THE IMPACT OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON TOURISM EXPERIENCE: THE ROLE OF SENSE OF PLACE, MEMORABILITY, AND AUTHENTICITY

Alina-Maria Vieriu[1*], Iulia Dăuș (Ogoreanu)[2], Andreea Fortuna Șchiopu[3], Ana Mihaela Pădurean[4]

[1]*Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania, vieriualina16@stud.ase.ro*
[2]*Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania, dausiulia17@stud.ase.ro*
[3]*Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania, andreea.schiopu@com.ase.ro*
[4]*Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania, mihaela.padurean@com.ase.ro*

Abstract
Tourists' satisfaction and post-travel experiences are impacted by sense of place, memorability and authenticity. These concepts have been thoroughly studied, but not from a socio-demographic perspective. The present study contributes to the growing literature regarding sense of place, memorability, authenticity and destination satisfaction in the context of socio-demographics (age, income, and gender). This paper employed a survey using a sample of 648 respondents. Kruskal-Wallis, Mann-Whitney and Linear Regression were applied. Findings show that sense of place varies according to age, with younger people more prone to develop ties with visited place. Memorability differs according to income and gender, where women tend to have a more memorable tourism experience. Authenticity differs according to gender and income, with women and high-income groups reporting higher authenticity; lastly, destination satisfaction variations were present across gender and income groups. In addition, regression results showed that sense of place, memorability and authenticity have a positive influence on tourist destination satisfaction. These findings contribute to travel experiences studies by integrating a socio-demographic context into destination satisfaction.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the landscape of tourism underwent a transformation driven by travelers seeking more than just a journey, but an immersive engagement with the essence of a local's culture. To travel is to experience; people travel every day, engaging in social and cultural activities and exploring new places, inadvertently creating experiences and memories. Amongst the numerous factors that contribute to tourists' satisfaction and post-travel behavior, sense of place (SP), authenticity (AU) and memorability (ME) have a significant positive impact. Given the competitive tourism industry and what makes or breaks a tourism experience, research on memorability, sense of place or intention to revisit and satisfaction (Chai et al., 2022) on past travel experiences is important for the tourism industry. A destination's ability to evoke a strong sense of place holds pivotal importance in attracting travelers searching authentic and meaningful experiences.

The idea of "sense of place" refers to an individual's emotional attachment to a specific geographical location or community (Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006). This sentiment can stem from various sources, such as one's birthplace, current residency, or even destinations visited during travels. While a strong

---

[*] Corresponding author
 Authors' ORCID:
 Alina-MariaVieriu
 Iulia Dăuș (Ogoreanu)
 Andreea Fortuna Șchiopu
 Ana Mihaela Pădurean

sense of place is important for tourists' satisfaction, another factor in this context is the memorability of a place (Oh, Fiore and Jeoung, 2007; Chai et al., 2022; Yi et al., 2023), which has a positive impact on tourists' experience, perceptions, and word-of-mouth endorsements. Additionally, the authenticity in tourism is perceived through the lens of a truth or reality that tourists seek to experience during their travels. Historically, the idea of authenticity has been deeply embedded in the tourism industry (Rickly, 2022), as it is widely understood that tourists want to immerse themselves in experiences that feel natural and culturally significant.

Moreover, research indicates that the perception of sense of place, authenticity and memorability among tourists varies depending on socio-demographic characteristics. Some studies (Duarte et al., 2023) show that tourism experiences can be perceived differently, based on gender, with Sthapit and Coudounaris (2018) noting that memorability particularly affects the well-being of women and older groups. Despite significant contributions in the literature brought by recent studies (Zou et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2023), further research is needed from a socio-demographic perspective regarding these concepts as recommended by Althubiti et al. (2025).

Accordingly, this research assumes a two-fold aim. Firstly, we want to determine how socio-demographic factors influence key experiential constructs in tourism, including sense of place, memorability, authenticity and destination satisfaction. Secondly, we aim to further examine the influence of memorability, sense of place and authenticity on tourists' satisfaction. All with the goal of understanding what affects touristic experiences.

2. Literature review

2.1 Sense of place in travel experiences

Traveling is more than just moving from one destination to another; for some tourists it is an opportunity to immerse and embrace the essence of a place. The concept of sense of place can be described as an emotional connection that goes beyond the physical presence and connects with cultural, historical, or environmental wealth of a destination. The term, sense of place, made its debut in 1968 (Cox, 1968). Nowadays, this concept has become a subject of exploration in various fields, from natural sciences to social sciences and humanities. For example, within the field of environmental psychology, Jorgensen and Stedman (2006) define the concept of "sense of place" as a multifaceted construct that encompasses individuals' beliefs, emotions, and behavioral commitments towards a specific geographical location. Despite the widespread use of the phrase "sense of place", defining the term itself continues to present many challenges (Nelson, Ahn and Corley, 2020), as there is still no universal accepted explanation.

Sense of place is generally understood as a person-to-place bond and it has as primary indicators place attachment associated with human emotion, place identity, in regards to beliefs about a place, self and the connection between the two, and place dependence associated with behavior (Agyekum and Newbold, 2019; Nelson, Ahn and Corley, 2020). The concept of place quality, as outlined by Carmona (2019), serves as another metric for assessing sense of place and establishes a connection to physical characteristics and considerations of a location. To put it differently, sense of place encompasses various interpretations, ranging from emotional connections (place identity) to practical affiliations (place dependence) that individuals or groups attribute to a particular spatial environment, as discussed by Stedman (2016) and Masterson et al. (2017).

The sense of place in the travel experience encapsulates the essence of exploration, a journey of discovery, connection, and transformation. According to d'Orey, Cardoso and Abreu (2019), tourists tend to form a strong bond with a destination, in other words they experience the feeling of sense of place when they immerse in the culture, history and traditions of a place. On the other hand, the strong feelings and bonds associated with a place are built over time (Lewicka, 2011), meaning that as people spend more time in a place, their attachment grows stronger. Another important aspect for a tourist to create a connection with a destination is to have their objectives and expectations met.

