MOBILE STUDENT EXPERIENCE: the Place of Tourism.

Abstract (120 words):
This paper reviews the conceptualisation of mobile student experience within tourism studies, sojourner adjustment studies, critical acculturation research, and mobilities research. Despite some useful contributions on "educational tourism", the study of mobile student experience has largely been left to sojourner adjustment studies. However, recent critiques create opportunities for a reconceptualisation of mobile student experience, drawing upon tourism studies engaging with power relations, performativity, and practice. The paper proposes the "Place Practice" model of mobile student experience, synthesising these contributions and developing a more holistic and contextual conceptualisation of mobile student experience. This highlights the unfulfilled potential for tourism researchers to contribute to understanding student mobility, and other contemporary hybrid mobilities that do not conform to conventional disciplines and social domains.

Keywords (6 words):
Student mobilities; adaptation; intercultural; power; performativity; practice.

MANUSCRIPT (9989 words):

1. INTRODUCTION

There is already considerable overlap between tourism and student mobility, according to accepted definitions of "tourism", "educational tourism", and "internationally mobile students" (UNESCO, OECD, & Eurostat, 2015, p. 32; UNWTO, 2010, 2019). The scale of international student mobility has been immense, accounting for more than 5.3 million tertiary international students annually (International Organization for Migration, 2020). Although COVID-19 is currently depressing student numbers, the pandemic is also increasing the challenges faced by mobile students, making an understanding of mobile student experience even more pertinent. Educational tourism researchers such as McGladdery and Lubbe (2017) propose an experiential learning model, conceptualising cognitive, affective, and behavioural global learning outcomes. Despite the potential for tourism researchers to significantly enhance our understanding of student mobility, it has remained a relatively neglected area of tourism research.

The sojourner adjustment literature provides a much larger body of work on the experiences of mobile students. Sojourners, defined as "individuals who reside in a destination for a temporary period . . ." (Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001, p. 6), have been extensively researched from the perspectives of culture shock (e.g., Furnham, 2019), acculturation (e.g., Berry, 2005), the adjustment process (e.g., Schartner & Young, 2016) and intercultural competence (e.g., Deardorff, 2006). However, there are growing calls from within the sojourner, intercultural competence, and critical acculturation literatures – representing both a critical and mobilities turn - to move beyond individualistic, deterministic, and reductionist models to a more holistic, relational and contextual understanding (Martin, 2015, p. 6). Conceptualisation of the context of intercultural interactions has been very limited, with notions of power, discourse, and the contested nature of cultures and identities only rarely addressed (e.g., Collier, 2015; Fitzpatrick, 2017; Martin, 2015). With some notable exceptions, such as Brown (2009), there has also been little dialogue between tourism studies and the sojourner literature. However, the recent critical and mobilities turn creates potential for the incorporation of alternative perspectives, particularly those from tourism research.

Contemporary tourism research engages convincingly with several areas where the sojourner literature is limited. Tourism researchers have engaged extensively with issues of discourse and power (e.g., Cheong & Miller, 2000; Wight, 2018). A performative perspective grasps the multi-sensual experiences of mobile students within the host locality (Crouch, 2010; Edensor, 2001). Recent work focussing on tourism as practice (e.g., Lamers, Van der Duim & Spaargaren, 2017) has considerable potential for understanding the various 'ground-level' practices salient to being a mobile student. Complementing recent contributions on educational tourism more generally, our understanding of student mobility would benefit from a more sophisticated and holistic understanding of mobile student experience.

This article aims to evaluate how the experience of mobile students is conceptualised within tourism studies, sojourner studies, critical acculturation research, and the mobilities literature, developing a conceptual model that synthesises their respective contributions. The paper proposes that the concept of "place practice" provides a more contested, fluid, and performative conceptualisation of mobile student experience. Place practice is where intercultural interactions are negotiated and performed, producing changes in the identities of

mobile students. This “polyadic amalgam” is also influenced by discourses, power relationships, and structures in both “home” and “host” cultures.

The paper argues that mobile students are transformed not only by adjustment, acculturation, and the development of intercultural competence; but also by their negotiation and performance of everyday practices in the host destination, which are influenced by both home and host cultures. Whilst the sojourner literature thoroughly conceptualises the rational responses of mobile students to the challenges of adapting and interacting within unfamiliar cultures, a mobilities perspective (e.g., Brooks & Waters, 2011; Collins, 2018) focusses attention on context, power relations, discourse, and the formation of hybrid identities. Crucially, it is the “context-rich” field of tourism studies that facilitates a performative and practice-based understanding of the everyday intercultural interactions of mobile students.

The sojourner literature would clearly benefit from a more sophisticated engagement with context, practice, performativity, and power. This paper heeds calls (e.g., McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017) for a more substantive engagement with mobile students from a tourism perspective. More fundamentally, it is argued that this “de-differentiation between social domains” (Cohen & Cohen, 2012, p. 2180) in the context of tourism and student mobility research confers mutual benefits to both fields. For tourism research, this facilitates an engagement with an interrelated form of mobility; and provides a more sophisticated conceptualisation of adjustment, adaptation, and the formation of hybrid identities in the context of tourism more generally.

2. THE EDUCATION-TOURISM NEXUS

According to accepted definitions of tourism, a large proportion of mobile students are also tourists. Following official definitions of tourism (e.g., UNWTO, 2010, p. 1), students studying abroad on one-year postgraduate programmes, study abroad ‘exchange’ students, and students on short-term mobility can be defined as tourists. Perhaps more debatable, is the status of international students studying on longer programmes, yet returning home during their study vacation. “Education Tourism”, more specifically, is defined as “those types of tourism which have as a primary motivation the tourist’s engagement and experience in learning, self-improvement, intellectual growth and skills development” (UNWTO, 2019, p. 5).

As there is clearly an overlap between tourism and student mobility, this paper argues that student mobility deserves more attention from tourism researchers, who have a lot to contribute from an experiential perspective. The pervasive influence of the mobilities turn within both student mobility and tourism research (e.g., Brooks & Waters, 2011; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006) further blurs conventional boundaries. As Cohen and Cohen (2019) argue, the mobilities approach, which has become increasingly influential within tourism studies, has contributed to the de-differentiation of tourism from other social domains of mobility, including those associated with studying and learning.

By 2017, internationally mobile tertiary education students numbered more than 5.3 million (International Organization for Migration, 2020) and pre-Covid forecasts suggested that mobile student numbers would reach 8 million by 2025 (Quacquarelli Symonds, 2019). COVID-19 is reducing mobile student numbers in the short-term, yet successful adaptation and intercultural interaction is becoming more salient as mobile students face additional challenges. More than half of international students are enrolled in just six countries: the USA, UK, Australia, France, Germany and the Russian Federation. The UK hosted 458,490 students in the 2017-18 academic year (UUKi, 2019), and the USA was recorded as hosting 1,095,299 students during academic year 2018/19 (IIE, 2019). A limited number of countries also dominate the generation of international students, most prominently China, India, Germany, South Korea, Nigeria, France, and Saudi Arabia. Countries in S.E. Asia are also significant generators, including Malaysia, and Singapore (International Organization for Migration, 2020).

