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ABSTRACT

Although shopping for a souvenir is rarely the main motive for taking a leisure trip, nonetheless, most tourists do take time to shop for souvenirs. Souvenirs play a major role in a tourist’s travel experience and memory. Traditionally, many studies about souvenir purchase behavior have mainly focused on the analysis of the different types, functions, store management, and customer’s satisfaction of souvenirs. Few have been done to analyze how tourists determine the authenticity of a souvenir as well as the effect of country of origin (COO). Therefore, this study proposes a souvenir purchase conceptual model that manifests the relationship between tourist experience modes, souvenir categories, authenticity, effect of COO, and souvenir purchase intent. This model suggests that both tourist experience modes and souvenir categories determine the level of authenticity, which in turn affects souvenir purchase intent. In addition, the effect of COO serves as a moderator influences the relationship between souvenir authenticity and souvenir purchase intent.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the most cherished collections in the National Palace Museum (NPM) is the “Jadeite Cabbage with Grasshopper”. This world-renowned masterpiece was replicated in China and displayed in the NPM’s gift shop. The “Made in China” label was thought to tarnish Taiwan’s image for tourists in China according to the China Post News on April 2, 2009. An official at NPM made an apology afterwards for the negligence. The “Made in China” label and all the other related souvenirs have since been removed from the gift shop. Later on, these souvenirs were restocked and replaced with a new label reading, “Designed in Taiwan, Manufactured in China”, to reflect the authentic production process. This practice, however, is now triggering an intense debate on the authenticity issue.

A lawmaker has contended that it is ridiculous and embarrassing for Chinese tourists to buy a Taiwanese souvenir from Taiwan. These souvenirs, supposed to be reminders of a pleasant trip to Taiwan, turn out to be made in China (The China Post, 2009). In addition, some political critics view the “Made in China” tag unfavorably. They suggest that the souvenirs procured in Taiwan stand for Taiwan’s image, and should be made in Taiwan, and that these souvenirs made in China are not authentic artifacts.

The label ‘country-of-origin’ (COO) affects souvenir shopping and is becoming an important issue as the number of tourists coming from China rises. The natures of souvenirs, tangible symbols of history, geography, heritage, and travel experience, are different from those of consumed products (Love & Sheldon, 1998). The literature is full of discussions surrounding the COO effect on product evaluations (Hulland, 1999; Insch & McBride, 2002), and while there is a solid understanding of the COO issue, there are still few research findings available that explain the COO’s effect on souvenir shopping.

Shopping is still not recognized as a primary motive for travelling, though it now accounts for half of all travel expenditure (Wong & Law, 2003). This phenomenon has triggered researchers to explore souvenir-shopping behaviors. The money spent on
souvenir purchase is significant, but researchers have limited their attention primarily to travel styles and souvenir items. For example, Littrell, Baizerman, Kean, Gahring, Niemeyer, Reilly, and Stout (1994) categorized the tourist into four groups by tourist activities: (1) ethnic, arts, and people; (2) history and parks; (3) urban entertainment; (4) and active outdoor.

Those in the first category, ethnic, arts, and people, travel primarily for cultural reasons. They tend to visit ethnic communities, participate in community festivals, visit to art galleries, and attend theater productions (Littrell et al., 1994). This group has a propensity to purchase crafts, jewelry, local foods antiques, and books for personal use and for gifts as remembrances of their travel experience. (Littrell et al., 1994). The history and parks group, preferring historical and nature’s beauty, usually enjoy travelling to historic sites and homes, and museums, and they tend to buy crafts, postcards, booklets, and local history books (Littrell et al., 1994). Urban entertainment tourists normally visit recreational theme parks, sporting events, and enjoy shopping for crafts, gifts, and souvenirs (Littrell et al., 1994). Finally, active outdoor tourists enjoy hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, boating, and backpacking and this group tends to buy t-shirts and sweatshirts along their journeys. The findings suggested that travel styles are strongly related to souvenir purchase. Travel styles though, based on travel activities, could not predict the causal relationship between travelers and souvenir purchasing behavior.

