The Journal Gastronomy Tourism 13(2) (2026) 164-182

The Journal Gastronomy Tourism

Journal homepage:
https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/gastur/index

Storynomics and Memorable Culinary Tourism Experiences in Relation to Willingness to Pay in Bali

Dewa Ayu Made Lily Dianasari, Hanugerah Kristiono Liestiandre, Dewa Ayu Nyoman Aridayanti, Ida Bagus Putra Negarayana*

Bali Tourism Polytechnic, Indonesia

*Correspondence: E-mail: lily.dianasari@ppb.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Culinary narratives connect food experiences with cultural meaning, yet their relationship with willingness to pay (WTP) requires further assessment. This study examines storynomics, memorable culinary tourism experience (MCTE), and stated WTP using reported findings from an online survey of 200 international tourists evaluating culinary experiences in Bali. The partial least squares model indicates positive relationships between MCTE and storynomics (β = 0.749) and between storynomics and WTP (β = 0.382). A small negative interaction coefficient (β = −0.030), with an estimated incremental effect size of 0.0015, suggests limited additional explanatory contribution. However, this estimate does not replace SmartPLS re-estimation or bootstrap inference. Item-level inspection reveals heterogeneous content, including revisit intention within storynomics and an education-related statement within WTP. Descriptive results indicate favourable evaluations of cultural connection, learning, and service reliability. The study supports culturally credible, guest-responsive culinary narratives while limiting conclusions to exploratory associations pending measurement and inferential verification.

© 2026 UPI Journal and Publication Office

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted/Received 19 May 2026
First Revised 23 September 2026
Accepted 1 November 2026
First Available online 22 Nov 2026
Publication Date December 2026

Keyword: Storynomics; Culinary Storytelling; Memorable Culinary Tourism Experience; Willingness to Pay; Bali

1. INTRODUCTION

Food provides a setting in which visitors encounter the culture of a destination through ingredients, preparation, hospitality, and social interaction. Research on memorable culinary tourism experiences identifies several sources of memorability, including the food itself, its setting, companions, occasions, novelty, and authenticity (Stone et al., 2018). Indonesian food culture also embeds geographical and historical differences that make a uniform national account insufficient (Wijaya, 2019). These perspectives suggest that culinary tourism should be examined through the relationship between what visitors experience and how they interpret its meaning. The connection between gastronomy and destination experience also follows Kivela & Crotts (2006) whose work provides a foundational tourism perspective rather than an interchangeable measurement instrument.

Gastronomic tourists also differ in the experiences and value they seek. An international demand study identified three visitor segments rather than a single uniform gastronomic-tourist profile (Barzallo-Neira & Pulido-Fernández, 2025a). This heterogeneity makes it important to specify whose experiences are being evaluated and to avoid treating favourable average ratings as evidence of identical preferences among all visitors.

Storytelling offers one means of making those meanings accessible. Tourism scholarship connects stories with immersive settings and visitor participation (Mossberg, 2008), while subsequent research examines value-oriented storytelling in destination performance and historical storytelling in heritage value co-creation (Ferdinand et al., 2024; Leong et al., 2024). These studies support the relevance of narrative interpretation, but they address different settings and outcomes. Evidence concerning destination performance or heritage co-creation cannot automatically establish a willingness-to-pay effect in a restaurant or cooking activity.

Three issues therefore require closer attention. First, the literature and tourism practice sometimes use storytelling, cultural narratives, and storynomics as interchangeable terms. Yet narrative content, its delivery, and its strategic commercial use operate at different conceptual levels. Second, an enjoyable meal may make its associated story more salient, just as a story may influence the interpretation of a meal. A cross-sectional survey cannot resolve this temporal sequence simply by choosing an arrow in a structural model. Third, an interaction between narrative evaluations and experience evaluations concerns conditional association; it is not direct evidence of an optimal amount of storytelling.

The possibility of excessive storytelling offers a useful boundary question. Detailed interpretation may enrich understanding, but it may also compete with tasting, conversation, or attention to the meal. Cognitive load theory provides a general rationale for considering processing demands (Sweller, 1988). Its application here is a theoretical extension from learning research, rather than established evidence that culinary storytelling has a saturation point. Narrative relevance, perceived authenticity, delivery timing, and information quantity should consequently be distinguished when examining this possibility.

This study focuses on culinary experiences in Bali evaluated by 200 international tourists. Sanur, Seminyak, and Ubud provide the destination context described in the source article. Although recruitment occurred online and the questionnaire uses broader references to Indonesia, all 200 respondents evaluated culinary experiences in Bali. This geographical scope does not imply representative coverage of Bali or Indonesia, or balanced representation across the three locations.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

This study asks how MCTE and storynomics-related evaluations are associated, how storynomics relates to WTP, and whether the interaction adds a practically meaningful contribution to the reported model. The expanded analysis uses the available item wording and aggregate statistics to identify what the evidence supports. Its contribution is a bounded account of narrative value, experience evaluation, and stated WTP, accompanied by a transparent assessment of measurement content and a provisional framework for Balinese culinary businesses. No national generalisation or optimal narrative intensity is inferred.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Defining Storynomics and Its Measurement Boundary

Storytelling refers here to the communication process through which a narrator organizes and conveys events or meanings. Cultural narratives are the content communicated, such as accounts of a dish's origin, a producer's practices, or the social meaning of a shared meal. Storynomics refers to the strategic integration of stories into marketing and experience design to create perceived value, following the broader managerial usage of McKee and Gerace (2018). This study uses "storynomics perceptions" for tourists' evaluations of those narrative elements. It does not directly observe a firm's complete storytelling strategy or financial performance.

The original conceptualization identified cultural storytelling, emotional engagement, digital narratives, and heritage interpretation. Their rationale is that culinary interpretation concerns culturally situated content, the visitor's affective response, a means of delivery, and the explanation of heritage meanings. Cultural content is relevant to food identity (Wijaya, 2019); immersion and participation help explain the affective role of stories (Mossberg, 2008); and heritage storytelling connects interpretation to place and interaction (Leong et al., 2024). Digital delivery is a channel through which that content may be encountered, rather than an intrinsically equivalent psychological dimension.

