



Tourists Expenditure on Shopping & Souvenirs: An Analysis of Association(s) Across Trip Typologies

Uttam Kr Baruah

Darrang College, Tezpur, Assam, India

Mrinmoy K Sarma

Tezpur University, Assam, India

(Received: 02/12/2015; Accepted: 05/05/2016)

Abstract

Extant literature reveals that tourists' expenditures incurred in the destination areas has been less focused and studied. The expenditure is a tool enticing development, poverty alleviation and employment creation within the local economy. Tourists' expenditures, particularly on items like souvenir purchase, shopping etc., are seen as positive spin-off in the local economic development. Attributing proper value, studies have been conducted involving different dimensions of tourists spending behaviours. Tourists' propensity to spend higher amount while staying long in the destination area has also been established in research findings. Studies have also been carried out to examine the nature, extent and composition of tourists' expenditure. In fact, the degree of economic benefit derived may vary across the nature or forms of tourists' expenditure. Research findings show that expenditures on shopping and souvenirs are very meaningful for the local economy. But the nature of association(s) between tourists trip typologies and expenditure on shopping and souvenirs has not been studied. With the objective of studying the same, a convenient sample survey was conducted among tourists in an emerging tourists' destination of India. The study results show that tourists incur a sizeable amount on shopping and souvenir purchase. The analyses also show that specific tourists' profile can be developed on the basis of trips typology and expenditure on shopping & souvenirs.

Keywords: Expenditure, Shopping, souvenirs, handicrafts, trip typology, economic benefits

JEL Classification: Z-3, Z-32, Z-33

Paper Classification: Research Paper

Introduction

Tourism has been experiencing immense proposition adding values towards the skills and heritage of local people, therefore, benefitting local economies. Grabbing the opportunity,

greater attentions are paid by policy makers or bureaucrats in addressing the issues as a means of promoting sustainable development. Similarly, increasing research interests are shown in tourists' expenditure in destination areas more in terms of the positive spin-offs. As understood, unless tourists' visit contributes to the economic well-being of the local people, tourism's very purpose will not be served. A part from revenue contribution for the Government, tourism has been encouraged for a number of reasons such as multiplier effect, labour intensiveness, supplementary income, additional direct benefits to the local community etc. Hence, tourism activities have been considered more in terms of the positive spin-offs and grossly meant as a tool for promoting development, for poverty alleviation, employment creation and preservation of the environment (Bezbarua, 2008). Tourism literature explains the concepts of multiplier effect of tourists' expenditure on domestic economy. A study by Menente (2000) revealed the consuming habits of tourists of different origins in terms of expenditure level and composition differ. Her research findings show the multiplier effect of tourist expenditure as 1.48 for domestic tourism and 1.56 for international tourism. In another study conducted in the Northeast part of India, Baruah and Sarma, (2013) analyzed tourists' expenditure and reported the existence of association between the extent of local economic benefits and nature of tourists' expenditure. Extant literature also covers the broad array of tourist expenditures and underlying factors influencing expenditure in each segment. Trip characteristics, demographic variables, spending behavior & patterns, travel motivation, amount spent on different accounts head etc., are some of the variables taken into account to examine the association with expenditure vis-à-vis economic benefits derived. Expenditure on accommodation, transportation, food & beverages, shopping, souvenir, handicrafts, entertainment, entry fees, local art & craft, clothing, tips etc., are meticulously analysed and discussed Wu, Zhang & Fujiwara, 2013; Anderson, 2010; Sarma & Baruah, 2013; Kent, Shock & Snow, 1983; Kreck, 1985; Godbey & Graefe, 1991; Jansen & Verbeke, 2000; Kim & Littrel, 2001; Littrell, Kean, Gahring, Niemeyer, Reilly & Stout, 1994; Snepenger, Murphy & Gregg, 2003; Sarma, 2004; Oh, Cheng, Lehto & O'leary, 2004; Anyango, Duim & Peters, 2013; Wu, Zhang & Fujiwara, 2012; Alegre & Cladera, 2012; Kinley et al., 2012; Damonte, Collings & Meghee, 2013; Hung, Shang & Wang, 2013; Brinda, Disenga & Osti, 2013). Researchers also identified two factors i.e., amount and pattern of expenditure to have influence on the depth of benefits accrued in the local economy. Mules (1998) and Littrell (1990) reported the existence of ever suspected relationship between economic contributions of tourism (to the local economy) with the amount of expenditure. In his words 'money which occurs to local residents depends on the amount of tourists' expenditures'. Again, Sarma and Baruah (2013) found that pitch of economic benefit is also related with the pattern of expenditure. The researchers in this study reported greater emphasis on unplanned form of expenditure for ignition of local economic benefits. In spite of all such studies covering various aspects connected with tourists' expenditure and economic benefits, still there are areas where either less or no focus has been accorded. Creation of specific tourists profile on the basis of purposes of visits and describing the relationships with the extent of expenditure on items which are locally made will provide a deeper insight into the role of tourism in strengthening the income level or providing the additional means of livelihood to the local people.

