The effect of tourism when choosing where to study abroad

*A study on exchange students’ destination choice*
Abstract
This thesis has established exchange students as a particular group of tourists and a segment in their own right. The purpose of the study was to find out to what extent a study abroad destination’s role as a tourism destination affects exchange students when they choose where to study abroad. The study was conducted through an online survey answered by exchange students of multiple nationalities and study abroad destinations. The study found that although there were clear individual differences in the degree of motivation, tourism affects the choice of study abroad destination to a great extent and the vast majority of exchange students choose to study in what they view as a tourism destination.

Keywords
exchange students, destination choice, study abroad destination, academic tourism
Table of content

1 Introduction ________________________________________________ 3
  1.1 Background ______________________________________________ 3
  1.2 Student Mobility __________________________________________ 3
  1.3 Student exchange __________________________________________ 5
  1.4 Exchange students as tourists ________________________________ 7
  1.5 Choosing a study abroad destination __________________________ 8
  1.6 Study question ____________________________________________ 9
  1.7 Purpose __________________________________________________ 9

2 Method _____________________________________________________ 9
  2.1 Research approach __________________________________________ 9
  2.2 Choice of method __________________________________________ 10
  2.3 Survey creation ____________________________________________ 11
  2.4 Sampling __________________________________________________ 12
    2.4.1 Convenience sampling ___________________________________ 12
    2.4.2 Snowball sampling _______________________________________ 13
    2.4.3 Facebook as a sampling platform ___________________________ 13
  2.5 Survey distribution and collection of data ________________________ 15
  2.6 Analysis __________________________________________________ 15
  2.7 Ethical considerations _______________________________________ 15
  2.8 Methodological considerations _________________________________ 16

3 Theoretical framework _________________________________________ 16
  3.1 Previous Research __________________________________________ 16
  3.2 Decision-making process & push and pull factors ________________ 17
  3.3 Links between study and travel ________________________________ 18
  3.4 Framework for tourism’s effect on destination choice ___________ 21

4 Tourism’s effect on study abroad destination _______________________ 21
  4.1 Respondent demographics and study abroad destination ___________ 21
  4.2 Is the study destination a tourism destination? _________________ 23
  4.3 The effect of tourism opportunities on the choice of study abroad destination __________ 26
  4.4 Travel in connection with studying abroad _______________________ 30
  4.5 Higher education institutions providing tourism information _______ 32

5 Conclusions __________________________________________________ 33

6 References __________________________________________________ 35

7 Appendixes ___________________________________________________ I
  7.1 Appendix A: Survey __________________________________________ I
  7.2 Appendix B: Figures _________________________________________ V
1 Introduction
This chapter provides a context for the study by explaining the background of student mobility and student exchange. It also explains the ambiguity of international students’ roles as tourists, problematises the choice of a study abroad destination and includes the study question and the purpose of the study.

1.1 Background
The growing student population in the world in recent years is a demographic change that has received little attention in the tourism literature (Babin & Kim 2001; Glover 2011a; Ritchie 2003). Students have a high tendency to travel and are encouraged to do so by their university environment, through the presence of on-campus travel agencies, society’s view of the student lifestyle and peer pressure to live up to this travel-oriented image of students (Ritchie 2003). However, the student population has until recently been ignored in tourism research, despite its size and growth, because students were assumed to have a low market value (Babin & Kim 2001; Ritchie 2003).

1.2 Student Mobility
The last few decades have seen not only an increase of students in general but also a dramatic increase in the mobility of higher education students, where more and more students are willing to travel abroad for their higher education studies (Glover 2011b; Rodríguez et al. 2012). That international travel has become more convenient, accessible and affordable, has led to an increase of the number of students who are pursuing all or part of their higher education abroad (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008). It has been estimated that as much as 20 % of all international travelers are students (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008; Ritchie 2003), meaning tourism research can no longer ignore students because of their perceived low market value or unpredictability.

From 0.8 million international students in 1975 (OECD 2014), to 2.9 million students studying outside their home countries in the year of 2007-2008 (Lee 2014), increasing until 2012 with a total of 4.5 million students studying outside their country of citizenship, and this number is only predicted to increase in the upcoming years (OECD 2014). The pace of student mobility growth could slow because of the current economic climate with tighter budgets for individuals and a decreasing support for scholarships and grants, but on the other hand, limited job opportunities in students’ home countries could increase the attractiveness of studying abroad in order to become more
competitive on the labour market, and thus boost student mobility (OECD 2014). Despite the size and growth potential of international students, they are a segment whose tourism impacts have received limited attention in research though (Llewellyn & McCabe 2008).

