

Souvenirs: What and why we buy

Hugh Wilkins

Griffith University

Hugh Wilkins, PhD

Associate Professor

Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel & Sport Management

Griffith University

Gold Coast campus

Queensland 4222

Australia.

Tel: +61 (7) 5552 8011

Fax: +61(7) 5552 7007

E-mail: h.wilkins@griffith.edu.au

Keywords: Souvenirs, purchase motivation, evidence, memory, gifts

Original submission 27 March, 2009; Accepted 7 December, 2009

Abstract

The souvenir is an important component of the tourist experience with most tourists bringing back mementos and souvenirs as evidence. People like to be reminded of special moments in their lives and to hold evidence of those special moments. However, despite the considerable previous research into souvenirs and purchase behavior, little research exists that investigates the motivations for souvenir purchase. Additionally, there has been little investigation of the impact of gender on the souvenirs purchased and the motivations for purchase. This research addresses these gaps in the literature and evaluates the souvenir purchase behavior of tourists. The research identifies the core importance of the souvenir as evidence of the experience as well as the roles of memory and as gifts.

Keywords: Souvenirs, purchase motivation, evidence, memory, gifts

Introduction

The purchase of mementos and souvenirs is an established behavior associated with many activities, including travel and other leisure activities. Few people will take a vacation without acquiring some form of evidence to tangibilise the experiences gained (Gordon 1986; Littrell et al. 1994). The type of evidence will vary from person to person and from experience to experience, from the artistic to the gaudy, from the unique to the commonplace, from a T-shirt to a tapestry or a shell to a snow-scene.

Shopping is a major tourist activity (Fairhurst, Costello, and Holmes 2007; Kim and Littrell 2001), with souvenir purchases forming a significant component of the shopping expenditure (Littrell et al. 1994; Lehto et al. 2004). Previous research has suggested expenditure on shopping comprises almost a third of the total travel spend (Littrell et al. 1994; Fairhurst, Costello, and Holmes 2007). Although there has been a considerable volume of research undertaken on the topic of souvenirs and the types of souvenirs purchased, further research is still needed on shopping and souvenir purchases within tourism (Lehto et al. 2004). Previous research has tended to focus on the types, uses and functions (Love and Sheldon 1998). Despite the significance of the souvenir in the tourism experience (Shenhav-Keller 1993; Lehto et al. 2004), little research has been found that investigates the usage and motivations for souvenir purchase. As part of a survey on vacations and the activities contained, including shopping, data were collected on souvenir purchase behavior and motivations.

A sequential mixed methods approach was used to identify the souvenirs purchased and the motivations for souvenir purchase. Derived from the qualitative data and the literature, scales in relation to the role of souvenirs as gifts, as evidence, and in

relation to memory were developed. The scale structures were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis. The data were also examined by gender to identify if there was a gender effect in the souvenirs purchased and the motivations for purchase. This paper will continue with a review of the relevant literature before proceeding to provide the details on the methodology and data collection approaches used. The results are then provided, followed by a discussion of the findings.

Literature Review

Tourism has been described as a sacred journey (Graburn 1989), with there being a need for people to bring back mementos and souvenirs of the “sacred, extraordinary time or space” (Gordon, 1986 page 136), not only to aid recollection of the experience, but also to prove it (Gordon 1986; Swanson 2004; Littrell et al. 1994). The gathering of souvenirs makes an experience tangible, either for consumption by others or as a means of prolonging the experience for one’s own consumption (Gordon 1986; MacCannell 1989). Zauberman, Ratner & Kim (2009) have coined the term ‘strategic memory protection’ to describe actions designed to encourage memory of important life events, with souvenirs being an example of a physical object intended to protect the memory of important life events, such as vacations (Zauberman, Ratner, and Kim 2009). There are many motivations for the purchase of souvenirs including the role of souvenirs as gifts (Kim and Littrell 2001; Gordon 1986), as signs (Gordon 1986) and as a reminder (Littrell et al. 1994; Swanson 2004). The role of souvenirs as gifts includes both the role of reintegration and desacralisation (Gordon 1986), as well as gift giving and self gifting behaviors (Ward and Tran 2007).