2.2 Memorability in travel experiences

For the travel sector, the shift to an experience-based economy has represented an important moment in redefining tourism consumption, especially from the perspective of memorability. In a study of

attempting to measure the experience economy, Oh, Fiore and Jeoung (2007) have explored the memorability and its importance to tourism experiences. Kim, Ritchie and McCormick (2012) have noted that experiences are memorable when they are recalled even after the event has passed. Yu et al. (2021) have shown that memorable experience is influenced by the diversity of tourist attractions from a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral perspective, and Zhang, Wu and Buhalis (2018) built a causal model that investigates both the background as well as the consequences of memorable tourism experiences. Starting from the aesthetic experience, Chai et al. (2022) elaborated a theoretical model made up of experience, memories of intangible cultural heritage tourists, perception of authenticity and behavioral intentions; they have shown that authenticity has a moderating role between experience and memory, the latter moderating the relation between experience and behavioral intention.

Studies have confirmed a strong and positive relation between satisfaction and memorable experiences, the higher the satisfaction, the greater the memorability (Gohary et al., 2020). Rasoolimanesh et al. (2022) emphasize the moderating effect of tourists' satisfaction between memorable experiences and behavioral intentions towards a travel destination, for which the authors considered the local culture, tourists' involvement in the consumption experience and their desire to acquire new knowledge. Studies show that memorability has a favorable impact on the intention to re-visit or to recommend to others the visited destination (Kim and Ritchie, 2014; Ali, Ryu and Hussain, 2016; Kim et al., 2023). This effect is created by some components of memorability on the intention to re-visit travel destination and to perform the same tourism activities: refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, hedonism and involvement (Kim and Ritchie, 2014). Moreover, Tsai (2016) has shown that memorability has had a significant positive influence on tourists' cognitive place attachment and their identification with and strong attachment to local attractions. Vada, Prentice and Hsiao (2019) further confirmed the impact of memorability on place attachment, as well as on well-being.

2.3 Authenticity of travel experiences

The concept of authenticity is central to the study of tourism and it is rooted in the belief that tourists seek experiences that reflect the true, genuine, or real essence of a place or culture (Brown, 2013; Rickly, 2022; Zhou, He and Li, 2023). People desire to engage with authentic objects, settings, and cultures that provide an honest reflection of the destination's unique identity (Rickly, 2022). The introduction of the term "authenticity" into tourism research can be traced back to the 1960s when sociologists began to look at tourists' motivations and experiences through a socio-cultural lens. MacCannell (1973) argued that for many tourists, the pursuit of cultural authenticity is the main motivation for their trip. Tourists are not only interested in visiting popular destinations, but also seek simple, natural and often "primitive" experiences that give them a sense of fulfillment and meaning.

Authenticity in tourism has also been examined from both object- and subject-related perspectives (Wang, 1999). Object-related authenticity focuses on the physical and external aspects of the tourist experience – museums, artworks, and traditional practices, which can be classified as either authentic or inauthentic depending on the tourist's perception. Visitors often evaluate the authenticity of these objects through the lens of their cultural knowledge, expectations, and beliefs (Wang, 1999; Lin and Liu, 2018). In contrast, subject-related authenticity shifts the focus to the internal experiences of the tourist. Here, the emphasis is placed on the personal, emotional, and psychological responses that tourists have while engaging in travel. According to Lin (2017), subject-related authenticity is deeply tied to the way in which tourists connect with themselves and with others during their travels. This form of authenticity is often referred to as existential authenticity, and it means that people are becoming one's "true self" in the context of tourism, which may be experienced through interactions with local cultures (Yi et al., 2017).

In addition, the relationship between intra-personal authenticity and tourist loyalty has also been observed in studies. Lin and Liu (2018) found that a combination of intra-personal authenticity—experiencing a sense of personal fulfilment or emotional alignment with one's true self—along with object-related and inter-personal authenticity, positively influences tourists' loyalty to destinations. For many, the pursuit of authenticity is less about the physical surroundings and more about the emotional state that accompany travel (Brown, 2013; Zhou, He and Li, 2023). These experiences allow people to escape the routine of daily life and explore dimensions of their identity (Wang, 1999; Brown, 2013).

2.4 Destination satisfaction

Destination satisfaction refers to all the feelings a tourist experiences when visiting a destination (Cole and Scott, 2004). The satisfaction level, which is determined by many factors, can influence whether a tourist will retake a trip, or not. In their review, Sánchez-Rebull et al. (2018) showed that loyalty is a direct consequence of satisfaction; also, service quality along with emotions are antecedents of satisfaction.

As research progressed in the quest of finding a better framework for defining destination satisfaction, studies have taken different angles, encapsulating the direct or indirect effects, through moderation or mediation, of other factors influencing satisfaction; we can mention sense of place (Deutsch, Yoon and Goulias, 2013; Abou-Shouk et al., 2018; Shaykh-Baygloo, 2021), memorability (Ali, Ryu and Hussain, 2016; Gohary et al., 2020; Chiappa, Napolitano and Atzeni, 2022; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2022; Kahraman and Cifci, 2023) and authenticity (Lu, Chi and Liu, 2015; Genc and Gulertekin Genc, 2023; Lu, Wang and Suhartanto, 2024; Zhang, Wen and Li, 2018). More precisely, the relationship between intra-personal authenticity and tourist loyalty has been observed in some studies. Lin and Liu (2018) found that a combination of intra-personal authenticity—experiencing a sense of personal fulfilment or emotional alignment with one's true self—with object-related and inter-personal authenticity positively influence tourists' loyalty to destinations.

2.5 Impact of socio-demographics factors on travel experiences

Several studies have shown that tourists' socio-demographic features affect or determine their travel behavior and are significant in understanding their touristic experiences. Wong, Fong and Law (2016) identified some effects in tourists' travel behavior in terms of gender, age, and income, influencing the distance travelled between the starting point and the final destination. Moreover, the sense of place can be shaped by the socio-demographic characteristics of the tourists even though this idea is sporadically mentioned in the literature. Deutsch, Yoon and Goulias (2013) and Deutsch and Goulias (2010) found support for the influence of gender and income on sense of place. Therefore, the socio-demographic variables are of upmost importance in tourism, the literature proving various classes of tourists perceive or behave differently while travelling. The study can be continued within the concepts of sense of place, memorability and authenticity where less work has been done.

