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ARTICLE INFO
Abstract
In tourism and hospitality experiences, visitors are an indispensable and important component and, through “gazing,” they can indirectly interact with each other. This research aims to investigate how visitors’ gazing of others’ behavior, appearance, and hospitableness during a tourism experience would influence their engagement in the experience. Also, the impact of visitors’ engagement on their memorable experience, satisfaction, and intention to revisit was investigated. Data was collected randomly by using a questionnaire from 373 visitors participating in this study. Findings of structural equation modeling analyses indicated that gazing others’ behavior, appearance, and hospitableness increases visitors’ engagement. Visitors’ engagement increases their memorable experience and satisfaction. Visitors’ satisfaction and memorable experience mediated the relationship between visitors’ engagement their intention to revisit. Theoretically, this study offers new insights by highlighting the concept of visitors gazing. Practical suggestions were provided for managers to increase their visitors’ intention to revisit by designing experiences that are memorable and ensure visitors’ satisfaction.

1. Introduction
In tourism and other hospitality experiences, visitors are an indispensable component, and by “gazing” they can indirectly interact with each other (Zheng et al., 2021). This study focuses on the visitors gazing at others and how their gazing might influence their tourism experiences. By gazing, visitors are using a non-verbal communication technique to communicate with others (Al-Tayyib, 2016). Gazing is an act defined as an “intentional steady look at something that excites admiration, curiosity, or interest” (Moufakkir & Reisinger, 2013a, 2013b). In this context, scholars have studied three types of gazing. Li et al. (2021) studied the first type of tourist gazing, which is tourists looking at their hosts. The second type of gazing involves tourist-to-tourist or visitor-to-visitor gazing (Pearce, 2005), which is colloquially referred to as “people watching.” The third type of gazing is between hosts and tourists, as the hosts assess the tourists’ behaviors or appearance (Reisinger et al., 2013). This study focuses on the second type, which is gazing between visitors. Specifically, this study concentrates on visitors’ gazing at others’ behaviors, appearance, and hospitableness during a shared experience.
In the tourism and hospitality literature, gazing behavior has received a fair amount of attention from scholars (i.e., Maoz, 2006; Holloway et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2021). Tourists’ gazing reflects the time they spend watching people and places during an experience and their recollection of its visual nature (Urry, 1992). According to Kendon and Cook (1969), gazing not only concentrates on what individuals physically observe, but it also relates to their impressions and attitudes. Peng et al. (2020) indicated that the places individuals visit influence their behaviors and physical appearance, and the hospitableness of others was selected because, by gazing, visitors can evaluate how hospitable others are during the same experience. In this study, the hospitableness of others is defined as visitors’ evaluations of others as being hospitable, i.e., welcoming through their gazing. However, gazing at appearances might influence individuals’ stereotyping of others based on their physical aspect, clothes, age, and ethnicity (Biernat & Billings, 2001).

In such a shared consumption environment as when shopping, previous studies have indicated that customers’ gazing at other customers significantly impacted their emotions and experiences (Kim & Lee, 2012; Hanks et al., 2017; Line & Hanks, 2019). The extent to which visitors were engaged is a critical sign of their association with an organization and plays a significant role in the business’s growth (Prentice et al., 2018). Previous studies have determined multiple antecedents for customers’ engagement (i.e., Van Doorn et al., 2010; Ahn & Back, 2018). However, only a limited number of studies have examined how visitors gaze at others, especially regarding how their behavior, appearance, and hospitableness could increase visitors’ engagement in such an experience.

Creating memorable experiences in hospitality and tourism has received attention from scholars (e.g., Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Kim & Chen, 2019). The more visitors engaged in an experience, the more positive were their memories of that experience, which increased their intention to revisit (Chen & Rahman, 2018). When customers’ engagement increases, their satisfaction increases as well (Abror et al., 2019; Sharma & Sarmah, 2019). The associations between an experience’s memorability and visitors’ revisit intention and between visitors’ satisfaction and their willingness to visit again were studied in the literature (e.g., Kim & Ritchie 2014; Lee et al., 2020); however, in the context of gazing, the relationship among a memorable experience, an intention to revisit, and satisfaction has received minimal attention from scholars.

