



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Take me back...but to where? A content analysis of how country of origin impacts on the authenticity of souvenirs

Item Type	event;event
Authors	Backer, Elisa;Zaveri, Moulik
Download date	2026-03-16 09:09:34
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/49147

Take me back...but to where? A content analysis of how country of origin impacts on the authenticity of souvenirs

1. Introduction

It is likely that anyone who has travelled to a destination in the capacity of a tourist has, at some stage of their life at least, purchased a souvenir. Purchasing souvenirs is regarded by many as a simple way to experience the culture in the destination being visited (L. Lin & Mao, 2015b). The types of souvenirs purchased vary between tourists, and the amount of money spent on souvenirs will vary between tourists. However, essentially souvenirs are bought for the same key reason – to remember. In fact, it is useful at this point to reflect on the word origins of souvenir; being ‘memory.’ The French word evolved around 1765 with origins from the Latin word ‘subvenire,’ meaning ‘to come to mind.’

Given how common purchasing of souvenirs is, it is perhaps somewhat surprising that there has not been more research into the authenticity of souvenirs. In particular, given that souvenirs represent a ‘memory’ of the destination for visitors, it is unknown whether the country of origin (CoO) (i.e., the ‘Made in...’ labels) for those souvenirs matters. That is, if a tourist from China to Australia buys a souvenir as a memory of Australia, should that souvenir be manufactured in Australia? Does it matter? Does the place of manufacture make a souvenir more or less authentic? Or is it only the image and not the creation that matters? Is price more important than authenticity?

Such questions were raised in an article entitled *No returns on ‘Aussie’ souvenirs* first published by ‘The Daily Telegraph’ and subsequently republished by The Courier Mail (Auerbach, 2013) The article stated:-

They come from China for a dream Australian holiday – then leave with armfuls of “Aussie” souvenirs that have been made in their own country....Some Chinese tourists spoken to by The Daily Telegraph were shocked to learn their cute and cuddly marsupial toys had been made in a factory back home (Auerbach, 2013, January 5).

This statement would seem to indicate that many tourists may purchase souvenirs without observing the CoO. Perhaps many tourists look only for the design and price without thinking about where it was manufactured. Maybe others simply assume it would be locally manufactured. Could more souvenirs be sold if they were manufactured in the country they were being sold in? Does CoO matter in determining souvenir authenticity? These are essential questions to explore and would have important implications for both scholarship and industry.

As a first step in understanding this research area, this paper offers the reader an analysis of the relevant literature to provide an informed platform to guide researchers into the future. Accordingly, this paper will introduce the literature briefly, discuss the method employed for conducting the content analysis, and then outline some key findings from the analysis of the literature. The next section in this paper is to briefly provide an overview of the literature as well as providing some examples of unique Australian souvenirs, which may be of interest to the international delegates at the 50th Travel and Tourism Research Association (TTRA) Conference in 2019.

2. Literature Review

The review of literature begins by briefly describing the research on authenticity in tourism, followed by the review of research on souvenirs. In particular, the types of souvenirs, major research themes in the area, and specifically souvenir authenticity are discussed, which is the main focus of this paper.

2.1 Authenticity in tourism

The literature on authenticity in tourism has flourished since MacCannell (1973) introduced the concept of 'staged authenticity' four decades ago. Ever since, authenticity has been researched in various aspects of tourism including - souvenirs, handicrafts, and heritage, food and cuisines, cultural events and festivals, cultural performances, tourists motivation and experience, tourist spending behavior, commoditisation, and pilgrimage and event experiences.

Authenticity has regularly been at the centre of tourism debates. The concept of authenticity is applied in tourism literature from its museum-linked usage. As reported by (Wang, 1999), the concept was described by (Trilling, 1972) as

where persons expert in such matters test whether objects of art are what they appear to be or are claimed to be, and therefore worth the price that is asked for them – or, if this has already been paid, worth the admiration they are being given (p.93).

The authenticity of tourist experiences and toured objects have been studied under various contexts with different conceptualisation and definitions. Through a genealogical meta-analysis, Wang (1999) offers a systematic framework on the evolution of authenticity from three paradigmatic approaches – particularly, modernist (object authenticity), constructivist (symbolic authenticity), and postmodernist (existential authenticity). The modernist approach holds that authenticity is an attribute of the toured object such as a site or specific event or attraction. Presumably, this can be measured with objective criteria to determine whether the object is authentic or not (Belhassen, Caton, & Stewart, 2008).

The constructivist approach suggests that authenticity is a social construct, which results from a process of interpretation. It emphasises the symbolic meanings created by tourists and tourism producers through socialisation, and there are various versions of authenticities of the same object. The meanings are created based on the preferences, beliefs, powers, and tourists's home culture, rather than an inherent quality of the toured object. The postmodernist approach stresses that authenticity is irrelevant or less relevant in tourism. He suggests that this approach is existential and resides in the subject (i.e., tourist) rather than the toured object. According to Wang (1999), activities such as visiting friends and relatives, beach holidays, adventures, nature tourism, visiting Disneyland, personal hobbies such as shopping, fishing, hunting, or sports, and so on, have nothing to do with authenticity. He argues that what tourists seek are their own authentic selves as opposed to the toured objects.

One of the leading contentions in the study of authenticity is the role of the authenticator. Wall & Xie (2005) suggested that authenticity is a "slippery and contested term" (p. 2), and it may be more relevant to determine who authenticates authenticity and why, rather than determining if something is authentic or not. The question then is: do tourists determine if souvenirs are authentic or not and if so what makes them authentic? For example, products of tourism such as handicrafts, artifacts, events, cuisine, souvenirs and so on are usually described as

“authentic” or “inauthentic” based on whether they are made or enacted “by local people according to custom or tradition” (Sharpley, 1994, p.130).