The memorability of the travel experience can differ within several socio-demographic categories and some studies (Sthapit, Coudounaris and Björk, 2019; Sthapit and Coudounaris, 2018) have showed that there is a relation between age and memorability. More so, earlier on, Lehto et al. (2008) analyzed some distinctions between Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation with regards to vacation activity and identified dissimilar travel experiences and behavioral outcomes in the examined age-cohorts. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

H1. There is a significant difference in age groups for sense of place.

H2. There is a significant difference in age groups for memorability

H3. There is a significant difference in age groups for authenticity.

H4. There is a significant difference in age groups for destination satisfaction.

Moving on, Rozynek and Lanzendorf (2023) connected income to the travel practices of older people recognizing dissimilarities in destinations, frequency and travelled distance. Other authors also identified variation among distinct demographic groups (Jain and Tiwari, 2020; Benita, 2023; LaMondia and Fisher, 2024) in terms of travel behaviors or choices. In addition, income is an affecting factor of memorability (Chiappa, Napolitano and Atzeni, 2022); also, Olya et al. (2020) demonstrated that income, among other demographic characteristics, condition the memorable augmented reality festival experience while Sorrentino et al. (2022) showed that travelers with lower income are more delighted by cruise experiences. As such, we formulated the following:

H5. There is a significant difference in income groups for sense of place.

H6. There is a significant difference in income groups for memorability

H7. There is a significant difference in income groups for authenticity.

H8. There is a significant difference in income groups for destination satisfaction.

Moreover, Duarte et al. (2023) investigated whether some demographic variables affect the tourism experiences and concluded that there are substantial differences between diverse groups (i.e., male vs. female). In addition, in a study conducted by Santos et al. (2022), they concluded that women rate their Airbnb experiences more enthusiastically; Ahn and Janke (2011) reported a gender association with motivations of older educational travelers, women having a raised level of intrinsic motivation than men. Besides age, Sthapit and Coudounaris (2018) also showed gender variation in tourism experiences, specifically, female travelers record a stronger influence of the precursors of memorable touristic experiences on their subjective well-being. Accordingly, we hypothesize:

H9. There is a significant difference in gender groups for sense of place.

H10. There is a significant difference in gender groups for memorability

H11. There is a significant difference in gender groups for authenticity.

H12. There is a significant difference in gender groups for destination satisfaction.

Finally, tourists that engage in experiences that resonate with their personal values or emotions, are more likely to be satisfied with the destination; likewise, experiences that are memorable and places that create bonds are playing a role in the tourist satisfaction. Therefore, we assume that sense of place, memorability and authenticity have a positive impact on destination satisfaction. Specifically, we hypothesize:

H13. Sense of place, authenticity, and memorability positively influence satisfaction.

3. Methodology

To test the hypotheses of our study, we conducted a survey based on a self-reported questionnaire. The items were translated from English by the authors and verified by two specialists. A pre-test was applied on a small convenience sample (N=11) after which the questionnaire was distributed online. All participants were informed about how their data is handled and stored, and all had the right drop out of the study at any time. More so, participants were filtered so that only those which had work experience (including remote) and travelled in the past two years were included in the questionnaire.

The scales used for the constructs/items were adapted from empirical research. Respondents were asked to rate all items on a 7-point Likert type/scale, with 1 = Totally disagree and 7 = Totally agree. The Sense of Place (SP) construct (6 items) was drawn from Yi et al. (2023); authenticity (AU) construct (4 items) was adapted from Lin and Liu (2018) and Memorability (ME) construct (3 items) from Oh, Fiore and Jeoung (2007). Finally, Destination Satisfaction (DS) was adapted from Chai et al. (2022) and consisted of three items.

Data was analyzed using SPSS (IBM Corp., 2019). Firstly, unengaged respondents and nonsensical answers were removed from the analysis (9 in total), and the final sample was N = 648. Second, data imputation for the income category was performed using missForest (Stekhoven and Buehlmann, 2012) package in R (R Core Team, 2023). For our study, 15% of the income category was imputed. Furthermore, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed p-value<0.05, thus the data did not show a normal distribution; lastly, multicollinearity was tested prior to employing linear regression; no multicollinearity issues were found.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Main findings

Descriptive statistics of socio-demographics are shown in Table 1. The sample was represented by 62.8% women. In terms of age, the 18-24 years group had the highest frequency with 34.4%, and for the income group, the most representative was the 2-4k lei/month (34.6%).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for age, income and gender

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percent (%)
	18-24 yrs.	223	34.4
	25-34 yrs.	113	17.4
Age	35-44 yrs.	108	16.7
	45-54 yrs.	152	23.5
	>55 yrs.	52	8.0
	< 2k lei/month	79	12.2
	2-4k lei/month	246	38.0
Income	4-5k lei/month	145	22.4
	5-6k lei/month	74	11.4
	> 6k lei/month	104	16.0
Gender	W	407	62.8
	M	241	37.2
N = 648			

Source: Authors' elaboration

Multicollinearity has been tested for the variables that are used in the regression models, using both Pearson's and VIF as seen in Table 2. All variables had a VIF < 5, and a Pearson's correlation under 0.8. The highest correlation coefficient was between memorability and authenticity (r= 0.496, p<0.05) and is considerate moderate, therefore the likelihood of multicollinearity was minimal (Shrestha, 2020).

Table 2. Multicollinearity testing. Output of Pearson's and VIF.

	Authenticity	Sense of Place	Memorability	Income	Gender	Age	*VIF*
Authenticity	1	0.310**	0.496**	0.047	-0.163**	-0.046	1.38
Sense of Place	0.310**	1	0.429**	-0.009	-0.034	-0.147**	1.27
Memorability	0.496**	0.429**	1	-0.061	-0.154**	-0.088*	1.52
Income	0.047	-0.009	-0.061	1	0.135**	0.414**	1.25
Gender	-0.163**	-0.034	-0.154**	0.135**	1	-0.033	1.07
Age	-0.046	-0.147**	-0.088*	0.414**	-0.033	1	1.26

* Correlation is significant at 0.05
** Correlation is significant at 0.01
Source: Authors' elaboration

Table 3 shows the constructs and items' summary with reliability analysis of the variables and their respective item statements. The sense of place scale (SP) consisted of 6 items (α = 0.9), memorability (ME) of 3 items scale (α = 0.91), authenticity (AU) with 4 items scale (α = 0.85) and destination satisfaction of 3 items (α = 0.92). The Cronbach's α for all constructs is > 0.7 indicating high reliability (Hair et al., 2019).