This study suggests applying the modes of travel theory, proposed by Cohen (1979), to solve this dilemma. Cohen (1979) divided the traveler into four modes based on travel experience instead of travel activities. The traveler was differentiated in this way: those that travel for mere pleasure and those that travel seeking authenticity along their journeys. Thus, the travel modes are used to determine the level of authenticity. Also, the concept of authenticity, which originated in museum travel, is extended to souvenir purchase to describe items as authentic or inauthentic based on established criterion (Wang, 1999). Accordingly, souvenir categories will eventually influence the level of authenticity.

Some souvenirs, especially those marketed for cultural tourism, serve as a form of
cultural expression (Asplet & Cooper, 2000). Authenticity is important in deciding whether a souvenir is a cultural expression, and thus affects the intention of purchase (Asplet & Cooper, 2000). The results suggested that New Zealand tourists prefer purchasing souvenir clothing with a traditional Maori cultural design (Asplet & Cooper, 2000). In this instance, the level of authenticity affects the souvenir purchase intent.

The effect of COO is substantial in quality evaluation and intent of product purchase (Hulland, 1999). The tag of COO on souvenirs also influences souvenir-purchasing behavior. However, there is little research that examines how the COO influences souvenir purchase in the tourism context. To explore the relationship among these complicated variables, the purpose of this study is to establish a theoretical framework to better understand the tourist experience modes, souvenir categories, and souvenir procurement. This study proposes a souvenir conceptual model that explains the relationship between tourist experience modes, souvenir categories, authenticity, effect of COO, and souvenir purchase intent.

FIGURE 1 Conceptual souvenir—purchasing behavior model

This model, depicted in Figure 1, suggests that both tourist experience modes and souvenir categories are the variables that determine the level of authenticity, which in
turn affect souvenir purchase. The effect of COO, serving as a moderator, influences the relationship between authenticity and souvenir purchase. More specifically, this study seeks to investigate how both high level of authenticity and low level of authenticity affect souvenir purchase. In addition to further explaining the role of authenticity, this model can contribute new insight into the souvenir purchase literature and benefit tourism retailers and marketers as they search for strategies to attract tourist souvenir consumption.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Tourist Experience Modes

Cohen (1979) proposed touristic experience modes on the basis of depth of experience: existential, experimental, experiential, recreational, and diversionary. First of all, the existential tourist leaves modernity behind in pursuit of more primitive travel adventures. These tourists avoid the beaten track and choose naturally preserved places in their seeking of authentic experiences. Secondly, the experimental tourist travels to many primitive places seeking an authentic experience, but does not deeply immerse himself into other societies (Cohen, 1988). Thirdly, experiential tourists tend to get involved in the everyday life of the locals (Cohen, 1988). Both experimental and experiential travelers are similar to existential travelers, sharing the same vigorous livelihood with one another.

The fourth, recreational tourists, motivated primarily by restoration and recuperation, loosely accept authentic replica and the imitation experience that resembles the genuine (Cohen, 1988). Finally, diversionary tourists, indifferent to authenticity, tend to focus on funny, cute, or romantic experiences (Cohen, 1988). We can conclude that recreational and diversionary tourists place less importance on authenticity.

The Cohen typology established the co-relationship between tourist modes and authenticity seeking experience, but it does not predict the relationships between tourist modes and souvenir purchase. In this study, two tourist modes - cultural and recreational are chosen for further study using a predictive model. The cultural and
recreational types selected are (1) distinctive feature in authenticity seeking and (2) basic categories in tourism typologies. The notion of a cultural tourist involves those who have special interests and devote substantial efforts in seeking authenticity (Robert, 1996). In the postmodern age, Urry (2001) argues that tourists seek play, pleasure, and pastiche. This study combines his notion of the recreational tourist with Cohen’s divisionary recreational tourist. Thus, this typology consists of cultural tourists, who hold high the level of authenticity, and recreational tourists, who do not place much importance on the level of authenticity. Accordingly, the following propositions are proposed:

Proposition 1: The cultural tourist tends to be positively associated with high level of authenticity.