Garcês (2024) brings authenticity and storytelling together in a conceptual account of gastronomic experience, while (Jain & Mitra, 2024) discuss how media can support culinary heritage and community participation. These contributions provide a rationale for culturally grounded interpretation. They also raise the question of how commercial narratives represent local communities, which a tourist-attitude scale alone cannot answer.

The available item wording now makes the measurement boundary clearer. S1–S2 concern interest and enjoyment associated with historical stories or myths; S3–S4 concern digital content and information search; S5 concerns cultural connection; S6 concerns revisit intention; and S7–S8 concern cultural learning and preference for culturally meaningful food. This broadly corresponds to the four intended domains, but the statements do not consistently measure the conceptual indicators listed in the operational-definition table. For example, the table refers to figures or legends, nostalgia, and preservation, whereas the corresponding statements emphasise enjoyment, revisiting, and preference. Appendix B distinguishes intended domains from observed wording.

The reported eight-item storynomics block combines engagement, information behaviour, affect, cultural learning, and a behavioural intention. It is therefore interpreted conservatively as a broad set of storynomics-related evaluations, not a validated four-dimensional measure of narrative strategy. S6 requires special attention because revisit intention is usually an outcome rather than a characteristic of the narrative itself. The present revision retains the reported model and does not delete items while keeping its original coefficients. Any revised measurement model must be re-estimated from respondent-level data.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

2.2 Memorable Culinary Tourism Experience and Willingness to Pay

Memorable culinary tourism experience (MCTE) concerns the visitor's remembered evaluation of a food-related encounter. The original operational definition groups the 15 items into local culture (MCTE1–MCTE4), authenticity (MCTE5–MCTE7), novelty (MCTE8–MCTE9), togetherness and social interaction (MCTE10–MCTE12), and service quality (MCTE13–MCTE15). Stone et al. (2018) support the relevance of food, setting, companions, occasions, and touristic elements to culinary memories. Kim & Ritchie (2014) provide a distinct cross-cultural validation of an MTE scale; citing that work does not mean that the present five-domain instrument reproduces its validated seven-dimensional structure.

Research on memorable cultural tourism experiences offers a related but distinct setting for studying how visitors recall encounters with heritage (Seyfi et al., 2020). Within gastronomy, cooking classes provide another experience format examined in the literature (Kokkranikal & Carabelli, 2024). Bütün & Önçel (2025) studying domestic tourists in Gaziantep, found that components of memorable gastronomic experience had different relationships with visitor satisfaction. Their results reinforce the need to distinguish dimensions and outcomes: evidence concerning satisfaction cannot automatically validate a WTP scale, and a measure developed for one activity or destination requires contextual assessment before use elsewhere.

Willingness to pay (WTP) refers to a stated willingness to incur expenditure for an offering. In this questionnaire, WTP1 invokes the respondent's budget, WTP3–WTP8 concern willingness or preference to pay more under particular conditions, and WTP2 asks whether education is considered when selecting a high-quality culinary experience. WTP2 does not directly ask about willingness to pay. Thus, the reported block mixes conditional payment intentions with a self-evaluation concerning education. Research on food-and-wine co-creation provides relevant context (Rachão et al., 2023), but the present scale cannot establish a monetary premium or observed spending.

Several studies clarify why payment intentions require more specific interpretation. Gözgeç Mutlu & Doğdubay (2024) examine gastronomic involvement as a mediator of restaurant customers' willingness to pay a premium. Rodrigues et al., (2026) link organic-food valuation to attitudes and ecological self-identity, while Lokman & Buyruk (2025) examine geographical-indication products, destination food image, and willingness to pay more. These studies concern distinct value propositions. In the present questionnaire, historical meaning, service quality, organic ingredients, and environmental practices are combined within WTP; their separate contributions cannot be established from an overall construct coefficient.

Evidence from conservation settings also links responsible behaviour and emotional affinity with willingness to pay (Batool et al., 2025). This is useful comparative evidence about environmental valuation, but paying for conservation differs from paying for a culinary encounter. Accordingly, the environmental WTP items warrant their own content assessment rather than borrowing validity from ecotourism research.

2.3 Structural Relationships and the Exploratory Interaction

A meaningful culinary encounter may give visitors concrete referents for interpreting stories about food. This offers a possible rationale for the reported MCTE-to-storynomics relationship. Conversely, stories encountered before or during a meal may shape how that experience is remembered. Both sequences are theoretically plausible. Because the supplied model diagram specifies MCTE as a predictor of storynomics, the present account follows that estimated orientation and treats the reverse sequence as an alternative requiring a separately specified analysis.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

The value co-creation perspective has also been applied to cultural entrepreneurship in small Central Asian ethnic restaurants (Li et al., 2026). It broadens the conceptual discussion beyond one-way delivery of a prepared story. For the present study, however, co-creation remains a possible interpretive perspective rather than a separately measured mechanism or a confirmed mediation pathway.

The first proposition is that MCTE is positively associated with storynomics perceptions. The second is that storynomics perceptions are positively associated with WTP when the other specified predictors are taken into account. The model also includes the MCTE main effect on WTP. These are associational propositions; the available documentation does not establish that they were preregistered or specified before data collection.

The interaction addresses whether the MCTE–WTP slope varies with storynomics perceptions. It is treated as exploratory and nondirectional because complementary and attenuating relationships are both plausible. For example, a relevant story may strengthen the value of an enjoyable meal, whereas redundant information may add little. A negative interaction alone does not identify a threshold, an inverted-U relationship, or a cognitive mechanism. Establishing saturation would require measures of narrative quantity or intensity and a design capable of estimating nonlinear change.