Literature Review

The contribution of travel and tourism to gross domestic product (GDP) has been well recognised. According to an estimate made by Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2009, the contribution is expected to be at US\$ 187.3 billion by 2019 (Siddique and Tripathy, 2010). The report also states that real GDP growth for the travel and tourism economy is expected to achieve an average of 7.7 per cent per annum over the next 10 years. Notably, the analyses of expenditures

incurred by tourists have received considerable recognition from academicians and researchers. Tourist's expenditure patterns are always important element for tour organizers and marketers when planning, designing and delivering their products (Anderson, 2010). In the words of Zhang, Junyi and Kuwano (2012) 'Tourist's expenditure patterns and amount have remained highly influential in the pitch of economic benefits, while Littrell (1990) recounted the association of local income with the pattern of expenditure and amount of goods and services that can be provided by the local community. He further added that as expected, lodging is the sector with the highest percentage of goods and services supplied locally and thus highest potential for generating local revenue. Expenditure on food and beverages and accommodation are other components where substantial amount is spent by tourists. Researchers also discussed expenditure pattern describing the proportion of major expenditure components to tourists' total expenditure in destination areas. Wellner (2002) in his study conducted in the U.S. measured that the single largest category that visitors' spend on when they were traveling in 5 states (California, Florida, New York, Texas and Illinois) is the food. Consumers on their trip to these regions spent nearly a quarter of their total travel budget on food in 1998, (totaling \$117.2 billion) while lodging accounted for 20 percent of the total vacation bill in the same year. The author also revealed that spending on transportation in US in the same year accounted for 42 percent of all domestic travel expenditures. In total, the domestic and international travelers spent \$207.3 billion in these top states. Suosheng and Qu (2004) reported that Chinese domestic tourist expenditures in transportation have the highest proportion (30.4%) followed by food and beverages (16.8%) and least on lodging (15.8%). Visitors spent an average \$96.03 a day (Llave, 2005) in Philippines and most of their money was spent on accommodation and food. The 1990 Alberta Non-Resident Travel Exist Survey (Getz, Joncas & Kelly, 1994) estimated that of the total tourists' expenditures in Alberta in 1991, 20 percent went to accommodations. In another study conducted by Li (1999), it was found that foreign tourists spent 31.8 percent of the trip budget on accommodation alone. Apart from these major heads of expenditure like transportation, accommodation, food and beverages, shopping has been identified as a popular activity among tourists (Kent et al, 1983), which in some cases occupy the second largest component of tourists' expenditures (Li, 1999). Interestingly enough sometimes shopping is reported to be the major attraction in some destinations drawing tourists to buy (Kim & Littrell, 2001; Moscardo, 2004). Llave (2005) estimated that tourists spend more than 25% (\$24.05) of their total travel budget on shopping. In another study conducted by Law and Au (2000), it is reported that tourist's expenditure on shopping ranges from 33% to 56% of the total travel spending.

During shopping, it is reported that the tourists engage themselves in purchasing of souvenirs and handicrafts in a major way (Godbey & Graefe, 1991; Jansen-Verbeke, 2000; Kim & Littrel, 2001; Snepenger et al, 2003; Park, 2000; Kincade & Woodard, 2001; Anderson & Littrell, 1995, 1996; Cohen, 1988; Gordon, 1986; Sarma, 2004; Swasion, 2004; Telfer & Hashimoto, 2000). Tourists' characteristics such as demographics, attitude towards local culture, attitude towards souvenirs etc., have been reported to be determining factors relevant to souvenir purchases. For example, Kincade and Woodard (2001) undertook to identify the characteristics of consumers who liked to shop for souvenir clothing. They reported that women who liked to shop for clothing at home also enjoyed shopping for clothing as tourists and with new souvenir retailers. Swansion (2004) analyzed the souvenir products, product attributes and store attributes to measure the differences in importance between tourists and local customer. Even wine, as souvenir item, also received attention from researcher. Telfer & Hashimoto (2000) carried out a study to examine the nature of wine tourism and the purchasing of wine as souvenir by Japanese tourists in Niagara. Park (2000) studied social and cultural factors influencing tourist's souvenir-purchase behavior taking into account Japanese 'omiyage' and Korean 'sunmul'. Kim and Littrell (2001) explored

the relationship among purchase intentions and predictors variables. Their findings show that purchase intentions for self vs. buying for family and friends differ and previous travelling experience and attitude towards culture play significant role in souvenir buying. The influences of planned behavior, impulsive behavior, and experiential consumption on tourists' intentions to purchase souvenirs in the tourism context have been measured by Meng and Xu (2012). Going into deeper insight, Gordon (1986) identified the probable classification of souvenirs like pictorial images, piece-of-the-rock, symbolic shorthand, marker and local product.