The main reason for students studying abroad is education, but they can also be motivated by wanting to travel prior to, during or after the completion of their studies (Weaver 2003 in Cerdeira Bento 2014) and tourism and travelling have been established to play an important role for international students’ experience abroad (Cerdeira Bento 2014). The large number of international students that are already present within the country for an extended period is also a potentially attractive and accessible market for tourism destination authorities (Gardiner et al. 2013).

International students’ travelling is a part of several different types of tourism, such as educational tourism, youth tourism and cultural tourism (Rodríguez et al. 2012; Martínez-Roget et al. 2013), but even so international students have their own specific characteristics and constitute a market segment of their own (Cerdeira Bento 2014; Glover 2011a; Martínez-Roget et al. 2013; Michael et al. 2003; Rodríguez et al. 2012).

Glover’s (2011a) study in Australia showed that international students’ trip characteristics were also different from that of domestic students and that they did not adopt the travel behaviour of domestic students, regardless of the amount of time they had spent in the country. Although Rodríguez et al. (2012) and Martínez-Roget et al. (2013) argue that international students have consumer patterns which are closer to those of residents than those of conventional tourists. Even though international students’ tourism is its own type of tourism, it contains sub-groups and studies by Gardiner et al. (2013) and Michael et al. (2003) have found that there are nationality- and region-based differences among international students and in their travel behaviours.

Something that is characteristic for the tourism of international students is their capacity to generate new visits through repeat visits, friends and relatives coming to visit (VFR) and to advocate for the host destination (Cerdeira Bento 2014; Davidson et al. 2010; Gardiner et al. 2013; Martínez-Roget et al. 2013; Rodríguez et al. 2012). Students are
also considered to have a lot of free time for potential travel, particularly during breaks (Carr 2003 in Glover 2011; Babin & Kim 2001) but lack of time has also been identified as significant inhibitor to travel among international students (Gardiner et al. 2013; Davidson et al. 2010).

1.3 Student exchange
Among studies on international students, most have focused on students who choose to get the entireness of their higher education abroad and little research have been made on students who study abroad for only part of their higher education, through student exchange programs (Davidson et al. 2010; Michael et al. 2003).

Rodriguez et al. (2012) coined the term “international academic tourism” for students who stay in higher education institutions in places outside their usual environment for a period of less than one year where the main objective is to complete degree-level studies. In this study, this kind of students involved in international academic tourism will be called “exchange students”. Rodríguez et al.’s study also included students attending shorter language courses at the host university in addition to exchange students but this type of students will not be a part of this study.

Exchange students study abroad through agreements between different higher education institutions and programs for student mobility, usually for a period of one semester or one year (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008). These student mobility agreements are two-way movements of students based on reciprocity, where the universities are simultaneously hosting and sending students and try to achieve a balance between the number of outbound and inbound students (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008). The study abroad destinations an exchange student has to choose from is limited by the agreements the host university has with institutions of higher education in other countries. The agreements can also be limited to certain fields of study. This constraint has led to Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) and Llewellyn-Smith and McCabe (2008) to identify “exchange partnerships” as the most important criterion for choosing a host university.

The largest program for student mobility is the European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (Erasmus) which during the period from 1987/88 to
2012/13 reached 3 million mobile students (European Commission 2014). The new Erasmus+ program will run from 2014 to 2020 and will provide grants for 4 million people, of which 2 million will be higher education students. The target for the European Union (EU) is to have an overall student mobility of at least 20% by 2020, which is a big increase from the current 10% of EU students who study or train abroad.

Apart from the Erasmus programme, there are other student mobility programs such as Nordplus for the Nordic and Baltic countries, Central European Exchange Program for University Studies (CEEPUS) focusing on central and eastern Europe, global programs like the USA-based consortia International Student Exchange Programs (ISEP) and University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC), as well as the universities’ own bilateral and interinstitutional agreements and other international university cooperations.

The predicted increase in student mobility constitutes a very large potential for tourism and the lack of research done on international students, and exchange students in particular, makes it a relevant phenomenon to study. This study will therefore focus on exchange students as a unique group of mobile international students and as a market segment of their own and exchange students will be defined as: students who move abroad, for a period of maximum 1 year, in order to complete their higher education studies.