3. METHODS

3.1 Design Setting and Participants

The study used a quantitative cross-sectional online survey distributed through social media. The analyzed sample comprised 200 international tourists, all of whom evaluated culinary experiences in Bali. The manuscript describes purposive selection and identifies Sanur, Seminyak, and Ubud as the destination context. Recruitment was targeted and non-probability based; the available records do not establish on-site recruitment or quotas across these locations. Research tables identify 2025 as the data year; exact fieldwork dates remain unreported.

The target characteristics were foreign-tourist status and experience of local cuisine in Bali. Neither attachment supplies the actual screening questions, a minimum age rule, a required period since the meal, or evidence that exposure to storytelling was an eligibility condition. The statements may capture general food-related attitudes as well as recollections of particular encounters. The original questionnaire wording referring to Indonesia is retained in Appendix B for fidelity to the instrument; the confirmed geographical scope of the evaluated culinary experiences is Bali.

3.2 Sample Size and Measurement

The original article states that N = 200 was chosen with reference to the number of indicators and minimum SEM sample-size considerations attributed to Hair and colleagues. With 31 indicators, this corresponds descriptively to approximately 6.45 respondents per indicator. This reconstructs the documented rationale but does not establish power for a small interaction. No a priori minimum effect, significance level, or target power is reported. The rationale should therefore be presented as an indicator-based rule of thumb, with its limitations, rather than described as a completed power analysis (Hair et al., 2019).

A supplementary regression sensitivity calculation was conducted for this revision, not before data collection. Assuming N = 200, three WTP predictors, an intercept, independent homoscedastic observations, a one-predictor F test at $\alpha = 0.05$, and power of 0.80, the minimum detectable incremental f^2 is approximately 0.0396. This calculation uses a noncentral

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

F distribution with 1 and 196 degrees of freedom and noncentrally N × f^2. It provides an idealized reference for the interaction, not a PLS bootstrap power guarantee or evidence that the original sample was planned this way.

The reported model contains eight storynomics indicators (S1–S8), 15 MCTE indicators (MCTE1–MCTE15), and eight WTP indicators (WP1–WP8 in the model). The original methods identify a four-point response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The exact verbal labels for the two intermediate categories are not reported. Appendix A provides frequencies, corrected arithmetic, and loadings; Appendix B provides the corresponding English statements and intended domains. The substantive blocks were reported as reflectively measured. Their heterogeneous content requires examination before that specification can be treated as established.

3.3 Analysis and Reporting Boundaries

The supplied results were produced using SmartPLS and a partial least squares structural equation modelling approach. Measurement assessment covers outer loadings, internal consistency, average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity. Structural assessment requires coefficients and their uncertainty, explanatory power, and incremental effect sizes. The reported tables and diagram provide point estimates but do not supply the bootstrap output needed for hypothesis decisions. Accordingly, the revision distinguishes available estimates from analyses still required for a complete report.

The estimated specification shown in the source diagram includes MCTE → storynomics, MCTE → WTP, storynomics → WTP, and the MCTE × storynomics interaction predicting WTP. The interaction is a constructed predictor. Reliability coefficients for a single constructed product score are not evaluated as if it were a separately measured psychological scale. The reported loading of that term is also distinct from its structural coefficient. The interaction construction method, score transformation, and estimation settings must be checked in the software project before interpretation.

To make fuller use of the available aggregate data, a fixed-score diagnostic was reconstructed from the rounded correlation matrix. The WTP predictors were ordered as MCTE, storynomics, and their constructed interaction. Solving the predictor correlation matrix against its correlations with WTP yields approximate standardised regression coefficients and an implied R^2. Removing the interaction from that same fixed-score regression gives a reduced R^2 and an incremental f^2. Diagonal elements of the inverse predictor correlation matrix provide corresponding VIF diagnostics. Appendix C reports the inputs, calculations, and rounding sensitivity. This is a new aggregate-data calculation, not a rerun of the PLS algorithm, whose latent scores may change on re-estimation.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Sample Profile and Descriptive Results

The reported age profile is predominantly young: 59.7% aged 17–28, 31.3% aged 29–44, and 4.5% in each older category. These figures sum to 100% but are not all compatible with integer counts at N = 200; the underlying denominator requires verification. The gender chart explicitly states 200 responses and shows 49.5% female and 49.0% male. These imply 99 women and 98 men, leaving three respondents (1.5%) in the chart's only remaining category, "prefer not to say." This arithmetic reconciliation replaces the approximate 1% in the source narrative; the underlying counts should still be checked.

The nationality chart identifies Australia as the largest group, followed by Japan and Russia. Its plotted labels include "England" and "UK" separately, so the categories require

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

harmonisation before geographic grouping or comparative analysis. Bar heights are not converted into exact respondent counts. The occupation chart explicitly shows 34% "others," 19.5% entrepreneur, 18% photography, and 11% employee, corresponding to 68, 39, 36, and 22 of the stated 200 responses. These are sample descriptions, not evidence of different preferences by nationality, occupation, gender, or age.

Appendix A reproduces the supplied item frequencies and recalculates totals and means consistently. On that basis, storynomics means range from 3.47 to 3.64, MCTE means from 3.55 to 3.70, and WTP means from 3.49 to 3.65. WTP4 is inconsistent in the original appendix: the frequencies 0, 1, 69, and 130 imply a total of 729 and a mean of 3.645, whereas the source reports 649 and 3.24. WTP8 implies a total of 710 and a mean of 3.55. The revised arithmetic is conditional on the reported frequencies being correct and is not a correction to the raw dataset.

All 31 items have 200 responses in their reported frequency rows. Of the 6,200 recorded item responses, 6,198 are in categories 3 or 4; only WTP4 and WTP8 contain one category-2 response each, and none contain category 1. The overall distribution is therefore highly concentrated at the favourable end of the scale. Equal-weight arithmetic averages across item means are 3.60 for storynomics, 3.65 for MCTE, and 3.57 for WTP after rounding. These are descriptive block averages, not PLS latent scores, and their interpretation remains subject to the heterogeneous item content.

