the data set was .80. KMO values between .8 and .9 are described as meritorious by Kaiser (1974).

The results from the two different methods showed similar structures having the same value of explained variances. Employing a combination of the Cattell (1966) screen test and the theoretical basis of the scale (i.e., eigenvalues greater than 1, Kaiser-Guttman criterion), the EFA of MTE scale extracted seven factors. The results obtained from the oblique rotation method were used for the data analysis. When deciding to retain an item, both the factor loading ($r > .4$; Floyd and Widaman 1995) and the communality ($r > .5$) of each item were examined. As a result, one items was eliminated and the EFA was conducted again using the principal components analysis with an oblique rotation method to permit the obtained components to correlate and, therefore, followed the assumption that MTE components are related yet distinct from each other (Lee and Comrey 1979). A final seven-factor model emerged, with the remaining 24 items accounting for 75.89% of the total variance. Factor 1 involved the items measuring hedonism, while factor 2 focused on the items measuring involvement. Factor 3 contained the items measuring novelty and factor 4 focused on the items measuring local culture. Factor 5 involved the items measuring refreshment, factor 6 contained the items measuring knowledge, and factor 7 focused on the items measuring meaningfulness.

Assessment of the Latent Structure

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using the covariance matrix to verify the factor structure identified from the previous EFA. Before performing the CFA, the sample was randomly split into two 200-case subsamples using SPSS routine random case selection. One sample was a calibration sample, while the other was a validation sample. The 24 scale items with the seven-factor structure were tested.

The first step in interpreting the results of CFA is assessing overall fit of the model. The overall model fit was evaluated statistically by the chi-square test and heuristically using a number of goodness-of-fit statistics, such as chi-square to the degrees of freedom ratio (i.e., χ^2/df), Bentler's (1992) comparative fit index (CFI), Bentler and Bonett's (1980) nonnormed fit index (NNFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). Results of the CFA showed that the measurement model fit the data very well. The ratio of the χ^2 to the degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df = 1.56$) and other commonly used goodness-of-fit indices (CFI = .98, NNFI = .98, IFI = .97, and RMSEA = .05) were in line with the established criteria (CFI >.90, NNFI >.95, and RMSEA <.08; Bentler 1992; Hu and Bentler 1999; Jöreskog and Sörbom 1996). The reliability of MTE scale is then analyzed by calculating composite reliability estimates. As shown in Table 4, the composite reliability estimates, ranging from .81 to .90, indicated a good internal consistency of multiple indicators for each construct in the model (i.e., composite reliabilities >.7, Hair et al. 1998).

The next step was to assess the convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was evaluated by checking all factor loadings ($r >.4$) and the values of average variance extracted (AVE >.5). As observed in Table 4, the estimated values of Fornell and Larcker's (1981) AVE of

Table 4. Scale Items and Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results (calibration sample)

Factors	Standardized Factor Loading	Composite Reliabilities	AVE	SMC
Hedonism		.86	.61	
Thrilled about having a new experience	.75			.56
Indulged in the activities	.78			.61
Really enjoyed this tourism experience	.77			.59
Exciting	.83			.67
Novelty		.89	.67	
Once-in-a-lifetime experience	.75			.56
Unique	.89			.79
Different from previous experiences	.85			.72
Experienced something new	.78			.60
Local culture		.81	.59	
Good impressions about the local people	.77			.59
Closely experienced the local culture	.78			.61
Local people in a destination were friendly	.76			.58
Refreshment		.87	.63	
Liberating	.80			.64
Enjoyed sense of freedom	.68			.46
Refreshing	.83			.69
Revitalized	.86			.74
Meaningfulness		.90	.75	
I did something meaningful	.90			.81
I did something important	.89			.79
Learned about myself	.80			.64
Involvement		.86	.68	
I visited a place where I really wanted to go	.85			.72
I enjoyed activities which I really wanted to do	.91			.83
I was interested in the main activities of this tourism experience	.70			.49
Knowledge		.84	.64	
Exploratory	.77			.59
Knowledge	.79			.62
New culture	.84			.71

Note: χ^2 = 345.24, 221 degrees of freedom (p< .001); comparative fit index = .98; incremental fit index = .98; nonnormed fit index = .97; root mean square error of approximation = .05; AVE = average variance extracted; SMC = squared multiple correlation.

the seven constructs were greater than the unexplained variances (>.5) and all of the factor loadings for the individual items were significant (>.5). Thus, the convergent validity of the latent constructs was confirmed. The discriminant validity of the MTE scale was investigated following Fornell and Larcker's (1981) suggestion. According to them, the AVE must exceed the corresponding correlation estimate between the two factors (i.e., the square of their intercorrelations). In the current study, the shared variance between any two constructs was not greater than the AVE of the construct (see Tables 4 and 5). In summary, the assessment of the measurement model showed strong evidence of reliability and validity of the latent constructs.