Although there have been a number of studies of souvenirs, the previous research has mainly focused on souvenir types and functions, as opposed to the meanings given to the souvenirs (Love and Sheldon 1998). The research has mainly polarized between that on artisan producers and tourist consumers (Kim and Littrell 2001) and has identified a range of souvenir products from mass produced products to specialty items and antiques (Swanson and Horridge 2004).

Research has also shown that women tend to purchase souvenirs more frequently than men (Littrell, Anderson, and Brown 1993), with souvenirs being more psychologically important to many women tourists (Anderson and Littrell 1996). Although it appears there may be gender differences regarding travel and tourism products, there has been relatively little investigation into this subject (Reisinger and Mavondo 2001), and research into souvenirs overall is limited (Swanson and Horridge 2006). Investigating gender differences is an important component of any study into tourism behavior as men and women consume tourism products differently (Swain 1995).

There have been a small number of studies investigating gender differences in purchasing behavior. Littrell (1990) investigated the symbolic meaning of textile crafts for tourists and examined gender differences. In addition, there have been studies into gender identity and material symbols (Dittmar, Beattie, and Frieseb 1995), cognitive and affective impulse buying and gender differences (Coley and Burgess 2003) and into partners' involvement in tourism decision processes (Zalatan 1998).

A further study was conducted by Littrell, Anderson and Brown (1993) into the definition of authentic craft souvenirs. No gender differences were found regarding the definition of authenticity for tourist crafts. This finding was in contrast to that of

Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton, 1981 (as cited in Littrell, Anderson & Brown, 1993) who found that men and women do differ regarding the symbolic attachment and meaning of objects in the home.

Data Collection and Methodology

A sequential mixed methods research approach was adopted. Mixed methods research includes both qualitative and quantitative data collection approaches within one study (Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003) and builds on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research, whilst also moderating any weaknesses associated with individual research approaches (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004). The review of the literature identified a lack of prior research into the reasons for purchase and the planned use of the souvenirs. In order to gain further understanding of souvenir purchase behavior in relation to these questions, a qualitative study was undertaken through focus groups, with the results being used as the basis for the formation of scales for use in the quantitative stage of the research.

The qualitative data were collected through three focus groups, with this element of the research providing greater understanding of the motivations for souvenir purchase not previously addressed in the literature. Each focus group comprised between six and eight respondents and lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. Respondents comprised staff and postgraduate students at a university in Queensland, Australia. The participants were asked about their souvenir purchases and the motivations and use of souvenirs. The focus groups were recorded, transcribed and content analyzed using Nvivo, a qualitative analysis software package. Themes identified from the content analysis were developed

into items for inclusion in the self administered survey. The items derived from the focus group data were supported and extended by items derived from the literature.

A rigorous scale development process, as recommended by Churchill (1979), was adopted. The first stage of the process was to use expert opinion to establish content validity. The survey instrument was examined by a number of academic experts in the field to ensure the items derived from the qualitative research and the literatures were appropriate and relevant. The scales were subjected to a pilot study with exploratory principal components analysis to ensure item purity. Items that failed to cleanly load onto one dimension were amended to improve item clarification. For all scales, except that on souvenir purchases, respondents indicated their agreement with the item on a seven point Likert type scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7). The use of a seven point Likert scale provides maximum response separation (Neuman 2003). The souvenir purchases scale, asking how often consumers would buy the following types of products, used a five point Likert type scale, ranging from Never (1) to Always (5).

A web based survey instrument was used to collect the quantitative data. An email was sent to contacts of the researcher and students at a large publically funded university in Queensland, Australia. The email asked them to complete the online survey and to forward the email to family, friends and colleagues to broaden distribution. The email gave a brief description of the research project and provided a hotlink to the web address. As an incentive to participate in the research a prize draw of a week's accommodation in a resort was provided. It is not possible to define the response rate as it is not known how many potential respondents received the invitation to participate. A total of 3,231 completed and usable survey responses were received. The respondent profile was

appropriate, with 92.1 percent of respondents having taken either a domestic or international vacation within the last year. The majority of the respondents identified they had taken a domestic holiday (86.1%), with over half (55.6%) having taken more than one domestic holiday in the last year. A smaller proportion (42.5%) had taken an international holiday, with relatively few (11.7%) having taken more than one international holiday.