Proposition 2: The recreational tourist tends to be positively associated with low level of authenticity.

Souvenir Categories

To understand the differences amongst souvenirs, Gordon (1986) classified them into five categories. The first are pictorial images. In this category are postcards, posters, photographs, illustrated books, and pictures, all of which are tangible items that remind the tourist of his presence in a country (Gordon, 1986). The second type is natural souvenirs - “piece-of-rock”. Included in this category are rocks, grasses, shells and driftwood, pine cones, stuffed moose or deer heads, sperm whale teeth, and stuffed alligators, all examples that are parts of the whole destination environment (Gordon, 1986). The third type is symbolic shorthand, including replicas of well-known attractions, and miniaturized iconic images, most of which are manufactured from synthetic materials (Gordon, 1986). Markers are the fourth type, consisting of t-shirts, coffee mugs, coasters and other sorts of memorabilia. These are not unique by design but are marked with local logos (Gordon, 1986). For example, a key ring inscribed with “Ali Mountain” becomes a marker for Taiwan, helping to preserve pleasant memories of Taiwan. Finally, local products are the fifth type, including an array of indigenous objects such as foods, liquor, cooking utensils, clothing, and handicrafts (Gordon,
Pictorial images, “piece-of-rock” items, and local products, all place-bound, share the attribute of the local ways of living, including foods, drinks, architecture, plants, handcrafted products, and entertainment. Thus, this study reclassifies them as ethnic souvenirs. Likewise, both symbolic shorthand and markers lose their primitive uniqueness from mass production and thus lose their original style by catering to large tourists populations. They are termed as commercial souvenirs in this study. Consequently, Gordon’s typology of souvenirs is reduced to two types in this study: ethnic souvenirs and commercial souvenirs.

Often the ethnic souvenirs, communicating individual, social, and spiritual distinctiveness, have long been a symbol of identity (Timothy, 2005). Through the production of ethnic souvenirs, the local community creates positive destination images and communicates through them to tourists. For instance, Taiwan’s aboriginal attires are seen as the embodiment of ethnic entity and a source of tribal spirit. On the contrary, commercial souvenirs are manufactured on a massive scale and do not portray local originality. Accordingly, ethnic souvenirs are highly related to the true level of authenticity while the commercial ones are related to the low level of authenticity. On the basis of the literature, this study proposes the following propositions:

Proposition 3: The ethnic souvenirs are positively related to the high level of authenticity.

Proposition 4: The commercial souvenirs are positively related to the low level of authenticity.

Authenticity

The high level of authenticity. Curators and ethnographers are always sure to employ the strictest standards to distinguish authenticity and non-authenticity. For example, McLeod explained authentic African art as “… piece made from traditional materials by a native craftsman for acquisition and use by members of local society that is made and used with no thought that it ultimately may be disposed of for gain to
Europeans or other aliens” (McLeod, 1976: 31).

McLeod (1976) emphasized the absence of modernity as a basic judgment of authenticity, for it is relevant to tradition, locality, and primitiveness of a culture. Similar to these views, Cornet contained authenticity as “any object created for a traditional purpose and by a traditional artist, with conforming to traditional form” (Cornet, 1975: 52).

To define a craft’s authenticity, Littrell, Anderson, and Brown (1993) purposed eight criteria: uniqueness and originality, workmanship, aesthetics, cultural and historical integrity, tourist function and use, craftsperson and materials, shopping experience, and genuineness or truth in advertising.

To solve the authenticity problems of Maori culture products and services, the Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation established three criteria: “from the mind of a Maori, by the hand of a Maori, and that the producer or provider has a genealogical and spiritual connection to a tupuna Maori” (Asplet & Cooper, 2000: 308).