Table 5. Construct Intercorrelations (calibration sample)

Measures	HD	IV	LC	RF	MF	KW	NV	*M*	SD
Hedonism (HD)	1.00							5.95	1.07
Involvement (IV)	.41	1.00						5.70	1.22
Local Culture (LC)	.36	.33	1.00					5.15	1.23
Refreshment (RF)	.49	.33	.45	1.00				5.32	1.09
Meaningfulness (MF)	.43	.28	.41	.44	1.00			5.04	1.52
Knowledge (KW)	.42	.30	.47	.35	.62	1.00		5.31	1.36
Novelty (NV)	.38	.39	.44	.31	.51	.65	1.00	5.37	1.43

Scale Validation

Validation of the Developed Scale

The results of the validation sample also showed that the indicators exhibited statistically significant standardized factor loadings, composite reliabilities, and AVE. The AVE of each construct (see Table 6) and the inter-correlations (see Table 7) provided support for construct and discriminant validity

Table 6. Scale Items and Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results (validation sample)

Factors	Standardized Factor Loading	Composite Reliabilities	AVE	SMC
Hedonism		.83	.54	
Thrilled about having a new experience	.62			.38
Indulged in the activities	.75			.57
Really enjoyed this tourism experience	.80			.64
Exciting	.77			.59
Novelty		.87	.64	
Once-in-a lifetime experience	.76			.58
Unique	.91			.83
Different from previous experiences	.78			.61
Experienced something new	.72			.52
Local culture		.86	.67	
Good impressions about the local people	.96			.92
Closely experienced the local culture	.82			.67
Local people in a destination were friendly	.65			.42
Refreshment		.83	.56	
Liberating	.76			.58
Enjoyed sense of freedom	.73			.53
Refreshing	.81			.66
Revitalized	.67			.45
Meaningfulness		.83	.63	
I did something meaningful	.80			.64
I did something important	.89			.78
Learned about myself	.67			.45
Involvement		.84	.63	
I visited a place where I really wanted to go	.82			.67
I enjoyed activities which I really wanted to do	.81			.66
I was interested in the main activities of this tourism experience	.75			.57
Knowledge		.88	.70	
Exploratory	.79			.62
Knowledge	.88			.77
New culture	.84			.71

Note: χ^2 = 330.47, 221 degrees of freedom ($p < .001$); comparative fit index = .97; incremental fit index = .97; nonnormed fit index = .97; root mean square error of approximation = .05; AVE = average variance extracted; SMC = squared multiple correlation.

Table 7. Construct Intercorrelations (validation sample)

Measures	HD	IV	LC	RF	MF	KW	NV	*M*	SD
Hedonism (HD)	1.00							6.40	0.67
Involvement (IV)	.62	1.00						5.94	1.15
Local culture (LC)	.21	.25	1.00					5.56	1.23
Refreshment (RF)	.21	.13	.23	1.00				5.44	1.06
Meaningfulness (MF)	.37	.33	.29	.23	1.00			5.04	1.49
Knowledge (KW)	.30	.26	.44	.22	.53	1.00		5.15	1.62
Novelty (NV)	.41	.38	.28	.25	.47	.51	1.00	5.45	1.46

(i.e., AVE >.5). The MTE model derived from the validation sample showed a good model fit to the data, $\chi^2(df = 221) = 330.47$, $p < .001$, CFI = .97, NNFI = .97, IFI = .97, and RMSEA = .05.

Invariance Tests

To assess the validity of the developed MTE scale across calibration and validation samples, two invariance tests were also conducted. These tests were conducted to examine whether the measurement model fit different samples and whether the factor loadings were identical across two samples. The former test is considered a prerequisite for the invariance test because failure to achieve configural invariance indicates that different constructs are measured across the groups. Such a failure indicates that it is meaningless to further examine whether the factor loadings are identical across the groups. In the process of conducting the invariance tests, the number of factors and patterns of the free and fixed loadings need to be the same across the calibration and validation samples. When assessing the model, an RMSEA value of ≤.05 was used (Cheung and Rensvold 2002). This value was used because some researchers suggested that the chi-square difference test is too strict whereas the CFI is too lenient (Wu, Li, and Zumbo 2007).