Each scale was subjected to an exploratory principal components analysis using an oblique rotation to identify complex and weak items. An oblique rotation was used as it is a recommended approach when correlation between components is anticipated (Hair et al. 1998). As the sample size exceeded 350, a factor loading of 0.40 was deemed acceptable (Hair et al. 1998). Complex items, those that load significantly onto more than one component, and weak items were removed. The Cronbach alpha for the resultant scales was used to measure the scale reliability. The scale structures were then subjected to confirmatory factor analysis. As recommended by Bagozzi and Heatherton (1994), a partial disaggregation was used, with each dimension represented as a separate latent variable measured by composites of subscales (Bagozzi and Heatherton 1994). The use of a partial disaggregation model provides a more detailed representation of constructs and supports the evaluation of discriminant validity.

Due to the sensitivity of fit indices to sample size, a random sample of 300 respondents was selected from the data to ascertain level of fit (Marsh, Balla, and McDonald 1988). The confirmatory factor analysis fit indices confirmed the structure, with all results within the recommended ranges. A second random sample of 300 respondents was then selected from the remaining data to retest the results. The structure of the dimension was supported by the retest sample. Both convergent and discriminant

validities were established. Convergent validity was demonstrated with inter-dimension correlations all significant ($p < 0.01$) (Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips 1991). Discriminant validity was also established with the AVE for each dimension being greater than the square of the inter-correlations (Fornell and Larcker 1981). The fit indices for the confirmatory factor analysis are provided in Table 1. The table provides the results for the overall dimension and the individual constructs.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Based on the literature, it was considered likely there would be gender effects in both purchase behavior and purchase motivations. A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was undertaken to identify if there were any significant differences between genders in the souvenirs purchased or the motivations for purchase.

Results

The data from the focus groups are provided in conjunction with the results from the germane items in the survey to provide results that integrate the qualitative and quantitative data.

Souvenir Purchases

During the focus groups, respondents mentioned a number of different souvenir items, from rugs and artwork to T-shirts and caps. The items ranged from a focus on authenticity to a focus on novelty. One respondent commented “*they were the local product and although they were souvenirs, they were not necessarily bought from a*

souvenir shop". Based on the qualitative research and the literature, souvenir purchases were grouped into eight categories of purchase type. Focus group respondents identified items including photographs and postcards, branded clothing, regional specialty art and craft and published material. Other items were identified from the literature, and the souvenir purchases were formed into categories on the basis of expert opinion.

The quantitative results showed little gender effect on the ranking of frequency of souvenir purchases. There was, however, a significant difference in the likelihood of purchase between the genders for five of the eight categories, with women being the more frequent consumers for all items. In the three items where there was no significant difference, males were marginally the more frequent purchasers of branded clothing, published materials and products that can be purchased at a discounted price. The most popular souvenir category for both genders was '*Photographs, postcards and paintings of the region*' with nearly 60% of women and over 43% of males often, or always, purchasing these items. For women, the second most popular category was regional specialty arts and crafts, followed by other local specialty products. For males, other local specialty products was the second most frequent purchase, followed by '*Perfume, electrical goods, cameras or other similar goods*' that can be purchased at a discounted price. This latter category was also popular amongst women. The souvenir categories and the purchase frequency by gender are provided in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

In Table 3 the items and the MANOVA results for the souvenir purchase categories by gender are provided. The existence of multivariate differences was identified, with Pillai's Trace results being significant ($p < 0.01$).