Tourists also spend on handicraft items to large extent as a souvenir. Handicraft has been regarded as the carrier of local culture and history. A tourist buying a craft item means he/she is knowingly or unknowingly buying a message to be taken home. Vidas De (1995) defined handicraft as 'a specific form of production and employment which creates as its product an object which represents a social group'. Thus, handicraft is taken to refer to a specific form of production and employment which represents a social group. Local handicrafts often include 'authentic' crafts products made by 'low-tech' but highly skilled methods (Cohen, 2000). Cohen (2000) further adds that, handicraft production and sales are supporting economic activities for which tourism creates demand. According to Cohen (2000) for tourists, handicraft souvenirs embody fantasies, daydreams, symbols and signs. For many destinations, revenue generated from the sale of handicraft forms a considerable amount of income. Evidences show that tourists incur a sizeable expenditure on handicrafts. The study conducted by Sarma (2004) explored how meaningful are handicrafts in providing employment to earn livelihood to local residents in peripheral areas of destinations of Northeast India. He estimated the demand for handicrafts at Rs. 229.22 crore (\$50.26 at the 2004 exchange rate) in the year 2004 in Northeast India. Economically, handicrafts production and sales are supporting activities for which tourism creates demand. This study was conducted to verify the relationships as may be between trip typology and expenditure on local items. The authors carried out descriptive analysis.

Research Gap and Contribution of the Study

There is a growing interest of researchers in exploring tourists' spending patterns, and the amount incurred on various heads by tourists while travelling (Keown, 1989; Jansen-Verbeke, 1990; Suh & McAvoy, 2005; Zhang et al., 2012; Kim & Eves, 2012). Literature study however doesn't confirm the existence of probable association of tourist's trip typologies with expenditure on shopping & handicrafts. Trip typology has been considered as one of the influential factors by several researchers (Dey & Sarma, 2006; Littrell et al., 1993; Yu & Littrel, 2003; Oh et al., 2004; Littrell, Rosalind & Kun, 2004). Tourism literature shows analysis of expenditure in the light of various situations and variables but the present studies departs from the previous studies in the sense that association, if any, between trip typology and expenditure on souvenirs and handicrafts has been investigated. This study is conducted in Northeastern part of India. This part of India was selected as study area considering the role that may be played by the tourism of Northeast India towards the economic development of the region. Although not fully explored, Northeast India has rich resources to attract tourists' from across regions and tourists' inflow into this part of India has been increasing at staggering rate. According to the statistics released by Department of Tourism, Government of India, in the year 2012, the number of domestic tourists visiting all states of India was estimated to be 104,50,47,536 registering a growth rate of 9.59 percent. The number of domestic tourists visiting all the seven states of Northeast India were estimated to be 59,20,395. Apart from domestic tourists, 39,813 foreign tourists visited the Northeast India in 2012. Tourism has been providing the means of livelihood to local people who work in the firms engaged in providing services to visitors. Besides, tourism has been counted as force behind

scaling up of volume of making production and sale of handicraft products by local entrepreneurs. The peasants during slack agricultural season, which synchronises with peak tourism season double as artisans making wood, cane and bamboo crafts. Similarly women, particularly from various tribal communities weave textiles for use as shawls, dress, bed sheets, curtain, table covers and other home decorative items employing traditional methods. This study was conducted in Northeast India in 2012. The study argues that analysis of tourists' expenditure on trip typologies can contribute to an improved understanding of tourists spending behaviour in the context of shopping and souvenirs. The result of the study may be of strategic importance for local entrepreneurs associated with making & selling of souvenirs and handicrafts items. Barsky and Nash (2002) argue that information on the consumer can imperatively help in offering successful tourism products and memorable experiences.

Objectives of the study

The objectives of this paper are as stated below:

1. To delineate specific classification of tourists on the basis of trip-typology.
2. To study the extent of expenditure incurred by tourists on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts.
3. To test the association, if any, between trip typology and expenditures incurred by tourists on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts.

Research Methodology

This study is basically a descriptive one and was conducted among tourists visiting northeast during the winter of 2012. In the present study, a research design has been drafted with the following parameters:

Population of the study

The population of the study is the tourists visiting destinations of the Northeast India. The population of non-residents to the region but originating from within the country with the motives of leisure, religion, culture, history, outdoor activities and to have relaxed time with families were selected as respondents. In case of tourists coming as family group, only one person of the family was interviewed.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed as survey instrument to collect structured information specifically on tourists spending during visit to Northeast India destinations particularly on souvenirs. The study incorporated ordinal, nominal and interval scale questions in the questionnaire. Only closed ended questions were used.