It is argued that from the perspective of a modernist, the place of manufacture, CoO, or “made in...” labels, are objective attributes of souvenirs, just as other cues such as price, colour, design or packaging, and shall thus, play a critical role in establishing the authenticity of souvenirs. This however, has not been conceptualised or validated by previous research in the area. These authors therefore set out to do this in the current article by systematically analysing the previous research and highlighting this significant gap. In doing so, these authors offer an overview of the research on souvenirs, an analysis of souvenir authenticity, and present for the readership a content analysis to assist with directing future tourism research.

2.2 *Souvenirs*

The extant literature reveals that numerous studies have been undertaken to examine the importance of souvenirs to touristic behaviour. Souvenirs can belong to a wide range of categories. Souvenirs may comprise clothing – either as traditional clothing depicting the culture of the destination visited, or embroidered or screened clothing outwardly expressing the name of the attraction or destination visited (e.g. ‘I (love heart symbol) NY’). Souvenirs may also be a rug, painting, craft, jewellery, an instrument (e.g., vuvuzela, djembe drum, and didgeridoo), miniature monuments (e.g., Eiffel tower), postcards, or even local alcohol.

Some particularly odd examples also exist, such as troll dolls from Scandinavian countries, used race horseshoes, voodoo dolls, and cane toad products from Australia such as a genuine cane toad coin purse (Figure 1). Australia also offers other oddities such as a kangaroo paw finger salute bottle opener (Figure 2) and Kangaroo scrotum gift pack (Figure 3).

Figure 1: Genuine Cane Toad Coin Purse



Source: Souvenirs Australia Warehouse (2018)

Figure 2: Kangaroo Paw Finger Salute Bottle Opener



Source: Souvenirs Australia Warehouse (2018)

Figure 3: Kangaroo scrotum gift pack



Source: Souvenirs Australia Warehouse (2018)

Having the correct range of souvenirs can be critical in determining whether or not a tourist will purchase a souvenir (Swanson & Horridge, 2006) Tourists buying souvenirs may have very different motivations to travel and may have very different reasons for the purchase of a souvenir. The amount of money expended also varies widely depending on whether someone is merely purchasing an item such as a postcard or purchasing something more expensive such as fine jewellery.

Analysis of souvenirs strengthened three decades ago, namely after Gordon (1986) developed a typology for souvenirs. Those classifications were: pictorial, piece-of-the-rock, symbolic shorthand, markers, and local products. Items such as postcards fall into the 'pictorial' category, where they are purchased by the tourist to either send to someone else or retain as a snapshot reminder. The second classification of 'piece-of-the-rock' comprise items gathered from nature. These could be a seashell, a rock, or item from a plant or tree. The third

classification, ‘symbolic shorthand,’ comprise manufactured items that represent the place they came from. Such items could be miniature statues such as a Big Ben clock, Opera House, Eiffel Tower, or snow globes. Symbolic shorthand items can often be functional so that they can be used in ordinary life (e.g., Figures 1, 2, and 3). The fourth category, ‘markers,’ are items inscribed with words belonging to the attraction (e.g., theme park) or destination to essentially advertise to the world where the tourist has been. Common examples include baseball caps and tee-shirts. The fifth and final category is ‘local products.’ Items belonging to this category are indigenous to the specific area and may comprise indigenous clothing, or maybe local food or wine.

Table 1: Typology of souvenirs

Category	Example
Pictorial	Postcards
Piece-of-the-rock	Seashells
Symbolic shorthand	Miniature Eiffel Tower
Markers	Tee-shirt inscribed with name of destination
Local products	Indigenous food

Of note, these typologies do not include a category or sub-category of the country of origin. While it is axiomatic that the local products typology and piece-of-the-rock typology will be authentic and accordingly represent the country (or destination) of origin, the other typologies could be manufactured anywhere. Often local culture is said to be destroyed and commoditised as a result of tourism (Cohen, 1988). As such, it is both ironic and unfortunate that for the tourist to have an authentic souvenir, they may at the same time be contributing to commoditisation.

Since Gordon's (1986) work, several other authors have attempted to categorise souvenirs. For example, (Decrop & Masset, 2011) recognise the symbolic souvenir, hedonistic souvenir, utilitarian souvenir, and souvenir as a gift. Swanson and Timothy (2012) discuss souvenir taxonomies as symbolic reminders, other commodities, other reminders, and tourist commodities. They then categorise souvenirs as a totality: linking life and pilgrimage (Swanson & Timothy, 2012). Hume (2014) simplified classifications into just three: sampled, representative and crafted; while (Decrop & Masset, 2014) discuss four souvenir typologies: tourist trinkets, destination stereotypes, paper mementos, and picked-up objects.

The framework chosen by each researcher will determine where an example souvenir would belong, and it may come down to personal preference or destination for the research as to whether researchers feel that one framework suits their needs better than another. However, Gordon's (1986) work is the best known because of its seminal status. In addition, despite recent advancements in souvenirs because of technology, such as 3D souvenirs (Anastasiadou & Vettese, 2019), Gordon's (1986) seminal typology work still embraces the options.