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Souvenirs as Gifts

There were a number of references to the purchase of souvenirs as gifts for family and friends in the qualitative data. In some cases, these were evidently associated with normal gift giving rituals, for example "*I will tend to combine Christmas and birthday presents with souvenirs I buy overseas*" and "*I specifically look out for little gifts or souvenirs that I can give to nieces and nephews as birthday and Christmas presents*". Other respondents identified gift giving as part of their vacation ritual through statements such as "*I generally buy gifts for my family*" and "*Most of my souvenirs are gift oriented*". The focus groups very clearly identified the importance of the gift giving rituals associated with vacations and souvenir purchase. Seven items were included in the survey instrument on the role of souvenirs as gifts. A principal components analysis with an oblique rotation identified two components. The seven item scale had a Cronbach alpha of 0.754, with the removal of no items increasing overall reliability.

There was a significant gender effect ($p < 0.01$) for the dimension as a composite and for five of the seven items. In particular, there was a significant difference between the genders for all items in component one which was named 'Holiday gifts', with females being more likely to purchase these gifts than males. All respondents showed a strong

inclination to provide holiday gifts, with over 75% of females purchasing and 70% of males. The second component reflected souvenir purchase as a means of buying gifts for other occasions, such as birthday and Christmas presents, and received lower support (females 57%; males 56%). The items, the component loadings and the MANOVA results are reported in Table 4. Multivariate differences were identified with Pillai's Trace results being significant ($p < 0.01$).

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Souvenirs as Memory

The role of memory was very important, with many respondents commenting on the need for souvenirs to remind them of special occasions. The role of the souvenir as a facilitator of memory is captured in comments such as *"I see tourist souveniring as part of a larger life plan, which is to collect things so that I can have memories"* and *"I really treasure the things which I can look at and remember where I've been and what I've done"*. Other comments identified the need for tangible evidence to re-live the experience *"I want to capture the event and hold on to it for a bit longer"* and to retain the experience as *"my memory fades over time"*. Another respondent, who had not travelled for several years, said *"having things around me reminds me I did have a life"* and, in a similar vein, another commented *"it's nice to look back on it and remember this is where I've been and done with my life"*.

Six items were included in the survey related to souvenirs as contributors to the memory of travel experiences. The scale comprised a single component, with a Cronbach alpha of 0.909.

The gender effect was significant ($p < 0.01$) for the dimension as a whole and for all items in this scale. In all items, females showed more importance for the role of the souvenir as an *aide memoire*. For females, this role was in all cases above 5.4 on a 7 point scale. For males, there was still a very strong level of importance, but slightly lower, with results ranging from 5.05 to 5.43. The results for the role of souvenirs as memories are provided in Table 5. Multivariate differences were identified, with Pillai's Trace results being significant ($p < 0.01$).

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Souvenirs as Evidence

There were two interrelated themes in this heading, souvenirs as conversation pieces and as evidence. Examples of respondent comments on the role of the souvenir as a conversation piece include "*people say oh that's nice, and you have the opportunity of talking about your holiday*"; "*I have it on display and talk about it*"; "*because you have something which is little different....it is a conversation piece*" and "*that's been a great souvenir tool – a great conversation piece*". In contrast, other respondents only focused on the role of the souvenir as evidence, with comments such as "*I bought plates which are representative of the country*"; "*so it's more you being different from other people because you've been there*" and "*I don't use them, they are on display*".

The data from this theme were very focused on public evidence of the travel destination and experience. The two themes of conversation pieces and evidence identified from the qualitative data comprised one scale with six items. The scale comprised a single component with a Cronbach alpha of 0.841.

The gender effect was significant at $p < 0.01$ for the dimension. Analysis identified that for five of the items in the scale, gender was a significant effect ($p < 0.01$) and at $p < 0.05$ for the final item. Again, the effect was stronger for females than males across all items. Multivariate differences were identified, with Pillai's Trace results being significant ($p < 0.01$). The results for the role of souvenirs as memories are provided in Table 6.

INSERT TABLE 6 HERE

Effect of purchase motivation on souvenir purchase

The qualitative data indicated a relationship between the purchase motivations and the type of souvenir purchased. On this basis it was hypothesized that the purchase motivations would be antecedent to, and affect the types of souvenirs purchased.