Overall, participants had a moderate sense of place in regard to their last travel (M = 4.15, SD = 1.52), a high memorability (M = 5.86, SD = 1.26) and authenticity (M = 5.69, SD = 1.11), as well as a high destination satisfaction (M =5.75, SD = 1.3).

<div align="center">**Table 3. Measurements and reliability**</div>

Constructs and Measurement Items			Mean Item	Avg. Index	Std. dev.	Cronbach's alpha (α)
SP - Sense of Place (Yi et al., 2023)	SP_1	I am very attached to that destination	3.97			
	SP_2	That destination means a lot to me.	4.13			
	SP_3	I feel a strong sense of belonging to that destination.	3.49			
	SP_4	Traveling to that destination says a lot about who I am	4.14	4.15	1.52	0.9
	SP_5	For the activities that I enjoy, the settings and facilities provided by that destination are the best.	4.67			
	SP_6	I enjoyed visiting that destination more than any other destination	4.47			
ME – Memorability (Oh, Fiore and Jeoung, 2007)	ME_1	I have wonderful memories about the trip	5.86			
	ME_2	I remember many positive things about this trip	5.85	5.86	1.26	0.91
	ME_3	I will not forget my experience on that trip.	5.86			
IA - Authenticity (Lin and Liu, 2018)	IA_1	I experienced heightened physical feelings and found various ways to express myself on the trip.	5.59			
	IA_2	I felt completely myself and as if I could do anything I wanted to during the trip.	5.62	5.69	1.11	0.85
	IA_3	I could escape from my everyday self on that trip.	5.84			
	IA_4	The trip contributed to my personal development.	5.73			
DS - Destination satisfaction (Chai et al., 2022)	DS_1	I am satisfied with the trip	5.72			
	DS_2	I have enjoyed myself during the trip	5.84	5.75	1.3	0.92
	DS_3	The trip met my expectations.	5.68			

Source: Authors' elaboration

4.1.1 Age effects

Table 4 shows the results of the Kruskal Wallis for age across for sense of place (SP), memorability (ME), authenticity (AU) and destination satisfaction (DS). For sense of place and age, the results indicate significant differences across groups, [H (4) = 15.74, p = 0.003 < 0.05]. The highest score belonged to participants in the age group of 18-14 (M = 4.41), indicating a higher likelihood to experience a stronger SP than all the other age groups. Furthermore, the trend seems to be downward, as age progresses the SP is lower up until those >55 (M= 5.90). Thus, these results show support for H1.

For memorability and age there were no significant differences [H (4) = 6.49, p = 0.165 > 0.05] found across the groups. The smallest score belonged to >55 (M=5.68) and highest to 35-44 (M= 6.02); meaning that older respondents reported a smaller memorability score than those aged between 35-44 years. For this intersection there was no support for hypothesis H2.

In terms of authenticity and age, results were not significant [H (4) = 1.47, p = 0.831 > 0.05]. Those in the 18-24 group (M = 5.78) showed higher authenticity than those in the other groups; however, the

differences were not so high, with those aged between 35-44 (M = 5.59) having the lowest score. Therefore, no empirical support was found for H3.

Finally, the results were not significant [H (4) = 6.91, p =.141 > 0.05] for age and destination satisfaction. Tourists in 18-24 group (M = 5.94) scored the compared with those aged between 35-54(M = 5.64). Overall, the differences between the groups were relatively small with the lowest satisfaction being for the >55 group (M = 5.57). These results find no support for H4.

**Table 4. Age across sense of place, memorability,
authenticity and destination satisfaction variables. Output of Kruskal Wallis test**

Variables	SP	ME	AU	DE
18-24 yrs.	4.41 (1.45)	6.02 (1.14)	5.78 (0.99)	5.94 (1.17)
25-34 yrs.	4.27 (1.48)	5.82 (1.37)	5.69 (1.12)	5.71 (1.37)
35-44 yrs.	3.97 (1.51)	5.75 (1.35)	5.59 (1.13)	5.64 (1.30)
45-54 yrs.	3.87 (1.64)	5.78 (1.27)	5.67 (1.2)	5.64 (1.43)
>55 yrs.	3.90 (1.32)	5.68 (1.17)	5.64 (1.22)	5.57 (1.27)
Kruskal Wallis	Test statistic(H): 15.74 df: 4 Sig: 0.003*	Test statistic(H): 6.49 df: 4 Sig: 0.165	Test statistic(H): 1.47 df: 4 Sig: 0.831	Test statistic(H): 6.91 df: 4 Sig: 0.141

*Note(s): *significance level at 95%, p<0.05*
Source: Authors' elaboration

4.1.2 Income effects

Table 5 shows the results of the Kruskal Wallis for income across for sense of place (SP), memorability (ME), authenticity (AU) and destination satisfaction (DS).

Regarding income and sense of place, no significant differences were noticed [H (4) = 2.2, p = 0.698 > 0.05]. The lowest SP score belonged to those who earn 4-5k lei/m (M = 4.01) while group >6 k lei/m (M = 4.23) had the highest reported SP. Nonetheless, we found no support in this study for hypothesis H5.

Concerning income and memorability, the test showed a significant difference across groups [H (4) = 12.11, p = 0.017 < 0.05]. Those with a lower income >2k lei/m (M = 5.95) and 2-4k lei/m (M = 5.97) ranked the highest ME scores. Lowest ME score belonged to the 5-6k lei/m (M = 5.39) group. Interesting to note that lower income had a higher memorability than those in the middle-higher income. These results indicate H6 is supported in this study.

For income and authenticity [H (4) = 18.02, p = 0.001 < 0.05], results were significant. The lowest AU score belongs to tourists with an income of 5-6k lei/m (M = 5.33) and the largest scoring group to those above 6k lei/m (M = 5.99). Thus, empirical support was found for H7.