The study aims to examine the influence of tourists gazing at others on their engagement and how their engagement influences their behavioral intentions. More specifically, the objectives of this study were to 1) test the relationship between visitors’ gazing at other visitors’ behaviors, appearance, and hospitableness and their engagement in their experiences; 2) investigate the interrelationship among engagement, memorable experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention of visitors; 3) examine memorable experiences as a mediator in the association between visitor engagement and their visit intention; and 4) examine visitor satisfaction as a mediator variable in the relationship between visitors’ engagement and their revisit intention.

**Literature Review**

**1.1. Visitor gazing**

The act of looking, which scholars named “gazing,” was highlighted in the psychology literature. According to Cook (1977), gazing is a non-verbal that occurs between two individuals and can be considered as a signal of communications. Tourists and visitors gaze at things around them, and their gazing creates their experience (Larsen, 2014). Studies have indicated that the presence of others in a services-related experience influences
customers’ experiences (Huang & Hsu, 2010; Holloway et al., 2011). Also, the culture background and its influence on gazing behavior has been studied, and scholars have indicated that different cultures may influence the behavior of gazing (Moufakkir & Reisinger, 2013a, 2013b). In the tourism context, tourist gazing is a process that indicates how visitors interact with different components during their tourism experience (Urry, 1992; Urry & Larsen, 2011). Bunten (2011) indicated that gazing can influence tourists’ perceptions of a destination.

1.2. Behaviors of others and visitor engagement

Individuals rely on gazing to evaluate the behavior of others (Matsumoto et al., 2010). Because local people portray their public image to tourists, they need to consider the importance of the tourists who are gazing at them (Light, 2000). Brocato et al. (2012) assert that customers evaluate the behaviors of others when they are friendly, pleasant, and acting appropriately for the setting. Previous studies have found that the behavior of others influences customers’ satisfaction and their general attitudes (Parker & Ward, 2000; Hanks & Line, 2018; Line & Hanks, 2019). Kim and Lee (2012) indicated that others’ behaviors can affect customers’ assessments of their service experiences in restaurants, and Zheng et al. (2021) found that the behavior of others influences customers’ feeling of arousal and curiosity during their theme park experiences. After reviewing the literature, the influence of gazing at others’ behavior as a part of visitors’ engagement is not clear yet. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H1: Gazing at others’ behaviors positively increases visitors’ engagement in a tourism experience.

1.3. Appearance of others and visitor engagement

Brocato et al. (2012) indicated that customers used the physical appearance of other customers as one key dimension of their perception of others, and Trampe et al. (2010) found that other customers’ attractiveness plays significant role in determining customer perceptions and attitudes. Brocato et al (2012) defined physical appearance in the context of the service industry as other customers’ overall look and their physical characteristics in the environment as it perceived by other individuals. Kim and Lee (2012) indicated that during their evaluation of service experiences, customers consider the appearance of others, and according to Mehrabian and Russell (1974), the physical appearance of others directly influences individuals’ emotional reactions (i.e., arousal and pleasure). McGrath and Otnes (1995) demonstrated that customers would prefer to be around those who they assess as attractive and positive, and Trampe et al. (2010) indicated that physical appearance of others influence customers’ mood and the service environment’s overall image. The influence of visitors’ gazing at others’ appearance on their engagement has received very limited attention, however. Hence, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H2: Gazing at others’ appearance positively increases visitors’ engagement in a tourism experience.

1.4. Hospitableness of others and visitor engagement

Tasci and Semrad (2016) describe hospitableness as “the positive attitudinal, behavioral, and personality characteristics of a host, which result in positive emotional responses in guests feeling welcomed, wanted, cared for, safe, and important” (p. 86). In the hospitality industry, the service providers’ hospitable attitude is a competitive advantage that companies rely on (Tomasella & Ali, 2019). This study defined hospitableness as the degree to which visitors evaluate the welcoming behaviors of others.
around them during a tourism experience. Grissemann et al. (2021) indicated that perceived hospitableness positively increases customers’ positive word of mouth, intention to book, and willingness to pay more for a hotel. Hospitableness has a positive relationship on customers’ satisfaction (Teng, 2011). The influence of customers’ gazing on another’s hospitableness has not been studied before. Therefore, based on the review of hospitableness literature, this study hypothesized that gazing at others’ hospitableness would increase customers’ engagement in an experience.