The now-available statements permit bounded content interpretation. S4 (social-media information search), S5 (cultural connection), S6 (revisit intention), and S8 (preference for food with cultural value) share a mean of 3.64. MCTE13 (service reliability) has the highest MCTE mean of 3.70, followed by MCTE4 (traditional cooking techniques), whose unrounded mean is 3.685. MCTE11, the explicit memory statement, has an unrounded mean of 3.645. These rankings describe endorsement levels; they do not identify causal drivers or show that a particular Balinese ritual was most effective.

For WTP, the source frequencies imply that WTP4 (high service quality) has a mean of 3.645, WTP3 (food with a historical story) 3.55, and WTP5 (organic and local ingredients) 3.605. These differences have not been tested for statistical significance and do not yield a monetary premium. They suggest concrete topics for service design and future testing while preserving the distinction between stated agreement and observed purchasing.

4.2 Measurement Model

Table 1 summarises the reported measurement statistics for the substantive constructs. Loadings range from 0.714 to 0.780 for storynomics, 0.724 to 0.813 for MCTE, and 0.705 to 0.787 for WTP. Their AVE values exceed 0.50. Internal consistency is high, although the MCTE composite reliability of 0.956 also warrants examination of item redundancy. These statistics support some aspects of measurement quality but do not establish content validity or justify the proposed conceptual dimensions without the items**.**

Table 1. Reported measurement statistics

Construct	Items	Loading Range	Alpha	rho A	CR	AVE
Storynomics	8	0.714–0.780	0.883	0.886	0.907	0.551
MCTE	15	0.724–0.813	0.951	0.952	0.956	0.594
WTP	8	0.705–0.787	0.888	0.890	0.911	0.562

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

The Fornell–Larcker assessment is not uniformly satisfactory. The storynomics square root of AVE is 0.742, below its correlation with MCTE of 0.749. The original assertion that all comparisons pass is therefore incorrect. The MCTE and WTP diagonal values are 0.771 and 0.749, respectively, and the remaining substantive correlations are 0.667. Table 2 presents the substantive comparisons without treating the product term as an independent trait.

Table 2. Construct distinction in the reported output

Pair	r	Square Roots of AVE	HTMT
Storynomics and MCTE	0.749	0.742 and 0.771	0.812
Storynomics and WTP	0.667	0.742 and 0.749	0.745
MCTE and WTP	0.667	0.771 and 0.749	0.723

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

HTMT point estimates are below 0.85, providing complementary evidence in favour of construct distinction. This does not erase the Fornell–Larcker discrepancy or substitute for an item-content review. Henseler et al. (2015) explain why HTMT provides information beyond traditional criteria. Bootstrap HTMT intervals remain necessary to support an inferential assessment in this dataset. The appropriate conclusion is mixed measurement evidence requiring verification, rather than an unqualified declaration of robust validity.

The source reports alpha, rho A, composite reliability, and AVE of 1.000 for the interaction and a loading of 0.976. These figures are not evidence of perfect psychological measurement or a strong moderating effect. They may reflect the treatment of a constructed score, but the exact reason must be checked in the project. Neither these values nor negative correlations involving the interaction independently establish collinearity, redundancy, improper centring, or substantive suppression.

4.3 Structural estimates and interaction

The supplied diagram reports positive coefficients for MCTE → storynomics (0.749) and storynomics → WTP (0.382), and a negative interaction coefficient (−0.030). It reports R^2 = 0.561 for storynomics and 0.510 for WTP. The direct MCTE → WTP coefficient is obscured by overlapping text in the original figure. Reconstruction from the rounded correlation matrix yields approximately 0.369 for that path and 0.381 and −0.030 for the other WTP paths. The reconstructed values are labelled separately from the reported software results.

Table 3. Structural results available for verification

Relationship or Statistic	Reported Value
MCTE → storynomics	β = 0.749
Storynomics → WTP	β = 0.382
MCTE → WTP	Not supplied legibly
MCTE × storynomics → WTP	β = −0.030
Storynomics explained variance	R^2 = 0.561
WTP explained variance	R^2 = 0.510

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

The fixed-score reconstruction implies a full WTP R^2 of 0.50947 and a reduced R^2 of 0.50874, a difference of approximately 0.00073. The resulting incremental f^2 is approximately 0.00149, or 0.0015 at four decimal places. The implied contribution is around 0.073 percentage points of explained variance within this fixed-score calculation. Across 64 endpoint scenarios that perturb the six rounded correlations by ±0.0005, f^2 ranges from approximately 0.00136 to 0.00164. This is a rounding sensitivity exercise, not a confidence interval or an exact bound over every possible matrix.

These diagnostics indicate a very small incremental contribution on the supplied score structure, well below the sensitivity calculation's detectable reference effect. They support reducing the prominence of the interaction in the discussion. They do not provide a bootstrap significance test or an official SmartPLS f^2: reduced-model PLS re-estimation may change the scores, and the correlation table may involve undocumented transformations. The inferred VIF values of approximately 2.48, 2.28, and 1.20 for MCTE, storynomics, and interaction do not indicate severe linear predictor collinearity in this reconstruction, but do not resolve content overlap, common-method bias, or endogeneity.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Experiential Meaning and Narrative Value

The positive MCTE–storynomics association is compatible with an account in which a culinary encounter gives a story tangible meaning. The item statements locate this meaning in local ingredients, preparation techniques, cultural learning, and interaction. This interpretation is consistent with the attention to participation and setting in Mossberg (2008) and the connection between historical storytelling, interaction, and place in (Leong et al., 2024). However, the inclusion of cultural-learning items in both blocks offers an alternative explanation for part of their association. The current evidence cannot separate conceptual overlap from a distinct experiential mechanism.

The association between storynomics and WTP is also directionally consistent with the broader proposition that interpretation contributes to perceived destination value (Ferdinand et al., 2024), destination performance, co-creation, and willingness to pay are different outcomes. Rachão et al. (2023) examine WTP in food-and-wine co-creation, offering a closer comparison while still involving a different setting and experience format. The present estimates therefore extend the question to sampled international culinary visitors without providing a direct replication or a verified price-premium effect.

