

**THE MEDIATING ROLE OF EXPERIENCE QUALITY BETWEEN  
AUTHENTICITY AND SATISFACTION IN A CONTEXT OF CULTURAL-  
HERITAGE TOURISM**

Domínguez-Quintero, Ana M.  
Department of Applied Economics I, University of Seville  
Faculty of Economics and Business Sciences  
Av. Ramón y Cajal, 1, 41018 Seville (Spain)  
[anadq@us.es](mailto:anadq@us.es)  
ORCID: 0000-0001-5066-0216

González-Rodríguez, M. Rosario  
Department of Applied Economics I, University of Seville  
Faculty of Economics and Business Sciences  
Av. Ramón y Cajal, 1, 41018 Seville (Spain)  
[rosaglez@us.es](mailto:rosaglez@us.es)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-6484-4128

Paddison, Brendan  
York Business School, York St John University  
Lord Mayor's Walk, York, YO31 7EX (United Kingdom)  
[b.paddison@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:b.paddison@yorks.ac.uk)  
ORCID: 0000-0003-2896-2837

**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the mediating role of experience quality between the dimensions of authenticity and satisfaction in a context of cultural-heritage tourism. This paper investigates the direct influences of these variables on satisfaction and the indirect influences of two dimensions of authenticity on satisfaction through quality of experience. This study is a pioneer in analysing the influence of each of the two dimensions of authenticity on satisfaction via quality of experience in a cultural-heritage context. A questionnaire survey administered to 205 visitors in the City of York, United Kingdom, was analysed using the structural equation modelling technique. The findings confirmed the direct and indirect influence of the variable authenticity in its double perspective (objective and existential authenticity) on satisfaction. The findings also identified the mediating role of quality of experience between authenticity and satisfaction. It is therefore recommended that cultural tourism attractions in a destination should be offered to provide visitors an authentic

experience and a high quality of personal experience that would favour the satisfaction of consumption.

### **Key Words**

cultural tourism, satisfaction, authenticity, experience quality, structural equation model.

### **Introduction**

The tourism industry has experienced significant growth which is predicted to be sustained. According to WTTC (2015), the contribution of tourism to the world GDP was 9.5% in 2014 and is expected to exceed 10.5% by 2024. According to UNWTO (2016), the arrival of international tourists is expected to grow by 3.3% per year between 2010 and 2030, to reach 1.8 billion by 2030. In 2016 there were 37.6 million inbound visits to the UK, an increase of 4.1% compared with 2015. These figures underscore the importance of tourism activity within the international economy. Public and private agents involved in the management of tourist destinations are showing a growing interest in the study of variables that can improve the satisfaction and fidelity of tourists. Heritage tourism has become popular with an increasing number of tourists seeking a meaningful experience and a relationship with the past (Watson and Waterton, 2011). In addition, increasing academic interest in heritage tourism has resulted in heritage being described as a 'contemporary epidemic' (Urry, 2002, p.5).

The variable authenticity is a relevant explanatory variable in the formation of tourist satisfaction and loyalty in general and with cultural motivation in particular (Kolar and Zabkar, 2010; Shen, Guo and Wu, 2012, Casteran and Roeder, 2013; Hede, Garma, Josiassen, and Thyne, 2014, Lee, Phau, Hughes, Li and Quintal, 2016). Some of these studies consider the variable authenticity as a one-dimensional construct while others consider it in its dual dimension: objective and existential (Kolar and Zabkar, 2010; Shen et al., 2012). This research considers authenticity in its double dimension as this results in a more informed understanding of the influence of authenticity and satisfaction.

A number of authors have found that the quality of experience variable, is important in the formation of the satisfaction and the loyalty of the tourists (Tian and Scott, 2004; Kim,

Ritchie and Tung , 2010, Chen and Chen, 2010 and 2013, Jin, Lee, and Lee, 2015). Otto and Ritchie (1995) define the quality of the experience as the affective component of the experience lived by a tourist in the visited destination. The cognitive-affective approach to satisfaction, mostly adopted in more recent research, has favored the study and use of this variable. Thereby, Kao, Huang and Wu, (2008) examined the mediating role of experience quality in a model of tourist experiences between performance quality and satisfaction. Altunel and Erkut (2015) analyse the mediation effect of experience quality and satisfaction on the relationship between involvement and recommendation intention. This paper explores the possible mediating role of the quality of experience on the relationship that unites the variables authenticity and satisfaction.

Regarding the authenticity variable, Li, Shen and Wen (2016) analyzes the relationship between this variable and the quality of experience in the context of cultural tourism. This work considers the authenticity variable as a one-dimensional construct. There is, however, limited empirical research which has analysed the possible influence or relationship of authenticity in its double dimension on the variable experience quality in the context of cultural-heritage tourism. In accordance with this, the following question is proposed: *Do each of the two dimensions of the authenticity variable exert a certain direct influence on the variables of experience quality?* In addition, this paper will explore if the data confirms the results obtained in previous works and verifies that the quality of experience exerts a positive or direct influence on satisfaction. In this case, the paper seeks to understand if *the experience quality exerts a mediating effect in the influence that each of the two dimensions of authenticity can have on satisfaction.*

The paper is structured as follows: Conceptual Background and Hypotheses, Methodology (sample, measures, data analysis), Results, Discussions and Conclusions, and Theoretical and Managerial Implications.

## **Theoretical Foundations, Research Model and Hypotheses**

### ***Authenticity and Satisfaction***

Recent studies have identified the importance of authenticity in the formation of the satisfaction of cultural tourists (Apostolokis, 2003, Zhou, Zhang and Edelheim, 2013; Hede, Garma, Josiassen, and Thyne, 2014; Lee, Phau, Hughes, Li and Quintal, 2016).