**H3: Gazing at others’ hospitableness positively increases visitors’ engagement in a tourism experience.**

1.5. The influence of visitor engagement on their experience memorability, their satisfaction and revisit intention

Visitors’ engagement is an important component during tourism experiences (So et al., 2014). The literature on tourism indicates that visitors’ engagement has a positive relationship with visitors’ overall satisfaction, which leads to a memorable experience (Taheri et al., 2014; Chen & Rahman, 2018). Seyfi et al. (2020) stated that the more a visitor engaged with a tourist attraction, the more memorable their experience would be. Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021) found that tourists’ engagement had a positive impact on their memorable experience and revisit intention. In the marketing context, Hollebeek (2011) indicated that customer engagement is the antecedent of their intention to purchase, and Rasoolimanesh et al. (2019) found a positive association between tourists’ engagement, satisfaction, and revisit intention. In addition, Lin et al. (2019) and Sharma and Sarmah (2019) found a positive association between tourists’ engagement and their satisfaction. Therefore, the influence of visitors’ engagement on creating a memorable experience, revisit intention, and satisfaction needs more studies. This need leads to the following hypotheses:

**H4: Visitors’ engagement positively increases their memorable experience.**

**H5: Visitors’ engagement positively increases their intention to revisit.**

**H6: Visitors’ engagement positively increases their satisfaction.**

1.6. Memorable experience and intention to revisit

Revisit intention is described as the likelihood of going back to a place or reperforming an activity (Baker & Crompton, 2000). The literature indicated that the more an experience is perceived as memorable by customers, the more likely they will have positive behavioral intentions (e.g., revisiting) (Kim et al., 2012; Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Zhang et al., 2018). Marschall (2012), claimed that after visiting a destination, tourists’ revisit intention is more likely to increase if they had a positively memorable experience (Marschall, 2012). Also, in the food experience context, Yu et al. (2019) found that a memorable food experience significantly increases customers’ intention to revisit. The phenomenon of memorable experience as a mediator has been used in several studies; for instance, Hoong and Hsu (2021) found that the association between pleasantness and tourists’ behavioral intentions was mediated by a memorable experience. Shafieizadeh et al., (2021) found that customers’ satisfaction with a dining experience positively influences their intention to say positive things via word of mouth, and this relationship was mediated by memorable dining experiences. This study assumed that customers’ engagement with highly positive memorable experiences leads to a higher intention to revisit. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:
H7: Visitors’ memorable experience positively increases their intention to revisit.

H8: The relationship between visitors’ engagement and their intention to revisit is fully mediated by visitors’ memorable experience.

1.7. Satisfaction and visitors’ revisit intention

Satisfaction is a substantial antecedent of customers’ intentions (i.e., revisit intention) (Hollebeek and Rather, 2019). The impact of customers’ satisfaction on their intention to revisit was highlighted in the hospitality and tourism literature (e.g., Cevdet et al., 2015; Ali et al., 2016; Frayag et al., 2017; Suhartanto, 2016; Cho et al., 2020). In the festival context, Baker and Crompton (2000) found that satisfaction is an antecedent of visitors’ behavioral intentions, and in the heritage tourism context, Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021) found that visitors’ satisfaction significantly increases their intention to revisit.

Satisfaction as a mediator variable was heavily examined in the hospitality and tourism literature. For instance, studies have found that a memorable experience influences tourists’ revisit intention and their word-of-mouth intention, and this relationship was mediated by their satisfaction (Zhang et al., 2018; Gohary et al., 2020). Also, Namkung and Jang (2009) found that satisfaction mediated the relationship between interactional fairness and customers’ future behavioral intentions. The impact of visitors’ engagement on their intention to revisit with satisfaction as the mediator between them needs more studies. Thus, this research hypothesized that when visitors are engaged and satisfied, they are more likely to revisit the site where they had the experience. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H9: Visitors’ satisfaction positively increases their intention to revisit.

H10: Visitors’ satisfaction fully mediates the relationship between visitors’ engagement and their intention to revisit.

Fig. 1. Conceptual framework.

3. Methods

3.1. Sample and procedure

Individuals who were 18 years old or above and visited an event during Riyadh Season 2022 within a month prior to data collection were the target population of this study.
Riyadh is the capital city of Saudi Arabia. A quantitative survey approach was used. The survey was designed in Qualtrics and then distributed randomly to visitors in two ways. First, data collectors were recruited to collect data from visitors at different events that occurred during the months of November and December 2021. Second, the survey was sent to individuals through social media. Collecting data through different sources and different time points helped avoid a common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Respondents were asked to answer the survey when they have time. Therefore, a convenience sampling was used.