The results supported the configural invariance of the measurement model across the calibration and validation samples (χ^2 = 822.37, df = 473, RMSEA = .05). This good model fit was also supported by the CFI value, which was .98. Therefore, the data were eligible for the next test, which was used to examine whether the factor loadings were identical regardless of group membership.

To develop a valid measurement scale, the equality of the factor loadings across the groups needs to be assured. This invariance postulates that one unit change of an item score is scaled to an equal unit change of the factor score across the groups. Therefore, a lack of this invariance is problematic because

> if one unit change in the item score does not result in an equal unit change in the factor score across groups, the regression lines are not identical because the slopes are unequal; hence the regression lines are not identical for the groups (Wu, Li, and Zumbo 2007, p. 8).

The results of the data also supported the invariance model (χ^2 = 848.94, df = 490, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .98). The model fit indices of two sets of data (i.e., calibration and validation sample) as well as the results of the two invariance tests suggested that the 24-item MTE scale developed in this study is viable and has construct validity.

Second-Order Factor Model

Researchers have often used different superordinate concepts/labels (such as affective factors, cognitive evaluation, and behavioral components), when referring to a group of experiential factors in the same nature (e.g., Dunman and Mattila 2005; Floyd 1997). For example, a variety of emotions and moods (e.g., happiness, relaxation, separation, anxiety, nervousness, and pleasure) are classified as affective factors in the literature. Therefore, to examine the hierarchical relationships between the constructs and whether the seven memorable tourist experience components are theoretically related to a higher order of constructs, a second-order CFA model was tested.

In a first step of this process, the seven constructs found in the first-order CFA model were used as the indicators. Then affective, cognitive, and behavioral components were used as the latent variables. Next, the initial correlation paths between the seven indicators and three latent constructs were connected based on the predetermined factor structure. In finding measurement errors and modifying coefficient paths, modification indices (MIs) were referenced. The second-order factor structure suggested that the subdimensions of the cognitive and affective components shared common variances. For example, five scale items were loaded on both cognitive and affective components in the final model. Eight items exhibited low factor loadings (<.5) and five items had significantly low SMC (<.2). In addition, the AVE values of the cognitive and affective components were significantly low (<.5). Although the AVE values near the .5 threshold are considered reasonable for the newly developed scales (Netemeyer, Bearden, and Sharma 2003), the AVE values of the affective components (.3) were too low to be accepted. These results provided good evidence that the memorable tourist experience scale fits best using a first-order model.

Discussion

The main purposes of this study were to establish the dimensions necessary to measure MTEs and to develop an instrument to measure MTE that achieves high levels of reliability and validity. Following the scale development procedure recommended by Churchill (1979) and Hinkins (1995), this study successfully developed and validated an MTE scale. A total of seven dimensions for MTE have been identified and 24 indicators were found. Evidence of construct and discriminant validity of the MTE scale were provided by the results of the EFA using SPSS and CFA using LISREL. The findings of the CFA were cross-validated by splitting the total sample into two 200-case subsamples. In supporting a consistent factor structure, both the calibration and validation samples yielded identical results. All of the major goodness-of-fit indices indicated the model's good fit to both data sets. According to the research results, seven constructs (i.e., hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, involvement, and novelty) are important components of the tourism experience that are likely to affect a person's memory.

The results also suggested that the measurement model should be retained as a first-order factor structure for two reasons. First, modeling the MTE factors at a higher order, with all seven first-order experience dimensions, did not fit the data well. Each indicator exhibited low factor loadings as well as squared multiple correlations. This indicated that the MTE dimensions may not share variance to a sufficient degree. Second, the second-order factor model failed to show any improvement in fit over the first-order model. Rather, the first-order model showed better values on all five model fit indices and made it much easier to interpret and understand the MTE dimensions. From a management standpoint, the first-order model can provide destination marketers with much more useful diagnostic information for developing and assessing tourism programs because each dimension of the model points to clear dimensions for managerial attention and program development actions.