Both international and exchange students are motivated to travel while studying abroad, in order to better understand the host country and its culture and people (Babin & Kim 2001; Hsu & Hung 1996). Many students lack a desire or ability to stay in the host country beyond their time at the higher education institution, which heightens the motivation to travel and leads to many students wanting to see as much of the country as possible during their studies abroad (Babin & Kim 2001). They have a tendency to explore the country in which they are studying abroad before returning home (Gardiner et al. 2013). As exchange students stay in the host country for a shorter time, compared to international students who study abroad for the entirety of their degree, they might travel more to make up for the limited time.
The tourism sector has realized the potential of international students with the birth and expansion of travel agencies targeting this group in particular, such as STA Travels and Kilroy Travels, and services like the International Student Identity Card (ISIC) providing benefits and discounts to international students. Recently companies have taken advantage of the increase in international academic tourism and niched travel opportunities for exchange students in particular have emerged, by for example Timetravels (http://www.aikamatkat.fi/) and Scanbalt Experience (http://www.scanbaltextperience.com) in Northern Europe.

1.4 Exchange students as tourists
International students may not see each other as tourists according to Ritchie (2003) who claims that educational tourists, who encompass university students studying abroad, might only see themselves as students with primarily education-related motivations and not as tourists. He says however that even though they may not view themselves as tourists, they have clear tourism impacts and their presence in the host country has implications for regional development (Ritchie 2003). Not only the students themselves but also the tourism industry might not view them as a tourism segment or a viable tourism market, leading to some impacts and opportunities not being fully realised or leveraged by tourism industry (Ritchie 2003).

According to Smith (2010) tourism is something you do when you travel away from where you normally live. This causes problems when it comes to international students, who have moved to temporarily live and study in another country. Researching international students in tourism is therefore complicated by the fact that they can be regarded as either domestic or international tourists, depending on their consecutive length of stay in the host country (Glover 2011a).

The World Tourism Organization’s (UNWTO) definition of tourism is: the activity of people temporarily away from their usual environment for a period not exceeding 1 year, and this definition has been accepted by most national statistical offices when it comes to collecting and reporting on the number of international tourists (Smith 2010). Students in long-term programmes that exceeds 1 year are therefore not considered as tourists according to this definition. As exchange students spend less than 1 year
studying abroad, the definition from UNWTO applies and will be the one used in this study.

Following UNWTO’s definition of tourism and previous research on student exchange, exchange students can clearly be defined as a type of tourists, though some questions still remain; while studying abroad, are the students engaged in international or domestic tourism? Is the study abroad destination outside the students’ usual environment or not, considering the destination is their new place of residence, albeit temporarily? When engaging in touristic and other activities at their study abroad destination, are they home or away, domestic or international?

1.5 Choosing a study abroad destination
Some studies have indicated the touristic aspects of studying abroad can be a factor when students choose their study abroad destination; Lee (2014) found that the climate of the destination and if the destination was viewed as an exciting place to live or not had an effect on their choice, and Rodríguez et al. (2012) found that the University of Santiago de Compostela was an attractive higher education institution for international students partly because of the city’s position as a well-known tourism destination. Peel (2004 in Glover 2011b) found that opportunities for travel played an important role when students from the United States choose to study abroad in Australia for their student exchange.

There have also been studies in Australia that have found that a desire to travel is the primary reason that students study abroad and a crucial factor influencing if the student chooses to do a student exchange at all (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) or even that the student exchange is only an excuse to travel (Jarvis & Peel 2008 in Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008). Ritchie (2003) on the other hand claims that education is the primary reason that exchange students study abroad.

What these studies have in common is that they are limited to a single place; a university, a city or a region, and the students in the research, though differing from each other in a lot of ways, have all chosen to study at this particular place. Tourism as a possible factor for influencing the choice has been identified with varying degrees of importance but with a limited focus, not directed at exchange students as a global
tourism segment. There have been no studies on exchange students with a more global perspective, which is why this study will encompass as wide a geographic area as possible, moving away from the regional focus and exploring what motivates exchange students as a group.

That choosing a destination for studying abroad is related to tourism is clear but the extent of the effect a place as a tourism destination has on this choice is unclear and inconsistent in the research of exchange students. This study will thus be based on the assumption that the study abroad destinations’ role as tourism destinations has an effect on the exchange students’ choice of study abroad destination and the question this study aims to answer is:

1.6 Study question

- To what extent is exchange students’ choice of study abroad destination affected by the place as a tourism destination?

1.7 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to find out to what extent a study abroad destination’s role as a tourism destination affects exchange students when they choose where to study abroad.

2 Method

This chapter tells the study’s research approach, what method was used and why, explains the sampling methods used, how the survey was created, as well as how the survey was distributed and how the data was collected and analysed. It also includes ethical and methodological considerations.