The study’s objectives and purpose and the approximate time to fill out the questionnaire were explained on the cover page. The survey contained two screening questions. To ensure that all respondents were 18 or over, the first question was: Are you 18 years old or older? The second question aimed to ensure reaching the target population: Have you visited any of the Riyadh Season’s events during the last month? Those who hadn’t visited an event were eliminated from the study. Lastly, a check attention question was used to ensure the accuracy of respondents’ answers.

3.2. Instrument development

All measurement items used in this study were adopted from previously published studies. The appearance of others was assessed by using three items from Naumann et al. (2009) and Vazire et al. (2008). Behavior of others was measured by using five measurement items (Oh et al., 2007). Four items from Tasci and Semrad (2016) and Mody et al. (2019) were used to measure others’ hospitableness. The customer engagement scale from Hollebeek et al. (2014) was used, and the satisfaction construct was measured by using the three times used by Oliver (1997). Memorable experience measurement items were borrowed from Cao et al., (2019), and intention to revisit was measured by using three items developed by Zhang et al. (2018). This study used a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) Likert scale for all measurement items. The demographic information of the respondents (i.e., age groups, gender, education, income, and marital status) were obtained, as presented in Table 1.

The original measurement scale used in this study was originally written in English. The measurement items were translated into Arabic using the method proposed by Brislin (1980). To ensure the quality of the translation, two experts with a background of business research and with adequate knowledge of English were invited. The translation was done in two steps. First, the survey was translated from English to Arabic (first expert). Second, the survey was back-translation from Arabic to English (second expert). The survey was modified based on the experts’ comments. Then, the Arabic version was finalized. Lastly, 46 participants were in a pilot study conducted before the formal data collection to check the contents’ validity and the scales’ reliability. Slight modifications were made based on the pilot’s results.

3.3. Data screening

The survey was opened by 901 respondents. Of these 901, 280 were removed because they had not visited any of the Riyadh Season’s events. An additional 248 were removed because (1) they did not correctly answer one of the two attention check questions, or (2) they did not complete the survey. The final sample size used in this study was 373. Based on Hair et al.’s (2006) recommendation (five observations per indicator), this study obtained a sufficient sample size for structural equation modeling. This study satisfied the minimum sample size (73*5 = 365). The response rate was 41.1% (901/373).
The normality assumption was checked by assessing skewness and kurtosis. The value of skewness ranged from -0.960 to -1.298, whereas the kurtosis ranged between -3.68 and 2.072. These results indicated an acceptable distribution (Kline, 2011). Also, the construct’s multicollinearity was checked. The results indicated that all variance inflation factors (VIF) did not exceed 10 (Kline, 2011). Therefore, multicollinearity is not a problem in this study. Lastly, the boxplot was tested to identify any univariate outliers, and the results showed that the data did not have any extreme outliers.

3.4. Data analysis

Anderson and Gerbing (1988) proposed a two-step approach to conduct a structural equation modeling (SEM) and analyze the data to accomplish the study’s objectives. The first step aimed to validate the measurement scales by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Hair et al., 2006). Through the second phase, SEM was applied to investigate the hypothesized relationships among the study’s variables. This study also assessed Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability (CR) to check reliability. In addition, construct validity was judged by using the average variance extracted (AVE). SPSS v. 24.0 and Mplus v. 7.3. software programs were used to analyze the obtained data.

4. Results

4.1. Respondents’ profile

As shown in Table 1, 55% of the sample were males and 45% were females. The majority (64.1%) of respondents were ages 18 to 34 years old, had a bachelor’s degree (59.8%), had never married (50.7%), and made less than 15,000 SAR a month (64.9%). Lastly, about half of the respondents visited an event during the Riyadh Season with friends (49.6%) or with family members (47.7%).