The findings of this study are valuable for both academic research and marketing practices. A major contribution of this study is that it adds what we believe to be a significant new benchmark to a growing body of literature on tourist experiences. Since little prior research has been conducted on ME, specifically scale development for MTE, this study

represents the first empirical examination of the concept. It establishes the representative dimensions of MTE and the relevant indicators that measure each dimension. Since no previous studies have conceptualized and measured the MTE, the present findings of this study cannot be empirically compared to or supported by the existing literature. However, the seven dimensions that we have identified as important components of the tourism experience are highly likely to affect a person's memory as it relates to tourism experiences. For example, hedonism, which has been discussed as an integral part of leisure experiences (Mannell and Kleiber 1997) and tourism service experiences (Otto and Ritchie 1996), is a crucial factor in determining tourists' satisfaction as well as their future behavior (Dunman and Mattila 2005). In addition, involvement in a customer experience (which introduces the notion of personal attachment to an experience) was found to reinforce a person's affective feelings when evaluating an experience (Bloch and Richins 1983; Blodgett and Granbois 1992; Swinyard 1993) and to stimulate cognitive analysis at a deep level (Craik and Lockhart 1972). In addition, we corroborated Morgan and Xu's (2009) findings that travelers who interact with local culture construct a unique and memorable holiday experience as local culture was found to be a component of MTE.

Another interesting finding of this study is that individuals tend to more easily recall positive experiences than negative ones. Based on discussions in the memory literature, which suggest an ME can be both positive and negative, the initial construct domains were developed to include both positive and negative items when assessing MTE. In addition, respondents were asked to freely recall their most MTE in the past five years. The results showed significantly low mean scores on negative experiential factors: frustrated ($M = 2.06$), angry ($M = 1.72$), embarrassed ($M = 1.75$), lost valuables ($M = 1.74$), terrible weather ($M = 2.03$), and problems ($M = 2.29$).

Marketing Implications for Destination Managers

In a highly competitive market situation, being able to provide memorable experiences is significant as it increases positive behavioral intentions. As Pine and Gilmore (1999) contended, experiences directly influence a business's ability to generate revenue. As such, the ability to provide tourist experiences that are more memorable and easier to recall should lead to business prosperity. The results of this study can be valuable to destination managers in several ways.

First, destination managers can most effectively allocate their resources when developing tourism programs by focusing their efforts on the seven dimensions identified in this study. More specifically, we believe that they should consider the memorable experience components and their sub-items when developing tourism programs. For example, learning about oneself was found to be one of the ways in which an individual finds meaning through tourism experiences. Thus, destination managers may be able to provide MTE by developing a variety of programs in which tourists can experience and learn new things. While individuals wish to participate in many different activities, they are especially attracted to activities in which they explore their talents and capabilities (Csikszentmihalyi and Kleiber 1992). Increasing an individual's level of social contact with different individuals and groups of people should also enhance the possibility of understanding oneself.

In addition, the results show that individuals who closely experience local culture are more likely to have MTE. Consequently, tourism programs should include opportunities to experience local culture. A number of ways to enhance this experience are possible. For example, the use of unique transportation modes while traveling in a destination area (such as a zippni in the Philippines, a gondola in Venice, or a dog sled in Alaska), staying in a traditional type of accommodation (such as a Ger/Yurt in Mongolia or an Ondol in South Korea), and the provision of tours to a location in which individuals can naturally observe and interact with local people, such as a traditional market, would enhance an individual's experience with the local culture.

Second, destination mangers can use this scale as a managerial tool to evaluate the performance of their businesses and institute proper practices, which are aimed at improving positive behavioral intentions. Tourism programs as well as the setting in which on-site experiences occur, should be thoroughly evaluated to determine whether they potentially satisfy each of the identified memorable tourism experiential components. Visitor surveys containing the memorable experiential components, which specifically ask about individuals' past tourism experiences constructed with destinations and tourism businesses, would help destination managers to understand how a particular tourism business performed in each of the seven dimensions.

Third, destination managers can obtain additional useful marketing information by utilizing this scale. For example, they can learn how their businesses rank against their competition across the seven components of memorable experiences by asking questions about their competitors. This competitive information could be transferred to advertising and sales efforts, not to mention operations. In addition, this scale can support a tourism business in its target marketing efforts. After identifying individual differences, such as sociodemographics and purpose of travel, in constructing MTE, destination mangers can possibly modify their tourism programs to effectively deliver memorable experiences to their target customers.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations of the current study need to be highlighted. First, the data were collected using convenience sampling of college students enrolled in a university located in a

Midwestern state in the United States. Thus, the limited ability to generalize the study results is undeniable. It would be interesting to see whether data obtained from different populations and/or from participants in different leisure activities would result in the same MTE construct components found in this study. Another drawback of the present study is that it examined a limited number of situational and individual difference factors. To enhance our understanding of MTE, future research should be expanded to include other experiential factors not discussed in this study, especially those that pertain to negative feelings (e.g., anger and frustration).