Variables studied

Variables studied for examining the nature of associations included (i) the purposes of trip (typology), (ii) destinations visited; and (iii) extent of expenditures incurred on shopping, souvenirs & handicrafts items.

Data collection method

Using a visitor exit-survey, tourists visiting Northeast India were interviewed. The survey was carried out in two exit points, viz., Shillong and Guwahati. Data were collected by employing a convenient sampling method. The respondents were interviewed personally and they were requested to put tick mark on appropriate boxes. For the purpose of collecting information on expenditure incurred, a 10-point Likert-type interval scale has been used indicating lowest scale '1' as least expenditure and highest scale '10' as maximum expenditure.

Sample size

A total of 650 domestic/national tourists visiting the Northeast India were interviewed of which 407 questionnaires were finally accepted for analysis. The ground for rejection of 243 questionnaires was incomplete and improper responses.

Analytical tools

One way ANOVA was conducted to explore probable relationship between trip typology and expenditure on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts. The ANOVA test was followed by the construction the Levene's test of homogeneity and Games-Howel and Bonferroni's multiple comparison tables. Frequency tables to highlight the representation of population to the sample were also developed.

Hypotheses Formulation

The following hypotheses are formulated to explore the probable associations between the trip typologies and expenditure on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts.

H₁: Tourists of all trip typology spend equal extent of money on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts.

H₂: There is no significant association between tourist's expenditure on shopping and souvenirs & trip typology.

For the purpose of this paper, the authors have used souvenirs and handicrafts as one head even though they differ conceptually.

Discussion

Tourists are often classified on the basis of various travel purposes and such classification may be used as parameter to test the nature of association with the extent of expenditure incurred on various heads. In order to provide a better understanding of tourists' needs and motivations, researchers have developed several tourist typologies using different parameters (Dey & Sarma, 2006). Littrell (1990) developed trip typology on the basis of tourists' travel style. Accordingly, the study identified four types of travelers: people-oriented visitors, history and park visitors; urban entertainment profile; and active outdoor profile. In another study, Yu (2003) developed trip typologies based on travel experience and behaviours. Trip typologies developed by Yu (2003) also include the social & cultural tourists, spectator & recreational tourists, and outdoor tourists. In another study augmenting the profiles of senior travellers by comparing and contrasting on shopping variables, Littrell et al. (2004) factored trip typology into outdoors, cultural, sports and entertainment tourists. In that study, typologies were developed based on travel activities. Oh et al. (2004) took trip typology as parameters for unveiling experiences sought by tourists during

trips and accordingly they generated seven segments to describe experience factors. These include active outdoor; history and park; social with friends; urban entertainment; escape and people; intimacy and romance; and relaxed with family groups. In the present study, trip typologies are developed on basis of experiences tourists sought during trips. Accordingly, four distinct trip typologies have emerged, viz., nature and parks oriented; rural and cultural oriented; active outdoor oriented; and relaxed with family group; 'nature and park' tourists are those who come to enjoy the experiences in terms of flora, fauna, and other natural resources. These types of tourists generally visit parks, reserve forests and sanctuaries. Again, tourists having interest in life style of rural people like culture, beliefs, lifestyle, culinary, art etc., are regarded as 'rural and cultural' tourists. Northeast India is the melting pot of variegated cultural mosaic of people and races, an ethnic tapestry of many hues and shades. 'Active outdoor tourists' are the tourists who come to participate in sports, adventure activities, etc. Finally, many tourists come with family members just for leisure purposes and to have a break from their routine life. They are assumed as 'relaxed with family members'. The tourists interviewed for the study consist of 75 'rural and cultural' tourists (18.4%), 137 'nature and parks tourists (33.7%), 114 'active outdoor tourists (28%) and 81 'relaxed with families tourists (19.9%).

Table 1: Respondents Profile on basis of trip typology

Typology	Number	Percentage
Rural and cultural oriented	75	18.4
Nature and parks oriented	137	33.7
Active outdoor oriented and	114	28
Relax with family group	81	19.9
Total	407	