A second alternative is common evaluative response: respondents who rate the meal favourably may also endorse its stories and payment-related statements. The near-absence of low responses strengthens the need to inspect response-quality checks, ceiling effects, and sampling selection. The item content supplies specific concerns: S6 embeds revisit intention, WTP2 invokes education rather than payment, and MCTE13–MCTE15 measure service quality. A sensitivity reanalysis with a theoretically justified measurement specification would be more informative than asserting that high loadings alone validate these boundaries. Items cannot be removed retrospectively without rerunning the analysis.

5.2 Limits of the storytelling saturation interpretation

The small negative interaction does not presently contradict studies reporting benefits of storytelling. A positive main association and a weak conditional association address different questions, and the latter has not been shown to differ from zero here. The findings should therefore not be promoted as evidence for a general "dark side" of tourism storytelling. Their contribution is to identify a testable boundary question and the information needed to assess

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

it.

Cognitive load offers one possible explanation to examine in future research: unsolicited explanation may draw attention away from sensory and social aspects of a meal (Sweller, 1988). Other explanations include perceived promotional intent, weak relevance, limited variation in favourable responses, or unstable estimation caused by overlapping predictors. The survey does not directly measure cognitive load, narrative dosage, perceived intrusion, or inauthenticity. Choosing among these explanations on the basis of the coefficient's sign would exceed the evidence.

A stronger test would independently vary the length and relevance of a culinary story, hold core food and service quality comparable, and measure recall, intrusion, authenticity, and WTP. A nonlinear narrative-intensity specification could then assess whether a turning point exists. Until such evidence is available, calibration should mean adapting interpretation to guest interest and the meal setting, without assigning a universally optimal number of stories or minutesmall negative interaction, together with the approximate fixed-score f^2 of 0.0015, provides little basis for making saturation the principal theoretical contribution. A favourable main association and a negligible incremental interaction are compatible with one another. There is no bootstrap evidence here that the latter differs from zero. The available results therefore do not establish a "dark side" of storytelling or contradict studies documenting positive narrative outcomes.

Cognitive load offers one possible explanation to examine in future research: unsolicited explanation may draw attention away from sensory and social aspects of a meal (Sweller, 1988). Other explanations include perceived promotional intent, weak relevance, limited variation in favourable responses, or unstable estimation caused by overlapping predictors. The survey does not directly measure cognitive load, narrative dosage, perceived intrusion, or inauthenticity. Choosing among these explanations on the basis of the coefficient's sign would exceed the evidence.

A stronger test would independently vary the length and relevance of a culinary story, hold core food and service quality comparable, and measure recall, intrusion, authenticity, and WTP. A nonlinear narrative-intensity specification could then assess whether a turning point exists. Until such evidence is available, calibration should mean adapting interpretation to guest interest and the meal setting, without assigning a universally optimal number of stories or minutes.

5.3 Balinese culinary context and visitor diversity

Megibung provides a locally specific illustration of interpretation through practice. The published account locates it in Karangasem and relates communal dining to cultural participation and stakeholder collaboration (Pramezwary et al., 2025). For a business in Bali, a relevant application would be to explain the provenance of a genuinely connected dining practice with input from its custodians. The current survey cannot establish that Megibung was encountered by respondents or that it outperformed other narrative themes.

An ingredient-based application is also relevant to the original bibliography's study of moringa as a gastronomic product in Ubud (Yanthy et al., 2024). This source provides a local contextual example, not evidence that the current respondents consumed moringa or rated its stories. The present questionnaire instead measures generic local ingredients (MCTE3), traditional techniques (MCTE4), and cultural connection (S5). Businesses could connect interpretation to the ingredient actually served and its documented preparation, while avoiding claims that this survey has ranked moringa, Megibung, or any other named tradition.

A comparison with Makan Bajamba in West Sumatra shows why Indonesian dining

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

traditions should be interpreted in their own social settings. Pramezwary et al. (2024) connect that tradition with community participation and heritage continuity; its account should not be presented as a Balinese practice. A separate Bali study examines storynomics at the archaeological site of Candi Tebing Tegallinggah (Sukanadi et al., 2022). Its setting and visiting-interest outcome differ from culinary WTP, providing a local comparison without establishing the effect of food narratives in the current sample.

The nationality distribution also supports caution. The charts give no within-country item means, interaction estimates, or measurement-invariance results. Their mixed use of England and UK further prevents a defensible "Western versus Asian" comparison without the original records. Likewise, the age denominator must be resolved before generational descriptions are finalized. Providers can offer language and narrative-depth choices based on guests expressed interests; these are practical design options rather than measured national preferences.

Visitor differences should likewise be tested rather than inferred from demographic proportions. Movahed et al. (2020) found differences between gender groups for some culinary-experience dimensions in Iran but not for others. Torres-Casado & López-Mosquera (2025) examine gastronomic preferences through a generational framework. These studies motivate future comparisons; they do not establish gender, age, or nationality effects in the Bali sample. Such comparisons require respondent-level observations, adequate group sizes, and evidence that the measures operate comparably across groups.

5.4 A practical framework for calibrated culinary storytelling

A calibrated narrative strategy is a deliberate choice of a relevant and supportable story, delivered at a suitable moment and expanded only when the guest wishes to engage. Its aim is to make the meal intelligible while preserving time for tasting and conversation. Table 4 translates this principle into practices that restaurants, cooking-class providers, and culinary guides can pilot. The framework draws on the literature and contextual interpretation; it is not an intervention validated by the present model.