While our findings support Hull's (1990) contention that pleasant memories of tourism experiences affect the consumer significantly by creating a positive mood and feelings of happiness that play a significant role in one's life (specifically, our study identified seven positive dimensions of an MTE), we failed to identify any negative experiential components of MTEs. Considering that the MTE is in itself neutral, it is reasonable to expect that negative experience components can just as strongly affect one's memorability.

In addition, by incorporating the concept of experiencescapes with MTEs, future research could seek to identify spatially defined factors that enhance one's memorability of tourism experiences. According to O'Dell and Billing (2005), experiences are inherently personal and have a material base that can be anchored in a strategically planned and designed space. Together with the current study results, this kind of research could help tourism businesses design and develop tourism programs. Third, given the fact that memories are distorted in various ways, it is necessary to identify and measure the nature of the feelings and/or experiences that remain in travelers' memories at any given point in time and space. Therefore, research that compares travelers' memories and future intentions at each stage of the experience, such as anticipation, on-site, and recollection, would provide valuable information to destination marketers. To conclude, we believe, as a result of this study, that the managers of tourism destinations and tourism businesses are now in a better position to more efficiently manage the different stages of the tourism experience. We look forward to seeing just how accurate our prediction turns out to be.

Acknowledgment

The authors express grateful thanks to the editor and reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

Aho, S. K. (2001). "Towards a General Theory of Touristic Experiences: Modeling Experience Process in Tourism." *Tourism Review*, 56 (3/4): 33-37.

Alba, J. W., J. W. Hutchinson, and J. G. Lynch. (1991). "Memory and Decision Making." In *Handbook of Consumer Behavior*, edited by T. S. Robertson and H. H. Kassarjian. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 1-49.

Anderson, J. C., and D. W. Gerbing. (1988). "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-step Approach." *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3): 411-23.

Ap, J., and K. K. F. Wong. (2001). "Case Study on Tour Guiding: Professionalism, Issues, and Problems." *Tourism Management*, 22: 551-63.

Arnould, E., and L. Price. (1993). "River Magic: Extraordinary Experience and the Extended Service Encounter." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20: 24-45.

Aziz, H. (1995). "Understanding Attacks on Tourists in Egypt." *Tourism Management*, 16 (2): 9-16.

Bartlett, P., and A. E. Einert. (1992). "Analysis of the Design Function of an Adult Softball Complex in a New Public Recreation Park." *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10 (1): 71-81.

Bentler, P. M. (1992). "On the Fit of Models to Covariances and Methodology to the Bulletin." *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 400-404.

Bentler, P. M., and D. G. Bonett. (1980). "Significance Tests and Goodness of Fit in the Analysis of Covariance Structures." *Psychological Bulletin*, 88: 588-606.

Berry, L. L. (1981). "The Employer as Customer." *Journal of Retail Banking*, 3 (March): 33-40.

Berry, L. L., L. P. Carbone, and S. H. Haeckel. (2002). "Managing the Total Customer Experience." *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 43 (3): 85-89.

Blackshaw, T. (2003). *Leisure Life: Myth, Modernity, and Masculinity*. New York: Routledge.

Bloch, P. H., and M. L. Richins. (1983). "A Theoretical Model for the Study of Product Importance Perceptions." *Journal of Marketing*, 47 (3): 69-81.

Blodgett, J. G., and D. H. Granbois. (1992). "Toward an Integrated Conceptual Model of Consumer Complaining Behavior." *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, 5: 93-103.

Bolla, P., D. Dawson, and M. Harrington. (1991). "The Leisure Experience of Women in Ontario." *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 16 (4): 322-48.

Brakus, J. J., H. Schmitt, and L. Zarantonello. (2009). "Brand Experience: What Is It? How Is It Measured? Does It Affect Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (3): 52-68.

Brandt, K. R., J. M. Gardiner, and C. N. Macrae. (2006). "The Distinctiveness Effect in Forenames: The Role of Subjective Experiences and Recognition Memory." *British Journal of Psychology*, 97: 269-80.

Brewer, W. F. (1988). "Memory for Randomly Sampled Autobiographical Events." In *Remembering Reconsidered: Ecological and Traditional Approaches to the Study of Memory*, edited by U. Neisser and E. Winograd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-90.

Bruner, E. (1991). "Transformation of Self in Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18 (2): 238-50.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). "The Scree Test for the Number of Factors." *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1: 245-76.

Celsi, R. L., and J. C. Olson. (1988). "The Role of Involvement in Attention and Comprehension Process." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (September): 210-24.