Souvenirs, in any form, help tourists cherish their memory of travels. In his seminal article, Gordon (1986) suggests a theory of sacredness, which proposes that a transitory shift occurs between a normal/mundane/ordinary existence, like staying at home, and an

abnormal/sacred/non-ordinary existence, such as traveling. The contrast between the mundane/ordinary and sacred/non-ordinary are suggested as reasons for collecting souvenirs. A souvenir helps the tourist to “locate, define, and freeze in time a fleeting, transitory experience, and bring back an ordinary experience something of the equality of an extraordinary experience” (Gordon, 1986, p.135). Souvenirs resemble “ordinary” everyday items but are from the place of “extraordinary” significance to its owners (Peters, 2011, p.235). Souvenirs become a tangible piece of extraordinary times and experiences, as tourists cannot stay in the sacred state forever. Tourists need to make their memories and experiences sacred, and this need is best served by tangible souvenirs (Setiyati & Indrayanto, 2011). While souvenirs may be tangible in nature or functional in characteristics, they also hold symbolic and intangible value.

2.3 Handicrafts as souvenirs

One particular type of souvenirs, handicrafts, deserves a special mention. Handicraft souvenirs are one of the popular choices amongst tourists to take back home. Tourists often recognise crafts and other objects purchased during travel as among their most valued possessions (Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988). As such, the authenticity of crafts has received much attention in the tourism literature. Littrell (1990) found that tourists derive multidimensional and rich symbolic meanings of the craft acquired during travel. Particularly for some tourists, it was a part of a shopping experience whereas for others it was seeking authentic craft, or a reminder of a special trip or finding something unique to express themselves. The question pertinent to this research is: what makes a souvenir authentic?

A study by (Littrell, Anderson, & Brown, 1993) found that authentic crafts souvenirs possess uniqueness, high-quality workmanship, meet aesthetic criteria of colour and design, are functional and useful, illustrate cultural and historical ties, are made with local materials by local craftspersons, and/or are sold with information about the craftsman or written hallmarks of genuineness. Authenticity of handicraft souvenirs is also derived from traditional elements. For example, Shenhav-Keller (1993) found three themes of authenticity, which captures Maskit’s (The Israel Center of Handicraft) ideology, viz. religion as authenticity, history as authenticity, and handicrafts as authenticity. Religion as authenticity is ascertained based on the objects that express “Jewishness,” these range from ritual objects, symbols of religion or artifacts. History as authenticity is identified with ancient motifs on artifacts, and handicraft as authenticity is expressed through materials such as dresses and linens embroidered in traditional styles from various historical locations.

In summary, Shenhav-Keller's (1993) study suggests that tourists use religious characteristics, historical cues, and handcrafted materials of objects as surrogates to ascertain the authenticity of handicraft souvenirs. In a more recent study, Revilla and Dodd (2003) found that people who purchase Talavera pottery determine authenticity based on five primary factors: appearance/utility, tradition, and certification, difficult to obtain, locally produced, and low cost. Similarly, Chang, Wall, and Chang (2008) found that Aytayal woven handicrafts were perceived authentic based on its local flavour, traditional characteristics, utility/appearance, and market-driven aspects.

2.4 Souvenir shopping based on tourist typologies

Various typologies of tourism roles or styles have been developed using different approaches. Typologies include behavioural or interactional, which emphasise travel activities and levels of interaction with tourist communities. Cognitive-psychological or benefit segmentation

typologies focus on the tourists' values, attitudes, needs, benefits, risk-taking behaviours, and motivations as related to travel. Finally, role typologies capture behavior and psychological variables into roles that travellers enact. Detail discussions of these typologies are outside the scope of this article but those keen to explore this area may find a wealth of references in Littrell et al. (1994). Relevant to this article though is the behavioural typology because shopping (for a souvenir) is predominantly a behaviour akin to travel activities.

Souvenir shopping is an important part of travel experiences and shopping preferences vary based on different tourism styles. Littrell et al. (1994) found that souvenir preferences for four types of tourism styles differ based on different travel experiences tourists seek. Tourists in the Ethnic, Arts and People Tourism prefer to purchase ethnic, folk, or one of a kind crafts, those in History and Parks Tourism seek photographs, postcards, and craft products made from wood and nature products, whereas the ones in Urban Entertainment Tourism style tend to buy commodities such as sweatshirts, t-shirts, and other memorabilia with the logos of tourist sites. Active Outdoor Tourism did not actively seek out to buy souvenirs, but those that did had a preference for nature materials and crafts with rural and recreational themes.

Understanding the shopping behaviour and tourist typologies is important for manufacturers and sellers to better market the souvenirs as per needs and preferences of the tourists. Fairhurst, Costello, and Holmes (2007) investigated the shopping preferences of five types of tourists and found that City tourists spent the largest amount of money on souvenirs and spent over five hours shopping when travelling. For the souvenir retailers, that can be very appealing. Understanding what attributes of souvenirs are evaluated by the tourists and providing a matching assortment of souvenirs to can be significantly rewarding.

2.5 Major research themes in souvenir literature

Many tourists purchase various kinds of souvenirs, depending on demographics, budget, preferences, and destination. Within souvenir research, there have been four primary research paths as described briefly in Table 2.