Furthermore, for income and satisfaction, the findings were significant [H (4) = 14.989, p = 0.005 < 0.05]. The lowest DS result was observed for the 5-6k lei/m group (M = 5.33) and the largest score registered was for the >6k lei/m group (M = 5.95), implying that tourists in the in highest income group reported the highest destination satisfaction. These findings support hypothesis H8.

**Table 5. Income across sense of place, memorability,
authenticity and destination satisfaction. Output of Kruskal-Wallis test**

Variables	SP	ME	AU	DE
< 2k lei/m	4.17 (1.47)	5.95 (1.07)	5.65 (0.98)	5.80 (1.20)
2-4k lei/m	4.21 (1.51)	5.97 (1.21)	5.69 (1.1)	5.85 (1.26)
4-5k lei/m	4.01 (1.51)	5.8 (1.28)	5.69 (1.19)	5.61(1.37)
5-6k lei/m	4.05 (1.55)	5.39 (1.51)	5.33 (1.15)	5.33 (1.46)
> 6k lei/m	4.23 (1.56)	5.93 (1.21)	5.99 (0.99)	5.95 (1.20)

Variables	SP	ME	AU	DE
Kruskal Wallis	Test statistic(H): 2.2 df: 4 Sig:0.698	Test statistic(H): 12.11 df: 4 Sig: 0.017*	Test statistic(H): 18.02 df: 4 Sig:0.001*	Test statistic(H): 14.989 df: 4 Sig:0.005*

*Note(s): *significance level at 95%, p<0.05*
Source: Authors' elaboration

4.1.3 Gender effects

Lastly, Table 6 shows the results of Mann-Whitney for gender across sense of place, memorability, authenticity and destination satisfaction.

Table 6. Gender across variables. Output of Mann-Whitney test

Variables	Women	Men	*Mann-Whitney*
SP	4.19 (1.54)	4.08 (1.47)	Test statistic U: 47188.5 z-score: - 0.80 Sig: 0.420
ME	6.00 (1.21)	5.60 (1.29)	Test statistic U: 38926.5 z-score: -4.48 Sig: 0.00*
AU	5.83 (1.08)	5.46 (1.12)	Test statistic U: 38761 z-score: - 4.48 Sig: 0.00*
DS	5.86 (1.29)	5.56 (1.30)	Test statistic U: 40873 z-score: -3.6 Sig: 0.00*

*Note(s): *significance level at 95%, p<0.05*
Source: Authors' elaboration

For SP the output revealed that there is no significant mean rank difference (U = 47188.5, z = -0.80, p = 0.420 > 0.05) between men (M = 4.08) and women (M = 4.19), meaning that both groups reported a similar sense of place towards their last destination. From a mean perspective, however, women had a higher SP than men, even if not significant. As a result, no empirical support was found for H9. When it comes to memorability, the Mann-Whitney test revealed a significant mean rank difference between men (M = 5.60) and women (M = 6.00) indicating that women have a higher chance of reporting a trip more memorable than men (U = 38926.5, z = -4.48, p = 0.00 < 0.05). These results find support for H10. Moving on, significant differences were noted for the gender groups in relation to authenticity (U = 38761, z = -4.48, p = 0.00 < 0.05); revealing that men (M = 5.46) felt lower authenticity than women (M = 5.83) during the trip. Likewise, empirical support was found also for H11. Finally, statistically significant gender differences were found in relation to DS (U = 40873, z = -3.6 p = 0.00 < 0.05), findings suggest that men (M= 5.56) experienced a lower satisfaction than women (M = 5.86). These results find support for H12.

4.1.5 Influence on destination satisfaction

The findings from the multiple linear regression are shown in Table 7, with destination satisfaction (DS) as the dependent, and sense of place (SP), memorability (ME) and authenticity (AU) as predictors. Overall, the results showed the model was significant F $(3,644)$ = 277.40, R^2 =0.56, p < 0.001, explaining 56% of the variance in destination satisfaction.

Sense of place was a significant positive predictor (β=0.159, t= 6.384, p < 0.05), as was memorability (β=0.56, t= 16.983, p < 0.05), and authenticity (β=0.214, t= 6.029, p < 0.05) of destination satisfaction. This means that memorability appears as the strongest predictor; a one-unit increase in ME is associated with a 56% increase in destination satisfaction, followed by a one-unit increase in authenticity which drives a 21.4% increase in satisfaction, and lastly, a one-unit increase in sense of place which renders a 15.9% tourist satisfaction.

Table 7. Destination satisfaction. Output of Linear Regression

Model	Unstd. Beta	Unstd. Std. Error	Std.Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.590	0.196		3.01	0.003
Sense of Place	0.159	0.025	0.185	6.384	0.000
Memorability	0.560	0.033	0.540	16.983	0.000
Authenticity	0.214	0.035	0.182	6.029	0.000

Notes: ANOVA: $F_{(3, 644)} = 277.407$, sig =0.000, R^2 = 0.564
Significance level at 95%, p<0.05
Source: Authors' elaboration

4.2 Discussions

The aim of this study was two-fold. Firstly, it aimed to explore how socio-demographics factors influence sense of place (SP), memorability (ME), authenticity (AU) and destination satisfaction (DS). Second, it aimed to analyze the influence of SP, ME, and AU on destination satisfaction. Table 11 provides a summary of our findings, which found support for 8 hypotheses out of 13. The main takeaways are described below.

This study adds to the theoretical body of tourism by strengthening the importance of how age, gender, and income shape tourists' post-travel experiences. Previous studies (Chai et al., 2022; Zou et al., 2022; Yi et al., 2023) have shown that loyalty, word-of-mouth recommendation and revisit intentions are influenced by tourists' perception of SP, ME and AU. Moreover, other findings confirm that socio-demographic factors affect the tourists' satisfaction and travel behavior. Our results have aligned with prior research as well.