As a result, the data were analyzed using hierarchical multiple regression. This analysis enables the inclusion of direct and moderating effects as sequential components, thus enabling the identification of the additional explanation provided by the moderating variables (Pedhazur 1997; Francis 2004; Hair et al. 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell 2001; Aguinis 1995). The use of hierarchical multiple regression or incremental partitioning of variance (Pedhazur 1997) is a recommended approach in moderated multiple regression,

in which the impact of a moderating variable on the relationship between two variables is measured (Aguinis 1995).

As can be seen in Table 7, the predictors of evidence, memory and gift as purchase motivations gain a R^2 of 0.268 for the souvenir purchase choice for males and 0.284 for females. It should be noted that for both sexes the role of evidence is the principal influence of the souvenir selected. The second most important factor was the role of gift, and memory was not significant for males.

INSERT TABLE 7 HERE

Discussion and Conclusions

This research provides new understanding of a number of facets of consumer purchase behavior in relation to souvenirs. In particular, the significant gender differences, both in the souvenirs purchased and the motivations for purchase, provides new insights. This information will be of relevance to retailers in tourism destinations, as it will enable them to structure retail outlets to be attractive and relevant to consumers.

There are a number of findings deriving from this research. Firstly, although there has been relatively little investigation into gender differences regarding travel and tourism products (Reisinger and Mavondo 2001), previous research has found that women tend to purchase souvenirs more frequently than men (Littrell, Anderson, and Brown 1993). This research supports this finding across most dimensions of souvenirs. Men are more likely to purchase discounted and branded products, whilst women are more likely to purchase other categories of souvenirs and, in particular, destination specific products.

Secondly, in relation to the souvenirs purchased, there is evidence of the importance of authenticity for souvenir purchases. Respondents indicated they were infrequent purchasers of the souvenir category of '*Non-regional arts and crafts, such as paintings, stuffed animals or toys, ornaments*', with people identifying purchase as either *Never* or *Rarely* on more than fifty percent of travel occasions. Somewhat surprisingly, given the product range found in many souvenir shops, '*Hats, caps or other clothing branded with the destination, hotel or attraction*' were also not frequently purchased, with less than twenty per cent of respondents indicating they *Always* or *Often* purchased these products. Although, as may be expected, the category comprising photographs, postcards and paintings of the region was the most popular purchase, the next most popular categories were both regional specific - regional arts and crafts and local specialty products. This clearly demonstrates that people want to purchase souvenirs reflective of the region, rather than more general items. The importance of a regional connection to the souvenir was clearly evident in both the qualitative and quantitative results. This finding should encourage souvenir retailers to change the product range and focus on authenticity.

Thirdly, the findings in relation to purchase motivations provide important understanding of consumer behavior. There is strong support identified for the role of souvenirs as gifts, with this support being stronger amongst females. These findings support and extend the previous research of Gordon (1986) and Ward and Tran (2007). This dimension was structured into two components with a subtle, yet interesting, difference between them. The first component strongly reflected the concept of purchasing gifts to bring back from the holiday, as recognition of the period spent away from normal existence. This aspect reflects the role of reintegration (Gordon, 1986). The

second component reflected the role of the souvenir as a substitute for special occasion gifts, such as Christmas and birthdays. Despite this slight division in the motivations for purchase, the majority of consumers purchase souvenirs as a gift for others. Souvenir retailers need to recognize that they are not providing souvenirs for the purchaser, but for an alternative consumer.

This also provides important understanding for retailers as the products tourists may buy for their own consumption will be different from the products they buy as gifts. As a result, retailers need to reposition the product range to reflect the role of the souvenir as a gift, and to enhance the motivations for tourists to purchase products in this context by identifying appropriateness as gifts amongst the products available. Although there is some gender effect, there is strong support and recognition by both sexes for the souvenir as a gift. There is an opportunity here for further research into the difference in the types of products bought as self gifts and as gifts for others. The importance should be noted here, especially for males, of vacation souvenirs as substitutes for Christmas and birthday presents.