Revilla and Dodd (2003) found that the tourist could distinguish Talavera pottery authenticity by its appearance and utility, traditional characteristics and certification, rarity, low price, and its local production.

**The low level of authenticity.** Authenticity has little importance for those who visit friends and relatives, spend time in Disneyland, or those that visit resorts for skiing or spa treatments. These pleasure-seeking tourists will delightfully accept the low level of authenticity. This tourist seeks entertainment in comfortable settings. Because they seek primarily entertainment and relaxation, they do not mind the low levels of authenticity in their souvenirs (Cohen, 1979). Likewise, they find great pleasure from the organized games of these resorts even though they may be unaware that these games lack authenticity as well (Feifer, 1985).

**Souvenir Shopping**

Souvenir shopping is seldom included as a main travel motive, but it is a popular activity that tourists frequently participate in (Cook, 1995; Kim & Littrell,
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2001). Taiwanese tourists validated this fact through their travels abroad in 1999, as souvenirs were only second to tobacco and wine as the most frequently purchased items (Lehto, Cai, O’Leary & Huan, 2004). For Chinese leisure travelers though, gift and souvenir shopping are ranked as their most important purchases, followed by lodging, food, and entertainment (Cai & O’leary, 2001). Thus, the purchasing of gifts and souvenirs constitutes a significant amount of tourist’s experience in many destinations.

Commercially produced souvenirs serve as remembrances, concrete reminders of extraordinary experiences, and special moments for tourists (Gordon, 1986). People escape from their mundane, ordinary lives looking for extraordinary new places to visit. Souvenirs serve as evidence that they have been there, which is psychologically important for tourists (Anderson & Littrell, 1995). A souvenir’s presence extends the fleeting, transitory experience to a non-ordinary experience (Gordon, 1986). A tangible piece of souvenir also proves the reality of tourist experience, thus tourists tend to purchase commercially produced souvenirs to remind them of the trip and also to demonstrate to others the memorable travel experience.

The tourists themselves attach meaning to souvenirs in addition to the meaning assigned by local producers (Kim & Littrel, 2001). Souvenirs make intangible experience tangible for tourists. They extend the ephemeral travel experience to an extraordinary destination to their homes in ordinary time (Gordon, 1986). Souvenir purchase is also indicative of esteem and ego promotion (Timothy, 2005). Souvenirs are the cues of travel accomplishment like colonialists and of a tourist’s experience in a destination at a specific time as missionaries and traders (Stanley, 2000). By displaying souvenirs, tourists can satisfy recognition and admiration needs among friends and relatives (Timothy, 2005).

Initially, the indigenous handicrafts and traditional art serve as ceremonial and functional needs. As the number of tourists grow, the demand for traditional artwork increases. To fulfill tourist expectations, the purposes of arts and crafts have switched from a once functional use to commercialized or commoditized forms (Timothy, 2005). Adapting functional use to commercial form, the commercial art or replica robs the depth of meaning from the original (Timothy, 2005). For example, the Taiwanese
aboriginal apparel has lost much of its traditional function and purpose, and is being replaced with new fashions and modern patterns.

As production processes and materials change, commercial arts transform into souvenirs (Timothy, 2005). The original patterns and designs may survive, yet the size and complicated structures may be reduced (Timothy, 2005). Miniature art replicas, such as the famous “Jadeite Cabbage with Grasshopper” are good examples. For economic scope and a cheaper price, souvenirs are mass manufactured and are departed from traditional materials and processes (Timothy, 2005). Thus, there are souvenir markets that do not care for authenticity. The levels of authenticity, which are determined by modes of tourism and categories of souvenirs, will in turn influence the souvenir purchase intent. In accordance with these considerations, the following proposition is proposed:

Proposition 5: Authenticity affects the souvenir purchase intent.