Table 11. Summary of hypotheses

Research Hypotheses	Result
Differences across socio-demographic variables.	
H1. Age → Sense of Place	Supported
H2. Age → Memorability	Not Supported
H3. Age → Authenticity	Not Supported
H4. Age → Satisfaction	Not Supported
H5. Income → Sense of Place	Not Supported
H6. Income → Memorability	Supported
H7. Income → Authenticity	Supported
H8. Income → Satisfaction	Supported
H9. Gender → Sense of Place	Not supported
H10. Gender → Memorability	Supported
H11. Gender → Authenticity	Supported
H12. Gender → Satisfaction	Supported
Relationships with destination satisfaction.	
H13. Sense of place, authenticity, and memorability positively predict satisfaction.	Supported

Source: Authors' own elaboration

By analyzing the effect of age, our observations indicate that participants between 18 and 24 years old were most likely to experience a stronger sense of place (SP) than those aged higher than 35. Albeit sense of place and age in tourism research is understudied, Lewicka (2011) notes that feelings of attachment are stronger the more time someone spends in a given place, and research of Lebrusán and Gómez (2022) showed that as an individual's age progresses, people develop strong attachment with the places they live in. Besides, this might be one reason why middle and older age groups had a lower SP in our study, as they already developed more significant bonds to other places. When it comes to memorability and age, Sthapit and Coudounaris (2018) found that older travelers report a stronger influence of memorable experiences on their well-being. More so, Olya et al. (2020) noted that, in the context of festivals, when using augmented reality, older people tend to have an increase in memorable experiences. We found no significant differences for memorability across age groups; the older group, those above 55, had the lowest level of memorability regarding the last visited destination. Our results

are comparable to Chiappa, Napolitano and Atzeni (2022) which suggested that ME was not different according to age, for winery visitors. One reason why ME was not significantly different for dissimilar age groups could be explained by the fact that ME has an influence on the touristic satisfaction (Gohary et al., 2020) and, as Duarte et al. (2023) mentioned, satisfaction tends to be similar for all age groups. This is in line with our findings pertaining to destination satisfaction and age – where no significant difference was found and satisfaction was similar across groups.

Concerning income and memorability, we found that those with middle-high income reported a lower memorability for their past travel experiences. These findings are partially in accordance to previous literature, that states how novelty impacts memorability (Sthapit and Coudounaris, 2018; Sorrentino et al., 2022) and as lower income groups may travel less, novelty could be more pronounced for these tourists. Though, it does not fully explain why people with highest income had higher levels of memorability. A presumption could be made that high incomers (Dahanayake, Wanninayake and Ranasinghe, 2024) are looking for more sophisticated and professional destination, compared to lower group which look for holistic and more engaging activities or destinations. Destination satisfaction was also lowest for middle-high incomers. Interestingly, income was significant for authenticity as well, and the same middle-high group of tourists reported the lowest authenticity while the highest incomers reported the greatest authenticity, which strengthens what Dahanayake, Wanninayake and Ranasinghe (2024) noted, respectively that tourists with more income search for professional and authentic experiences.

In terms of gender, the results showed that women have a higher chance of reporting a trip more memorable than men. Similarly, Sthapit, Coudounaris and Björk (2019) found that when women seek out novel experiences in food tourism, their experience become more memorable than men's. And as Duarte et al., (2023) and Santos et al. (2022) indicate, women tend to rate travel experiences higher. Moreover, our findings noted a high authenticity for women as well. In line with our results, destination satisfaction was also significant between gender groups, women rating their satisfaction greater. However, in analyzing what shapes ME experiences, Seyfi et al. (2024) found no gender differences, concluding that both men and women have similar memorability.

When tested together, our model found that SP, ME and AU had an influence on satisfaction. This further corroborates other studies. For example, Shaykh-Baygloo (2021) study mentions a positive impact of sense of place on travel satisfaction, in Iran on foreign tourists in relation with city attractions. Research on authenticity has shown that AU had a positive impact on tourist loyalty (Lin and Liu, 2018); as loyalty and intention to revisit are a direct consequence of satisfaction (Sánchez-Rebull et al., 2018), it can be presumed that satisfaction will follow a similar pattern. Moreover, the strong influence of sense of place can be explained based on the person-to-place bond (d'Orey, Cardoso and Abreu, 2019); when people travel they have the opportunity to immerse themselves in other cultures or history (Nelson, Ahn and Corley, 2020)

From a practical perspective, this research provides some insights for managers and stakeholders, as the study also highlights the importance of tailoring and segmentation, which suggest managers should accentuate what sets their destinations apart, such that it appeals and could evoke the sense of place in tourists. As younger tourists (18–24) report a higher sense of place, marketers can design more immersive cultural programs that could deepen emotional bonds — such as walking tours or artistic events. In addition, income groups may seek different tourism experiences, and marketers should consider different experiences for tourists at different level of income, avoiding to create packages based solely on price-income relationships.

Despite our contributions, this study also has some limitations. Although self-reporting questionnaires are widely used in social sciences, one drawback is that respondents may not always engage in the questionnaire (Demetriou, Ozer and Essau, 2015), and provide careless responding, leading to invalid responses. Also, there is the possibility of recall bias (Coughlin, 1990) – participants may have difficulty accurately remembering past events or experiences, leading to inaccuracies in their responses. In plus, an increased sample size can help when invalid responses may be needed to exclude from the analysis. In this study we focused on some key constructs that influence satisfaction and them alone determined

a great number of questions; respondents could have gotten tired based on the length of the questionnaire.

Future studies can collect additional information about the travel behavior. Additionally, future studies can opt for a combined approach, in which to analyze not only quantitative data, but also qualitative data and should be more inclusive of socio-demographic analysis in the tourism dimension for sense of place, authenticity, and memorability as they provide insights to how different aspects of an individual, such as age or income, can influence the touristic experiences. That is especially true for how age affects the sense of place and income memorability. We also recommend studies that encapsulate all three variables (sense of place, authenticity, memorability) for both direct and indirect effects.

5. Conclusions

Our results contributed to the literature by showing how socio-demographics factors are valuable in understanding the tourism experience in the context of sense of place, memorability and authenticity. In addition, the results showed sense of place, memorability and authenticity are important in shaping the touristic experience as well as the post-travel behavior intentions. Experiences that are meaningful and unforgettable are deemed as memorable, and it has been shown that memorability affects the tourists' satisfaction. Certain destinations can evoke strong feelings of attachment and belonging in people, leading to a heightened sense of place. Understanding what drives the tourism experience is pivotal for marketers in creating tailored services and offering appropriate experiences; segmentation is a very powerful method in understanding the touristic profile.