Cheung, G. W., and R. B. Rensvold. (2002). "Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing MI." *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9: 235-55.

Choi, H. C., and E. Sirakaya. (2005). "Measuring Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Tourism: Development of Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale." *Journal of Travel Research*, 43: 380-94.

Christianson, S. A. (1992). "Do Flashbulb Memories Differ from Other Types of Emotional Memories?" In *Affect and Accuracy in Recall: Studies of Flashbulb Memories*, edited by E. Winograd and U. Neisser. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-211.

Chu, K. H., and S. K. Murrmann. (2006). "Development and Validation of the Hospitality Emotional Labor Scale." *Tourism Management*, 27: 1181-91.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Construct." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (February): 64-73.

Cliff, A. D., and C. Ryan. (1994). "Do Travel Agencies Measure up to Customer Expectation? An Empirical Investigation of Travel Agencies' Service Quality as Measured by SERVQUAL." In *Proceedings of Tourism Down Under*, edited by J. Buchanan-Cheyne and C. Ryan, Massey University, 6-9 December, pp. 553-78.

Cohen, E. (1979). "A phenomenology of Tourist types." *Sociology*, 13: 179-201.

Craik, F. I. M., and R. S. Lockhart. (1972). "Levels of Processing: A Framework for Memory Research." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11: 671-84.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety: The Experience of Play in Work and Games*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., and D. Kleiber. (1992). "Leisure and Self-actualization." In *The Benefits of Leisure*, edited by B. Driver, P. Brown, and G. Peterson. College Park, PA: Venture Press, pp. 91-102.

Delamere, T. A. (1998). "Development of a Scale to Measure Local Resident Attitudes toward the Social Impact of Community Festivals." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Devellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dunman, T., and Mattila, A. S. (2005). "The Role of Affective Factors on Perceived Cruise Vacation Value." *Tourism Management*, 26: 311-23.

Farber, M. E., and T. E. Hall. (2007). "Emotion and Environment: Visitors' Extraordinary Experiences Along the Dalton Highway in Alaska." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 39 (2): 248-70.

Floyd, M. F. (1997). "Pleasure, arousal, and dominance: Exploring affective determinants of recreation satisfaction." *Leisure Sciences*, 19: 83-96.

Floyd, F. J., and K. Widaman. (1995). "Factor Analysis in the Development and Refinement of Clinical Assessment Instruments." *Psychological Assessment*, 7 (3): 286-99.

Fornell, C., and D. F. Larcker. (1981). "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1): 39-50.

Gardner, M. P. (1983). "Advertising Effects on Attributes Recalled and Criteria Used for Brand Evaluations." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (December): 310-18.

Gunter, B. G. (1987). "The Leisure Experience: Selected Properties." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19: 115-30.

Hair, J. F. Jr., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tatham, and W. C. Black. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 5th edition. New York: Prentice Hall.

Hinkins, T. R. (1995). "A Review of Scale Development Practices in the Study of Organizations." *Journal of Management*, 21 (5): 967-88.

Hjemdahl, K. M. (2003). "Negotiating Theme Park Culture." *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, 26: 1-14.

Hoch, S., and J. Deighton. (1989). "Managing What Consumers Learn from Experience." *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (April): 1-20.

Holbrook, M. B., and E. C. Hirschman. (1982). "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (September): 132-40.

Hosany, S., and D. Gilbert. (2009). "Measuring Tourists' Emotional Experiences toward Hedonic Holiday Destinations." *Journal of Travel Research*, 48 (October): 1-14.

Howard, E. A., J. A. H. Tinsley, D. J. Tinsley, and M. S. Holt. (1993). "Attributes of Leisure and Work Experiences." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40 (4): 447-55.

Hu, L., and P. M. Bentler. (1999). "Cut off Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria versus New Alternatives." *Structural Equation Model*, 6: 1-55.

Hull, R. B. (1990). "Emotion and Leisure: Causes and Consequences." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22: 55-67.

Hull, R. B., and S. E. Michael. (1995). "Nature-Based Recreation, Mood Change, and Stress Reduction." *Leisure Sciences*, 17: 1-14.

Hung, K., and J. F. Petrick. (2010). "Developing a Measurement Scale for Constraints to Cruising." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37 (1): 206-28.

IACVB, Kovaleski, D., and G. Sherwin. (2005). *Destination Brand Science*. Washington, DC: Destination Marketing Association International (formerly known as International Association of Convention & Visitors Bureau).