However, it is important to distinguish between “international students”, typically enrolled on a tertiary degree or postgraduate programme in a country other than their own, and “credit mobile” students, participating in student exchange or study abroad programmes. In 2016-17, for example, 312,300 students and 62,500 staff participated in Erasmus+ mobility alone (European Commission, 2018). According to Teichler (2017), the statistics on student mobility only partially capture credit-mobile students, with inconsistencies in reporting between different countries. Teichler (2017) estimates that credit-mobility accounts for around 30 per cent of all international student mobility. Furthermore, the proliferation of short-term mobility - including field trips, summer schools, and international volunteering opportunities - is missing from most student mobility statistics.

Another group that is omitted from headline figures is secondary education students studying abroad, as these students – more so than closely supervised younger pupils - will share many of the same challenges of adjustment and adaptation to new environments and cultures. For example, around 20 per cent of the estimated 5.5 million international school students are studying abroad (ISC Research, 2018). This paper is concerned with all of these types of mobility, preferring the term "mobile student". This follows the joint definition by UNESCO Institute for Statistics, OECD, and Eurostat:

> *An internationally mobile student is an individual who has physically crossed an international border between two countries with the objective to participate in educational activities in a destination country, where the destination country is different from his or her country of origin.* (UNESCO, OECD, & Eurostat, 2015, p. 32)

Until recently, there was limited work on educational tourism apart from the seminal text by Ritchie, Carr and Cooper (2003). This work is notable for comprehensively segmenting the educational tourism market according to travel motivations. An alternative approach considers the learning process of educational tourism (e.g., McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017; Falk, Ballantyne, Packer & Benckendorff, 2012). This approach draws upon the experiential learning model (Kolb, 1984). In this reflective learning cycle, first-hand experiences lead to reflective observation. Conceptualisation occurs, in which the individual draws conclusions from their experience. Experimentation follows, through which the individual tries out what they have learnt. This leads to the accumulation of new first-hand experiences. The model provides a useful cyclical conceptualisation of the process of learning through tourism, although it tells us relatively little about the holistic lived experiences of mobile students, including the micro and macro-variables impacting upon experiences.

McGladdery and Lubbe (2017) discuss how educational tourism and international education are closely aligned in terms of origins, the process of learning, and educational outcomes. They argue that educational tourism actually makes a contribution beyond that of international education. International education facilitates the development of intercultural competence, enabling the individual to function effectively within intercultural settings. Educational tourism - presumably due to its more holistic perspective - contributes to "global

learning", characterised by "openness, tolerance, respect and a sense of responsibility towards self, others and the environment" (McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017, p. 326). Global learning consists of global awareness (knowledge), global mindedness (attitude), and global competence (behaviour) (McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017, p. 326). In an ethnographic study of international students, Brown (2009) reveals how freedom from familial and cultural expectations can facilitate profound self-discovery and the development of intercultural competence. However, the relatively limited experiential conceptualisation of mobile students within tourism studies prompts authors such as Brown (2009) to engage with the extensive sojourner adjustment literature, much of which focusses on mobile students.

3. STUDENT SOJOURNERS

3.1 Culture Shock and Acculturative Stress

Culture Shock is the "unexpected and often negative reaction of people to new environments" (Furnham, 2019, p. 1832), salient to both tourists and mobile students (Furnham, 1984; Hottola, 2004; Moufakkir, 2013; Ward at al., 2001). Typical symptoms of culture shock include feelings of strain, a sense of loss, deprivation, rejection, confusion, surprise, anxiety, impotence, and even disgust and indignation (Ward et al., 2001). Individuals are likely to experience "lowered mental health status (especially confusion, anxiety, depression), feelings of marginality and alienation, heightened psychosomatic symptoms, and identity confusion" (Berry, 1995, p. 479). Central to the concept is the "U-Curve" of culture shock (Furnham 1984; Ward at al., 2001), in which the individual experiences various psychological states following their arrival in an unfamiliar destination and culture. Adler (1975) separated the process into five stages: initial contact (exciting and fresh experience), disintegration (confusing and disorientating period), reintegration (rejection of disintegration), autonomy (understanding the host culture), and independence (benefitting from cultural differences and similarities).

Researchers have also extended the U-curve to a W, conceptualising the process of readjustment when the sojourner returns to their home culture (Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Gray & Savicki, 2015). There have been a variety of explanations for culture shock, including attitudes, expectations, values, negative life events, and social skills (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). However, researchers have increasingly challenged the U-Curve hypothesis. Critics suggest that the theory is deterministic and over-generalised (Fitzpatrick, 2017; Chien, 2018).

Although most culture shock models conceptualise the first stage as one of excitement and a positive frame of mind, studies by Brown and Holloway (2008) and Chien (2018) suggest otherwise. Researchers have increasingly replaced the term with "acculturative stress" (Berry, 2006), which implies positive and negative impacts within both cultures. Given that both positive and negative emotions and impacts are common (Chien, 2018), it would seem that the term "Acculturative (Eu)stress" is more appropriate, representing the positive and negative emotions and impacts arising from temporary migration.

3.2 Adjustment and Adaptation

Mobile students face numerous challenges in adapting to a new culture, and often undergo a difficult period of adjustment. Student sojourner adjustment is "the dynamic, interactive processes involved in functioning in the new academic environment" (Young & Schartner (2014, p. 548). According to Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping and Todman (2008), conceptual models have increasingly drawn upon social psychology and education, and contemporary approaches now recognise three main ways of adjusting. "Culture Learning" emphasises behavioural changes, whereby individuals acquire new skills to cope with social interactions (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Culture Learning also facilitates "academic adjustment", defined as "adjustment to the specific demands of academic study including styles of teaching and learning at the host university" (Schartner & Young, 2016, p. 374).

A second approach focusses on stress and coping mechanisms, in which the individual is able to develop strategies to manage their stress and improve their psychological well-being (Zhou at al., 2008). A third approach emphasises cognitive components, in which the individual changes the way that they identify with the host and home culture respectively (e.g., Berry, 1995). Changes in social identification influence both self-identity, and the way that individuals cope with group membership (Zhou at al., 2008).

According to Berry (2006, p. 52), the long-term goal of adjustment is to achieve adaptation, representing "the relatively stable changes that take place in an individual or group in response to external demands". Although the term "adaptation" has been used to refer to both a process and an outcome, a more conceptually-sound understanding refers to the outcomes of adjustment processes (Young & Schartner, 2014, p. 548). Ward and colleagues (e.g., Searle & Ward, 1990) have argued that adaptation outcomes are both psychological (well-being, self-

esteem) and socio-cultural (the ability to fit in or negotiate interaction within the host culture). Schartner and Young (2016) add "academic adaptation" as a separate outcome of adaptation.

3.3 Acculturation

Zhou et al. (2008, p. 68) assert that "acculturation refers to the process of intercultural adaptation". Acculturation is therefore the whole process, beginning with the stress and skills deficit experienced upon intercultural contact, and ending with psychological, socio-cultural, and academic adaptation. Berry (2005, p. 698) defines acculturation as "the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members". As Smith and Khawaja (2011) explain, in Berry's acculturation model (2005), changes are conceptualised as occurring in both cultures at the individual level (psychological) and at the group level (socio-cultural).