Table 4. Proposed practice framework for Balinese culinary businesses

Principle	Operational practice	Evaluation for a local pilot
Context relevance	Connect the account to the dish, ingredient, producer, or practice actually experienced. Avoid interchangeable destination stories.	Ask guests to recall the connection between the story and the meal.
Cultural credibility	Check provenance with cooks, producers, or custodians. Identify whose account is being shared and acknowledge local variation.	Record local review of content and any corrections requested.
Guest choice	Offer a brief introduction and ask whether the guest wants further detail. Place optional material on a menu or digital link.	Record requests for more detail and reports of unwanted interruption.
Service timing	Deliver essential context before tasting or at a natural pause; let staff pause when guests eat or converse.	Observe interruptions and collect feedback on timing.
Channel coherence	Coordinate host, menu, and digital material so each adds useful context rather than repeating the same script.	Check repetition across channels and guest comprehension.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

Principle	Operational practice	Evaluation for a local pilot
Measured refinement	Pilot alternative formats with comparable dishes and prices. Assess recall, perceived authenticity, intrusion, and stated WTP separately.	Compare outcomes and uncertainty; track actual purchases separately.

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

An initial short account with optional elaboration is a proposed service design, not an empirically established ideal dose. Providers should shorten or postpone delivery when guests disengage, request quiet, or prioritize conversation. Where guests seek deeper cultural learning, a cook or guide can expand the explanation. Businesses should not infer a price increase from the reported β coefficient or assume that additional narrative content generates proportional revenue.

Implementation also requires coordination beyond the dining room. Barzallo-Neira & Pulido-Fernández (2025b) consider gastronomic tourism as a territorial-development strategy, while Mukaromah et al., (2024) examine sustainable urban-kampong tourism and creative-industry development. These wider perspectives situate the proposed practices within destination development rather than demonstrate their financial return. The Singapore–Batam study by Juliana et al. (2026) more directly identifies cultural identity, digital promotion, and cross-border collaboration as themes in integrating food and travel. For Bali, these accounts suggest involving producers, cultural custodians, and tourism businesses in designing and reviewing culinary interpretation.

Staff communication is another practical consideration. Supartini et al. (2024) examine storynomics-based language education for tourism students in Bali and report improved speaking performance in their educational setting. This supports considering culturally grounded communication exercises when developing staff training. Whether such training improves tourists' culinary memories or WTP remains a separate question that a business would need to evaluate.

5.5 Limitations and future research

Targeted non-probability online recruitment limits external validity. All 200 respondents evaluated culinary experiences in Bali, but the sample cannot be assumed to represent all international visitors to Bali or visitors to other Indonesian destinations. The cross-sectional design cannot identify temporal or causal direction. The item wording reveals content-validity concerns that high loadings cannot repair. The distribution of responses is concentrated at the positive end, the Fornell–Larcker result is mixed, and there are no bootstrap uncertainty estimates. The aggregate reconstruction adds transparent diagnostics but cannot substitute for respondent-level re-estimation, item removal, subgroup analysis, or assessment of common-method and endogeneity concerns.

Future work should document sampling and instrument development fully, distinguish narrative relevance from delivery channel and quantity, and collect behavioural valuation alongside stated intentions. Multiple destinations would permit examination of transferability beyond Bali. Experimental or longitudinal designs would help separate the contribution of stories from prior interest and experience quality. The present revision does not treat these future tasks as analyses already completed.

6. CONCLUCION

For the 200 international tourists evaluating culinary experiences in Bali, the reported

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

model shows positive associations between MCTE and storynomics-related evaluations and between storynomics and WTP. An approximate reconstruction from rounded correlations indicates that the interaction adds very little explanatory contribution (fixed-score $f^2 \approx 0.0015$). This evidence does not establish cognitive saturation, a meaningful negative moderation effect, or an ideal storytelling dosage. The recovered instrument enables more specific interpretation, while also revealing measurement overlap and item-content concerns.

For culinary businesses, the available evidence supports examining relevant stories alongside service reliability, cultural connection, and traditional preparation. The proposed practice framework prioritizes contextual relevance, cultural credibility, guest choice, and unobtrusive delivery. Its Balinese examples illustrate possible applications; the survey does not establish the effectiveness of specific rituals or foods across Bali. Final empirical conclusions depend on examination of measurement specification and complete inferential reporting.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Politeknik Pariwisata Bali for the institutional support provided throughout this research. Special appreciation is extended to all respondents who generously participated in this study and shared their valuable experiences related to gastronomic tourism in Indonesia. The authors also acknowledge the contributions of colleagues and reviewers whose insights and feedback have significantly improved the quality of this manuscript. Finally, appreciation is given to all stakeholders involved, including tourism practitioners and local communities, whose perspectives have enriched the understanding of narrative-driven culinary experiences in the context of sustainable tourism development.

8. REFERENCES

Barzallo-Neira, C., & Pulido-Fernández, J. I. (2025a). The demand for gastronomic tourism—Characterization and tourists' profiles. Sustainability, 17(16), Article 7206. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17167206

Barzallo-Neira, C., & Pulido-Fernández, J. I. (2025b). The role of gastronomic tourism as a sustainable territorial development strategy. In A. D'Auria & J. Sanchez-Rivas Garcia (Eds.), Strategies for sustainable territorial development (pp. 169–194). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7081-0.ch009

Batool, N., Wani, M. D., Shah, S. A., & Dada, Z. A. (2025). Tourists' attitude and willingness to pay on conservation efforts: Evidence from the west Himalayan eco-tourism sites. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 27(8), 18933–18951. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-024-04679-2

Bütün, S., & Önçel, S. (2025). Components of memorable gastronomic experience and their effects on visitor satisfaction. GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites, 59(2), 810–821. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.59226-1458

Ferdinand, A. T., Gunawan, Y. A. K., & Santosa, S. B. (2024). Value-oriented storytelling: Does it matter for destination performance? Tourism and Hospitality Management, 30(2), 151–163. https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.30.2.1

Garcês, S. (2024). Gastronomy experiences, authenticity, and storytelling in tourism destinations: A conceptual paper. In R. A. Castanho & M. Franco (Eds.), Cultural, gastronomy, and adventure tourism development (pp. 191–206). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3158-3.ch009

Gözgeç Mutlu, H., & Doğdubay, M. (2024). Far Eastern restaurant customers' willingness to

pay a price premium (WTPP): Gastronomic involvement as a mediator. Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2024.2440585