Table 2. Major research themes within souvenir literature

Research area	Studies
Exploring the meaning of souvenirs as the mementos, and how souvenirs serve as symbols in the construction of tourists' identities	(Cohen, 1993; Love & Sheldon, 1998; Morgan & Pritchard, 2005; Smith & Reid, 1994; Swanson & Timothy, 2012)
The retail setting of souvenirs, in which the investigation has focused on tourism behavior within a retail environment, to understand how tourists can be served better as consumers, in the commercial setting of travel	(Kim & Littrell, 2001; Littrell et al., 1994; Swanson, 2004; Swanson & Horridge, 2002, 2004, 2006; Trinh, Ryan, & Cave, 2014)
Motivations travellers have for purchasing specific souvenirs through their journeys, including purchasing souvenirs for gift-giving	(Edelheim & Parker, 2008; L. Lin, 2017; L. Lin & Mao, 2015a; Littrell et al., 1993; Sirakaya, Uysal, & Yoshioka, 2003; Swanson, 2014; Swanson & Horridge, 2006; Wilkins, 2011; Witkowski & Yamamoto, 1991)

Authenticity of souvenirs based on their classification as objects into levels of their authenticity	Asplet & Cooper, 2000; Chang et al. 2018; Fu et al., 2018; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Lin & Wang, 2012; Littrell et al., 1993; Revilla & Dodd, 2003; Setiyati & Indrayanto, 2011; Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019; Torabian & Arai, 2016; Trinh et al., 2014; Xie et al., 2012
--	---

2.5.1 Meaning of souvenirs

Within the first area of research, Love and Sheldon (1998) found that more experienced travellers assigned souvenir meanings that focus on relationships, people and events, whereas novice travelers assign meanings that were more reflective of the destination such as, a Hawaiian shirt from Hawaii. This is similar to a model proposed later by Smith and Olson (2001), which illustrates how tourists' shopping becomes more sophisticated over time. The model shows that shopping and consumption may originate as a leisure-recreational pursuit for tourists but is transformed, over time, into a learning activity, that facilitates their integration into a host culture.

2.5.2 Retail environment

Swanson (2004) undertook a study of retailers in the south-west of the USA to assess their knowledge of tourists' souvenir purchase behavior. In her research, souvenir products, product attributes, and store attributes were analysed for the difference between tourists and retailers. One of the key findings in her study suggests that tourists place higher importance on souvenir products that are believed to be unique and authentic, and she recommends retailers stock a broad range of souvenir items, including those that are authentic and unique. These authors note that even though CoO is not one of the aspects explicitly included in Swanson's (2004) study, it does measure the perception of retailers and tourists towards local products and collectibles.

2.5.3 Purchase motivation and gift giving of souvenirs

Souvenirs are often purchased for self as well as others. Wilkins (2011) found three motivations for souvenir purchase – souvenirs as gifts, souvenirs as memory, and souvenirs as evidence. Souvenirs as gifts is comprised of two components – holiday gifts and gifts for other occasions (such as gifts for birthdays or Christmas), whereas souvenir as memories and evidence were single-dimension constructs. The findings from his study suggest that consumers want to purchase souvenirs reflective of the region, rather than general items. One of the features of the souvenir that makes it reflective of region and authenticity is its place of manufacture. This is not surprising, for example, as these authors argue that a boomerang made in Australia is more likely to be seen as authentic and reflective of the region compared to one that is manufactured in a different country.

Gifting souvenirs have been linked to providing validation, contrition, and affirmation of the travel experience (Swanson, 2014). Swanson (2014) explains that sending postcards during travel offers evidence that the tourist is experiencing a special event, and shares it with the recipient of the postcard. Gifting souvenirs is a way of recognising the period spent away from the normal experience (Wilkins, 2011), and to offer contrition for the sacred experience to those

who had remained at home. Gifting souvenirs in some cultures is considered essential. Lin (2017) found that specialty food were popular souvenir gifts among Chinese tourists, and served as tangible means of capturing a destination's essence. For example, gift-giving is an essential aspect of Japanese culture that is supposed to reflect the importance of the relationship (Witkowski & Yamamoto, 1991) was the only study to measure the importance of CoO in souvenir evaluation explicitly.

2.5.4 Souvenir authenticity

The fourth category of research on souvenir has studied the authenticity of souvenirs, and have tried to classify different objects into levels of their authenticity. Whether and to what extent tourists are concerned with authentic tourism experiences, namely authentic souvenirs, is, therefore, an important issue to explore. It is argued that souvenir authenticity is a pertinent 'common thread' across the research themes, which may be moderated or mediated by the motivation of tourist, the purpose of the purchase, tourist demographics, and meanings derived from the souvenir. Souvenir authenticity is reviewed in more details below, as it is the core focus of this study.

3. Method

This study used 'Google Scholar' (GS) as the search engine for the data collection on topics relevant to the study. GS has also been used by a number of other researchers (Banyai & Glover, 2012; Griffin, 2013; Xiao & Smith, 2008; Yousuf & Backer, 2015), and is now considered a "comprehensive tool for citation tracking for social science" (Kousha & Thelwall, 2007, p.1064). Since literature in souvenirs strengthened after Gordon's (1986) article, these authors searched from 1986 until January 2019, and GS returned 3,570 results for that period. The search terms "souvenir" and "authenticity" in "tour*" were used to source articles in which those terms appeared in the title, abstract or keywords. Appreciating that any database has limitations, additional searches were carried out by going through the reference lists of papers to reduce the prospect of relevant articles being omitted. The unit of analysis selected was journal papers that met the following criteria:-

- Souvenir authenticity had to be the primary focus of the research for inclusion in the review. Studies that merely mentioned souvenir or authenticity in the literature were not included.
- The journal articles needed to be peer-reviewed following the standard research format.
- The publication needed to be in English.
- The articles had to be published in tourism journals. Publications relating to souvenirs existed in anthropology, political science, economics, and other journals but these were not considered in the analysis, as the focus of this study was tourism.

The search resulted in 21 journal articles. It should be noted that while Gordon's (1986) was used as the starting point for the content analysis, her article was not captured in the analysis because it did not fit the criteria identified above. That is, Gordon's (1986) study focused on the typologies of souvenirs rather than authenticity.