Table 1. Sample characteristics (n=373).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With whom did you visit the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monthly Income
5,000 SAR and less 94 25.2
5,001 SAR to 10,000 SAR 79 21.2
10,001 SAR to 15,000 SAR 69 18.5
15,001 SAR to 20,000 SAR 38 10.2
20,001 SAR and over 52 13.9
Prefer not to disclose 41 11.0

Marital Status
Married 153 41.0
Never married 189 50.7
Divorced 31 8.3

Note: Each 3.75 SAR is equal to 1 US dollar

4.2. Measurement model

The initial model showed an excellent data fit ($\chi^2= 459.567$, $df = 231$, $p<0.001$, TLI = 0.970, CFI = 0.975, SRMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.058). Table 2 displays the reliability, convergent validity and discriminant validity. The standardized factor loading for each item ranged from 0.712 to 0.948, indicating the reliability the measurement items. The recommended threshold of composite reliability (CR) and Cronbach’s alpha of 0.7 and all variables passed it (Hair et al., 2010). All variables were 0.50 or above in the average variance extracted (AVE), indicating that convergent validity was achieved (Malhotra & Dash, 2011). Lastly, the square root of all AVE was bigger than squared correlations between pairs of constructs that ensure the discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2006). As shown in Table 3, at $p <0.001$, all correlations among constructs were significant, indicating potential relationships among constructs.

Table 2. Results of confirmatory factor analysis, constructs validity, and reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Std. loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors (BA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of other visitors was amusing to watch (BA1)</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching other visitors’ onsite behaviors was captivating (BA2)</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoyed watching what other visitors were doing (BA3)</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of others was fun to watch (BA4)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching the behavior of others was very entertaining (BA5)</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance (AP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the other visitors were always smiling (AP1)</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the other visitors looked energetic (AP2)</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the other visitors looked cheerful (AP3)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitableness (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assume, to feel welcome at this event (PH1)</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assume, that I would be treated friendly in this event (PH2)</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I assume, that this event is very concerned about its guest’s well-being and satisfaction (PH3)
I assume, that I would be treated with respect in this event (PH4)

Visitor Engagement (VE)
I feel positive when I visit/play in this event (TE1)
Visiting/playing in this casino makes me happy (TE2)
I feel good when I visit/play in this casino (TE3)

Memorable Experience (ME)
Speak to others of this experience (ME1)
Recall this dining experience (ME2)
Remember vividly (ME3)

Satisfaction (SAT)
I am pleased with my experience. (SAT1)
My experience is pleasurable (SAT2)
My choice was a wise one (SAT3)

Intention to Revisit (ITR)
I think I intend to revisit this event (ITR1)
I think I intend to recommend this event to others (ITR2)
I think I will plan to revisit this event (ITR3)

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and correlations matrix (n=373)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitableness</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Engagement</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorable experience</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Revisit</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = mean; SD = standard deviations

a Correlations between variables are below the diagonal.
b Squared correlations between variables are above the diagonal.

**p < .01

4.3. Structural equation

A structural equation modeling (SEM) was applied to test the suggested associations between variables. The suggested model is given in Fig. 1. The results implied that the...
goodness-of-fit of the model indicated a good fit ($\chi^2= 537.892$, $df = 241$, $p<.001$, TLI = 0.962, CFI = 0.967, SRMR = 0.054, and RMSEA = 0.064) (Kline, 2011). For hypotheses testing, the results showed that all direct (H1, H2, H3, H4, H6, H7, H8) hypotheses, except H5, and indirect (H9, H10) hypotheses were statistically supported (Table 4).

As expected, the proposed effect of gazing at other visitors’ behavior ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.05$), appearance ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.05$), and hospitableness ($\beta = 0.50$, $p < 0.05$) were found to significantly increase visitors’ engagement in an experience, supporting H1, H2, and H3. The results indicated that customers’ engagement in an experience positively influenced their memorability ($\beta = 0.66$, $p < 0.05$) and satisfaction ($\beta = 0.90$, $p < 0.05$), supporting H4 and H6. The relationship between visitors’ engagement and intention to revisit ($\beta = 0.06$, $p > 0.05$) was not supported by the data. Thus, H5 is not supported. Lastly, visitors’ experience memorability ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.05$) and satisfaction ($\beta = 0.72$, $p < 0.05$) significantly increased visitors’ intention to revisit, supporting H7 and H8. In terms of the indirect proposed hypotheses, the results indicated that visitors’ engagement indirectly influences their intention to revisit through their memorable experience ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.05$), supporting H9. Lastly, visitors’ engagement also influenced their intention to revisit through their satisfaction ($\beta = 0.72$, $p < 0.05$).