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review, 31(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43, 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Jain, V., & Mitra, A. (2024). Culinary narratives and community revitalization: The role of media in promoting sustainable gastronomy tourism. In A. E. Jimenez Ruiz, S. Bhartiya, & V. Bhatt (Eds.), Promoting sustainable gastronomy tourism and community development (pp. 67–80). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1814-0.ch005

Juliana, J., Hubner, I. B., Pramezwary, A., Lemy, D. M., & Djakasaputra, A. (2026). Integrating culinary and travel experiences: Innovations in tourism marketing for Singapore and Batam. In B. Alareeni (Ed.), Technology and entrepreneurship: Systems driving innovation (pp. 65–73). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-99466-1_7

Kim, J.-H., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2014). Cross-cultural validation of a memorable tourism experience scale (MTES). Journal of Travel Research, 53(3), 323–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513496468

Kivela, J., & Crotts, J. C. (2006). Tourism and gastronomy: Gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 30(3), 354–377. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348006286797

Kokkranikal, J., & Carabelli, E. (2024). Gastronomy tourism experiences: The cooking classes of Cinque Terre. Tourism Recreation Research, 49(1), 161–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2021.1975213

Leong, A. M. W., Yeh, S.-S., Zhou, Y., Hung, C.-W., & Huan, T.-C. (2024). Exploring the influence of historical storytelling on cultural heritage tourists' value co-creation using tour guide interaction and authentic place as mediators. Tourism Management Perspectives, 50, Article 101198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101198

Li, R., Lin, M. S., Xu, F. Z., & Lin, P. M. C. (2026). A value co-creation perspective on cultural entrepreneurship within small Central Asian ethnic restaurants. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 31(7), 1310–1338. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2026.2633111

Lokman, U., & Buyruk, L. (2025). Do tourists' perceptions of GI products affect destination food image and pay more? Evaluating the moderating role of seeking diversity. British Food Journal, 127(10), 3689–3706. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-02-2025-0126

McKee, R., & Gerace, T. (2018). Storynomics: Story-driven marketing in the post-advertising world. Twelve.

Mossberg, L. (2008). Extraordinary experiences through storytelling. Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 8(3), 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250802532443

Movahed, A., Ghasemi, M., & Gholamalifard, N. (2020). An analysis of the culinary tourism experience between gender groups in Iran. Quaestiones Geographicae, 39(1), 99–108. https://doi.org/10.2478/quageo-2020-0008

Mukaromah, H., Astuti, W., Putri, R. A., & Suminar, L. (2024). Developing urban kampong as a sustainable tourism destination to elevate creative cluster industry. AIP Conference Proceedings, 2838, Article 030012. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0186069

Pramezwary, A., Pakasi, D., Juliana, Indra, F., Putranto, A. A., & Teguh, F. (2024). Bajamba traditional dining culture of Nagari Jawi-Jawi West Sumatera as a potential sustainable

gastronomy tourism attraction. In B. Alareeni & A. Hamdan (Eds.), Technology: Toward business sustainability (pp. 456–468). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54009-7_42

Pramezwary, A., Pakasi, D., Juliana, J., Indra, F., Agungputranto, A., & Teguh, F. X. (2025). Megibung traditional dining culture of Karangasem Bali as a potential sustainable gastronomy tourism. In E. AlDhaen, A. Braganza, A. Hamdan, & W. Chen (Eds.), Business sustainability with artificial intelligence (AI): Challenges and opportunities (pp. 871–880). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71526-6_78

Rachão, S., Breda, Z., de Oliveira Fernandes, C., Joukes, V., & Ferreira, C. (2023). Food-and-wine tourists' willingness to pay for co-creation experiences: A generational approach. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 56, 245–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2023.06.004

Rodrigues, Á., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Nascimento, J. (2026). Food appraisal: Explaining tourists' willingness to pay more for organic food. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 9(1), 144–162. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-01-2025-0036

Seyfi, S., Hall, C. M., & Rasoolimanesh, S. M. (2020). Exploring memorable cultural tourism experiences. Journal of Heritage Tourism, 15(3), 341–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2019.1639717

Stone, M. J., Soulard, J., Migacz, S., & Wolf, E. (2018). Elements of memorable food, drink, and culinary tourism experiences. Journal of Travel Research, 57(8), 1121–1132. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517729758

Sukanadi, I. W., Lestari, D., Ekasani, K. A., & Widhiarini, N. M. A. N. (2022). Storynomics tinggalan arkeologi: Mediasi antara motivasi dan minat berkunjung ke Candi Tebing Tegallinggah Desa Bedulu Gianyar Bali. Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies), 12(2), 450–470. https://doi.org/10.24843/JKB.2022.v12.i02.p07

Supartini, N. L., Sudipa, I. N., Pastika, I. W., & Simpen, I. W. (2024). Integrating storynomics into language education to enhance speaking skills of tourism students in Bali, Indonesia. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 13(2), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v13n2p169

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Torres-Casado, B., & López-Mosquera, N. (2025). From Baby Boomers to Z: Gastronomic preferences and the generational framework of experience and branding. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 37, Article 101003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2025.101003

Wijaya, S. (2019). Indonesian food culture mapping: A starter contribution to promote Indonesian culinary tourism. Journal of Ethnic Foods, 6, Article 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42779-019-0009-3

Yanthy, P. S., Indrawati, Y., Azmi, A., Aryanti, N. N. S., Dewi, L. G. L. K., & Rusadi, N. W. P. (2024). The Moringa superfood: Iconic gastronomic tourism food in Ubud Gianyar. Pusaka: Journal of Tourism, Hospitality, Travel and Business Event, 6(2), 2