Fourthly, there was strong support amongst all respondents for the role of the souvenir as an *aide memoire*, and this would support previous research (Zauberman, Ratner, and Kim 2009). It is important that destinations and retailers identify what it is tourists want to be reminded of on their return home. The lack of support for buying named products and non-regional products clearly suggests that tourists want meaningful reminders, as opposed to the more novelty focused products reflecting the destination. However, the hierarchical regression analysis identified that the role of the souvenir as an *aide memoire* was subservient to the role as evidence.

Fifthly, the importance of the souvenir as evidence, both for the tourist and as a means of communicating their experiences with others, is an important finding. This finding reflects and supports previous work that recognizes the role of the souvenir, not only as an aid to memory but also as a means to prove the experience (Gordon 1986; Swanson 2004; Littrell et al. 1994). The use of souvenirs as conversation pieces and as evidence of travel experiences clearly reflects the importance of travel experiences in the construction of the self and as status consumption products. This finding is of importance for destination marketers and retailers as it clarifies how consumers use souvenirs to enhance themselves and their travel experiences. The opportunity to use souvenirs that might encourage envy amongst people who have not experienced the destination could prove to be a powerful marketing tool and marketers should look at the development of souvenirs that reflect aspirational experiences for travelers. The hierarchical regression clearly identifies the importance of evidence as the main purchase decision influencer. Although the importance of the other dimensions is evident from the strength of the agreement with the individual scale items, the importance of the dimensions of memory and gift are clearly secondary to that of evidence.

Finally, there are both a number of limitations to the research and opportunities for future research. A specific limitation of the research relates to the sample. Firstly, this was a convenience sample and secondly, it comprised, in the main, respondents from one country, namely Australia. Although, given the almost universal purchase of souvenirs by tourists from Western countries, a convenience sample may be valid representation of the population, there is opportunity for future research to adopt a more stringent sampling

approach to test the findings. Equally, there is a need to extend the research to other countries, and especially non-Western cultures.

As previously identified in this paper, there is a paucity of research into the purchase motivation and usage of souvenirs, as opposed to the types, uses and functions. There are a number of opportunities for further research that arise from the finding in this research. As an example, the role of the souvenir as evidence provides opportunity for research on the links to destination choice, travel behaviour and status consumption. The multiple roles of the souvenir as gift, as evidence and as an aid to memory also provides opportunity for further research.

References

- Aguinis, Herman. 1995. Statistical power problems with moderated multiple regression in management research. *Journal of Management* 21 (6):1141-1158.
- Anderson, Luella, and Mary Littrell. 1996. Group profiles of women as tourists and purchasers of souvenirs. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 25 (1):28 - 55.
- Bagozzi, Richard P, and Todd F Heatherton. 1994. A general approach to representing multifaceted personality constructs: Application to state self-esteem. *Structural Equation Modelling* 1 (1):35-67.
- Bagozzi, Richard P., Youjae Yi, and Lynn W Phillips. 1991. Assessing Construct Validity in Organizational Research. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36 (3):421-458.
- Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr. 1979. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research* 16 (1):64-73.
- Coley, Amanda, and Brigitte Burgess. 2003. Gender differences in cognitive and affective impulse buying. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management* 7 (3):282 - 295.
- Dittmara, Helga, Jane Beattieb, and Susanne Frieseb. 1995. Gender identity and material symbols: Objects and decision considerations in impulse purchases *Journal of Economic Psychology* 16 (3):491-511.
- Fairhurst, Ann, Carol Costello, and Alycia Fogle Holmes. 2007. An examination of shopping behavior of visitors to Tennessee according to tourist typologies. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 13 (4):311-320.
- . 2007. An examination of shopping behavior of visitors to Tennessee according to tourist typologies. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 13 (4):320-320.