Effect of COO

Consumers will evaluate a product by using intrinsic (physical and performance attributes, design) and extrinsic (price, brand image, store image, warranties) information cues based on the information theory (Bilkey & Nes, 1982). These information cues affect perceived quality, perceived risk, and purchase intention (Bilkey & Nes, 1982). Both empirical notes and experimental findings support the COO assumption substantially in consumer purchase decision, as well as in industrial purchase decision.

Hulland (1999), expanding the single cue of the COO effect to country-of-brand (COB) across countries, argues that brand name and COB effect on product evaluation are substantial. The COO and brand name act as extrinsic filters to form consumer consideration sets (Hulland, 1999). Therefore, the COO and COB information will influence product evaluation from different countries and in turn will affect product consideration (Hulland, 1999).

Unfortunately, the aforementioned research findings cannot generalize all souvenir purchase patterns. The difference between product procurement and souvenir
procurement is obvious. First of all, there is a fundamental difference between souvenir procurement and industrial procurement in terms of ego and meaning. Secondly, a tourist’s purchase motivation is different from an ordinary consumer’s. These differences prove that a revised model for souvenir procurement is needed.

Because the tag of COO contains the extrinsic information cues of souvenir thus signifies the nature of souvenir quality and risk. This study argues that the information cue is crucial to a tourist’s evaluation of the souvenir. In addition, tourists use COO as a key factor in the purchase decision-making process. Therefore, it is expected that the cue of COO (made in Taiwan) congruent with destination country (Taiwan) increase the souvenir purchase intent. In contrast, the tourist’s intent of buying a souvenir decreases with the cue of COO (Made in China) incongruent with the destination country (Taiwan). That is, the effect of COO will moderate the relationship between authenticity and the souvenir purchase intent. Therefore, the following proposition is proposed:

*Proposition 6:* The impact of authenticity on the souvenir purchase intent is moderated by the effect of COO.

Based on the aforementioned literature review, this study assumes that a cultural tourist is more likely to focus on a high level of authentic experience as well as authentic souvenirs while a recreational tourist will place less emphasis on this authenticity. In addition, ethnic souvenirs are highly related to authenticity while commercial ones are not. Further, authenticity will affect the souvenir purchase intent, which will be moderated by the effect of COO.

**CONCLUSION**

Souvenirs made in foreign countries and sold in tourist destination are not uncommon. As souvenir shops are competing to attract tourists, the trend is inevitable that souvenirs are manufactured in labor-discounted countries (Timothy, 2005). Thus, it is not surprising to find the “Jadeite Cabbage with Grasshopper” was made in China at the National Palace Museum (NPM) in Taiwan. Most of these souvenirs though are marketed primarily for commercial purposes. Thus, in order to understand the
complicated souvenir purchasing behavior, souvenir categories, tourist experience modes, authenticity, and effect of COO are all necessarily to take into consideration.

**Cultural Tourist and Authenticity**

Cultural tourists believe authenticity to be important in their travel experience. It has long been held that tourists search for authentic experiences and places known for heritage tourism (Timothy & Boyd, 2002). Most tourists seek to find indigenous people living in their natural ways in their actual homes. Serious cultural travelers and visitors that arrive for pilgrimages are extremely concerned for authentic sites and rituals (Errington & Gwertz, 1989). Authenticity is a critical issue in heritage tourism and a determinant factor that influences tourist choice of destination (Moscardo & Pearce, 1986). The perception of real experience could affect tourist satisfaction (Moscardo et al., 1986). To reflect the need of authenticity for tourists, tour operators and marketers have begun to use “real”, “authentic” and “genuine” in their text descriptions (Timothy et al., 2002). Therefore, it is a logical result that cultural tourists, who search for authentic experiences, will embrace the high levels of authenticity.