3.1 Results

This study is concerned with providing an analysis of the literature relevant to country of origin impacts on the authenticity of souvenirs. Accordingly, this section provides the reader with a

summary of the content of those literature identified through the search, as outlined in the previous section (Section 2).

3.2 Publications by year

As can be seen in Table 2, the number of publications is small and sparse. Many years revealed no publications while in other years there may have been one or perhaps two outputs. Exceptions were for years 2012 and 2018 where there were four publications in each of those years.

Table 3 Number of publications by year

Year	Number of publications
1988	1
1993	2
1995	1
2000	1
2003	1
2007	1
2011	1
2012	4
2014	1
2015	1
2016	1
2018	4
2019	2
Total	21

3.3 Publications by journal

The 21 journal articles fell across 11 different journals. Overwhelmingly, the focus was on two A* journals (Tourism Management (6 articles) and Annals of Tourism Research (4)). Those two A* journals hold almost half of the suite of articles in the field (Table 3).

Table 4. Number of publications by journal

Journal	Number of publications
Tourism Management	6
Annals of Tourism Research	4
Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing	2
Tourism Geographies	2
Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research	1
Current Issues in Tourism	1
Journal of Travel Research	1

Leisure Studies	1
Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism	1
Tourism Planning and Development	1
Tourism, Culture & Communication	1
Total	21

3.4 Souvenir authenticity

There is a lack of agreement on the definition of souvenir authenticity. From the 21 studies analysed for this study, 11 of the articles had clearly defined the construct. A summary of the definitions and key attributes of souvenir authenticity are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5 Definitions and attributes of souvenir authenticity

Authors	Definitions
(Littrell et al., 1993)	"authentic crafts can be products that are unique or original, exhibit a handmade appearance and high quality workmanship, meet aesthetic criteria for color and design, are functional and useful, illustrate cultural and historical ties, are made with local materials by local craftspersons, and/or are sold with information about the craftsperson or written evidence of genuineness" (p. 210)
(Shenhav-Keller, 1993)	"authenticity...can be classified into five basic dimensions: craftsmanship, art and aesthetic, originality, cultural and historic roots, and ritual objects" (p.187)
(Anderson & Littrell, 1995)	Shopping experiences, reasons for purchase of souvenirs, their purchase styles, and the changes through time in their shopping behavior related to souvenirs factor in the characterization of the authenticity of souvenirs.
(Asplet & Cooper, 2000)	Adopted the definition of Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation, which includes "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" (p.308)
(Yu & Littrell, 2003)	"authenticity of craft is related to cultural and historical context and artisans and materials" (p. 148)
(Xie, Wu, & Hsieh, 2012)	authenticity of indigenous souvenirs comprises of markers, design, and material
(Torabian & Arai, 2016)	souvenir authenticity includes: "(1) using local materials at the destination, (2) crafting by hand and produced locally by artist, (3) displaying artist's signature or hallmark, and (4) uniqueness costing more, but being of higher quality and better design" (p.709)
(Elomba & Yun, 2018)	Souvenir authenticity comprises of six attributes "features, materials, presentation, spirit and feelings, image, and interpretation" (p.107)
(Fu, Liu, Wang, & Chao, 2018)	souvenir authenticity is formed by three dimensions: traditional features, local production and display of authenticity (p. 359)
(Schilar & Keskitalo, 2018)	"souvenirs <i>become</i> through stories, which narratively embed the products and construct their "authenticity" (p.96)

(Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019)	souvenir authenticity comprises of economic and symbolic value (which includes integrity of culture, history and place identity, and origins of products) and artisan value (which includes skilled craftsmanship, patterns and presentation, and handmade or handicrafts)
---------------------------------	--

Table 5 shows that several contributions have defined souvenir authenticity by characterizing it in different ways. Various adjectives are used to describe the authenticity of souvenirs such as original, handmade, aesthetics, historical, cultural, and so on. Souvenir authenticity appears to be a multidimensional construct. The analysis of definitions reveal three dimensions, first the making of the souvenirs (e.g. handmade, crafted, local materials), second, the attributes of the souvenir (e.g., colour, design, material), and third, the experience of the souvenir (e.g., history, culture, spiritual connections, feelings). There is a fourth dimension, which seems to have been overlooked in the definitions, i.e., the value of the souvenir to its possessor (e.g., symbolic value, sentimental value, its place in home and heart).

Surprisingly, previous research contributions have not captured country of origin or ‘made in...’ labels in the definitions. For example, boomerang – a quintessential symbol of Australia may only be considered authentic and worthy of ‘showcasing’ if it is made in Australia. As reviewed earlier, various attributes have been studied to understand what makes a souvenir authentic, except its “made in...” labels. Studies have found that locally manufactured souvenirs are essential for tourists as well as its producers and suppliers (Asplet & Cooper, 2000; Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019; Sthapit, Coudounaris, & Björk, 2018; Torabian & Arai, 2016; Trinh et al., 2014). However, research in this field has remained relatively silent and yet to conceptualize the role country of origin in souvenir authenticity despite previous research calls (eg Hashimoto & Telfer, 2007).