Berry's influential work (e.g., 1995; 2005) is best known for proposing four acculturation modes, consisting of categories representing the perspective an individual takes with respect to both their host culture and their home culture. One dimension represents the perceived value in maintaining relationships with the host culture; and the other is the perceived value in maintaining the cultural identity of the home culture. Of the four possible modes - assimilation, integration, marginalisation, and separation – integration is considered the most appropriate (Berry, 2005). In the integration mode, the sojourner values both their own cultural identity and their relationships with the host culture.

According to empirical studies, mobile students are likely to experience challenges in academic matters, physical health, financial matters, vocational issues, and personal / social issues (Yi, Lin & Kishimoto, 2003). Comprehensive reviews of empirical research report acculturative stress associated with the home country / region, language, educational issues, practical issues, and perceived racism and discrimination (Smith & Khawaja, 2011; Zhang & Goodson, 2011, p. 142-3). An association with gender has also been found, with women reporting higher levels of acculturative stress in numerous studies (Zhang & Goodson, 2011, p. 143). Successful sociocultural adaptation has been associated with second language proficiency, greater contact with host members, social support, personality, length of residence, greater host identification, and the country / region of origin (Zhang & Goodson, 2011). Accordingly, Smith and Khawaja (2011) recommend interventions by higher education

institutions based upon empirical findings, including a focus on developing mobile students' skills and confidence, improving social ties, and developing support programmes.

3.4 Intercultural Competence

Intercultural competence, a theme within both the sojourner and educational tourism literature, has been defined as "appropriate and effective management of interaction between people who, to some degree or another, represent different or divergent affective, cognitive, and behavioural orientations to the world" (Spitzberg & Changnon 2009, p. 7). There is much debate, however, regarding the equivalence of related terms (e.g., Arasaratnam, 2016; Chiu, Loner, Matsumoto & Ward, 2013). Whilst studies such as Deardorff (2006) illustrate a general consensus, others argue that the lack of conceptual and measurement clarity severely hampers both research and practice (e.g. Griffith, Wolfeld, Armon, Rios & Liu, 2016).

In their comprehensive review, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) identify 21 different models of intercultural competence. However, as Martin (2015, p. 6) explains, the majority of intercultural competence models reflect the "ABC Triumvirate", conceptualising affect, cognition, and behaviours. The basic premise is that an individual who has developed appropriate attitudes, knowledge, and behaviours is able to interact effectively with cultural others, creating shared meaning and mutual understanding (Martin, 2015). Deardorff's model of intercultural competence (2006) is notable for the attempt to elicit a consensus amongst leading intercultural competence scholars. The study identified a preferred definition of intercultural competence: "the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (Deardorff, 2006, pp. 247-248).

In the Process Model of Intercultural Competence (Deardorff, 2006, p. 256), the individual begins by developing appropriate "attitudes" (respect, openness, and tolerance of ambiguity). The next phase is the development of knowledge and comprehension (cultural self-awareness, a deep cultural knowledge), complemented by skills (listening, observing, evaluating, analysing, interpreting, and relating) (Deardorff, 2006, p. 256). The individual first develops internal intercultural competence outcomes (adaptability, flexibility, ethnorelative view, empathy); followed by the desired external outcome through interactions (effective and appropriate communication and behaviour in an intercultural situation) (Deardorff, 2006, p.

256). Although Deardorff's (2006, p. 256) process model hints at the ongoing and developmental nature of intercultural competency, Bennett's model (2017) is overtly developmental.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986) conceptualises individuals moving along a continuum, characterised by the increasing complexity and sophistication of their perceptions of other cultures (Leung, Ang & Tan, 2014, p. 493). The culturally-competent individual passes from the ethnocentric stages of *Denial*, *Defence*, and *Minimization*; to the ethnorelative stages of *Acceptance*, *Adaptation*, and *Integration* (Bennett, 2017, p. 4). While "Denial" represents a failure to perceive the existence or relevance of cultural others, "Defence" is a dichotomous mode, with the other culture perceived as inferior. In "Minimization", the individual obscures cultural differences, exaggerating similarities. "Acceptance" allows cultural differences to be organised into categories potentially as complex as for ones' own culture. "Adaptation" is characterised by the development of empathy, underpinning authentic and appropriate behaviour. The final stage, "Integration", allows "the movement in and out of different cultural world views . . . to construct cultural bridges and to conduct sophisticated cross-cultural mediation." (Bennett, 2017, p. 5).

4. FROM ACCULTURATION TO MOBILITIES

4.1 Critical Acculturation

Intercultural competence researchers are beginning to engage with specific contexts (e.g., Steyn & Reygan, 2017; Wang & Kulich, 2015), alternative approaches to assessing intercultural competence (e.g., Deardorff & Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017), and concepts such as power, prejudice and discrimination (e.g., Holliday, 2010; Jenks, Bhatia & Lou, 2013). However, evaluations of intercultural competence and acculturation research (e.g., Griffith at al., 2016; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013; Rudmin, 2009) suggest that very few studies demonstrate adequate levels of validity.

Martin (2015, p. 6) highlights a more fundamental problem, rooted in the conceptualisation of acculturation and intercultural competence, arguing that the field needs to "move beyond individual-focused reductionist models" to more relational, holistic, and spiritual perspectives. Collier (2015) has long argued for more complex and contextually-contingent

conceptualisations of cultures - conceptualisations that recognise multiple cultural group identities. Martin (2015, p. 7) warns against conceptualising cultural identity as bounded, singular, homogenous, and synonymous with nationality. Instead, she advocates an engagement with the contested and dynamic nature of cultures and identities, and the power relationships that underpin intercultural interactions (Martin, 2015). Whilst some recent progress has been made, the field is still some way off conceptualising context as "a fluid and dynamic space that is shaped by both local and global forces that constantly reconfigure it." (Martin, 2015, p. 7).

The notion of cultures as reified, distinct, bounded units that conform to national boundaries has been convincingly challenged in recent decades (e.g., Bhatia & Ram, 2009). In the context of international student experience, Fitzpatrick (2017) is critical of the "billiard ball" conceptualisation of cultures, as self-enclosed national entities clashing against each other. Mobile students are immersed in hybrid university or college cultures, which are far from synonymous with national cultures. Mobile students interact with a diverse range of cultural others, including fellow sojourners. Cross-cultural psychology, however, seeks universal laws that govern the acculturation process, which are "independent of time, place, and people involved" (Chirkov, 2009a, p. 178).

The process of acculturation in the majority of studies is unrealistically understood as individuals' rational choice between fixed acculturation strategies, ignoring the unpredictable, unintended, symbolic, and meaning-producing nature of sociocultural interactions (Chirkov, 2009a, p. 178; Collins, 2018). This assumes that there are no structural constraints, power relations, or inequalities (Bhatia & Ram, 2009). Acculturation research tends to ignore the social, historical, and political context of both the acculturating individuals and host communities, creating a contextual vacuum (Bhatia & Ram, 2009; Chirkov, 2009a). It is simplistic to assume that the burden of acculturation, whether successful or not, lies only with the individual (Bhatia & Ram, 2009).