According to Trilling (1972), the original use of this concept arises in museum studies, where experts were interested in differentiating authentic works of art from those that looked to be, especially in the face of economic valuation. This use of the term was extended to tourism, particularly cultural tourism and the valuation of objects related to this activity. There is no consensus regarding the definition of the word authenticity. According to MacCannel, the authenticity of a destination can be defined as a global assessment of "genuineness of a tourist destination" (1973, p.590). Wang (1999) and Reisinger and Steiner (2005) conducted a comprehensive review of the different approaches and interpretations of the concept and identified that most of the works (Kolar and Zabkar, 2010, Shen et al., 2012, Lee et al., 2016) coincide in pointing out two dimensions within this variable: the object-based and the existential. Objective authenticity is an inherent feature of objects and can be interpreted as the authenticity of objects that are original or as the authenticity projected onto objects by tourists (Wang, 1999; Reisinger and Steiner, 2005). Existential authenticity refers to a potential state of personal connection with destiny driven by participation in activities (Wang 1999, Reisinger and Steiner 2005, Steiner and Reisinger 2005).

The variable satisfaction has been widely studied in the field of marketing in general and tourism in particular. There is no single definition of this concept unanimously accepted. However, a number of elements common to most of the contributions can be identified. First, satisfaction is a cognitive or emotional response, second, the response is related to an aspect or specific subject (expectations, product, consumer experience) and generally involves the comparison of a perception with a previously established standard, and third, satisfaction is the response at a time or during a certain time (after consumption, after a choice, during or after an experience ...). Oliver (1997, p. 13) defined satisfaction as "*the consumers' fulfilment response. It is a judgment on the product or service feature, or the product or the service itself, concerning the provision of a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfilment, including levels of under- or over-fulfilment*" In the field of tourism, the most recent definitions consider satisfaction as an evaluation judgment in which cognitive and affective aspects are combined (Bigné, Andreu and Gnoth, 2005; De Rojas and Camarero, 2008; Rodríguez and San Martín, 2008; Yuksel, Yuksel and Bilim, 2010; Chen and Chen, 2010; Lee, et al. 2016). According to Rodríguez and San Martín (2008), satisfaction as an individual's cognitive-affective state derived from a tourist experience. It is this definition that is adopted in this study.

The causal relationship between perception of authenticity and satisfaction has been examined by a number of authors (Lu, Chi and Liu, 2015; Nguyen and Cheung, 2016; Lee et al., 2016). Lu, Chi and Liu (2015) and Nguyen and Cheung (2016) analyse the direct influence of authenticity as a single variable on the satisfaction of cultural tourists, whilst Lee et al., (2016) considers the two dimensions of the authenticity variable, objective-and-existential, and analyses the influence of each on satisfaction. The first and the third of these papers found that the relationship between authenticity and satisfaction was not significant. However, Nguyen and Cheung (2016) identified that a high perception of the authenticity also implies a high level of satisfaction in heritage tourism. It is suggested, therefore, that the consideration of the double dimension of authenticity is more enriching and can provide further clarity and information on the characteristics of the relationships explored in this study. This research, therefore, considers the two dimensions of the authenticity variable, objective-and-existential, and analyses the influence of each on satisfaction of cultural tourists. To verify if our data confirms the results obtained by the works mentioned above and to deepen the knowledge of these relations, the following hypotheses are proposed:

*H1: The higher the objective authenticity that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of satisfaction they have. ( $a > 0$ )*

*H2: The higher the existencial authenticity that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of satisfaction they have. ( $b > 0$ )*

Kolar and Zabkar (2010) and Shen et al. (2012) find that the objective dimension of authenticity positively influences its existential dimension. In the context of cultural tourism, it is reasonable to suggest that a high perception of objective authenticity, a positive evaluation of architecture, materials, presentation of resources, activities, all positively influences the perception of the existential authenticity, and it can favour the feeling of connection and the immersion of the tourists in the local culture. To verify this and to explore if the findings of this research corroborates the results obtained by Kolar and Zabkar (2010) and Shen et al. (2012), the contrast hypothesis three of the model is as follows:

*H3: The higher the objective authenticity that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of existencial authenticity they experience. ( $c > 0$ )*

### ***Authenticity and Experience Quality***

In the early 1980s, within the field of consumer satisfaction studies, the experimental approach focused on the individual's affective response following the act of consumption (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Within this approach, Otto and Ritchie (1995; 1996) introduced the concept of quality of experience and applied this concept to leisure and tourism services. Otto stated that: “*The affective component of the service experience has been shown to comprise the subjective, emotional and highly personal responses to various aspects of service delivery which lead to satisfaction with the service overall*” (1996, p.169). Chang and Horng (2010, p.2403) defined the quality of experience as: “*a representation how customers emotionally evaluate their experiences as they participate in consumption activities, others customers, customers’ companions, and other elements*”.

Different scales have been proposed to measure the quality of the experience. Otto and Ritchie’s scale (1996) is composed of four dimensions (hedonic, peace of mind, involvement, and recognition). Kao, Huang and Wu's scale (2008) also identified four dimensions which consist of immersion, surprise, participation, and fun. Chang and Horng (2010) considers a scale with five dimensions including physical surroundings, service providers, other customer, customer's companions and customers themselves.