3.5 Research methods in souvenir authenticity

Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies are adopted in the studies analyzed for this paper; with two conceptual papers. As outlined in Table 4, quantitative and qualitative research methods were chosen almost evenly. Quantitative methods include traditional surveys (Asplet & Cooper, 2000; Elomba & Yun, 2018; Fu et al., 2018; Lin & Wang, 2012; Sthapit & Björk, 2019; Xie et al., 2012; Yu & Littrell, 2003), and inventories (Hashimoto & Telfer, 2007). Qualitative methods include ethnographic research (Trinh et al., 2014), grounded theory (Sthapit & Björk, 2019; Torabian & Arai, 2016), fieldwork and cast study (Shenhav-Keller, 1993; Trinh et al., 2014), and in-depth interviews (Anderson & Littrell, 1995; Paraskevaidis & Andriotis, 2015; Peters, 2011; Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019). Only two studies adopted a mixed-methods approach (Chang, Wall, & Hung, 2018; Littrell et al., 1993)

Table 6 Research methods in souvenir authenticity research

Author	Methodology	Technique	Analysis	Sample size	Sampling procedure
Cohen (1988)	Conceptual				
Littrell et al. (1993)	Quantitative	Survey	Content analysis, PCA*	385	Random
Shenhav-Keller (1993)	Qualitative	Interviews			Purposive
Anderson & Littrell (1995)	Qualitative	Interviews	Constant-comparative	42	Purposive

Asplet & Cooper (2000)	Quantitative	Survey	Descriptive	322	Convenience
Yu & Littrell (2003)	Quantitative	Survey	PCA, Path analysis	182	Random
Hashimoto & Telfer (2007)	Quantitative	Inventory & observations	Descriptive	100	Purposive
Peters (2011)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews, biographies, photography		15	Convenience & snowballing
Swanson & Timothy (2012)	Conceptual				
Xie et al. (2012)	Quantitative	Survey	ANOVA, Scheffe post-hoc	318	Intercept
Lin & Wang (2012)	Quantitative	Survey	SEM	419	Intercept
Chang, Wall, & Hung (2012)	Mixed	In-depth interviews, Survey	Content analysis, Descriptive	24, 407	Judgment, Purposive
Trinh et al. (2014)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews, case study, ethnography	Perceptual maps, dendrogram	25	Convenience
Paraskevaidis & Andriotis (2015)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews	Constant-comparative	20	Intercept
Torabian & Arai (2016)	Qualitative		Constructivist grounded theory, memo writing	14 (blogs)	Purposive
Elomba & Yun (2018)	Quantitative	Survey	MDS, <i>t</i> -tests	637	Intercept
Fu et al. (2018)	Mixed	In-depth interviews, Survey	PLS-SEM	792	Convenience
Sthapit et al. (2018)	Quantitative	Survey	CFA, SEM	301	Convenience
Schilar & Keskitalo, (2018)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews	Thematic analysis	35	Purposive
Soukhathammavong & Park (2019)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews, observations	Thematic analysis	24	Purposive & snowballing
Sthapit & Björk (2019)	Qualitative	In-depth interviews	Grounded theory	18	Purposive

PCA- Principal Component Analysis, SEM- Structural Equation Modeling, MDS- Multidimensional Scaling, PLS- Partial Least Square, CFA- Confirmatory Factor Analysis

3.6 Major authors

Within the 21 articles analysed, there were in total 41 different authors; with most papers involving more than one author. Most authors only contributed one article to the field. However, four authors published more than one article in the area, as outlined in Table 5.

Table 6. Publications by authors

Author	Number of Publications
Mary Ann Littrell	3
Luella F. Anderson	2
Erose Sthapit	2
Peter Bjork	2

4.0 Discussion and conclusion

Souvenirs are an essential aspect of tourism. Tourists will often actively seek out souvenirs, which can bring considerable joy. The question then is, does authenticity matter to tourists when sourcing souvenirs? For souvenir authenticity (Sharpley, 1994) states that “generally, something is considered to be authentic if it is made, produced or enacted by local people according to customs and tradition” (p.130). However, this has not been tested within the conceptualisation of CoO of souvenir, and whether it is operationalized by tourists as a cue in establishing souvenir authenticity.

Souvenirs are important to many people and are often used as conversation pieces and as evidence of travel experiences in the construction of the self and as status consumption products. They are showcased to reflect travel experiences and aspirational experiences of travel. Some claim that souvenirs hold a special ‘place’ not only in the home but in the heart of its owner, even when they are a banal collection (Peters, 2011). The authenticity of souvenirs is then even more important when they are used for status, display and aspirational purposes.

As tourism is intangible, yet involves an enormous investment of time, money, and planning, souvenirs can be a tangible way to remember the trip and accordingly hold memories and emotions. Given the importance of souvenirs, it is surprising that little research has been dedicated to the relationship between souvenirs and authenticity. This is especially the case in terms of examining country of origin. As this paper identified, only 21 journal articles have been published between 1986 and mid-January 2019 that focus on the authenticity of souvenirs. Further, only one study (Goo & Shen, 2011) conceptualised country of origin as a variable within souvenir authenticity.

Over the decades, the research field of tourism has grown considerably. There are more tourism journals, and a deepening of understanding into touristic behavior, and how to meet the needs and desires of tourists. However, despite this deeper research, so few studies have examined souvenir authenticity, and yet as has already been outlined, souvenirs are valuable to tourists, and authentic experiences are valued. Thus, it is surprising how few researchers have sought to examine the field of souvenir authenticity, and that an examination into whether country of origin for souvenirs matters has been virtually overlooked. Based on the findings of this content analysis, these authors believe that further research would be highly valuable to both scholarship and practice and hope that this paper informs and directs new research in the field. In particular, these authors consider the concept of country of origin of souvenirs to be of urgent importance so that there is an understanding of whether country of origin matters. When tourists buy souvenirs, and those souvenirs contain memories of their travels, where do their memories take them? As outlined at the beginning of this article, the word origins of souvenir are: ‘what comes to mind.’ Emotionally, are tourists ‘taken back’ to the destination they visited or are they taken to visions of the country in which the souvenir was manufactured? Souvenirs, just like aromas, can ‘take people back’...but taken back to where is the question.