There is a need for studies that capture mobile students' intersubjective yet multiple cultural realities, including successes, problems, conflicts, and the dynamics of their actions as they try to navigate through these realities (Chirkov, 2009b; Collins, 2018; Ploner, 2017). It is therefore necessary to "look outwards to the sociocultural activities" (Cresswell, 2009, p. 164). Following Bakhtin's (1986) "speech genres" - the vocabulary of a community,

ideology, and bodily style - the acculturation of mobile students is related to the dynamics of change as unfamiliar "speech genres" are encountered (Cresswell, 2009, p. 165). Bakhtin (1982) has also influenced advocates of a dialectical approach (e.g., Martin & Nakayama, 2015, p. 18). The focus becomes the juxtaposition of cultures, and the development of intersubjectivity in terms of words, ideology, and embodied experiences. Mobile student experiences are both embodied and intersubjective, and not merely individualised psychological processes (Fitzpatrick, 2017). In other words, "intercultural relations are always contextualised" (Marginson & Sawir, 2012, p. viii).

4.2 International Student Mobilities

The experience of being a mobile student thus involves embodied interpersonal interactions with a diverse range of cultural others, requiring the dialogical co-construction of meaning (Tardif-Williams & Fisher, 2009, p. 153). The work of cultural researchers such as Bakhtin (1986) "disrupts ideas that fixed, pre-set meaning exists beyond the interaction and active engagement of people with each other, with cultural texts, or with cultural discourses" (Tardif-Williams & Fisher, 2009, p. 153). From this perspective, cultural meaning is created, negotiated, contested, and reproduced through the daily interactions of mobile students (Ploner, 2017). As Fitzpatrick (2017, p. 288) argues, without understanding the background to intercultural interactions, it is impossible to understand the meaning of behaviour, or the "context of culture". Mobile students will at times embrace meaning, and at other times discard it, creating hybrid cultures (Marginson, 2014; Tardif-Williams & Fisher, 2009). The practice of daily interactions is dialogic, framed by discourses, power relations, and stereotyped beliefs pertaining to both home and host cultures.

One response to a dialogic understanding has been the emergence of work on diaspora and transnationalism (e.g., Bhatia & Ram, 2009). Diasporas are defined as immigrant communities who maintain real and imagined commitments and connections to their homeland, *and* recognise and value their participation in host cultures (Bhatia & Ram, 2009, p.141). In the context of mobile students, transnationalism focusses on "embodied mobility", including the creation and negotiation of multiple identities (Brooks & Waters, 2011). This typifies the mobilities approach, which is also increasingly influential within tourism research (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Hannam et al., 2006). Diaspora studies encourage a more fluid and

politicised understanding of mobile student identity, incorporating material and discursive forces that both enable and constrain the acculturation process and the formation of identities.

Mobile students are "always in a state of *becoming* as a result of interactions of various kinds" (Rizvi, 2009, p. 264). Marginson (2014) argues that instead of viewing mobile students as in deficit and in need of normalisation and assimilation, we should be focussing on the dynamics of self-formation. Mobile students navigate a trajectory somewhere between their home identity and the various host identities, forming a new hybrid identity. Rather than universal acculturative stress, this brings mixed emotions, including both isolation and loneliness, and a sense of freedom and self-determination (Brown & Holloway, 2008; Ploner, 2017). The context is framed by macro-level processes, creating power relations and differentials between individuals (Marginson, 2014).

Mobile students are caught up in the neoliberalist discourses and practices driving contemporary international education (Bamberger, Morris & Yemini, 2019), including predatory international recruitment practices, discourses of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism (Rizvi, 2009; Brooks and Waters, 2011), and nationalistic discourses of citizenship and loyalty (Dickerson & Ozden, 2018). Student mobility is driven by both ideology and a "social imaginary", relating to the perceived benefits of transnationalism (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009). Given evidence of these complex and entangled processes operating at different spatial scales, it is necessary to "reconcile the interplay between individual competence and societal forces" (Martin & Nakayama, 2015, p. 16).

5. THE PLACE PRACTICE OF TOURISM

5.1 Power Relations and Discourse

Several branches of the context-rich field of tourism studies contribute to a more contextual and critical understanding of mobile student experience. Since Urry's seminal "Tourist Gaze" (1990), tourism researchers have continued to engage with Foucault (see Wight, 2018, for a comprehensive review). Significantly, for Foucault the local context represents "the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39).

According to Cheong & Miller (2000, p. 380), at the ground-level, through everyday interactions, mobile students are "stripped of many of their cultural and familial ties and protective institutions, and are exposed to new norms and expectations". Their existing culture loses its validity, and they are compelled to reconsider their political status and to adjust. For Foucault, power is omnipresent and found in dynamic power-knowledge relations. A starting point to understanding power relations is to identify both the targets and agents in the power relationships operating in specific contexts (Cheong & Miller, 2000, p. 378). Whilst the status of mobile students as targets of power is not fixed or inevitable, it is possible to recognise a range of agents including fellow students, academic staff, local inhabitants, higher education institutions, international recruitment agents, governmental departments (particularly those responsible for immigration), NGOs, and intergovernmental institutions.

Mobile students are targeted - and othered - by a wide range of discourses. In the COVID-19 environment, discourses around social distancing regulations - and those associating COVID-19 with specific countries and regions - are particularly salient. As a consequence of Brexit, European Union students studying in the United Kingdom will face an increase in fees from August 2021. Students studying in the UK will no longer be able to participate in Erasmus+, although the UK's Turing Scheme will fill the gap to some extent. However, discourses associated with Brexit have arguably been much more damaging to international education in the UK. Since well before the referendum, an anti-immigration discourse has been perpetuated by politicians, facilitated by right-wing tabloid newspapers and social media. This creates a more hostile environment for international students in the UK, whilst repelling some prospective international students.

Wight (2018) explains how the archaeological approach (Foucault, 1969) creates the potential to critique discourses, revealing both privileged subject positions, and those who are marginalised. The smallest unit of analysis is the "statement", understood as meaning that follows the agreed codes of a broader discourse (Wight, 2018, p. 127). A discourse is the knowledge represented by the total body of statements, a framework that contains sets of concepts, narratives, signs, and ideologies (Barnes & Duncan, 1992). A "discursive formation" is the ordered system distributing the statements (Wight, 2018, p. 127). Tourism researchers have had a long-standing engagement with discourse. It has increasingly been recognised that discourses enable a naturalising power, legitimising the "truths" that they produce (Foucault, 1969).