**Recreational Tourist and Authenticity**

Originally, tourism was thought of as a superficial, peripheral, and trivial activity in the face of the concerns of modern society (Boorsin, 1961). The search for authentic experience by tourists was ignored and overlooked by some sociological elitists such as Boorstin and MacCannell. By examining mass tourism, Boorstin (1961) regarded tourist vacations as “pseudo-events”, because the tourist is seeking staged attractions and contrived experiences, fulfilling this experience with commoditized products, cultures, and images. Based on these imitations, he suggested that tourists are unable to have an authentic experience.

Likewise, MacCannell (1973) suggested this “staged authenticity” as part of an obvious inauthentic experience. Drawing on the notion of front stage and back stage from Goffman, a structural division of social hierarchy, MacCannell (1973) contended that the front stage, where hosts meet guests, and patrons interact with service providers,
could be a “false reality” for show and performance, while the back stage a “real reality” for performers and showers (Goffman, 1959; MacCannell, 1973: 589-590). Therefore, he concluded that tourists who were bored with their monotonous lives of routine work were motivated to pursue genuine, spontaneous, and authentic experiences, to mingle with natives, and to “see the real life as it is”, only failed to see their wishes come true (MacCannell, 1973).

Cohen (1988) argued that the notion of authenticity is a socially negotiable construct and proposed an emergent authenticity to replace the museum-related authenticity. He suggested that emergent authenticity is a gradual uniting of the tourist’s perspective to the host culture. Certain contrived settings, once viewed as inauthentic, could become authentic over time. Disneyland, for instance, once seen as only a contrived theme park, is becoming an eminent representation of American culture (Cohen, 1988). In the near future, Disneyland will eventually be seen as an American cultural destination.

In addition, Cohen (1988) suggested that the tourist is different from the ethnologist. The former hold a less strict criterion of authenticity than the latter did. However, this does not mean that the tourist does not care about authenticity. It implies that the degree of intensity of the search for authenticity varies, according to the degree of estrangement to modernity (Cohen, 1988). Thus, at a given staged attraction or environment, there is no consensus on the impression of the scene. One tourist with loose criteria may respond to the staged environment with a positive attitude while the other with rigorous criteria may see it more negatively and not accept it as an authentic attraction (Cohen, 1988). Thus, recreational tourists who do not see tourism as a mean of self-realization, but rather travel for entertainment, will embrace the low level of authenticity.

**Ethnic Souvenir Purchaser and Commercial Souvenir Purchaser**

Ethnic souvenirs are originally created by native peoples for decorative functions or utilitarian purposes and are seen as symbols and sources of pride (Timothy, 2005). Ethnic souvenir purchasers are always attracted to local handicrafts, traditions,
gastronomy, architecture, music, religious manifestations, arts, and the like. Purchasers see these ethnic arts not only as representations of local cultural, but also as mementos of a country and as authentic souvenirs (Asplet & Cooper, 2000).

Ethnic souvenirs describe traditional elements of local society and reveal meaning behind its culture. The ethnic purchasers too are likely to attach special meanings to their souvenirs (Kim & Littrell, 2001). The souvenirs are also symbolic of a tourist’s travel accomplishment, proving his experience in a country (Timothy, 2005). Purchasing ethnic souvenirs, in addition, can satisfy the need of recognition and admiration by friends (Kim & Littrell, 2001). Thus, authenticity is a vital evaluation for cultural tourists in making souvenir-purchasing decisions.

As the demand for local art grows, the nature of indigenous art becomes commercialized for tourists and can lead to changed forms, functions, and meanings (Timothy, 2005). Recreational tourists from different social classes, lifestyles, and psychographics tend to favor inexpensive imitation arts (Cohen, 1988). Commercial souvenir buyers do not focus on the meaning and the symbol of the souvenirs, and authenticity is not of great importance to them.

**The Effect of COO**

Most multinational companies adopt international division of labor strategies for designing, manufacturing, and assembly of items. These corporations are able to capitalize on the lower wage rates and tariff arrangements of underdeveloped countries. These international companies are able to manage from headquarters in their home countries where they retain the core functions of product design and brand management, while outsourcing the manufacturing and assembly operations to offshore firms.