Table 1 depicts the profiles of respondent tourists. It is seen that respondents are basically nature based tourists, which is in line with the kind of tourists that visit the region. The synergy between local economic benefits and nature of expenditure and the amount of money spent by tourists in the destination areas have attracted attentions from researchers (Baruah & Sarma, 2013; Littrell 1990). Littrell (1990) recognised that financial gain accrued to local residents depends on the amount of tourists' spending. Besides, tourists impulsive and unplanned buying on items produced locally benefit the local people. Baruah & Sarma (2013) reported that the propensity to inject local economic benefits derived from 'other' expenditure is higher than the usual travel related expenditures such as transportation, lodging etc. In another paper, Sarma & Baruah (2013) emphasized that expenditures on the items locally made are more significant in terms of economic wellbeing of the local people. Here expenditures on accommodation owned by local residents, shopping, purchase of souvenirs & handicrafts have been identified as 'other or uncategorized' expenditures. To have a deeper insight into possible association between expenditure on shopping, and souvenirs & handicrafts with trip typologies, the means of responses against 'shopping' and 'souvenir & handicrafts' are calculated (see Table 2). It is seen that respondents have spent a significant amount of money on 'shopping' (mean 4.37, while on souvenirs & handicrafts, the extent is comparatively lower, though still high in values (mean 3.14). It is important information for the destination stakeholders that tourists spent a sizeable amount on shopping and souvenirs & handicrafts. For the people engaged in making and selling of souvenirs & handicrafts items and those dealing in shopping products, there is an opportunity to gain positive evaluation if products are arranged as per needs and preferences of the tourists.

Table 2: Expenditure pattern of tourists during November-December, 2012

Extent of expenditure on	N-407	Mean (Between 1 to 10)
Shopping		4.37
Souvenirs & handicrafts		3.14

One way ANOVA test was conducted to test the nature of association between domestic tourists' expenditure on shopping and the trip typology. The ANOVA test rejected the null hypothesis of equality of expenditure across broad sections of tourists. The p value derived was .000 at 99% level of significance. This implies that there is a strong association between the trip typology and shopping expenditure. The ANOVA test was followed by the test of homogeneity of variances and multiple comparison tables. This was done to unveil the section of tourists spending more on shopping and also the groups showing significant differences in the expenditure incurred on the aforesaid heads.

Table 3: Shopping and Trip Typologies

ANOVA Shopping	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	064.833	3	354.944	101.332	.000
Within Groups	1411.620	403	3.503		
Total	2476.452	406			

The mean values reproduced in the descriptive Table 3 show that 'rural and cultural' tourists are the high spending category tourists on shopping (mean-6.56) followed by 'relaxed with family members' tourists (mean 6.27); 'nature and park' tourists (mean 3.22) and 'active outdoor' tourists have the lowest estimate, though still high in values (mean 2.95). The Bonferroni's multiple table constructed to explore the associations (since Levene's test p value is derived as 0.229) exhibits the pair-wise differences among groups in the amount spent on shopping (see Table 4 & 5).

Table-4: Means of extent of expenditure on Shopping

Trip typologies	N	Mean (between 1 and 10)
Rural and cultural	75	6.56
Nature and parks	137	3.22
Active outdoor	114	2.95
Relaxed with family members	81	6.27
Total	407	4.37

Table-5: ANOVA: Expenditure on Souvenirs & Handicrafts and Trip Typology

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	558.438	3	186.146	96.174	.000
Within Groups	780.010	403	1.936		
Total	1338.447	406			

Differences are more apparent between 'rural and cultural' tourists and 'nature and park'; between 'rural and cultural' tourists and 'active outdoor' tourists; between 'relaxed with family

member’ tourists and ‘nature and park’ tourists; and also between ‘relax with family member’ and ‘active outdoor’ tourists.

Table 6: Means of extent of expenditure on Souvenir and Handicrafts)

Souvenirs & Handicrafts	N	Mean (between 1 to 10)
Rural and cultural	75	1.6133
Nature and parks	137	3.8613
Active outdoor	114	2.1667
Relax with family members	81	4.7284
Total	407	3.1450

The analysis in Table 6 depicts that within groups ‘rural and cultural’ tourists spend higher amount on shopping and ‘active outdoor’ tourists spend least amount on shopping.

Tourists also spend on handicraft items to a large extent as a souvenir. Handicrafts have been an inseparable part of souvenirs but to avoid confusion, the term, souvenirs & handicrafts, has been used in this study. Northeast India is rich in handicrafts items. To verify if the amount spent on this item varies across different trip typologies, one way ANOVA has been conducted. The test results indicate the existence of differences across various groups of tourists in terms of spending on souvenir & handicrafts with a F statistics of 96.17 (df=3) indicating a p value of 0.000.

Table 7: Multiple Comparison Table, Dependent Variable: Shopping

	(I) Trip purpose	(J) Trip purpose	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% confidence level	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bonferroni	Rural and cultural	Nature and parks	3.34(*)	.269	.000	2.63	4.05
		Active outdoor	3.61(*)	.278	.000	2.87	4.35
		Relax with family members	.29	.300	1.000	-.51	1.08
	Nature and parks	Rural and cultural	-3.34(*)	.269	.000	-4.05	-2.63
		Active outdoor	.27	.237	1.000	-.36	.90
		Relax with family members	-3.05(*)	.262	.000	-3.75	-2.36
	Active outdoor	Rural and cultural	-3.61(*)	.278	.000	-4.35	-2.87
		Nature and parks	-.27	.237	1.000	-.90	.36
		Relax with family members	-3.32(*)	.272	.000	-4.05	-2.60
	Relax with family members	Rural and cultural	-.29	.300	1.000	-1.08	.51
		Nature and parks	3.05(*)	.262	.000	2.36	3.75
		Active outdoor	3.32(*)	.272	.000	2.60	4.05

(Continued...)