References

- Anastasiadou, C., & Vettese, S. (2019). "From souvenirs to 3D printed souvenirs". Exploring the capabilities of additive manufacturing technologies in (re)-framing tourist souvenirs. *Tourism Management*, 71(September 2018), 428–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.10.032>
- Anderson, L. F., & Littrell, M. A. (1995). Souvenir-purchase behavior of women tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 328–348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)00080-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)00080-8)
- Asplet, M., & Cooper, M. (2000). Cultural designs in New Zealand souvenir clothing: The question of authenticity. *Tourism Management*, 21(3), 307–312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(99\)00061-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00061-8)
- Auerbach, T. (2013). No returns on "Aussie" souvenirs. *The Courier Mail*, 4–5. Retrieved from <https://www.couriermail.com.au/news/national/no-returns-on-aussie-souvenirs/news-story/5821c1a1a8bfb148d0354ca5c2661c95?sv=fdd2d1da434a3b0025037f097a127f6d>
- Banyai, M., & Glover, T. D. (2012). Evaluating research methods on travel blogs. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287511410323>
- Belhassen, Y., Caton, K., & Stewart, W. P. (2008). The search for authenticity in the pilgrim experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(3), 668–689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.03.007>
- Chang, J., Wall, G., & Chang, C. L. (2008). Perception of the authenticity of atayal woven handicrafts in Wulai, Taiwan. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 16(4), 385–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10507050801951700>
- Chang, J., Wall, G., & Hung, J. (2018). Tourists' Perceptions of Aboriginal Heritage Souvenirs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(6), 684–700.
- Chang, J., Wall, G., & Hung, J. C. (Richard). (2012). Tourists' Perceptions of Aboriginal Heritage Souvenirs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(6), 684–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2011.640700>
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6592.2010.01279.x>
- Cohen, E. (1993). The study of touristic images of native people: mitigating the stereotype of a stereotype. In D. G. Pearce & R. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism Research Critiques and Challenges* (pp. 36–69). New York: Routledge.
- Decrop, A., & Masset, J. (2011). I want this Ramses' statue: Motives and meanings of tourist souvenirs. In N. Kozak, M & Kozak (Ed.), *Sustainability of tourism: cultural and environmental perspectives* (pp. 17–41). Newcastle: Cambridge.
- Decrop, A., & Masset, J. (2014). This is a piece of coral received from captain Bob": Meanings and functions of tourist souvenirs. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(1), 22–34.
- Edelheim, J., & Parker, J. (2008). Souvenirs and Jung's Archetypes. In S. Richardsom, L. Fredline, A. Patiar, & M. Ternel (Eds.), *Where the "Bloody Hell" Are We?* (pp. 49–53). Gold Coast, Australia: Griffith University.
- Elomba, M. N., & Yun, H. J. (2018). Souvenir Authenticity: The Perspectives of Local and

- Foreign Tourists. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 15(2), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2017.1303537>
- Fairhurst, A., Costello, C., & Holmes, A. (2007). An examination of shopping behavior of visitors to Tennessee according to tourist typologies. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(4), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766707081005>
- Fu, Y., Liu, X., Wang, Y., & Chao, R. F. (2018). How experiential consumption moderates the effects of souvenir authenticity on behavioral intention through perceived value. *Tourism Management*, 69(June), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.06.023>
- Goo, Y. J., & Shen, M. J. (2011). The Relationship between Authenticity and the Souvenir Purchase Intent. *Pan-Pacific Management Review*, 14(2), 109–129. Retrieved from <http://140.133.46.32/ir/retrieve/52350/13207.pdf>
- Gordon, B. (1986). The souvenir: Messenger of the extraordinary. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 20(3), 135–146.
- Griffin, T. (2013). Research Note: A Content Analysis of Articles on Visiting Friends and Relatives Tourism, 1990–2010. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, June, 1–22.
- Hashimoto, A., & Telfer, D. J. (2007). Geographical representations embedded within souvenirs in Niagara: The case of geographically displaced authenticity. *Tourism Geographies*, 9(2), 191–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680701278547>
- Hume, D. (2014). *Tourism Art and Souvenirs: The material culture of tourism*. New York: Routledge.
- Kim, S., & Littrell, M. A. (2001). Souvenir Buying Intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 638–657.
- Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. (2007). Google scholar citations and Google Web/URL citations: a multi-discipline exploratory analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58(7), 1055–1065.
- Lin, C., & Wang, W. (2012). Effects of Authenticity Perception, Hedonics, and Perceived Value on Ceramic Souvenir-Repurchasing Intention. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 29(8), 779–795. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2012.730941>
- Lin, L. (2017). Food souvenirs as gifts: tourist perspectives and their motivational basis in Chinese culture. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 15(5), 439–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2016.1170841>
- Lin, L., & Mao, P.-C. (2015a). Food for memories and culture - a content analysis study of food specialties and souvenirs. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 22, 19–29.
- Lin, L., & Mao, P.-C. (2015b). Food for memories and culture - A content analysis study of food specialties and souvenirs. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 22, 19–29.
- Littrell, M. (1990). Symbolic significance of textile crafts for tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 228–245.
- Littrell, M., Anderson, L. F., & Brown, P. J. (1993). What makes a craft souvenir authentic? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(1), 197–215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(93\)90118-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(93)90118-M)