![Fig. 2. The results of the structural model.](https://jaauth.journals.ekb.eg)

**Table 4. Direct and indirect effects (n=373).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
<th>Standard Estimates</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>BA $\rightarrow$ TE</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>AP $\rightarrow$ TE</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>PH $\rightarrow$ TE</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>VE $\rightarrow$ ME</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>VE $\rightarrow$ ITR</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$p &gt; 0.05$</td>
<td>rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>VE $\rightarrow$ SAT</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>ME $\rightarrow$ ITR</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>VE $\rightarrow$ ME $\rightarrow$ ITR</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>SAT $\rightarrow$ ITR</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>VE $\rightarrow$ SAT $\rightarrow$ ITR</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE*: **$p < .001$ *$p < .05$*
5. Discussion

This study aimed to explore the impact of visitors’ gazing at other visitors’ behaviors, appearance, and hospitableness on their engagement in an experience. Also, the interrelationship among visitors’ engagement, satisfaction, and memorable experience was examined. The results indicated that visitors’ gazing of other visitors’ behavior increases the former’s engagement in the experience. Customers rely on the behaviors of others to determine if their behaviors were friendly, pleasant, and appropriate for the setting (Brocato et al., 2012). The findings of this study indicated that gazing the appropriate behaviors of others would increase visitors’ engagement in the experience.

Also, gazing at others’ appearance was found to be a positive antecedent of a visitor’s engagement in an experience. Kim and Lee (2012) asserted that customers use the appearance of others when they evaluate a service experience. This study found that gazing at others’ appearance positively increases visitors’ engagement in an experience. Lastly, previous studies found that hospitableness positively influences customer satisfaction, intention to revisit, and intention to purchase (i.e., Grissemann et al., 2021). This study found that gazing at others’ hospitableness is important for increasing visitors’ engagement.

Customers’ engagement increased their satisfaction and memorability. Such a finding is consistent with prior research (i.e., Taheri, Jafari, & O’Gorman, 2014; Chen & Rahman, 2018; Seyfi et al., 2020). Additionally, this study found that visitor satisfaction and memorable experience positively increases their intention to revisit. One unanticipated finding was that visitors’ engagement did not affect their intention to revisit. This finding does not align with the findings of previous research (i.e., Rasoolimanesh et al., 2019). However, interestingly, when visitors are engaged and satisfied, they are more likely to revisit the event. Also, when visitors are engaged and forming a positive memory, they are more likely to revisit. Therefore, the mediation role of visitors’ satisfaction and memorable experience between the relationship of visitors’ engagement and their revisit intention is positively significant.

5.1. Theoretical implications

The current research provides several important theoretical implications. First, this study’s findings contribute to the engagement literature by providing new antecedents to visitors’ engagement. Previous studies focused on how the servicescape (i.e., Li & Wei, 2021), brand experience (i.e., Yasin et al., 2019), and place attachment (i.e., Loureiro & Sarmento, 2019) increased customers’ engagement. Also, the relationships among visitors’ and locals and how their interaction would influence visitors’ experience have received attention from scholars (i.e., Holloway et al., 2011; Urry & Larsen, 2011). However, the influence of other visitors’ appearance, behavior, and hospitableness on visitors’ engagement has received minimal attention from scholars. The results showed that other visitors’ appearance and behaviors would positively influence visitors’ engagement in an experience. In other words, events create an atmosphere during which visitors discover their surroundings and, more specifically, other visitors’ behavior, appearance, and hospitableness, which increase their engagement in the experience.

The investigation of the direct influence among visitors’ engagement, experience’s memorability, and revisit intention is the second contribution of this study. When visitors are engaged in an experience, they are more likely to create positive memory, and their satisfaction would increase. It was found that the creation of positive memory directly
increases the desire to revisit. Also, getting satisfied after the event directly create a desire to revisit.

Testing the mediation impact of experience memorability and satisfaction in the link between their engagement and their revisit desire is the third contribution. Schmitt (1999) indicated that customers’ memorable experiences have an influence on their behaviors and attitudes. Highlighting the mediation impact of memorability between the link between visitors’ engagement and their revisit intention is another theoretical contribution. This study found that visitor engagement influences their intention to revisit only when their engagement creates a positive memory. Lastly, the mediation effect of visitors’ satisfaction in the relationship between visitors’ engagement and their intention to revisit was important to examine, and it is one of the study’s contributions. When visitors engaged in an experience during an event, they are more likely to return only when they are satisfied.