- Fornell, Claes, and David F. Larcker. 1981. Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18 (1):39-50.
- Francis, Glenda. 2004. *Introduction to SPSS for Windows*. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education Australia.
- Gordon, Beverly. 1986. The souvenir: Messenger of the extraordinary. *Journal of Popular Culture* 20 (3):135-151.
- Graburn, Nelson H H. 1989. Tourism: The sacred journey. In *Hosts and Guests*, edited by V. L. Smith. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hair, Joseph, F, Jr., Rolph E Anderson, Ronald L Tatham, and William Black, C. 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Edited by D. Borkowsky. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, R Burke , and Anthony J Onwuegbuzie. 2004. Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come. *Educational Researcher* 33 (7):14-26.
- Kim, Soyoung , and M A Littrell. 2001. Souvenir buying intentions for self versus others. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28 (3):638-657.
- Lehto, Xinran Y, Liping A Cai, Joseph T O'Leary, and Tzung-Cheng Huan. 2004. Tourist shopping preferences and expenditure behaviours: The case of the Taiwanese outbound market. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 10 (4):320-332.
- Littrell, Mary Ann, Luella F. Anderson, and Pamela J. Brown. 1993. What makes a craft souvenir authentic? *Annals of Tourism Research* 20:197-215.

- Littrell, Mary Ann, Suzanne Baizerman, Rita Kean, Sherry Gahring, Shirley Niemeyer, Rae Reilly, and JaneAnn Stout. 1994. Souvenirs and tourism styles. *Journal of Travel Research* 33 (1):3-11.
- Love, Lisa L, and Peter S. Sheldon. 1998. Souvenirs: Messengers of Meaning. Paper read at Advances in Consumer Research.
- MacCannell, Dean. 1989. *The tourist : A new theory of the leisure class*. 2nd ed. New York: Schocken Books.
- Marsh, Herbert W., John R. Balla, and Roderick P. McDonald. 1988. Goodness-of-Fit Indexes in Confirmatory Factor Analysis: The Effect of Sample Size. *Psychological Bulletin* 103 (3):391-410.
- Neuman, W Lawrence. 2003. *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Edited by J. Lasser. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Pedhazur, E J. 1997. *Multiple regression in behavioral research : Explanation and prediction*. 3rd ed. Forth Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Reisinger, Yvette, and Felix Mavondo. 2001. Gender Differences In The Psychographic Profiles Of The Youth Travel Market. Paper read at Travel and Tourism Research Association, October 14-16, 2001, at Niagara Falls, Canada.
- Shenhav-Keller, Shelly. 1993. The Israeli souvenir: Its text and context. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20:182-196.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 1995. Gender in Tourism *Annals of Tourism Research* 22 (2):247-266
- Swanson, Kristen K. 2004. Tourists' and retailers' perceptions of souvenirs. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 10 (4):363-377.

- Swanson, Kristen K, and Patricia E Horridge. 2004. A Structural Model for Souvenir Consumption, Travel Activities, and Tourist Demographics. *Journal of Travel Research* 42 (4):372-380.
- Swanson, Kristen K., and Patricia E. Horridge. 2006. Travel motivations as souvenir purchase indicators *Tourism Management* 27 (4):671-683.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G, and Linda S Fidell. 2001. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tashakkori, Abbas, and Charles Teddlie. 2003. Issues and dilemmas in teaching research methods courses in social and behavioural sciences: US perspective *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6 (1):61 - 77.
- Ward, Cheryl B, and Thuhang Tran. 2007. Consumer Gifting Behaviors: One for You, One for Me? *Services Marketing Quarterly* 29 (2):1-17.
- Zalatan, Antoine 1998. Wives' involvement in tourism decision processes *Annals of Tourism Research* 25 (4):890-903.
- Zauberman, Gal, Rebecca K. Ratner, and B. Kyu Kim. 2009. Memories as Assets: Strategic Memory Protection in Choice over Time. *Journal of Consumer Research* 35 (5):715-728.