Games-Howell	Rural and cultural	Nature and parks	3.34(*)	.280	.000	2.61	4.07
		Active outdoor	3.61(*)	.281	.000	2.88	4.34
		Relax with family members	.29	.314	.794	-.53	1.10
	Nature and parks	Rural and cultural	-3.34(*)	.280	.000	-4.07	-2.61
		Active outdoor	.27	.229	.636	-.32	.86
		Relax with family members	-3.05(*)	.268	.000	-3.75	-2.36
	Active outdoor	Rural and cultural	-3.61(*)	.281	.000	-4.34	-2.88
		Nature and parks	-.27	.229	.636	-.86	.32
		Relax with family members	-3.32(*)	.269	.000	-4.02	-2.63
	Relax with family members	Rural and cultural	-.29	.314	.794	-1.10	.53
		Nature and parks	3.05(*)	.268	.000	2.36	3.75
		Active outdoor	3.32(*)	.269	.000	2.63	4.02

Descriptive means reproduced in Table-8 show that the amount spent by tourists of different trip typologies differs across motivational groups. The descriptive analysis show lowest estimate against 'rural and cultural' tourists (mean 1.6) while that of 'relaxed with family members' group had the highest estimate (mean 4.7). The values extracted against the 'nature and park' tourists and 'active outdoor tourists' are 3.86 and 2.16 respectively. This reveals that the latter group spends higher amount on souvenirs & handicrafts. This, of course, conveys a message for the communities engaged in making and trading of such items that they may gain from the tourists' visits. Further enquiry has been made to identify the groups spending more on this item.

Table 8: Multiple Comparison Table, Dependent Variable: Souvenir & Handicraft

	(I) Trip purpose	(J) Trip purpose	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% confidence level	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Bonferroni	Rural and cultural	Nature and parks	-2.2480(*)	.19984	.000	-2.7778	-1.7181
		Active outdoor	-.5533(*)	.20685	.047	-1.1018	-.0049
		Relax with family members	-3.1151(*)	.22294	.000	-3.7062	-2.5240
	Nature and parks	Rural and cultural	2.2480(*)	.19984	.000	1.7181	2.7778
		Active outdoor	1.6946(*)	.17637	.000	1.2270	2.1623
		Relax with family members	-.8671(*)	.19499	.000	-1.3841	-.3501
	Active outdoor	Rural and cultural	.5533(*)	.20685	.047	.0049	1.1018
		Nature and parks	-1.6946(*)	.17637	.000	-2.1623	-1.2270
		Relax with family members	-2.5617(*)	.20217	.000	-3.0978	-2.0257
	Relax with family members	Rural and cultural	3.1151(*)	.22294	.000	2.5240	3.7062
		Nature and parks	.8671(*)	.19499	.000	.3501	1.3841
		Active outdoor	2.5617(*)	.20217	.000	2.0257	3.0978

(Continued...)

Games-Howell	Rural and cultural	Nature and parks	-2.2480(*)	.18387	.000	-2.7242	-1.7718
		Active outdoor	-.5533(*)	.16511	.005	-.9814	-.1253
		Relax with family members	-3.1151(*)	.17355	.000	-3.5659	-2.6642
	Nature and parks	Rural and cultural	2.2480(*)	.18387	.000	1.7718	2.7242
		Active outdoor	1.6946(*)	.19142	.000	1.1995	2.1898
		Relax with family members	-.8671(*)	.19875	.000	-1.3818	-.3524
	Active outdoor	Rural and cultural	.5533(*)	.16511	.005	.1253	.9814
		Nature and parks	-1.6946(*)	.19142	.000	-2.1898	-1.1995
		Relax with family members	-2.5617(*)	.18153	.000	-3.0324	-2.0910
	Relax with family members	Rural and cultural	3.1151(*)	.17355	.000	2.6642	3.5659
		Nature and parks	.8671(*)	.19875	.000	.3524	1.3818
		Active outdoor	2.5617(*)	.18153	.000	2.0910	3.0324

The Post Hoc analysis using Games-Howells' method ($p = 0.000$) show that the pair-wise nature of association among tourists of different trip typologies vary. Groups significantly differ in the amount spent on this item. The differences are very much apparent between all the groups which exhibit that tourists can be segmented for spending on souvenirs and handicrafts.