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

Appendix A Item statistics from the supplied tables

Item	1	2	3	4	Total	Mean	Loading
S1	0	0	106	94	694	3.47	0.736
S2	0	0	87	113	713	3.57	0.755
S3	0	0	77	123	723	3.62	0.714
S4	0	0	72	128	728	3.64	0.739
S5	0	0	72	128	728	3.64	0.757
S6	0	0	72	128	728	3.64	0.716
S7	0	0	79	121	721	3.61	0.737
S8	0	0	72	128	728	3.64	0.780
MCTE1	0	0	91	109	709	3.55	0.774
MCTE2	0	0	87	113	713	3.57	0.748
MCTE3	0	0	76	124	724	3.62	0.734
MCTE4	0	0	63	137	737	3.69	0.724
MCTE5	0	0	66	134	734	3.67	0.745
MCTE6	0	0	66	134	734	3.67	0.777
MCTE7	0	0	68	132	732	3.66	0.774
MCTE8	0	0	76	124	724	3.62	0.775
MCTE9	0	0	72	128	728	3.64	0.813
MCTE10	0	0	71	129	729	3.65	0.771
MCTE11	0	0	71	129	729	3.65	0.805
MCTE12	0	0	65	135	735	3.68	0.779
MCTE13	0	0	60	140	740	3.70	0.811
MCTE14	0	0	65	135	735	3.68	0.754
MCTE15	0	0	66	134	734	3.67	0.774
WTP1	0	0	102	98	698	3.49	0.740
WTP2	0	0	98	102	702	3.51	0.720
WTP3	0	0	90	110	710	3.55	0.753
WTP4	0	1	69	130	729	3.65	0.705
WTP5	0	0	79	121	721	3.61	0.787
WTP6	0	0	87	113	713	3.57	0.759
WTP7	0	0	79	121	721	3.61	0.780
WTP8	0	1	88	111	710	3.55	0.747

Source: Data Research, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

Appendix B Reported statements and intended domains

Code	Intended domain	Reported statement with minor language corrections
S1	Cultural narrative	I am interested in trying food that has a historical story behind it.
S2	Cultural narrative	I enjoy food more when I know the story or myth behind it.
S3	Digital media and storytelling	I am more interested in visiting culinary attractions after seeing digital content about the story behind the food.
S4	Digital media and storytelling	I often look for information related to the story behind food on social media before trying the food.
S5	Personalized and emotional experience	I feel more connected to the local culture through the stories behind the food I consume.
S6	Personalized and emotional experience	The experience of enjoying food that has a special story makes me want to return to the destination.
S7	Educational and heritage value	I feel I have gained new insights into local culture through food that has a historical story.
S8	Educational and heritage value	Food with strong cultural value is more interesting to me than ordinary food.
MCTE1	Local culture	The local culinary experience in Indonesia reflects the daily life of its people.
MCTE2	Local culture	Local cuisine in Indonesia gave me insight into the historical values of this area.
MCTE3	Local culture	I was impressed with the use of local ingredients in the dishes served.
MCTE4	Local culture	The traditional cooking techniques used in Indonesian cuisine gave me a different experience.
MCTE5	Authenticity	Culinary experiences in Indonesia gave me an authentic experience.
MCTE6	Authenticity	I feel that the local cuisine in Indonesia has the authentic taste of this area.
MCTE7	Authenticity	The cuisine in Indonesia feels in keeping with local customs.
MCTE8	Novelty	Culinary experiences in Indonesia gave me a new experience that I had never tried before.
MCTE9	Novelty	Local food in Indonesia has a unique taste.
MCTE10	Togetherness and social interaction	I feel that the culinary experience in Indonesia is more enjoyable because it can be enjoyed with friends or family.
MCTE11	Togetherness and social interaction	Culinary experiences in Indonesia create memories that are hard for me to forget.
MCTE12	Togetherness and social interaction	I feel that the culinary experience in Indonesia becomes more meaningful through interactions with local people.
MCTE13	Service quality	I can always rely on the service at culinary places in Indonesia.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

Code	Intended domain	Reported statement with minor language corrections
MCTE14	Service quality	The staff at the culinary places in Indonesia were responsive to my needs.
MCTE15	Service quality	My requests are always fulfilled when enjoying culinary delights in Indonesia.
WTP1	Economic and demographic factors	I am willing to pay more for a culinary experience based on my budget.
WTP2	Economic and demographic factors	I consider my education level in choosing a high-quality culinary experience.
WTP3	Experience quality and cultural value	I am willing to pay more for food that has an interesting historical story.
WTP4	Experience quality and cultural value	Culinary experiences with high service quality make me willing to pay more.
WTP5	Environmental awareness and sustainability	I prefer to pay more for food that uses organic and local ingredients.
WTP6	Environmental awareness and sustainability	I am willing to pay more for restaurants that implement environmentally friendly practices.
WTP7	Psychological and social factors	I am willing to pay more for a unique and exclusive culinary experience.
WTP8	Psychological and social factors	I tend to pay more for culinary places recommended by friends or influencers.

Appendix C Aggregate reconstruction and sensitivity calculations

Score	MCTE	Storynomics	Interaction	WTP
MCTE	1.000	0.749	−0.409	0.667
Storynomics	0.749	1.000	−0.305	0.667
Interaction	−0.409	−0.305	1.000	−0.297
WTP	0.667	0.667	−0.297	1.000

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

Diagnostic	Calculated value	Status
MCTE → WTP	0.369157	Approximate fixed-score coefficient
Storynomics → WTP	0.381451	Approximate fixed-score coefficient
Interaction → WTP	−0.029672	Approximate fixed-score coefficient
Full WTP R^2	0.509468	Approximate; source diagram reports 0.510
Reduced WTP R^2	0.508735	Fixed scores; no PLS re-estimation

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970

Diagnostic	Calculated value	Status
Incremental R^2	0.000733	Full minus reduced
Interaction f^2	0.001495	Approximate fixed-score diagnostic
VIF for MCTE / S / interaction	2.481 / 2.278 / 1.201	Approximate from rounded matrix
64 rounding endpoint scenarios	f^2 0.001358–0.001638	Sensitivity range, not a confidence interval
Sensitivity at N = 200	Detectable $f^2 \approx 0.039632$	Idealised regression power reference

Source: Analyzed Data, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/gastur.v13i2.292
p- ISSN 2774-6186 e- ISSN 2716-3970