Jamal, T., and K. Hollinshead. (2001). "Tourism and the Forbidden Zone: The Underserved Power of Qualitative Inquiry." *Tourism Management*, 22 (1): 63-82.

Jennings, G., and N. P. Nickerson. (2006). *Quality Tourism Experiences*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Jones, T. O., and E. Sasser, Jr. (1995). "Why Satisfied Customers Defect." *Havard Business Review*, 73 (November-December): 88-99.

Jöreskog, K., and D. Sörbom. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). "An Index of Factorial Simplicity." *Psychometrika*, 39: 31-36.

Keiningham, T., and T. Vavra. (2001). *The Customer Delight Principle*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kerstetter, D., and M. Cho. (2004). "Tourists' Information Search Behavior: The Role of Prior Knowledge and Perceived Credibility." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (4): 961-85.

Kozak, M. (2001). "Repeaters' Behavior at Two Distinct Destinations." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28 (3): 784-807.

Lankford, S. V., and D. Howard. (1994). "Development of a Tourism Impact Scale." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21: 121-39.

Larsen, S. (2007). "Aspects of a Psychology of the Tourist Experience." *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 7 (1): 7-18.

Larsen, S., W. Brun, and T. Ogaard. (2009). "What Tourists Worry About—Construction of a Scale Measuring Tourist Worries." *Tourism Management*, 30: 260-65.

Larsen, S., and D. Jenssen. (2004). "The School Trip: Travelling with, Not to or from." *Scandinavian Journal of Tourism Research*, 4: 43-57.

Latour, S. A., and N. C. Peat. (1979). "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Consumer Research." In *Advances in Consumer Research*, edited by L. W. William. Ann Arbor, MI: Association of Consumer Research, pp. 431-37.

Lee, H. B., and A. L. Comrey. (1979). "Distortions in a Commonly Used Factor Analytic Procedure." *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 14: 301-21.

Lee, Y., J. Dattilo, and D. Howard. (1994). "The Complex and Dynamic Nature of Leisure Experience." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26: 195-211.

Lehto, X. Y., J. T. O'Leary, and A. M. Morrison. (2004). "The Effects of Prior Experience on Vacation Behavior." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (4): 801-18.

Leiss, W. (1979). *The Limits to Satisfaction*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Litwin, M. S. (1995). *How to Measure Survey Reliability and Validity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mannell, R., and D. Kleiber. (1997). *A Social Psychology of Leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.

Mannell, R., and S. E. Iso-Ahola. (1987). "Psychological Nature of Leisure and Tourism Experience." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14: 314-31.

Mannell, R., J. Zuzanek, and R. Larson. (1988). "Leisure State and Flow Experiences: Testing Perceived Freedom and Intrinsic Motivation Hypotheses." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20 (4): 289-304.

Mazursky, D. (1989). "Past Experience and Future Tourism Decisions." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16 (3): 333-44.

Morgan, M., and F. Xu. (2009). "Student Travel Experiences: Memories and Dreams." *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18: 216-36.

Netemeyer, R. G., W. O. Bearden, and S. Sharma. (2003). *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Neumann, M. (1992). "The Trail through Experience: Finding Self in the Recollection of Travel." In *Investigating Subjectivity: Research on Lived Experience*, edited by C. Ellis and M. G. Flaherty. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 176-201.

Noy, C. (2004). "This Trip Really Changed Me: Backpackers' Narratives of Self-change." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (1): 78-102.

Obenour, W., M. Patterson, P. Pedersen, and L. Pearson. (2006). "Conceptualization of a Meaning-Based Research Approach for Tourism Service Experiences." *Tourism Management*, 27: 34-41.

O'Dell, T., and P. Billing. (2005). *Experiencescapes: Tourism, culture, and economy*. Copenhagen Business School Press, Denmark: Morten Hojmark.

Oh, H., A. M. Fiore, and M. Jeong. (2007). "Measuring Experience Economy Concepts: Tourism Applications." *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (November): 119-32.

Ooi, C. S. (2005). "A Theory of Tourism Experiences: The Management of Attention." In *Experiencescapes: Tourism, Culture, and Economy*, edited by T. O'Dell and P. Billing. Copenhagen, Denmark: Copenhagen Business School Press, pp. 51-68.

Otto, J. E., and J. R. B. Ritchie. (1996). "The Service Experience in Tourism." *Tourism Management*, 17 (3): 165-74.

Park, J., and M. Hastak. (1994). "Memory-Based Product Judgments: Effects of Involvement at Encoding and Retrieval." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 534-47.