References

Abou-Shouk, M.A., Zoair, N., El-Barbary, M.N. and Hewedi, M.M. (2018). Sense of place relationship with tourist satisfaction and intentional revisit: Evidence from Egypt. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(2), pp. 172-181. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2170.

Agyekum, B. and Newbold, K.B. (2019). Sense of place and mental wellness amongst African immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 12(2), pp. 188-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2018.1552885.

Ahn, Y. and Janke, M.C. (2011). Motivations and Benefits of the Travel Experiences of Older Adults. *Educational Gerontology*, 37(8), pp. 653–673. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601271003716010.

Ali, F., Ryu, K. and Hussain, K. (2016). Influence of Experiences on Memories, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions: A Study of Creative Tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33(1), pp. 85-100. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2015.1038418.

Althubiti, K., Alhamadani, A., Khan, M. and Shah, M.G.H. (2025). Unveiling negative memorable experiences of hotel guests: An innovative algorithmic analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 126, 104087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2025.104087.

Benita, F. (2023). Exploring non-mandatory travel behavior in Jakarta City: Travel time, trip frequency, and socio-demographic influences. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 21, 100896. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2023.100896.

Brown, L. (2013). Tourism: A catalyst for existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, pp. 176-190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.08.004.

Carmona, M. (2019). Place value: place quality and its impact on health, social, economic and environmental outcomes. *Journal of Urban Design*, 24(1), pp. 1-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2018.1472523.

Chai, Y., Na, J., Ma, T. and Tang, Y. (2022). The moderating role of authenticity between experience economy and memory? The evidence from Qiong Opera. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1070690.

Chiappa, G. Del, Napolitano, E. and Atzeni, M. (2022). Memorability, satisfaction, and intention to recommend to others: a segmentation-based study of winery visitors in Australia. In: S.K. Dixit, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Wine Tourism.* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003143628.

Cole, S.T. and Scott, D. (2004). Examining the Mediating Role of Experience Quality in a Model of Tourist Experiences, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 16(1), pp. 79-90. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v16n01_08.

Coughlin, S.S. (1990). Recall bias in epidemiologic studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 43(1), pp. 87-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/0895-4356(90)90060-3.

d'Orey, F., Cardoso, A. and Abreu, R. (2019). 'Tourist' Sense of Place", an Assessment of the Sense of Place in Tourism Studies: The Case of Portugal'. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(1), pp. 1-14.

Dahanayake, S., Wanninayake, B. and Ranasinghe, R. (2024). Demographics shaping memorable wellness tourism experiences: A comparative analysis. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584241306368.

Demetriou, C., Ozer, B.U. and Essau, C.A. (2015). Self-Report Questionnaires. In: *The Encyclopedia of Clinical Psychology*. Wiley. pp. 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp507.

Deutsch, K. and Goulias, K. (2010). Exploring Sense-of-Place Attitudes as Indicators of Travel Behavior. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2157(1), pp. 95-102. https://doi.org/10.3141/2157-12.

Deutsch, K., Yoon, S.Y. and Goulias, K. (2013). Modeling travel behavior and sense of place using a structural equation model. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 28, pp. 155-163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.12.001.

Duarte, P., Rodrigues, R.G., Sampaio, C., Manuel Hernández-Mogollón, J., Sofía Pasaco-González, B., María Campón-Cerro, A., Moreno-Lobato, A. and Sánchez-Vargas, E. (2023). The Role of Demographics and Previous Experience in Tourists' Experiential Perceptions. Sustainability, 15(4), 3768. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU15043768.

Genc, V. and Gulertekin Genc, S. (2023). The effect of perceived authenticity in cultural heritage sites on tourist satisfaction: the moderating role of aesthetic experience. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 6(2), pp. 530-548. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-08-2021-0218/FULL/PDF.

Gohary, A., Pourazizi, L., Madani, F. (Fatima) and Chan, E.Y. (2020). Examining Iranian tourists' memorable experiences on destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(2), pp. 131-136. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1560397.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 8th ed. Hampshire: Cengage Learning.

Harvey Gallagher Cox (1968). *The restoration of a sense of place: a theological reflection on the visual environment*. 151st ed. Athens Center of Ekistics.

IBM Corp., 2019. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows*.

Jain, D. and Tiwari, G. (2020). Gender and income based variability in travel choices in Vishakhapatnam, India. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 48, pp. 2870-2890. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2020.08.232.

Jorgensen, B.S. and Stedman, R.C. (2006). A comparative analysis of predictors of sense of place dimensions: Attachment to, dependence on, and identification with lakeshore properties. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 79(3), pp. 316-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.08.003.

Kahraman, O.C. and Cifci, I. (2023). Modeling self-identification, memorable tourism experience, overall satisfaction and destination loyalty: empirical evidence from small island destinations. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 6(2), pp. 1001-1023. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-02-2022-0090.

Kim, J.-H. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (2014). Cross-Cultural Validation of a Memorable Tourism Experience Scale (MTES). *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(3), pp. 323-335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513496468.

Kim, J.-H., Badu-Baiden, F., Kim, S. (Sam), Koseoglu, M.A. and Baah, N.G. (2023). Evolution of the Memorable Tourism Experience and Future Research Prospects. *Journal of Travel Research*. 63(6), pp. 1315-1334. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875231206545.

Kim, J.-H., Ritchie, J.R.B. and McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), pp. 12-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510385467.

LaMondia, J. and Fisher, M. (2024). Can we focus long-distance travel survey sampling? Analyzing travel behavior trends between and within demographic groups. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 76, pp. 520-533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.12.073.

Lebrusán, I. and Gómez, M.V. (2022). The Importance of Place Attachment in the Understanding of Ageing in Place: "The Stones Know Me". *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(24), 17052. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192417052.

Lehto, X.Y., Jang, S. (Shawn), Achana, F.T. and O'Leary, J.T. (2008). Exploring tourism experience sought: A cohort comparison of Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(3), pp. 237-252. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766708090585.

Lewicka, M., 2011. Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31(3), pp. 207-230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.10.001.