The relationship between authenticity and quality of experience variables has thus far not been fully explored. Hang’s (2010) study identified the existence of a positive linear correlation between both variables but does not raise the contrast of the hypothesis concerning the existence of such relationship. Li, Shen and Wen (2016) analyzes the aforementioned relationship in a context of cultural tourism. This work considers authenticity as a one-dimensional construct and their results indicate the existence of a positive influence of the authenticity on the quality of the experience. This work considers the two dimensions of authenticity and it is suggested that each of these two dimensions, objective and existential, can influence the perception of the quality of the experience by tourists in a context of cultural tourism. Consequently, hypotheses four and five are identified as follows:

H4: *The higher the objective authenticity that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of experience quality they have. ( $d > 0$ )*

H5: *The higher the existencial authenticity that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of experience quality they have. ( $e > 0$ )*

### ***Experience Quality and Satisfaction***

The influence of experience quality on the satisfaction of cultural-heritage tourists has been extensively studied (Chen and Chen, 2010, Li, Shen and Wen, 2016, Nguyen and Cheung, Lee et al., 2016). In all of these works it has been shown that the quality of the influence exerts a positive or direct influence on the satisfaction of tourists. To verify if the data from this study supports the results obtained in these previous studies, the following hypothesis six is proposed:

*H6: The higher the experience quality that the heritage tourists perceive, the higher the level of satisfaction they have. ( $f > 0$ )*

The proposed model is shown in Figure 1.

[Insert figure 1 ]

### ***Mediating effects***

A deeper study of the relationships raised in the model leads to a consideration of the significance of the indirect effects that may arise. This research will therefore seek to understand if each of the two dimensions of authenticity have an influence on satisfaction through the quality of experience. To answer these questions the following hypotheses are proposed:

*H7: Via experience quality, the objective authenticity positively influences satisfaction ( $g = d * f > 0$ )*

*H8: Via existential authenticity and via experience quality, the objective authenticity positively influences satisfaction ( $h = c * e * f > 0$ )*

*H9: Via experience quality, the existential authenticity positively influences satisfaction ( $i = e * f > 0$ )*

## **Method**

### ***Sample and Data Collection***

The research population of this study is visitors aged eighteen years or older who visit the city of York. Data collection was conducted in November 2016 in the Visit

York Visitor Information Centre (VIC) and in the surroundings of the Cathedral and the York Castle Museum, where 218 completed questionnaires were obtained. After excluding 13 cases due to excessive missing data and when a response pattern was observed (Hair et al., 2017), 205 questionnaires (94.04%) were retained as valid for the empirical analysis. According to Green (1991, p. 503), for an 80% confidence level and a 5% error level for a maximum of 3 predictors (which in our model feature the satisfaction variable), the minimum sampling size required for the measurement of the medium-sized effects between the variables would be 76 surveys. Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents.

### *Measures*

The questionnaire's design-base is a literature review of cultural tourism. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish, English, French, German and Mandarin in order to include tourists of many different nationalities. The first part includes questions regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of the interviewee (gender, age, place of origin, level of studies). The second section asks respondents for information regarding their visit, such as the duration of the visit, cultural events or attractions visited, and the fundamental objective of the trip. The third part of the questionnaire includes the measurement of the constructs. These were measured using question statements adapted from academic studies related to this topic.

A first version of the questionnaire was presented to experts from the VIC in York (Visit York) who made suggestions for the adaptation of certain items or for improvement in the writing therein. In addition, a pilot survey was conducted to ensure the validity of the content.

The measurement of the authenticity variable in its double perspective – objective authenticity and existential authenticity – is based on the work by Kolar and Zabkar (2010) and employs five items for objective dimension and six items for the existential dimension. This double perspective of authenticity provides a richer version of this variable than that gathered by others author. Quality of the experience is measured using an adaptation of the scale proposed by Otto and Ritchie (1996) and it employs five items for the measurements. The measurement of the satisfaction variable is an adaption of the multi-dimensional scale provided by Oliver (1997). The authors have included two items that refer to the affective and cognitive evaluation of satisfaction and a third item for a global evaluation of satisfaction. A seven-point Likert scale was used for the measurement of all the variables, whereby the score



1 refers to *strongly disagree*, and 7 refers to *strongly agree*.

### ***Data Analysis***

The research model outlined in Figure 1 has been tested using Partial Least Squares (PLS) - a variance-based structural equation modelling technique. The following reasons justify the choice of PLS (Roldán & Sánchez-Franco, 2012): 1) the complexity of the research model, not only concerning the type of variables included in the model (reflective, formative, first and higher order constructs), but also the relationships established between the variables (direct mediating and moderating relations); 2) to explore and/or predict the behaviour of the dependent variables; 3) the non-normality of the research model's variables; 4) to allow robust estimations when the number of observations is small (Reinartz, Haenlein, & Henseler, 2009). In order to conduct the analysis, SmartPLS 3.4 software is used.

For the assessment of the research model in York, a two-stage procedure was conducted (Hair et al., 2018). First, the measurement model is evaluated (outer model) by evaluating the reliability and validity of composite Mode A constructs. Second, the structural model is evaluated (inner model) by assessing the path coefficients, explanatory power ( $R^2$ ), and the values of the Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) as an approximate model fit for PLS-SEM (Henseler, Hubona, and Ray 2016).

### **Results**

A PLS model must be analysed and interpreted in two stages (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarsted, 2014). First, the measurement model is evaluated. The measurement model allows evaluating if the theoretical concepts or constructs are measured correctly through the items observed. The evaluation is different according to the construct being formative or reflective. Second, the structural model is evaluated. The magnitude and significance of the causal relationships between the different variables is assessed from this model.

#### ***Measurement Model***

In the first stage of the analysis, the assessment of the measurement model allows 19 items to be observed. The assessment of the measurement model for Composite Mode A entails an

evaluation of the validity and reliability (Hair et al., 2017). Table 2 shows that the indicators of Composite Mode A variables meet reliability requirements since, in general, they are higher than 0.7. In addition, there are some items with a loading of 0.4–0.7. These items should be considered for removal if they increase the Composite Reliability (CR) and AVE to a level above the threshold. However, the decision is to retain them to support the content validity of the scale. Table 2 shows that the CR are greater than 0.7 and the AVE of the constructs is higher than 0.5, and therefore convergent validity is acceptable (Hair et al., 2017). The fact that CR and AVE surpass the 0.5 threshold confirms that the removal of indicators in the two groups with loadings 0.4–0.7 was unnecessary. Table 3 shows that all variables achieve discriminant validity following both the Fornell-Larcker and the HTMT criteria. This result suggests that each construct is distinct from other constructs (Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt, 2015).