Findings

The findings of the discussion made can be interpreted as follows:

- i. 'Rural and cultural' tourists spent higher amount on shopping while 'relaxed with family member' incur high on souvenirs & handicrafts.
- ii. 'Nature and park' tourists incur a significant and almost equal amount on both shopping and souvenirs & handicraft.
- iii. 'Active outdoor' tourists incur least amount on both shopping, and on souvenirs & handicraft.
- iv. Tourists of all trip typologies spent relatively higher amount on shopping (mean 4.37) than on souvenirs & handicrafts (mean 3.14).

Limitation and Future Scope for Research

Tourists' expenditure is an important variable for this study but the researchers used interval scale to measure the extent of expenditure incurred on shopping and souvenirs & handicraft items. Using of ratio scale would have been more significant. Another limitation is that this study is the premier study conducted in Northeast India and there is also no reference of such study elsewhere investigating the association between trip typology and expenditure on souvenirs & handicrafts. Dey & Sarma (2006) and Littrell (1990) used trip typology to study tourists travel needs and motivation. On the other hand, Oh et al. (2004) developed trip typology for unveiling experiences sought by tourists during trips. Again, Yu (2003) developed trip typologies to see travel experience and behaviours of tourists at the destination areas. So, a comparative analysis could not be put forward. Again, in this study researchers did not differentiate between souvenirs and handicraft items. Future studies may be carried out by incorporating ratio scale and the study area may be limited state-wise or destination-wise. Again, future studies should differentiate between souvenirs and handicrafts items. There is also scope to test the association of trip typology with expenditure on common or prepaid expenditure like accommodation, transportation and food & beverages etc.

Practical Implication

This study contributes to the tourism and hospitality management literature by showing that trip typology has a significant bearing on amount spent on shopping and souvenirs & handicraft items. Besides, the finding that 'rural and cultural' and 'nature and park' tourists spend higher amount on shopping, souvenirs and handicraft items is an important message for entrepreneurs connected with making and sale of such items. Souvenirs and handicraft items may be kept by the sellers in their ventures in the destinations visited by 'rural and cultural' and 'nature and park' tourists.

References

- Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2012). Tourist characteristics that influence shopping participation and expenditures. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(3), 223 – 237.
- Anderson, L. F., & Littrell, M. (1996). Group profiles of women as Tourists and purchase of Souvenirs. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 25(1), 28-56.
- Anderson, L., & Littrell, M. (1995). Souvenir purchase behaviour of women tourists. *Annals of Tourism search*, 22(2), 328-348.
- Anderson, W. (2010). Determinants of all-inclusive travel expenditure. *Tourism Review*, 65(3), 4-15.
- Anyango, N., Duim, R., & Peters, K. (2013). Spending of Dutch tourists: The locality of money. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 625-650.
- Barsky, J., & Nash, L. (2002). Evoking emotion, affective keys to the hotel loyalty. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 39-46.
- Baruah, U., & Sarma, M. K. (2012). Tourists indulgence towards unplanned expenditure: A study in an emerging destination. *Tourism Review International*, 16(3), 239-246.
- Bezbaruah, M. P. (2008). Development trends and the role of tourism in Northeast India. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 37(2), 122-123.
- Brinda G., Disenga, M., & Osti, L. (2013). The effect of authenticity on visitors' expenditure at cultural events. *Current Issue in Tourism*, 16(3), 266-285.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 371-386.
- Cohen, E. (2000). *The commercialized crafts of Thailand: Hill tribes and lowland villages*. North America: University of Hawaii Press.
- Damonte, L., Collings, M., & Meghee, C. (2013). Segmenting tourists by direct tourism expenditures at new festivals. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(1), 51-57.
- Dey, B., & Sarma, M. K. (2006). Tourists typologies and segmentation of variables with regard to eco-tourists. *Tourism Management*, 8, 31-39.
- Getz, D., Joncas, D., & Kelly, M. (1994). Tourist shopping villages in the Calvary region. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 5(1), 2-15.
- Godbey, G., & Graefe, A. (1991). Repeat tourism, play and monetary spending. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 213-225.
- Gordon, B. (1986). The Souvenir: Messenger of the extra-ordinary. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 20(3), 135-146.
- Hung, W., Shang, J., & Wang, F. (2013). A multilevel analysis on the determinants of household tourism expenditures. *Current Issue in Tourism*, 16(6), 612-617.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (2000). Leisure shopping: A magic concept for the tourism industry? *Tourism Management*, 12(1), 9-14.