Pine, J. B., and J. H. Gilmore. (1999). "Welcome to the Experience Economy." *Harvard Business Review* (July-August): 97-105.

Rajaram, S. (1996). "Perceptual Effects on Remembering: Recollective Processes in Picture Recognition Memory." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22: 365-77.

Raju, P., and M. Reilly. (1979). "Product Familiarity and Information-Processing Strategies: An Exploratory Investigation." *Journal of Business Research*, 8: 187-212.

Reder, L. M., D. K. Donavos, and M. A. Erickson. (2002). "Perceptual Match Effects in Direct Tests of Memory: The Role of Contextual Fan." *Memory & Cognition*, 30 (2): 312-23.

Reichheld, F. F. (1993). "Loyalty-Based Management." *Harvard Business Review*, 71 (March-April): 64-73.

Ritchie, J. R. B., and S. Hudson. (2009). "Understanding and Meeting the Challenges of Consumer/Tourist Experience Research." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11: 111-26.

Robinson, J. A. (1976). "Sampling Autobiographical Memory." *Cognitive Psychology*, 8: 578-95.

Ryan, C. (1991). *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Approach*. London: Routledge.

Ryan, C. (1993). *Tourism and Terrorism in Egypt and Kenya: Conflict Update*. London: Research Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism.

Ryan, C. (1995). *Researching Tourist Satisfaction: Issues, Concepts, Problems*. London: Routledge

Ryan, C. (1998). "Saltwater Crocodiles as Tourist Attractions: A Pilot Study." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6 (4): 314-27.

Ryan, C. (2002). *The Tourist Experience*. 2nd edition. New York: Continuum.

Samdahl, D. M. (1991). "Issues in the Measurement of Leisure: A Comparison of Theoretical and Connotative Meanings." *Leisure Sciences*, 13: 33-50.

Sanbomatsu, D. M., and R. H. Fazio. (1990). "The Role of Attitudes in Memory-Based Decision Making." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (October): 614-22.

Schmidt, S. R. (1991). "Can We Have a Distinctive Theory of Memory?" *Memory and Cognition*, 19: 523-42.

Schmitt, B. (1999). "Experiential Marketing." *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15 (1-3): 53-67.

Swinyard, W. R. (1993). "The Effects of Mood, Involvement, and Quality of Store Experience on Shopping Intentions." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20: 271-80.

Talarico, J. M., and D. C. Rubin. (2003). "Confidence, Not Consistency, Characterizes Flashbulb Memories." *Psychological Science*, 14: 455-61.

Tulving, E., S. Kapur, F. I. M. Craik, M. Moscovitch, and S. Houle. (1994). "Hemispheric Encoding/Retrieval Asymmetry in Episodic Memory: Positron Emission Tomography Findings." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 91 (6): 2016-20.

Turner, V. W., and E. M. Bruner. (1986). *The Anthropology of Experience*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Uriely, N. (2005). "The Tourist Experience: Conceptual Developments." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (1): 199-216.

Wang, K., A. Hsieh, S. Chou, and Y. Lin. (2007). "GPTCCC: An Instrument for Measuring Group Package Tour Service." *Tourism Management*, 28: 361-76.

Wilson, E., and C. Harris. (2006). "Meaningful Travel: Women, Independent Travel and the Search for Self and Meaning." *Tourism*, 54 (2): 161-72.

Wirtz, D., J. Kruger, C. N. Scollon, and E. Diener. (2003). "What To Do on Spring Break? The Role of Predicted, On-line, and Remembered Experience in Future Choice." *Psychological Science*, 14: 520-24.

Wu, A. D., Z. Li, and B. D. Zumbo. (2007). "Decoding the Meaning of Factorial Invariance and Updating the Practice of Multi-group Confirmatory Factor Analysis: A Demonstration with TIMSS Data." *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 12 (3): 1-26.

Yoon, Y., and M. Uysal. (2005). "An Examination of the Effects of Motivation and Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Structural Model." *Tourism Management*, 26 (1): 45-56.

Bios

Jong-Hyeong Kim, PhD, is a post-doctoral fellow in tourism at University of Calgary, Canada. His research interests are in tourism marketing with a focus on memorable experience management.

J. R. Brent Ritchie, PhD, is the chair of World Tourism Education Research Centre at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Bryan McCormick, PhD, CTRS, is an associate professor in the department of recreation, park and tourism studies at Indiana University. His research interest includes social psychological elements of leisure behavior in both general populations as well as people with mental illnesses.