[Insert Table 2]

[Insert Table 3]

### ***Structural Model***

In the second stage of analysis, the structural model was assessed. Table 4 shows the path coefficients and the hypothesis testing by using 5,000 bootstrap resamples and the confidence intervals at 95%. From Table 4 and Figure 2, it can be observed that the objective and existential authenticity exerts a positive and significant influence on satisfaction ( $a=0.317$  and  $b=0.322$ ). Hence, Hypotheses H1 and H2 are confirmed. Similarly, it can be observed that objective authenticity exerts a positive and significant influence on existential authenticity ( $c= 0.680$ ). Hence, Hypothesis H3 is confirmed. Likewise, hypotheses H4 and H5 are also supported since a positive and significant effect of the objective and existential authenticity are observed on experience quality ( $d=0.351$  and  $e=0.410$ ). Hypotheses H6 is confirmed on observing a positive influence of the quality of the experience on satisfaction ( $f=0.171$ ). Table 4 also reports the mediating relationships in the model as the product of the coefficients of each of the causal relations in the mediating chain (Hayes, Preacher, and Myers, 2011). Based on the one-tailed t-test, the indirect effect of the objective authenticity through experience quality on satisfaction ( $g=d*f= 0.060$ ). The indirect effect of objective authenticity through experience quality and existential authenticity on satisfaction is also significant ( $h=c*e*f=0.048$ ). This supports Hypothesis H7 and Hypothesis H8. The indirect

effect of the existential authenticity through experience quality on satisfaction ( $i=e*f= 0.070$ ) is significant. The importance of these indirect effects on satisfaction has been tested using 5,000 bootstrap resamples (Chin, Kim and Lee 2013). The model has predictive validity for the three endogenous variables since the coefficient  $Q^2$  is positive in all three cases. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) as an approximate fit of the composite factor model (Henseler, Hubona, and Ray 2016) is also computed. The results revealed that the SRMR model fits values of 0.081. Since these values are lower than 0.10, they can be considered as acceptable for PLS-SEM.

[Insert Figure 2]

[Insert Table 4]

Three Multigroup analyses have also been conducted to support the research model and the analysis detailed above. First, given the high percentage of modern tourists (aged 18-34), a multigroup analysis with two groups “modern” versus “non-modern” tourists has been conducted. Second, differences on the model relationships might be observed regarding the groups “domestic” versus “non-domestic” tourists encouraging another multigroup analysis. Lastly, the analysis of possible differences between “strictly cultural” versus “others” tourists appears to be appropriate in the cultural context of the study. The findings reveal no significant differences between the path coefficients in the three multigroup analyses supporting the specification of the research model proposed.

## **Discussion and Conclusions**

This study tests a structural model integrating constructs of objective and existential authenticity, quality of experience and satisfaction in a context of cultural-heritage tourism. Focusing on the research model relationships, the influences of objective and existential authenticity on satisfaction were found to be significant. The findings suggest that tourists with positive perceived authenticity are better satisfied with the cultural site. These results are different to those obtained by Lu, Chi and Liu (2015) and Lee et al. (2016) who found that this relationship was not significant. However, the results from this research coincide with those obtained by Nguyen and Cheung (2016) and have identified that objective authenticity can be considered as a determinant of existential authenticity. This has also been observed by Kolar and Zabkar (2010). These results mean that the objective authenticity induce the tourist to experience subjective perceptions attached to the objects’ authenticity.

The model also highlights the relationship not previously studied in tourism and therefore contributes to our understanding of the factors leading to cultural consumption. Positive influence of authenticity (objective and existential) on the experience quality has been confirmed.

The study also shows the significant influence of the experience quality on satisfaction. This is consistent with other research in this area (Tian Cole and Scott, 2004; Kao et al., 2008; Chen and Chen, 2010; Hang, 2010; Altunel and Erkut, 2015).

The influences of the objective and existential authenticity on satisfaction are even greater if the mediating effects that appear in the model are considered. The results reveal that the greatest influence of objective authenticity is on satisfaction via existential authenticity and via experience quality and the greatest influence of existential authenticity is on satisfaction via experience quality. There is limited research that has examined this mediating relationship.

This study was motivated by the need to strengthen the understanding of the role of objective authenticity, existential authenticity, and experience quality on satisfaction. In this paper, not only are the direct influences of these variables on satisfaction analysed but the indirect influences of the predictor variables on the endogenous variables of the model were also studied. Testing these relationships leads to a better understanding of how these variables interact in a cultural-heritage tourist destination. This study is a pioneer in analysing the influence of each of the two dimensions of authenticity on satisfaction via quality of experience in a cultural-heritage context. The findings confirmed the importance of the variable authenticity in its double perspective (objective and existential authenticity) and quality of experience in cultural tourism consumption. Cultural tourist attractions in a destination should be offered to provide visitors an authentic experience and a high quality of personal experience that in turn would favour the satisfaction of consumption.

### **Theoretical and Managerial Implications**

Regarding the notion of authenticity, the findings of this study reveal that cultural offerings were perceived not only as tangible tourism attractions but also as existential experiences derived from the different feelings attached to the tourism products (sense of enjoyment and escape). The results clearly show that visitors interpret authenticity in its double dimension (objective and existential authenticity) and that the concept of authenticity may have different

meanings depending on the destination characteristics. The consideration of the notion of authenticity constitutes a key element in the present study since there is limited research in the generic and cultural-heritage tourism literature that has considered the influence of perceived authenticity on either satisfaction and behavioural intentions (Sedmak and Mihalic, 2008; Ramkisson and Uysal, 2011). The findings collaborate with Kolar and Zabakar (2010) and Ramkisson and Uysal (2011) who also noted that perceived authenticity in its double perspective influences successful consumption of cultural attractions. The theoretical contribution of this research aims at enriching the understanding of the complexity of the authenticity concept as a multi-dimensional construct and to provide relevant information for tourism marketers, planners and policy-makers to offer authentic experience at heritage sites.