5.2 Performativity

Contemporary conceptualisations of tourist experience, and even Urry's later work on the tourist gaze (see Urry & Larsen, 2011), increasingly embrace a performative approach (e.g. Edensor, 2001; Haldrup & Larsen, 2009). Tourism is understood as a set of embodied and habitual practices, including the complex styles, rhythms, steps, and gestures of different groups (Edensor, 2001). According to Edensor (2007, p. 204), who draws upon Goffman (1959), "performance can be conceptualised as an interactive and contingent process which succeeds according to the skills of the actors, the context within which it is and the way in which it is interpreted by an audience." As Thrift and Dewsbury (2000) illustrate, there are certain places where performances are acted out, and these "vortexes" are places of intercultural interaction for mobile students. It is argued that there is a paradigmatic shift in how agency in tourism is conceptualised, "from the gaze to the body . . . and from representations to everyday habits and practices" (Valtonen & Viejola, 2011, p. 176). As Larsen (2012, p. 67) argues, "situations, processes and performances are everything: tourism is doing, something accomplished through performances".

Performativity research enables an embodied understanding of interactions between mobile students, local students, academic staff, and local inhabitants. Encounters are inherently multi-sensual, in contrast to the disembodied perspective common within the student sojourner literature. As Edensor (2012) suggests, mobile student experience consists of numerous sensations including sight, smell, touch, sound, and taste. Habitual practices are often salient, and as Minca and Oakes (2006, p. 20) argue, "places are at once the sedimented layers of historical experience, cultural habit, and personal and collective memory, and continually remade by lived bodily movement".

A more radical approach to performativity in tourism (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Harwood & El Manstrly, 2012) draws upon Austin (1978) and Butler (1993). This approach recognises how the iterability of practice on a micro-scale (re)produces identity (Butler, 1993). According to Butler, performativity is "a regularized and constrained repetition of norms" (Butler, 1993, p. 95). These repeated and reiterated versions of race, nationality, gender, sexuality, and dis/ability reproduce what is considered natural, typical, and appropriate for specific groups (Borgerson & Schroeder, 2002). This iterability produces some identities and forecloses

others, creating precarity for some (Butler, 2009), whilst always maintaining the illusion of natural categories.

"Foreclosure" creates contexts that establish what the subject "is not, can never be, or know" (Borgerson, 2005, p. 70). Salient to mobile students, foreclosure threatens the subject and creates both anxiety and the possibility "to reinstate the subject on new and different ground" (Butler 2004, p. 333). "Resignification", which challenges dominant forms of authority, is possible through the (re)appropriation of terms (Butler, 2004). Performativity theory engages with the existence of structures, discourses, power, and materiality, but only in their re-enactments in a spatial, temporal and social context.

5.3 Intersubjective Practices

A major influence on performativity research, including Butler's seminal work, is the work of phenomenologists such as Merleau-Ponty (1962). Tourism Studies has a long-standing engagement with various branches of phenomenology, (e.g. Brown, 2013; Pernecky & Jamal, 2010; Wassler & Kirillova, 2019). Drawing upon Merleau-Ponty (1962), the mobile student casts an "intentional arc" in their new environment, projecting around themselves their past, their future, and their human setting. However, on an intersubjective level, mobile students draw upon a vast collection of both first-hand and culturally-transmitted knowledge, termed the "stock of knowledge" (Schutz & Luckmann, 1973). Culturally-communicated knowledge provides intersubjective "recipes for acting" in various contexts. Through the solutions provided by the stock of knowledge, the mobile student is "relieved of the need to find their own solutions" (Selby 2003, p. 158), leading to habitual behaviour. It is only when these recipes are of limited use in the new environment, or when knowledge is insufficient or contradictory, that mobile students will be motivated to seek new recipes for action (Schutz, 1970, p. 153), consistent with "adjustment strategies" in the sojourner literature.

Recent tourism work drawing upon practice theories also emphasises shared practical understandings (e.g. Lamers et al., 2017; de Souza Bispo, 2016). Social practice has been defined as "a routinized type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge" (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 249). It is argued here that analysis should

begin with the "field of practices" (Bourdieu, 1977) salient to mobile students at ground level, identifying "practice-arrangement bundles" (Schatzki, 2012, p. 24). The field is the place of struggle between different actors, who are differentiated according to their respective capitals (economic, cultural, social, and increasingly, mobile) (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 101). "Habitus" refers to the shared set of dispositions that orient actors within a particular field, dispositions that are neither reactions to external constraints, nor subjective and conscious action (Bourdieu, 1980). According to Shove, Pantzar & Watson (2012), social practices should be analysed as combinations of materials, competences, and meanings.

Practice is "real-time doing and saying something in a specific place and time" (Nicolini, 2012, p. 219). Studies of mobile students are particularly in need of research adhering to a "flat ontology" (Lamers et al., 2017, p. 57), which enables researchers to identify the everyday practices that are salient to mobile students, before "zooming out" to larger practice-arrangement bundles (Nicolini, 2012, p. 229). In the case of mobile students, these larger practice-arrangement bundles encompass both their home and host environments, and there are often contradictions and tensions between them. This is in the spirit of the dialectical approach advocated by Martin and Nakayama (2015), yet avoids the creation of new *a priori* binaries. This points towards qualitative - and particularly ethnographic - research methods as the starting point for understanding place practice, enabling a thick description of mobile student practice in specific contexts. This can facilitate analysis of larger practice-arrangement bundles – discourses, power relations, and structures – provided that they are salient to the practices of mobile students in the specific context. The place practice of mobile students is thus a polyadic amalgam of practice-arrangements, influenced by both "home" and "host" cultures, contingent over time, and operating on different spatial scales.

6. PLACE PRACTICE MODEL

The Place Practice Model of Mobile Student Experience (Figure 1) consists of a circuit that includes Place Practice, Acculturative (Eu)stress, Adjustment Strategies, Adaptation Outcomes, Identity, and Intercultural Competence. It also incorporates a more spontaneous two-way process linking Place Practice to Identity. The substantive contribution of the model is "Place Practice", representing the performative practices of mobile students in specific contexts. These practices are spontaneous interactions within the cultural contexts and environments of the study destination.

Place Practice is influenced by practice-arrangement bundles ("Home Practice Arrangements" and "Host Practice Arrangements") in both the home and host culture (Nicolini, 2012), and these may be contradictory and in tension (Martin & Nakayama, 2015). It is important to avoid being overly prescriptive regarding the contents of practice-arrangement bundles, without first establishing what is salient to mobile students in specific contexts (Lamers et al., 2017). However, following the discussion above (4.1 Critical Acculturation, 4.2 International Student Mobilities, 5.1 Power Relations and Discourse, 5.2 Performativity, and 5.3 Intersubjective Practices), these are likely to include discourses, power relations, identities, capitals, stocks of knowledge, and language (Brooks & Waters, 2011; Cheong & Miller, 2000; Rizvi, 2009; Wight, 2018).

Place Practice has a symbiotic relationship with "Identity", as the intercultural interactions of place practice (re)produce identities, creating new hybrid identities (Butler, 1997; Rizvi, 2009). Identity, in turn, influences the performances of Place Practice. The proposed relationship between Place Practice and Identity represents a more dynamic, spontaneous and habitual process than the slower and more internal rational circuit. The former "real-time" process might be considered hot, relative to the cooler rational circuit. This is because daily social interactions within the host environment and culture have an immediate impact – however small - upon the identity of the mobile student. Identity thus evolves with each interaction of place practice, and the mobile student is in a constant state of becoming (Rizvi, 2009, p. 264). The identity of the mobile student feeds back into the interactions of Place Practice, with the potential to influence the lived experience and outcomes of interactions.