Table 1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices

Dimension	Norm							
	χ^2	DF	P	χ^2	AGFI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Full Construct	8.36	6	0.213	1.39	0.968	0.998	0.035	0.014
Gift	4.54	2	0.103	2.27	0.963	0.993	0.065	0.018
Memory	4.78	2	0.092	2.39	0.962	0.996	0.068	0.014
Evidence	10.27	5	0.068	2.05	0.960	0.988	0.059	0.026

Table 3: Souvenir Purchases

Item	Mean		f value	Sig.
	Male	Female		
Photographs, postcards and paintings of the region	3.34	3.74	94.046	.000
Other local specialty products, such as regional food products, wine, clothing	3.30	3.49	23.279	.000
Perfume, electrical goods, cameras or other similar goods that can be purchased at a discounted price	3.17	3.12	1.175	.279
Regional specialty arts and crafts, such as carvings, jewellery, glassware	3.07	3.59	177.929	.000
Published material on the destination / region, such as books, magazines	2.86	2.85	.055	.814
Other items representative of the location / destination, such as key rings /chains, fridge magnets, mugs	2.85	3.00	11.454	.001
Hats, caps or other clothing branded with the destination, hotel or attraction	2.51	2.46	1.205	.272
Non-regional arts and crafts, such as paintings, stuffed animals or toys, ornaments	2.17	2.39	30.072	.000

Multivariate results: Wilks' Lambda Value .912; F 38.584; Sig .000 Degrees of freedom: 1,3198

Table 4: Souvenirs as Gifts

Item	Comp	Comp	Mean		f value	Sig.
	1	2	Male	Female		
The item makes a good gift	0.741		5.43	5.75	50.995	.000
Buying souvenirs for others shows that you are thinking of them	0.827		5.16	5.52	53.859	.000
I generally buy gifts for my family or friends	0.706		5.14	5.52	47.562	.000
I buy souvenirs as a gift to take when staying with family and friends overseas or interstate.	0.547		4.32	4.75	0.138	.000
I like to buy souvenirs that I can give to family or friends as gifts for special occasions		0.929	4.37	4.34	43.108	.710
I like to buy souvenirs that can be used as Christmas or birthday presents		0.954	4.05	4.10	0.606	.436
I like to exchange souvenirs with relatives		0.508	3.31	3.64	24.683	.000

Multivariate results: Wilks' Lambda Value .963; F 17.743; Sig .000 Degrees of freedom: 1,3198

Table 5: Souvenirs as Memories

Item	Mean		f value	Sig.
	Male	Female		
Souvenirs allow me to have a memento of where I've been	5.43	5.89	96.913	.000
I like to buy souvenirs that represent the country I visited.	5.40	5.75	57.347	.000
Souvenirs are a reminder of how special my travel experiences were	5.34	5.78	80.037	.000
I buy souvenirs that create an association with the place that I visited.	5.16	5.56	70.224	.000
The souvenirs I buy bring connection to my trip	5.07	5.40	39.800	.000
Souvenirs bring back the travel experience.	5.05	5.43	53.169	.000

Multivariate results: Wilks' Lambda Value .967; F 18.417; Sig .000 Degrees of freedom: 1,3198

Table 6: Souvenirs as Evidence

Item	Mean		f value	Sig.
	Male	Female		
I like to buy souvenirs that identify where I've been.	5.22	5.47	26.959	.000
I like souvenirs that you can talk about with others.	4.90	5.02	4.281	.039
Buying souvenirs gives you the opportunity to share your experience with others	4.86	5.17	31.979	.000
I like to buy souvenirs that are famous from a particular place.	4.70	4.91	13.677	.000
I like to put my souvenirs on display to show the places I've visited	4.44	4.70	17.754	.000
I like to buy souvenirs so that I can decorate my home or office with artifacts from other countries.	4.43	4.59	6.773	.009

Multivariate results: Wilks' Lambda Value .986; F 7.332; Sig .000 Degrees of freedom: 1,3198

Table 7: Hierarchical regression results

Gender				R Square		Sig. F
	Model	R	R Square	Change	F Change	Change
Male	1	.477 ^a	.228	.228	252.945	.000
	2	.514 ^b	.264	.036	42.454	.000
	3	.517 ^c	.268	.003	4.040	.045
Female	1	.490 ^a	.240	.240	739.920	.000
	2	.521 ^b	.271	.031	98.057	.000
	3	.533 ^c	.284	.013	41.059	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), evidence

b. Predictors: (Constant), evidence, gift

c. Predictors: (Constant), evidence, gift, memory