Another theoretical implication and contribution derived from the research model is the significant influence of perceived authenticity on quality of experience and the significant and positive mediating effect of quality of experience between both dimensions of authenticity and satisfaction. Cultural offerings seek to provide visitors with authentic experiences that influence the quality of the tourist experience. Thus, this study also contributes to the generic and cultural-heritage literature by examining those relationships that thus far has not been analysed.

In addition to the theoretical implications of this study, managerial implications should also be identified. According to the relationships found in the research model, tourism marketers, planners and policy-makers should pay attention to the objective and existential dimension of authenticity to improve the quality of the tourist experience. Both dimensions should be considered as key factors in achieving differentiation and the competitive positioning of a destination in relation to other cultural-heritage destinations. Policy makers should consider these variables and identify destination scenarios where tourists are able to create their own authentic experiences. In order to provide a positive cultural experience, it is necessary to meet the expectations of visitors. In this sense, there must be correspondence between tourism advertisements and the offered experience. The marketing messages should be properly designed and communicated to ensure that tourists get the experience presented to them.

Managers of cultural tourist destinations should pay attention to architecture, faithful restoration of buildings, harmony of the buildings with the context of the destination, and provide attractive and complete heritage information. Tourist destination managers should pay special attention to the management of tourist flows ensure tourists are able to enjoy the

environment without crowds of people. The cultural experience improves if heritage managers design strategies to meet expectations regarding the components of peace of mind, cultural experience, and involvement in the traditions and customs with the local population. The environment should allow tourists to connect with the history of the place and its inhabitants and facilitate the lived emotions that make the experience authentic and memorable. In this sense, it is crucial that cultural tourism authorities present the cultural heritage within a setting that allows tourists to immerse themselves in different historical periods of the destination with accurate and detailed information. The symbolic and simulated elements must be carefully presented to facilitate the imagination and enjoyment of tourists. There must be an adequate balance between genuine and simulated objects in what is described here as the performance space. While simulated objects can facilitate the imagination and recreation of an earlier period of history, their excessive use may seem frivolous. It would be advisable that a mixture of genuine and simulated objects be used in order to stimulate the imagination and the enjoyment of tourists.

To improve the tourist experience of visitors, the destination should improve all elements that interact with tourists, from street cleaning and security to noise levels. Tourism managers should facilitate the meeting and connection with the local population, service workers and local residents. Tourists usually remember with pleasure the hospitality with which they have received. This provokes positive feelings and makes their experience memorable and authentic.

Tourist perceptions of authenticity, objective and existential, are important because both dimensions are the means by which individuals connect the materiality of visited space to the significance of their lived experiences (Rickly & McCabe, 2017, p.65). This increases the likelihood of the experience been memorable and unique to each person and increases the likelihood that tourists are satisfied with their visit.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

There are a number of limitations that should be highlighted and avenues that merit further investigation. First, no minimum period of stay by the respondent was stipulated. Therefore, it would be interesting to interview people who stayed at the destination for several days so that the involvement of tourists with the place visited and with its residents could be observed. The active participation of tourists in the cultural life of the destination would

therefore be encouraged, which would enhance the Experience Quality and consequently lead to greater Satisfaction and a better recommendation of the visit.

The analysis of the causal relationships has hitherto been restricted to the city of York and therefore limits generalisation of the study's finding. It would therefore be interesting to contrast the relationships explored in the research model with those of another cultural destination. A cross-cultural study (multi-group analysis) could be employed that would not only allow the validity of the measurement model to be analysed in various cultural contexts, but would also enable the detection of any significant differences in certain causal relationships between the tourist destinations involved. Furthermore, the study sample size is another limitation that should be acknowledged. Although, the sample size used met the sample size requirements for Partial Least estimation, the fairly small sample size limits the degree of generalisation and validation of the model.

**Table 1.** Respondent Demographics

	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	41.5%
Female	58.5%
<i>Age</i>	
18-24	39.0%
25-34	21.0%
35-44	13.8%
45-54	11.8%
55-64	10.3%
Over 65	4.1%
<i>Level of studies</i>	
Primary	0.0%
Secondary	22.1%
A-levels/Professional training	47.9%
University studies	30.0%
<i>Origin</i>	
United Kingdom	62.2%
European Union (except U.K.)	11.9%
Rest of the world	25.9%
<i>Main aim of the visit</i>	
Visit friends or family	13.7%
Cultural tourism	40.6%
Congress/Business	0.0%
Studies	14.1%
Shopping	11.2%
Other	20.4%