- Kent, W., Shock P.J., & Snow, R. E. (1983). Shopping: tourism's unsung hero (ine). *Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 27-31.
- Keown, C. F. (1989). A model of tourists' propensity to buy: The case of Japanese visitors to Hawaii. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 31-34.
- Kim, S., & Littrel, M. A. (2001). Souvenir buying intentions for self versus others. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 638-657.
- Kim, Y. G., & Eves, A. (2012). Construction and validation of a scale to measure tourists' motivation to consume local food. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1458-1467.
- Kincade, D., & Woodard, G. (2001). Shopping for souvenir clothing. *Pacific Tourism Review*, 5(3/4), 159-165.
- Kinley, T., Forney, J., & Kim, Y. (2012). Travel motivation as a determinant of shopping venue. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(3), 266-278.
- Kreck, L. (1985). The effect of the cross-the border commerce of Canadian tourists on the city of Spokane. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24, 27-31.
- Law, R., & Au, N. (2000). Relationship modeling in tourism shopping: A decision rules induction approach. *Tourism Management*, 21(3), 241-249.
- Li, K. S. (1999, April 3). Tourists spent RM 2.5bn on shopping in Malaysia last year. *Business Times*, 02.
- Littrel, M. A., Rosalind, C. P., & Kun, S. (2004). Senior travelers: Tourism activities and shopping behaviours. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(4), 348-363.
- Littrell, M. A. (1990). Symbolic significance of textile crafts for tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(2), 228-245.
- Littrell, M. A., Kean, S. R., Gahring, S., Niemeyer, S., Reilly, R. & Stout, J. (1994). Souvenirs and tourism styles. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(1), 3-11.
- Llave, E. (2005). Special Report: Tourism Industry Report. *Business World*, 5, 1-5.
- Manente, M. (2000). Tourism consumption and interregional economic impacts in Italy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(7), 417-423.
- Meng, F., & Xu, Y. (2012). Tourism shopping behavior: Planned, impulsive, or experiential? *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(3), 250-265.
- Moscardo, G. (2004). Shopping as destination attraction: An empirical examination of the role of shopping in tourists' destination choice and experience. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(4), 294-307.
- Mules, T. (1998). Decomposition of Australian tourist expenditure. *Tourism Management*, 19(3), 267-271.
- Oh, J., Cheng, C., Lehto, X., & O'leary, J. (2004). Predictors' shopping behaviour: examination of Socio-demographic characteristics and trip typologies. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(4), 308-319.
- Park, M. K. (2000). Social and cultural factors influencing tourists souvenir-purchase behavior: a comparative study on Japanese 'Omiyage' and Korean 'sunmul'. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 9(1/2), 81-91.
- Sarma, M. K. (2004). *A study on the demand pattern of tourism oriented cottage industry products in the North-East India*. Unpublished project report submitted to Maulana Abdul Kalam Institute of Asian Studies, Kolkata.
- Sarma, M. K., & Baruah, U. (2013). Destination information sources: A spatial study across time and expenditure. *IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, 12(1), 59-69.
- Siddiqui, M. A., & Tripathy, S. N. (2010). Performance of tourist centers in Uttar Pradesh: An evaluation using data envelopment analysis. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 40(1), 31-51.
- Snepenger, D. J., Murphy, L. O., & Gregg, R. E. (2003). Tourists' and residents' use of a shopping space. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 567-580.
- Suh, Y. K., & McAvoy, L. (2005). Preferences and trip expenditures-a conjoint analysis of visitors to Seoul, Korea. *Tourism Management*, 26(3), 325-333.

- Suosheng, W., & Qu, H. (2004). A comparison study of Chinese domestic tourism: China vs. the USA. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 108-115.
- Swanson, K. K. (2004). Tourists' and retailers' perceptions of souvenirs. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(4), 363-377.
- Telfer, D. J., & Hashimoto, A. (2000). Nagara ice wine tourism; Japanese souvenir purchases at Inniskillin winery. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(4), 343-356.
- Vidas De, A. A. (1995). Textiles, memory and the souvenir industry in the Andes. In M. F. Lanfant, J. B. Allcock & E. M. Bruner (Eds.), *Collection Studies in International Sociology* (pp. 67-83). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Wellner, A.S. (2000). Where the tourists spend big? *American Demographics*, 22(12), 1-2.
- Wu, L., Zhang, J., & Fujiwara, A. (2013). Tourists participation and expenditure behaviour: Analysis using scobit based discrete continuous choice model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, 1-17.
- Yu, H., & Littrell, M. A. (2003). Product and process orientations to tourism shopping. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 140-150.
- Zhang, H., Junyi, Z., & Kuwano, M. (2012). An integrated model of tourists' time use and expenditure behaviour with self-selection based on fully nested Archimedean copula function. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1562-1573.
-

Authors' Profile

Uttam Kr Baruah is a senior Assistant Professor in Commerce at Darrang College, Tezpur- Assam, India. He has been teaching undergraduate level for last 16 years. He has to his credit three books and number of research papers published in reputed journals. His areas of research interest are marketing, finance and tourism.

Mrinmoy K Sarma has been teaching management in the Department of Business Administration Tezpur University, Napaam- Assam, India for the last 20 years out of which more than 18 years are devoted to hard core research in the marketing area. He has published two books and one edited volume and large number of research articles in peer reviewed international and national journals including book chapters.