- Littrell, M., Baizerman, S., Kean, R., Gahring, S., Niemeyer, S., Reilly, R., & Stout, J. (1994). Souvenirs and tourism styles. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(1), 3–11.
- Love, L. L., & Sheldon, P. S. (1998). Souvenirs: Messengers of Meaning. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 170–175. Retrieved from <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8149/volumes/v25/NA-25>
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589–603. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225585>
- Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2005). On souvenirs and metonymy: Narratives of memory, metaphor and materiality. *Tourist Studies*, 5(1), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797605062714>
- Paraskevaidis, P., & Andriotis, K. (2015). Values of souvenirs as commodities. *Tourism Management*, 48, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.10.014>
- Peters, K. (2011). Negotiating the “place” and “placement” of banal tourist souvenirs in the home. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(2), 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2011.569570>
- Revilla, G., & Dodd, T. H. (2003). Authenticity perceptions of Talavera pottery. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(1), 94–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503253906>
- Schilar, H., & Keskitalo, E. (2018). Elephants in Norway: Meanings and authenticity of souvenirs from a seller/crafter perspective. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, 18(2), 85–99.
- Setiyati, E. A., & Indrayanto, A. (2011). Outsourced souvenirs: An investigation towards authenticity anxiety and tourists purchase behaviour. *International Journal on Social Science, Economics and Art*, 1(3), 196–201. Retrieved from http://ijssea.insightsociety.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8&Itemid=1&article_id=61
- Sharpley, R. (1994). *Tourism, Tourists and Society*. Cambridgeshire: Elm Publications.
- Shenhav-Keller, S. (1993). The Israeli souvenir. Its text and context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(1), 182–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(93\)90117-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(93)90117-L)
- Sirakaya, E., Uysal, M., & Yoshioka, C. F. (2003). Segmenting the Japanese tour market to Turkey. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(3), 293–304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287502239038>
- Smith, & Olson, L. (2001). Tourist shopping activities and development of travel sophistication. *Visions in Leisure and Business*, 20(1), 23–33.
- Smith, S. L. J., & Reid, L. J. N. (1994). Souvenirs of tourism scholarship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 855–857. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90097-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90097-3)
- Soukhathammavong, B., & Park, E. (2019). The authentic souvenir: What does it mean to souvenir suppliers in the heritage destination? *Tourism Management*, 72(May 2018), 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.11.015>
- Souvenirs Australia Warehouse. (2018). Kangaroo Cane Toad Products. Retrieved December 19, 2018, from <https://www.souvenirsaustralia.com/kangaroo-toad/cane-toad-products/>
- Sthapit, E., & Björk, P. (2019). Relative contributions of souvenirs on memorability of a trip experience and revisit intention: a study of visitors to Rovaniemi, Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 19(1), 1–26.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2017.1354717>

- Sthapit, E., Coudounaris, D. N., & Björk, P. (2018). The memorable souvenir-shopping experience: antecedents and outcomes. *Leisure Studies*, 37(5), 628–643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2018.1519031>
- Swanson, K. K. (2004). Tourists' and retailers' perceptions of souvenirs. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(4), 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135676670401000407>
- Swanson, K. K. (2014). Souvenirs, Tourists, and Tourism. In A. Lew, M. Hall, & A. Williams (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism* (pp. 179–188). New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Swanson, K. K., & Horridge, P. E. (2002). Tourists' souvenir purchase behavior and retailer's awareness of tourists' purchase behavior in the southwest. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 20(2), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X0202000202>
- Swanson, K. K., & Horridge, P. E. (2004). A structural model for souvenir consumption, travel activities, and tourist demographics. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 372–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504263031>
- Swanson, K. K., & Horridge, P. E. (2006). Travel motivations as souvenir purchase indicators. *Tourism Management*, 27(4), 671–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.03.001>
- Swanson, K. K., & Timothy, D. J. (2012). Souvenirs: Icons of meaning, commercialization and commoditization. *Tourism Management*, 33(3), 489–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.10.007>
- Torabian, P., & Arai, S. M. (2016). Tourist perceptions of souvenir authenticity: an exploration of selective tourist blogs. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(7), 697–712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.820259>
- Trilling, L. (1972). *Sincerity and Authenticity*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Trinh, T. T., Ryan, C., & Cave, J. (2014). Souvenir sellers and perceptions of authenticity - The retailers of Hôi An, Vietnam. *Tourism Management*, 45, 275–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.05.005>
- Wall, G., & Xie, P. F. (2005). Authenticating ethnic tourism: Li dancer's perspectives. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1094166042000330191>
- Wallendorf, M., & Arnould, E. (1988). "My favourite things": A cross-cultural inquiry into object attachment, possessiveness, and social linkage. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, 531–547.
- Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience.pdf, 26(2), 349–370. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(98\)00103-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0)
- Wilkins, H. (2011). Souvenirs: What and Why We Buy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 239–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510362782>
- Witkowski, T., & Yamamoto, Y. (1991). Omiyage Gift Purchasing By Japanese Travelers in the U.S. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18(Morsbach 1977), 123–128.
- Xiao, H., & Smith, S. L. J. (2008). Knowledge impact an appraisal of tourism scholarship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), 62–83.
- Xie, P. F., Wu, T. C., & Hsieh, H. W. (2012). Tourists' Perception of Authenticity in Indigenous Souvenirs in Taiwan. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 29(5), 485–

500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2012.691400>

Yousuf, M., & Backer, E. (2015). A content analysis of Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR) travel research. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 25, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2015.07.003>

Yu, H., & Littrell, M. A. (2003). Product and process orientations to tourism shopping. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503257493>