**Table 2:** Measurement model for Mode A composites: loadings, construct reliability and convergent validity

<i>Constructs/ items</i>	<i>Weights</i>	<i>Loading</i>	<i>CR</i>	<i>AVE</i>
<b>Experience Quality</b>			0.829	0.500
EQ1: I've had fun	0.245***(5.616)	0.756		
EQ2: I've felt at ease and relaxed during the visit	0.265***(5.361)	0.684		
EQ3: I believe that visiting a cultural heritage site has been a good learning experience and instructive	0.346***(8.550)	0.731		
EQ4: I have escaped from the daily routine and done something really new in my visit	0.257***(6.113)	0.614		
EQ5: I believe that my belongings and myself have been safe during the visit	0.310***(6.817)	0.717		
<b>Objective Authenticity</b>			0.913	0.679
AUT1: The overall architecture and impression of the buildings inspired	0.252***(16.628)	0.851		
AUT2: Restoring historic buildings respects the same style (architecture, furniture, utensils, etc...)	0.239***(14.903)	0.844		
AUT3: I liked the peculiarities about the interior design and furnishings	0.254***(13.669)	0.845		
AUT4: I liked the way the site blends with the attractive landscape, scenery, historical ensemble, the town	0.238***(17.341)	0.828		
AUT5: I liked the information about the site and I found it interesting	0.230***(14.398)	0.748		
<b>Existential Authenticity</b>			0.885	0.563
AUT6: I liked special arrangements, events, concerts, celebrations connected to the site	0.192***(10.658)	0.687		
AUT7: The visit provided a thorough insight into different historical periods of the city	0.246***(12.723)	0.766		
AUT8: During the visit I felt the related history, legends and historical personalities	0.201***(13.055)	0.764		
AUT9: I enjoyed a unique experience that allowed me to contact with the local people, their traditions and customs	0.202***(12.613)	0.782		
AUT10: I liked the calm and peaceful atmosphere during the visit	0.240***(12.611)	0.745		
AUT11: I felt connected with human history and civilization	0.248***(11.949)	0.754		
<b>Satisfaction</b>			0.903	0.746
SAT1: This is one of the best destinations I could have visited	0.341***(12.444)	0.810		
SAT2: Overall, I am pleased with my decision to visit the cultural heritage in Seville / York	0.423***(17.008)	0.896		
SAT3: My overall satisfaction towards visiting York's cultural heritage	0.390***(17.301)	0.884		

Note:\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

**Table 3: Discriminant validity**

Constructs	Fornell-Larcker Criterion				Heterotrait–monotrait ratio Criterion			
	OA	EA	EQ	SA	OA	EA	EQ	SA
<b>OA</b>	<b>0.824</b>							
<b>EA</b>	0.680	<b>0.750</b>			0.784			
<b>EQ</b>	0.630	0.649	<b>0.702</b>		0.758	0.797		
<b>SA</b>	0.644	0.649	0.580	<b>0.864</b>	0.748	0.766	0.721	

Notes: EA: Existential Authenticity; OA: Objective Authenticity; E Q: Experience Quality; SA: Satisfaction;  
Fornell-Larcker Criterion: Diagonal elements (bold) are the square root of the variance shared between the constructs and their measures (AVE: average variance extracted). Off-diagonal are the correlations among constructs. For the discriminant validity, diagonal elements should be larger than off-diagonal elements.

**Table 4: Structural Model results**

<b>Relationships</b>	$R_{SAT}^2 = 0.512 / Q^2 = 0.366$ $R_{EA}^2 = 0.463 / Q^2 = 0.242$ $R_{EQ}^2 = 0.487 / Q^2 = 0.219$
<b>H1: OA-&gt;SAT (a &gt; 0)</b>	a= 0.317 [0.122;0.522]
<b>H2: EA-&gt;SAT (b &gt; 0)</b>	b= 0.322 [0.150;0.456]
<b>H3: OA-&gt;EA (c &gt; 0)</b>	c= 0.680 [0.524;0.770]
<b>H4: OA-&gt;EQ (d &gt; 0)</b>	d= 0.351 [0.111;0.413]
<b>H5: EA-&gt;EQ (e &gt; 0)</b>	e= 0.410 [0.271;0.566]
<b>H6: EQ&gt;SA (f&gt;0)</b>	f= 0.171 [0.089;0.356]
<b>H7: OA*EQ-&gt;SAT (g=d*f &gt; 0)</b>	g= 0.060 [0.017;0.131]
<b>H8: OA*EA*EQ&gt;SAT (h=c*e*f&gt;0)</b>	h= 0.048 [0.024;0.109]
<b>H9: EA*EQ-&gt;SAT (i=e*f &gt; 0)</b>	i=0.070 [0.038;0.159]

Notes: QE: Quality Experience; OA: Objective Authenticity; EA: Existential Authenticity; SAT: Satisfaction.

Bootstrapping 95% confidence intervals bias corrected in square brackets (based on n = 5000 subsamples).

## REFERENCES

- Altunel, M. C., and Erkut, B. (2015). Cultural tourism in Istanbul: The mediation effect of tourist experience and satisfaction on the relationship between involvement and recommendation intention. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 4(4), 213-221.
- Apostolakis, A. (2003). The convergence process in Heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(4), 795-812.
- Bigné, J.E., Andreu, L. and Gnoth, J. (2005). The Theme Park Experience: An Analysis of Pleasure, Arousal and Satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 834-844.
- Bryce, D., Curran, R., O'Gorman, K., & Taheri, B. (2015). Visitors' engagement and authenticity: Japanese heritage consumption. *Tourism Management*, 46, 571-581.
- Castéran, H. y Roederer, C. (2013). Does authenticity really affect behavior? The case of the Strasbourg Christmas Market. *Tourism Management*, 36, 153-163.
- Chang, C.T-Y. and Horng, S-C.(2010). Conceptualizing and measuring experience quality: the customer's perspective. *The Service Industries Journal*, 30(14), 2401-2419.
- Chen, C-F. and Chen,F-S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, 29-35.
- Chen, C-F. and Chen, P-C (2013). Another look at heritage tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 236-240.
- Chin, W. W., and Dibbern, J. (2010). A Permutation Based Procedure for Multi-Group PLS Analysis: Results of Tests of Differences on Simulated Data and a Cross Cultural Analysis of the Sourcing of Information System Services between Germany and the USA. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications*, edited band V. Esposito Vinzi, W. W. Chin, J. Henseler, and H. Wang, 171–93. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Del Bosque, I. R. and San Martín, H. (2008).Tourist Satisfaction: A cognitive-affective Model. *Annals of Tourist Research*, 35(2), 551-573.
- De Rojas, C. y Camarero, C. (2008). Visitors' experience, mood and satisfaction in a heritage context: Evidence from an interpretation center. *Tourism Management*, 29, 525-537.
- Green, S.B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26, 499-510.
- Hede, A-M., Garma, R., Josiassen,A., and Thyne, M. (2014). Perceived authenticity of the visitor experience in museums: Conceptualization and initial empirical findings. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(7-8), 1395-1412.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., and Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publications.

- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., and Gudergan, S.P. (2018). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Henseler, J., G. Hubona, and Raand, P. A. (2016). Using PLS Path Modeling in New Technology Research: Updated Guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116 (1), 2–20.
- Henseler, J., C. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt. (2016). Testing Measurement Invariance of Composites Using Partial Least Squares. *International Marketing Review*, 33(3) 405–31.
- Henseler, J., C. Ringle, and Sinkovics, R..(2009). The Use of Partial Least Squares path Modeling in International Marketing. *Advances in International Marketing*, 20(1), 277–320.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *The Journal of Marketing*, 6(3), 92-10.
- Holbrook, M.B. y Hirschman, E.C. (1982). The experimental aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 132-140.
- Jin, N. P., Lee, S., and Lee, H. (2015). The effect of experience quality on perceived value, satisfaction, image and behavioral intention of water park patrons: New versus repeat visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(1), 82-95.
- Kao, Y-F., Huang, L-S. and Wu, C-H. (2008). Effects of Theatrical Elements on Experiential Quality and Loyalty Intentions for Theme Parks. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 163-174.
- Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. R., and Tung, V. W. S. (2010). The effect of memorable experience on behavioral intentions in tourism: A structural equation modeling approach. *Tourism Analysis*, 15(6), 637-648.
- Kolar, T. and Zabkar, V. (2010). A consumer-based model of authenticity: An oxymoron or the foundation of cultural heritage marketing? *Tourism Management*, 31, 652-664.
- Lee, S., Phau, I., Hughes, M., Li, Y. F., and Quintal, V. (2016). Heritage tourism in Singapore Chinatown: A perceived value approach to authenticity and satisfaction. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 33(7), 981-998.
- Li, X., Shen, H., and Wen, H. (2016). A Study on Tourists Perceived Authenticity towards Experience Quality and Behavior Intention of Cultural Heritage in Macao. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 8(4), 117-123.
- Lu, L., Chi, C. G., & Liu, Y. (2015). Authenticity, involvement, and image: Evaluating tourist experiences at historic districts. *Tourism Management*, 50, 85-96.
- Nguyen, T. H. H., & Cheung, C. (2016). Chinese heritage tourists to heritage sites: what are the effects of heritage motivation and perceived authenticity on satisfaction?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(11), 1155-1168.
- Oliver, R.L. (1997): *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

- Otto, J.E. and Brent Ritchie, J.R. (1995). Exploring the Quality of the Service Experience: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. *Advances in Services Marketing and Management*, 4, 37-61.
- Otto, J.E. and Brent Ritchie, J.R. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(3), 165-174.
- Reisinger, Y. and Steiner, C.J. (2005): Reconceptualizing Object Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), 65-86.
- Rickly, J. M., and McCabe, S. (2017). Authenticity for tourism design and experience. *Design Science in Tourism* (pp. 55-68). Springer, Cham.Rodríguez
- Del Bosque, I. and San Martín, H. (2008). Tourist Satisfaction: A cognitive-affective Model. *Annals of Tourist Research*, 35(2), 551-573.
- Roldán, J. L. and Sánchez-Franco, M. J. (2012). Variance-Based Structural Equation Modelling: Guidelines for Using Partial Least Squares in Information Systems Research. *Research Methodologies, Innovations and Philosophies in Software Systems Engineering and Information Systems*, edited band M. Mora, O. Gelman, A. Steenkamp, and M. Raisinghani, 193– 221. Hersheand, PA: IGI Global.
- Sarstedt, M., J. Henseler, and C. Ringle. (2011). Multigroup Analysis in Partial Least Squares (PLS) Path Modelling: Alternative Methods and Empirical Results. *Advances in International Marketing*, 22(1), 195–218.
- Shen, S., Guo, J. and Wu, Y. (2012). Investigating the Structural Relationships among Authenticity, Loyalty, Involvement, and Attitude toward World Cultural Heritage Sites: An Empirical Study of Nanjing Xiaoling Tomb, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 10-121.
- Steiner, C.J. and Reisinger, Y. (2005). Understanding Existential Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 299-318.
- Tian Cole, S. and Scott, D. (2004). Examining the mediating role of experience of quality in model of tourist experiences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 16(1), 79-90.
- Tiberghien, G., Bremner, H., & Milne, S. (2017). Performance and visitors' perception of authenticity in eco-cultural tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(2), 287-300.
- Timothy, D. J. (Ed.). (2017). *Managing heritage and cultural tourism resources: Critical essays*, Volume one. Routledge.
- Urry, J (2002) *The tourist gaze* (published in association with theory, culture & society). 2nd edn. London: Sage Publications.
- Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26, N° 2, (349-370)
- Watson, S. and Waterton E. (2011). Introduction: Heritage and Community Engagement'. In E. Waterton and S. Watson, (eds) *Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation?* London: Routledge.

WTTC (2015). Travel & Tourism. Economic impact 2014 world. World Travel and Tourism Council. London. UK.

Yüksel, A., Yüksel, F. and Bilim, Y. (2010). Destination attachment: Effects on customer satisfaction and cognitive, affective and conative loyalty. *Tourism Management*, 31, 274-284.

Zhou, Q. B., Zhang, J., & Edelheim, J. R. (2013). Rethinking traditional Chinese culture: A consumer-based model regarding the authenticity of Chinese calligraphic landscape. *Tourism Management*, 36, 99-112.