Thus, designated local souvenir labeling with a foreign manufacturer for consumption in tourist destinations in a global community has become common (Asplet & Cooper, 2000). Most of these souvenirs are of the commercial variety. For instance, in United States and Canada, many welcomed souvenirs are made in China, Vietnam, or Indonesia, where labor and materials are much cheaper (Timothy, 2005).

Likewise, “Made in China” woodcarvings are sold everywhere in Sanyi, Miaoli
County. Thus, tourists are aware of the fact that the souvenirs have “Made in China” stickers on them. The “Jadeite Cabbage with Grasshopper” replica has been the most popular souvenir sold to Chinese tourists in NPM for years, indicating that authenticity is not of great importance to them. Thus, the commercial souvenir purchasers accept the low level of authenticity with little attention given to the COO.

In a survey of 322 visitors in New Zealand however, Asplet and Cooper (2000) found that over half of these tourists were more likely to purchase souvenir clothing if authenticity of design was guaranteed on the label. Thus, ethnic souvenir purchasers tend to devote themselves to search for authentic experiences and authentic souvenirs. Ethnic souvenirs with a label claiming the COO, the originality, the materials, the local manufacturer, the origin process, and indigenous crafts will surely meet and satisfy the cultural tourist’s needs (Asplet & Cooper, 2000).

The effect of COO is an important moderator in the objective of souvenir purchase. The intent of souvenir buying is dependent on the indication of COO. When the cue of COO is consistent with the destination country, it is assumed that if the souvenir is authentic, the souvenir purchase intent increases. It is also expected that if the sign of COO is not congruent with the destination country, the intent of purchase will decrease. That is, the cues of COO moderate the relationship between authenticity and the souvenir purchase intent.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

The primary objective of this study is to discuss the role of authenticity within the tourist modes and souvenir categories, and it also addresses the effect of COO on souvenir shopping behavior. The souvenir-shopping model seeks to merge the methods of the tourist mode, souvenir group, and authenticity literatures; accordingly a number of propositions have developed that illustrate the level of authenticity within a souvenir-marketing context. In addition, to empirically investigate the propositions above, a number of other research areas specific to souvenir shopping are needed.

Additional research is needed to further test the impact of demographic variables
on authenticity and souvenir shopping behavior. Several studies have proved that age and gender influence souvenir purchase behavior (Anderson & Littrell, 1995). Studies, however, explore the relationship of age, gender, and authenticity to shopping behavior is limited. Thus, it is recommended that the effects of age, gender, and authenticity along with other variables related to shopping behavior be further explored.

Cultural aspects should be looked at more extensively in the future as well. As the international tourism industry continues to expand, understanding tourist behavior from the cultural aspect has emerged as a pressing issue for tourism research. Culture is referred to as “the collective mental schemes pervaded in every aspect of social interaction which tell the members of a particular society from others” (Hofstede, 1980). That is, culture is the result of shared behavior, but culture is a conditioning factor of further behavior as well (Hofstede, 1980). Realizing this, nations, organizations, and groups have established their own cultures. Accordingly, future studies might look to test this souvenir model with different samples of international travelers.
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中文摘要

雖然很少有人會把購買紀念品，當成觀光旅遊的主要目的，不過大部份的觀光客，
都會花時間去購買紀念品。所以，紀念品在觀光客的旅遊體驗與回憶裡，都佔有
重要地位。過去關於紀念品購買行為的研究，偏重在探討紀念品的種類、功能、
商店管理和顧客滿意等議題，深入探討紀念品的真實性與原產國效果的相關研
究，卻非常少見。因此，本研究提出一個紀念品購買行為的觀念架構，用來說明
遊客的體驗型態、紀念品種類、真實性、原產國效果和購買意願之間的關係。這
個觀念架構認為，遊客的體驗型態和紀念品種類會影響真實性，然後真實性會影
響購買意願。原產國效果則有調節功能，會影響真實性與購買意願之間的關係。
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