Lin, Y.C. and Liu, Y.C. (2018). Deconstructing the internal structure of perceived authenticity for heritage tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(12), pp. 2134-2152. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1545022.

Lin, Y.C. (2017). The willingness of heritage tourists to pay for perceived authenticity in Pingxi, Taiwan. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(10), pp.1 044-1069. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1123677.

Lu, C.Y., Wang, Y. and Suhartanto, D. (2024). Memory impressions in slow tourism: Intrapersonal and interpersonal authenticity as antecedents. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2604.

Lu, L., Chi, C.G. and Liu, Y. (2015). Authenticity, involvement, and image: Evaluating tourist experiences at historic districts. Tourism Management, 50, pp. 85-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.01.026.

MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology,* 79(3), pp. 589-603.

Masterson, V.A., Stedman, R.C., Enqvist, J., Tengö, M., Giusti, M., Wahl, D. and Svedin, U. (2017). The contribution of sense of place to social-ecological systems research: A review and research agenda. *Ecology and Society*, 22(1):49. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08872-220149.

Nelson, J., Ahn, J.J. and Corley, E.A. (2020). Sense of place: trends from the literature. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 13(2), pp. 236-261. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2020.1726799.

Oh, H., Fiore, A.M. and Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring Experience Economy Concepts: Tourism Applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), pp. 119-132. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507304039.

Olya, H., Jung, T.H., Tom Dieck, M.C. and Ryu, K. (2020). Engaging visitors of science festivals using augmented reality: asymmetrical modelling. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(2), pp. 769-796. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2018-0820.

R Core Team (2023) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. [online] Available at: <https://www.R-project.org/>, [Accessed 10 February 2025]

Rasoolimanesh, S.M., Seyfi, S., Rather, R.A. and Hall, C.M. (2022). Investigating the mediating role of visitor satisfaction in the relationship between memorable tourism experiences and behavioral intentions in heritage tourism context. *Tourism Review*, 77(2), pp. 687-709. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-02-2021-0086.

Rickly, J.M. (2022). A review of authenticity research in tourism: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research Curated Collection on authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 92, p. 103349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103349.

Rozynek, C. and Lanzendorf, M. (2023). How does low income affect older people's travel practices? Findings of a qualitative case study on the links between financial poverty, mobility and social participation. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 30, pp. 312-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2022.10.003.

Santos, A.I.G.P., Perinotto, A.R.C., Soares, J.R.R., Mondo, T.S. and Cembranel, P. (2022). Expressing the Experience: An Analysis of Airbnb Customer Sentiments. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 3(3), pp. 685-705. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp3030042.

Seyfi, S., Rasoolimanesh, S.M., Sthapit, E. and Hall, C.M. (2024). Antecedents of domestic visitor's memorable experiences and gender difference: a heritage tourism context. *Tourism Recreation Research*, pp. 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2024.2309761.

Shaykh-Baygloo, R. (2021). Foreign tourists' experience: The tri-partite relationships among sense of place toward destination city, tourism attractions and tourists' overall satisfaction - Evidence from Shiraz, Iran. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, p. 100518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100518.

Shrestha, N. (2020). Detecting Multicollinearity in Regression Analysis, *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 8(2), pp. 39-42. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-8-2-1.

Sorrentino, A., Ferretti, M., Risitano, M., Del Chiappa, G. and Okumus, F. (2022). The influence of the onboard servicescape on cruisers' experiential state, delight and memorability. *Consumer Behavior in Tourism and Hospitality*, 17(1), pp. 17-41. https://doi.org/10.1108/CBTH-11-2020-0258.

Stedman, R.C. (2016). Subjectivity and social-ecological systems: a rigidity trap (and sense of place as a way out). *Sustainability Science*, 11(6), pp. 891-901. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-016-0388-y.

Stekhoven, D.J. and Buehlmann, P. (2012). missForest: Nonparametric Missing Value Imputation using Random Forest. Bioinformatics, 28(1), pp. 112-118. https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.missForest.

Sthapit, E. and Coudounaris, D.N. (2018). Memorable tourism experiences: antecedents and outcomes. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 18(1), pp. 72-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2017.1287003.

Sthapit, E., Coudounaris, D.N. and Björk, P. (2019). Extending the memorable tourism experience construct: an investigation of memories of local food experiences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 19(4-5), pp. 333-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2019.1689530.

Tsai, C. (Simon). (2016). Memorable Tourist Experiences and Place Attachment When Consuming Local Food. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(6), pp. 536–548. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2070.

Vada, S., Prentice, C. and Hsiao, A. (2019). The influence of tourism experience and well-being on place attachment. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 47, pp. 322-330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.12.007.

Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), pp. 349-370. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0.

Wong, I.A., Fong, L.H.N. and Law, R. (2016). A Longitudinal Multilevel Model of Tourist Outbound Travel Behavior and the Dual-Cycle Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(7), pp. 957-970. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515601239.

Yi, X., Fu, X., So, K.K.F. and Zheng, C. (2023). Perceived Authenticity and Place Attachment: New Findings from Chinese World Heritage Sites. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 47(5), pp. 800-826. https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480211027629.

Yi, X., Lin, V.S., Jin, W. and Luo, Q. (2017). The Authenticity of Heritage Sites, Tourists' Quest for Existential Authenticity, and Destination Loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(8), pp. 1032-1048. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516675061.

Yu, Q., Pickering, S., Geng, R. and Yen, D.A. (2021). Thanks for the memories: Exploring city tourism experiences via social media reviews. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 40, p. 100851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100851.

Zhang, H., Wu, Y. and Buhalis, D. (2018). A model of perceived image, memorable tourism experiences and revisit intention. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8, pp. 326-336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.06.004.

Zhang, T., Wen, H. and Li, X. (2018). A Tourist-Based Model of Authenticity of Heritage Sporting Events: The Case of Naadam. *Sustainability*, 11(1), p. 108. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010108.

Zhou, Q. (Bill), He, Z. and Li, X. (Robert). (2023). Quantifying Authenticity: Progress and Challenges. *Journal of Travel Research*, 62(7), pp. 1460–1479. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221131560.

Zou, W., Wei, W., Ding, S. and Xue, J. (2022). The relationship between place attachment and tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 43, p.100983. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TMP.2022.100983.