<https://www.visitbritain.org/forecast>

**Table 1.** Respondent Demographics

	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	41.5%
Female	58.5%
<i>Age</i>	
18-24	39.0%
25-34	21.0%
35-44	13.8%
45-54	11.8%
55-64	10.3%
Over 65	4.1%
<i>Level of studies</i>	
Primary	0.0%
Secondary	22.1%
A-levels/Professional training	47.9%
University studies	30.0%
<i>Origin</i>	
United Kingdom	62.2%
European Union (except U.K.)	11.9%
Rest of the world	25.9%
<i>Main aim of the visit</i>	
Visit friends or family	13.7%
Cultural tourism	40.6%
Congress/Business	0.0%
Studies	14.1%
Shopping	11.2%
Other	20.4%



**Table 2:** Measurement model for Mode A composites: loadings, construct reliability and convergent validity

<i>Constructs/ items</i>	<i>Weights</i>	<i>Loading</i>	<i>CR</i>	<i>AVE</i>
<b>Experience Quality</b>			0.829	0.500
EQ1: I've had fun	0.245***(5.616)	0.756		
EQ2: I've felt at ease and relaxed during the visit	0.265***(5.361)	0.684		
EQ3: I believe that visiting a cultural heritage site has been a good learning experience and instructive	0.346***(8.550)	0.731		
EQ4: I have escaped from the daily routine and done something really new in my visit	0.257***(6.113)	0.614		
EQ5: I believe that my belongings and myself have been safe during the visit	0.310***(6.817)	0.717		
<b>Objective Authenticity</b>			0.913	0.679
AUT1: The overall architecture and impression of the buildings inspired	0.252***(16.628)	0.851		
AUT2: Restoring historic buildings respects the same style (architecture, furniture, utensils, etc...)	0.239***(14.903)	0.844		
AUT3: I liked the peculiarities about the interior design and furnishings	0.254***(13.669)	0.845		
AUT4: I liked the way the site blends with the attractive landscape, scenery, historical ensemble, the town	0.238***(17.341)	0.828		
AUT5: I liked the information about the site and I found it interesting	0.230***(14.398)	0.748		
<b>Existential Authenticity</b>			0.885	0.563
AUT6: I liked special arrangements, events, concerts, celebrations connected to the site	0.192***(10.658)	0.687		
AUT7: The visit provided a thorough insight into different historical periods of the city	0.246***(12.723)	0.766		
AUT8: During the visit I felt the related history, legends and historical personalities	0.201***(13.055)	0.764		
AUT9: I enjoyed a unique experience that allowed me to contact with the local people, their traditions and customs	0.202***(12.613)	0.782		
AUT10: I liked the calm and peaceful atmosphere during the visit	0.240***(12.611)	0.745		
AUT11: I felt connected with human history and civilization	0.248***(11.949)	0.754		
<b>Satisfaction</b>			0.903	0.746
SAT1: This is one of the best destinations I could have visited	0.341***(12.444)	0.810		
SAT2: Overall, I am pleased with my decision to visit the cultural heritage in Seville / York	0.423***(17.008)	0.896		
SAT3: My overall satisfaction towards visiting York's cultural heritage	0.390***(17.301)	0.884		

Note:\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

**Table 3: Discriminant validity**

Constructs	Fornell-Larcker Criterion				Heterotrait–monotrait ratio Criterion			
	OA	EA	EQ	SA	OA	EA	EQ	SA
OA	<b>0.824</b>							
EA	0.680	<b>0.750</b>			0.784			
EQ	0.630	0.649	<b>0.702</b>		0.758	0.797		
SA	0.644	0.649	0.580	<b>0.864</b>	0.748	0.766	0.721	


Notes: EA: Existential Authenticity; OA: Objective Authenticity; E Q: Experience Quality; SA: Satisfaction;  
Fornell-Larcker Criterion: Diagonal elements (bold) are the square root of the variance shared between the constructs and their measures (AVE: average variance extracted). Off-diagonal are the correlations among constructs. For the discriminant validity, diagonal elements should be larger than off-diagonal elements.

**Table 4: Structural Model results**

<b>Relationships</b>	$R^2_{SAT} = 0.512 / Q^2 = 0.366$ $R^2_{EA} = 0.463 / Q^2 = 0.242$ $R^2_{EQ} = 0.487 / Q^2 = 0.219$
<b>H1: OA-&gt;SAT (a &gt; 0)</b>	a= 0.317 [0.122;0.522]
<b>H2: EA-&gt;SAT (b &gt; 0)</b>	b= 0.322 [0.150;0.456]
<b>H3: OA-&gt;EA (c &gt; 0)</b>	c= 0.680 [0.524;0.770]
<b>H4: OA-&gt;EQ (d &gt; 0)</b>	d= 0.351 [0.111;0.413]
<b>H5: EA-&gt;EQ (e &gt; 0)</b>	e= 0.410 [0.271;0.566]
<b>H6: EQ&gt;SA (f&gt;0)</b>	f= 0.171 [0.089;0.356]
<b>H7: OA*EQ-&gt;SAT (g=d*f &gt; 0)</b>	g= 0.060 [0.017;0.131]
<b>H8: OA*EA*EQ&gt;SAT (h=c*e*f&gt;0)</b>	h= 0.048 [0.024;0.109]
<b>H9: EA*EQ-&gt;SAT (i=e*f &gt; 0)</b>	i=0.070 [0.038;0.159]

Notes: QE: Quality Experience; OA: Objective Authenticity; EA: Existential Authenticity; SAT: Satisfaction.  
Bootstrapping 95% confidence intervals bias corrected in square brackets (based on n = 5000 subsamples).

Figure 1: Research Model



**Figure 2: Estimated model**