"FIGURE 1 HERE"

The circuit represents the more rational, internal, and reflective components of mobile student experience, conceptualised and researched within the sojourner and educational tourism literature. Place Practice may lead to acculturative stress (Berry, 1995; Zhou et al., 2008), yet this does not have a universal and deterministic pattern over time (Chien, 2018; Fitzpatrick, 2017). Mobile students experience both positive and negative emotions, hence the use of the term "Acculturative (Eu)stress". Acculturative (Eu)stress is subject to reflection and evaluation, leading to various "Adjustment Strategies", representing conscious actions aimed at improving the lived experiences of Place Practice. These strategies may be related to stress

and coping, cultural learning, or social identification (Zhou et al., 2008). These adjustment strategies may also contribute to changes in Identity, including attitudes towards "home" and "host" cultures.

Over time, repeated circuits following place practice encounters will enable mobile students to achieve "Adaptation Outcomes", including psychological, socio-cultural, and academic outcomes (Schartner & Young, 2016; Searle & Ward, 1990). The mobile student, through both the trial and error of place practice and through more formal training, will also develop internal outcomes characterising "Intercultural Competence" (Deardorff, 2006; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). This includes the development of ethnorelative attitudes (Bennett, 2017), skills, and knowledge; all of which can be applied during the intercultural interactions of Place Practice. Intercultural Competence, Adaptation Outcomes and Identity, will all influence Place Practice. However, due to the effects of larger practice-arrangement bundles (Nicolini, 2012), the mobile student does not have autonomy over the outcomes of their intercultural interactions and experiences (Bhatia & Ram, 2009).

The Place Practice Model draws upon conceptualisations of power, performativity and practice in a specific context, to propose a more spontaneous, habitual, and contingent conceptualisation of mobile student experience. The Place Practice model recognises that the experiences of mobile students will be influenced not only by their adjustment strategies, attitudes, skills and competencies; but simultaneously by larger practice-arrangement bundles. These will be rooted in both home and host cultures and environments, and include discourses, power relations, identities, capitals, intersubjective stocks of knowledge, and language. The (re)production of identities through the encounters of Place Practice is also an important component of the model. It is argued that this synthesis offers a more holistic and sophisticated conceptualisation of mobile student experience, synthesising performative and practice-based intercultural encounters, the influence of "macro" structures and power relations, and the more rational and strategic actions of mobile students.

This raises some pertinent questions about the model's applicability beyond the mobility of tertiary education students, including other types of students, long-stay tourists, and those more usually classed as temporary migrants. Although younger age groups will be closely supervised, it is argued that the model is at least applicable to post-sixteen international student mobility in the secondary sector. Likewise, the model is considered applicable to

other types of educational tourist studying abroad, such as language students. With the exception of 'academic adaptation outcomes', it is also proposed that the model is salient to other groups of long-stay tourists and temporary migrants for whom adaptation, the formation of hybrid identities, and the development of intercultural competence is important. These groups include gap-year students, volunteers, temporary work migrants, backpackers, and lifestyle travellers.

Whilst mobile students are likely to engage in more conventional touristic activities at times during their stay, the model does not differentiate conceptually between these activities and day-to-day lived experiences. Although more typically touristic activities contribute to place practice, the creation of new binaries is not considered helpful. An important assumption is that the model applies to mobile students irrespective of their duration of study, which raises the thorny issue of temporality. According to accepted definitions, students spending more than one year in the host destination are not defined as tourists. However, their lived experiences are not considered qualitatively different from students who spend less than one year. Whilst few would argue that the lived experiences of mobile students are dramatically transformed on day 365, some might question whether these students should be the concern of tourism researchers. This issue strikes at the heart of the mobilities debate within tourism research, and hints at more fundamental implications for how tourism is conceptualised in the context of a proliferation of interrelated contemporary mobilities. This has been the subject of some debate within tourism studies, particularly following Hannam et al.'s (2006) ambitious - and to some, "programmatic" - agenda for mobilities research.

However, the ethos and potential of the mobilities turn is compelling. Even critics recognise the value of "multiplying the meanings, uses, functions and movements" of tourism (Doering & Duncan, 2016, p. 54). If we accept that contemporary mobility has increased exponentially - consisting of myriad forms - it becomes difficult to cling to conventional binaries and categories. There are clearly interrelationships between tourism, temporary migration, work travel, international study, transnationalism, disasporas, nomadism, lifestyle migration, and even (permanent) migration. As many of these contemporary mobilities also cross the borders of conventional disciplines, recent years have seen an eclectic group of tourism researchers (see Cohen & Cohen, 2019) unite around the need for both the de-differentiation of binaries and categories, and the development of interdisciplinary approaches. As Hannam, Butler and Paris (2014) argue, the mobilities turn actually places tourism at the core of social and cultural

life, rather than at the margins. It is argued that student mobility is one of the many mobilities that - rather than being beyond tourism - is an opportunity to extend the reach of tourism (Doering & Duncan, 2016).

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has reviewed how the experience of mobile students is conceptualised within tourism studies, the sojourner literature, and studies adopting a critical / mobilities perspective. The educational tourism literature has brought much needed attention to student mobility amongst tourism researchers, and the experiential learning cycle has been proposed for conceptualising educational tourism. However, the educational tourism literature contributes only a limited conceptualisation of the holistic experience of mobile students.

The much larger student sojourner literature offers conceptualisations of acculturative stress, acculturation, adjustment, adaptation, and intercultural competence. The literature conceptualises mobile student experience as a rational process of adaptation and change. However, there is an adherence to conceptualisations of cultures as bounded, homogeneous, and synonymous with national cultures. Acculturation and intercultural competence are conceptualised as rational strategies, and - in the absence of structures, power relations, and discourses - the burden of acculturation and adaptation rests solely on the mobile student. The student mobilities literature goes some way towards addressing these issues. By highlighting the formation of dynamic and contested hybrid cultures, the literature offers an alternative to fixed, linear acculturation strategies. Both critical acculturation and mobilities researchers illustrate how the experiences of mobile students are influenced by hybrid identities, multiple discourses, and power relations.

It is contemporary research on tourist experience, however, that engages with the ground-level performativity and practices of being a mobile student in a specific place. The literature on tourist experience contributes conceptualisations of power and discourse, performativity, and practice theories. Tourism research recognises the performative practices of being a mobile student, the formation of hybrid intercultural identities, and the influence of identities on ongoing intercultural interactions. Larger practice-arrangement bundles in both the home and host environment – often termed the “macro” environment – exert a considerable influence on the intercultural practices of mobile students. Yet, there is a pressing need to

focus on what is salient to mobile students in specific places and contexts, before "zooming out".