5.2. Practical implications

Designers of visitors’ experiences spend great amounts of money on infrastructures and decorations to create an experience during which visitors will become engaged. However, the influence of visitors’ gazing at others on their engagement has not been ignored. The impact of visitors’ gazing at others’ behavior, appearance, and hospitableness is positive on their engagement. Therefore, visitors are more likely to engage when they observed desirable behaviors, appearance, and hospitableness from others around them. Thus, practitioners may promote some activities during the experience that motivate visitors to engage in certain favorable behaviors (i.e., smiling, dancing, singing) and increasing the chance that other visitors may engage in positive gazing at those behaviors.

Practitioners have more control of the appearance and the behaviors of their employees. Therefore, this study recommends that practitioners focus on their employees’ training to present certain positive behaviors when they interact with visitors. The appearance of employees also will play a significant role in tourists’ engagements. Therefore, employees’ clothes, smiles, and cheerfulness that they present are important. Hence, managers should train, observe, and evaluate their employees’ appearance. Lastly, the more visitors perceive other individuals around them as being hospitable, the more engaged they will be. Thus, it is important that practitioners train their employees to express their hospitableness during their duties. Also, practitioners should emphasize hospitableness through their websites when they use photos to market the experience they provide.

This study assists practitioners to better understand what makes their visitors intend to revisit the experience that was provided. This study found that visitors’ engagement positively influences their intention to revisit only through their memorable experience and satisfaction. Therefore, this study recommends that managers collect data from visitors to measure their satisfaction level and how likely they would be creating a positive memory. The information taken from the data would help managers to enhance the design of the experience they provide during the events. Also, providing new, unique experiences may be helpful to increase customer engagement and, through their satisfaction and memorable experience, increase their intention to revisit.

5.3. Limitations and future research

This study has important findings. However, like many other studies, it contains several limitations. First, this study only focused on local visitors (Saudis) to Riyadh Season’s events. Comparing local and international visitors may provide more insights on the proposed relationships. Therefore, future studies may collect data from local and international visitors and compare how other visitors’ behavior, appearance, and
hospitableness affects their engagement in an experience. Also, exploring the moderation effect of the sample's characteristics (i.e., age) would provide different results. Second, the study focused only on other visitors' behavior, appearance, and hospitableness on visitors' engagement. Therefore, other mediators (i.e., satisfaction and experience quality) need to be investigated in future studies. Lastly, the findings of this study cannot be generalized beyond the target population, as the study was conducted in a specific regional context (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia). The results might therefore deviate when the data are collected from other regions. Therefore, future studies are encouraged to replicate the study within different regional contexts.
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تأثير النظر إلى سلوك ومظهر وكرم ضيافة الزوار الآخر على انخراط السياح في التجربة وتأثير ذلك على السلوكية
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الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة تأثير تحييد الزوار في سلوك ومظهر وكرم ضيافة الزوار الآخرين أثناء التجربة سياحة على انخراطهم في التجارة. أيضاً، تم دراسة تأثير تفاعل الزائرين على خلق تجارب لا تنسى وعلى رضاهم وتنبؤهم في تكرار الزيارة. باستخدام الاستبانة، تم جمع البيانات عشوائياً من 373 زائراً في هذه الدراسة. أشارت نتائج تحليلات نمذجة المعادلات الهيكلية إلى أن التحديق في سلوك ومظهر وكرم ضيافة الزوار يزيد من انخراط الزائرين في التجارة. كما أن انخراط الزوار في التجارب يزيد من احتمالية خلق ذكريات لا تنسى ويزيد من رضاهم. أكدت النتائج الدور الوسيط للذكرى التي لا تنسى والرضاء في العلاقة بين تفاعل الزائرين وتنبؤهم في تكرار الزيارة. من الناحية النظرية، قدمت هذه الدراسة نتائج جديدة من خلال تحليل الضوء على فهمه تحييد الزوار. كما تم تقديم اقتراحات عملية للمدراء لزيادة نسبة زوارهم في تكرار الزيارة من خلال تصميم تجارب لا تنسى وضمان رضاهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية
تحييد الزوار؛ تجربة الزائر؛ تجربة لا تنسى؛ كرم الضيافة؛ انخراط الزائر.
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