Whilst it is not intended to operationalise the Place Practice model in this paper, that is the aim of forthcoming projects. The author would welcome research on student mobility from a performative and practice-based perspective, drawing upon the Place Practice model. There is particularly a need for emic approaches that capture the salient lived experiences of mobile students in specific contexts. The mobilities turn, which has gained traction in both tourism and student mobility research, appears to provide the most vociferous call to transcend both ontological and disciplinary boundaries in order to better understand phenomena such as student mobility. However, this is also a common aim of emergent conceptual perspectives in tourism research, including performativity research, Actor-Network Theory, and practice theories (see Cohen & Cohen, 2019).

As de Souza Bispo (2016, p. 71) argues, none of these approaches disregards or refutes the other, as they all focus on activity, doing, action, and performance, conceptualising tourism as a "continuously negotiated entity". In common with these theoretical perspectives, this paper calls for interdisciplinary work focussing on contemporary mobilities, and a de-differentiation of conventional social domains. Student mobility is an exemplar of the need to move beyond traditional definitions and subject boundaries, and provide a more holistic understanding of contemporary real-world mobilities. It is hoped that future research on student mobility will give mobile students a voice, and attempt to understand their lived realties of this complex polyadic amalgam. Since mobile students around the world enter into transformative life events, whilst also enriching the lives of others, they deserve to be understood as whole people. Hopefully, within this endeavour there will be a place for - and the place of - tourism.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S. (1975). The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15(4), 13–23.

Arasaratnam, L. A. (2016). Intercultural Competence. In Oxford research encyclopaedia of communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J. L. (1978). How to do things with words, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1982). Dialogic imagination: Four essays (New Edition). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Speech genres and other late essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bamberger, A., Morris, P., & Yemini, M. (2019). Neoliberalism, internationalisation and higher education: Connections, contradictions and alternatives. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 40(2), 203-216.

Barnes, T. J., & Duncan, J. S. (2013). Writing worlds: Discourse, text and metaphor in the representation of landscape. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bennett, M. (1986). A developmental approach to training intercultural sensitivity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10(2), 179-186.

Bennett, M. (2017). Development model of intercultural sensitivity. In Y. Kim (Ed.) International encyclopaedia of intercultural communication. New York: Wiley.

Berry, J. W. (1995). Psychology of acculturation. In N. R. Goldberger & J. B. Veroff (Eds.), The culture and psychology reader (pp. 457-488). New York: New York University Press.

Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29, 697–712.

Berry, J. W. (2006). Stress Perspectives on Acculturation. In D. L Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology (pp. 43-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2009). Theorizing identity in transnational and diaspora cultures: A critical approach to acculturation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 140-149.

Borgerson, J. (2005). Judith Butler: on organizing subjectivities. The Sociological Review, 53, 63-79.

Borgerson, J., & Schroeder, J. E. (2002). Ethical issues of global marketing: Avoiding bad faith in visual representation. European Journal of Marketing, 36(5/6), 570-594.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le capital social: notes provisoires. Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, 31(1), 2-3.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). An invitation to reflexive sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brooks, R., & Waters, J. (2011). Student mobilities, migration, and the internationalisation of higher education. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, L. (2009). The transformative power of the international sojourn: An ethnographic study of the international student experience. Annals of Tourism Research, 36(3), 502-521.

Brown, L. (2013). Tourism: A Catalyst for Existential Authenticity. Annals of Tourism Research, 40, 176-190.

Brown, L., & Holloway, I. (2008). The adjustment journey of international postgraduate students at an English university: An ethnographic study. Journal of Research in International Education, 7(2), 232-249.

Butler, J. (1993). Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of *'sex'*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). Changing the subject: Judith Butler's politics of radical resignification. In S. Salih & J. Butler (Eds.), The Judith Butler reader. Oxford: Blackwell.

Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, precarity and sexual politics. AIBR: Revista de Antropologia Iberoamericana, 4(3), 321-336.

Cheong, S-M., & Miller, M. L. (2000). Tourism and Power: a Foucaultian observation. Annals of Tourism Research, 27(2), 371-390.

Chien, Y-Y. G. (2018). After six decades: Applying the u-curve hypothesis to the adjustment of international postgraduate students. Journal of Research in International Education 2016, 15(1), 32-51.

Chirkov, V. (2009a) Summary of the criticism and of the potential ways to improve acculturation psychology. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 177-180.

Chirkov, V. (2009b) Critical psychology of acculturation: What do we study and how do we study it, when we investigate acculturation? International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 94-105.

Chiu, C-Y., Loner, W. J., Matsumoto, D., & Ward, C. (2013). Cross-cultural competence: Theory, research, and application. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44(6), 843-848.

Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. A. (2012). Current sociological theories and issues in tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 39(4), 2177-2202.

Cohen, S. A., & Cohen, E. (2019). New directions in the sociology of tourism. Current Issues in Tourism, 22(2), 153-172.

Collier, M. J. (2015). Intercultural communication competence: Continuing challenges and critical directions. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 48, 9-11.

Collins, F. L. (2018). Desire as a theory for migration studies: Temporality, assemblage and becoming in the narratives of migrants. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44(6), 964-980.

Cresswell, J. (2009). Towards a post-critical praxis: Intentional states and recommendations for change in acculturation psychology. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 162-172.

Crouch, D. (2010). The perpetual performance and emergence in heritage. In E. Waterton & S. Watson, Culture, Heritage, and Representation: perspectives on visuality and the past (pp. 57-72). Farnham: Ashgate.

de Souza Bispo, M. (2016). Tourism as practice. Annals of Tourism Research, 61, 170-179.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalisation. Journal of Studies in International Education, 10(3), 241-266.

Deardorff, D. K., & Arasaratnam-Smith, L. A. (Eds.). (2017). Intercultural competence in higher education: International approaches, assessment and application. Abingdon: Routledge.

Doering, A., & Duncan, T. (2016). Mobilities for tourism studies and "beyond": A polemic. Tourism Analysis, 21(1), 47-59.

Dickerson, S., & Ozden, C. (2018). Diaspora engagement and return migration policies. In A. Triandafyllidou (Ed.), Handbook of migration and globalisation (pp. 206 – 225). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Edensor, T. (2001). Performing tourism, staging tourism: (Re)producing tourist space and practice. Tourist Studies, 1(1), 59-81.

Edensor, T. (2007). Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism. Social & Cultural Geography, 8(2), 199-215.

Edensor, T. (Ed.). (2012). Geographies of rhythm: nature, place, mobilities and bodies. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

European Commission, (2018). Erasmus+ Annual Report 2017. Luxemburg: Publications Office of the European Commission.

Falk, J. H., Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Benckendorff, P. (2012). Travel and learning: A neglected tourism research area. Annals of Tourism Research, 39(2), 908-927.

Fitzpatrick, F. (2017). Taking the “culture” out of “culture shock” – a critical review of literature on cross-cultural adjustment in international relocation. Critical Perspectives on International Business, 13(4), 278-296.

Foucault, M. (1969). The archaeology of knowledge. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. London: Vintage.

Furnham, A. (1984). Tourism and culture shock. Annals of Tourism Research, 11(1), 41-57.

Furnham, A. (2019). Culture shock: A review of the literature for practitioners. Psychology, 10, 1832-1855.

Furnham, A., & Bochner, S. (1986). Culture Shock. Psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments. London: Methuen.

Gray, K., & Savicki, V. (2015). Study abroad re-entry: Behaviour, affect and cultural distance. Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 26, 264-278.

Griffith, R. L., Wolfeld, L., Armon, B. K., Rios, J., & Liu, O. L. (2016). Assessing intercultural competence in higher education. ETS Research Report Series, 16-25.

Haldrup, M., & Larsen, J. (2009). Tourism, performance and the everyday: Consuming the Orient. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. Mobilities, 1(1), 1-22.

Hannam, K., Butler, G., & Paris, C. M. (2014). Developments and key issues in tourism mobilities. Annals of Tourism Research, 44, 171-185.

Harwood, S., & El-Manstrly, D. (2012). The performativity turn in tourism. University of Edinburgh Business School Working Paper Series, 12(5), 1-18.

Holliday, A. (2010). Intercultural communication & ideology: Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hottola, P. (2004). Culture confusion: Intercultural adaptation in tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 31(2), 447-466.

IIE (2019). Open doors report on international educational exchange. Washington D.C.: Institute of International Education.

International Organisation for Migration (2020). Migration data portal, “Types of migration: International students”. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/international-students

ISC Research (2018). Global report on the international schools market. Oxfordshire: ISC Research.

Jenks, C., Bhatia, A., & Lou, J. (2013). The discourse of culture and identity in national and transnational contexts. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experience as the source of learning and development. Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Lamers, M., Van der Duim, R., & Spaargaren, G. (2017). The relevance of practice theories for tourism research. Annals of Tourism Research, 62, 54-63.

Larsen, J. (2012). Performance, space and tourism. In J. Wilson (Ed.), The Routledge handbook of tourism geographies (pp. 67-73). Abingdon: Routledge.

Leung, K., Ang, S., & Tan, M. L. (2014). Intercultural competence. Annual review of organisational psychology. Organisational Behaviour, 1(1), 489-519.

Marginson, S. (2014). Student self-formation in international education. Journal of Studies in International Education, 18(1), 6-22.

Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2012). Ideas for intercultural education. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, J. N. (2015). Revisiting intercultural communication competence: where to go from here. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48, 6-8.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2015). Reconsidering intercultural (communication) competence in the workplace: A dialectical approach. Language and Intercultural Communication, 15(1), 13-28.

Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 44(6), 849-873.

McGladdery, C. A., & Lubbe, B. A. (2017). Rethinking educational tourism: proposing a new model and future directions. Tourism Review, 72(3), 319-329.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of Perception. London: Routledge.

Minca, C., & Oakes, T. (2006). Introduction: traveling paradoxes. In C. Minca, & T. Oakes (Eds.), Travels in paradox: remapping tourism (pp. 11-28). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Moufakkir, O. (2013). Culture shock, what culture shock? Conceptualizing culture unrest in intercultural tourism and assessing its effect on tourists' perceptions and travel propensity. Tourist Studies, 13(3), 322–340.

Nicolini, D. (2012). Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pernecky, T., & Jamal, T. (2010). (Hermeneutic) phenomenology in tourism studies. Annals of Tourism Research, 37(4), 1055-1075.

Ploner, J. (2017). Resilience, moorings and international student mobilities - Exploring biographical narratives of social science students in the UK, Mobilities, 12(3), 425-444.

Quacquarelli Symonds (2019). Growth of international student numbers in higher education. Retrieved on April 17, 2020 from QS Website: https://www.qs.com/growth-international-students-higher-education/

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. European Journal of Social Theory, 5(2), 243-263.

Ritchie, B. W., Carr, N., & Cooper, C. P. (2003). Managing Educational Tourism. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 30(3), 253-268.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2009). Globalizing Education Policy. Abingdon: Routledge.

Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 106-123.

Schartner, A. & Young, T.J. (2016). Towards an integrated conceptual model of international student adjustment and adaptation, European Journal of Higher Education, 6(4), 372-386.

Schatzki, T. R. (2012). A primer on practices: Theory and research. In J. Higgs, R. Barnett, S. Billett, M. Hutchings, & F. Trede (Eds.), Practice-Based Education (pp. 13-26). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Schutz, A. (1970). Reflections on the problem of relevance. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schutz, A., & Luckmann, T. (1973). The structures of the life-world (Vol. 1). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14(4), 449-464.

Selby, M. (2003). Understanding Urban Tourism: image, culture, experience. London: I.B. Tauris.

Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). The dynamics of social practice: Everyday life and how it changes. London: Sage.

Smith, R. A., & Khawaja, N. G. (2011). A review of the acculturation experiences of international students. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35, 699-713.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), The Sage Handbook of Intercultural competence (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Steyn, M., & Reygan, F. (2017). New competencies for intercultural communication: Power, privilege, and the decolonisation of higher education in South Africa. In D. K. Deardorff & L. A. Arasaratnam-Smith (Eds.) Intercultural competence in higher education: International approaches, assessment and application (pp. 83-94). Abingdon: Routledge.

Tardif-Williams, C. Y., & Fisher, L. (2009). Clarifying the link between acculturation experiences and parent-child relationships among families in cultural transition: The promise of contemporary critiques of acculturation psychology. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33(2), 150-161.

Teichler, U. (2017). Internationalisation trends in higher education and the changing role of international student mobility. Journal of International Mobility, 1(5) 177-216.

Thrift, N., & Dewsbury, J. D. (2000). Dead geographies - and how to make them live. Environment and planning D: Society and Space, 18(4), 411-432.

UNESCO, OECD, & Eurostat (2015). UOE Data Collection on Formal Education: manual on concepts, definitions and classifications. Montreal, Paris, Luxembourg: UNESCO-UIS/OECD/ Eurostat.

UNWTO (2010). International recommendations for tourism Statistics 2008. New York: UNWTO.

UNWTO (2019). *UNWTO tourism definitions*. Madrid: UNWTO.

Urry, J. (1990). The tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary societies. London: Sage.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). The Tourist Gaze 3.0. London: Sage.

UUKi (2019). Gone International: report on the 2016/17 graduating cohort. London: Universities UK International.

Valtonen, A., Viejola, S. (2011). Sleep in Tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 38(1), 175-193.

Wang, Y., and Kulich, S. J. (2017). Does context count? Developing and assessing intercultural competence through interview-and model-based domestic course design in China. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48, 38-57.

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). The psychology of culture shock. Abingdon: Routledge.

Wassler, P., & Kirillova, K. (2019). Hell is other people? An existential-phenomenological analysis of the local gaze in tourism. Tourism Management, 71, 116-126.

Wight, A. C. (2018). Putting Foucault to work in tourism research. International Journal of Tourism Research, 21(1), 122-133.

Yi, J. K., Lin, J. C. G., & Kishimoto, Y. (2003). Utilization of counselling services by international students. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 30(4), 333-342.

Young, J. J., & Schartner, A. (2014). The effects of cross-cultural communication education on international students' adjustment and adaptation, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35(6), 547-562.

Zhang, J., & Goodson, P. (2011). Predictors of international students' psycho-social adjustment to life in the United States: A systematic review. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 35, 139-162.

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 33(1), 63-75.