2.1 Research approach

The study focuses on a study abroad destination as a tourism destination and to what extent it affects the exchange students’ choice. How the students view the destination in their mind and their awareness of it and their own choice is in focus, not the physical characteristics of the destination, nor its position as a tourism destination in relation to other destinations, nor the number of tourists visiting the place.
2.2 Choice of method
To answer the question of to what extent an exchange student’s choice of study abroad destination is affected by the place as a tourism destination, a survey was chosen as the most appropriate research method. Surveys are useful when it comes to collecting data from a large number of people and from a wide geographic area (Smith 2010) which was the aim of this study in order to gather data that was not only contained to a single region or group, but encompassed respondents of various nationalities and localities.

Other methods, such as interviews and grounded theory, were considered but were deemed unsuitable due to their inability to reach a large enough number of respondents or reach a geographically wide enough area. Other studies on international and exchange students’ motivation have also used surveys as a successful research method (Cerdeira Bento 2014; Glover 2011b; Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008; Mazzarol & Soutar 2002; Michael et al. 2003).

The survey was self-completing, meaning respondents answered the survey questions themselves. Self-completing surveys can be the only practicable approach when the people in the study are widely scattered geographically (Veal 2011) as was the case in this study. They are also cheaper and quicker to administer and are without interviewer effects but have lower response rates than surveys completed by an interviewer (Bryman & Bell 2011; Veal 2011).

To reach as many respondents as possible, as well as a diverse range of nationalities and geographical locations, the survey was web-based. Doing an web-based survey tends to generate a low response rate (Bryman 2012; Smith 2010) but a large sample size can be more easily achieved than with other forms of surveys. It is also cheaper to distribute and makes data collection quicker (Bryman 2012; Robson 2011). Doing a web-based survey also means that respondents can complete it on their own schedule but there is no opportunity to clarify eventual respondent confusion (Smith 2010).

A web-based survey is limited to those who have access to the internet and feel comfortable answering surveys online (Smith 2010) and the response rate can be affected by respondents’ limited digital literacy (Hill et al. 2014). Students however, are
used to computers and the internet and doing a web-based survey was deemed as not having any negative impact on the response rate.

2.3 Survey creation
The survey was created using the Google forms survey tool, which enabled answers to be logged instantly and automatically downloaded to a Google spreadsheet. The advantages of using an online survey tool are that it can be designed to skip automatically to the next appropriate question after a filter question, the number of questions to appear at the same time can be controlled, and answers can be automatically downloaded to a database that can be retrieved once the data collection is complete, without the need for coding, which saves time and reduces the risk of errors (Bryman 2012).

The survey contained both closed-ended and open-ended questions, though the majority of the questions were closed-ended in order to make it easier for respondents to answer the survey and simplify the data analysis. A pilot survey with a small number of respondents was conducted, after which some questions were added, removed and reworded.

The survey consisted of 17 questions, split in 7 parts. The first part was a filter question to identify those eligible for the study, asking if the respondent were currently or had been on a student exchange at a higher education institution. This ensured that people who had been on other types of educational exchanges or international students who had not been exchange students did not answer the rest of the questions.

The second part of the survey asked about demographic information and about the destination where the student exchange is taking or has taken place. Questions about gender and nationality were asked in order to enable identifying possible gender or nationality bias among the respondents. The country, region and city of the student exchange were likewise asked about in order to make sure if there was a destination bias in the answers.

The third part asked about the respondents’ image of the study abroad destination, country, region and city, as a tourism destination. The fourth part of the survey was a
question with a 4-point ordered category scale, asking the respondent how much tourism opportunities affected their choice of study abroad destination. This further developed in the fifth part, where the importance of tourism opportunities in the host country, region, city and neighbouring countries were asked about.

The sixth part asked about travelling prior to and upon completion of the student exchange and if and how much this affected the choice of study abroad destination, and the seventh part questioned if the website of their study abroad higher education institution had information about tourism opportunities.

2.4 Sampling
The population in the study is exchange students who have made the choice to study abroad which makes both current and former exchange students eligible for the study. In order to gather information about them a sample of the population was studied.

2.4.1 Convenience sampling
The study used convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling that means that the respondents are chosen because of their accessibility, because they are available to the researcher (Bryman & Bell 2011; Smith 2010).

A convenience sample may not representative of a population and the validity of generalisations made from the data gathered can therefore not be guaranteed (Bryman & Bell 2011). This means that definite conclusions are hard to draw but the findings can still be relevant as a springboard for further research and for forging links with existing findings in the research area (Bryman & Bell 2011). As such, it is difficult for this study to make universal generalisations for all exchange students, but it can be an exploration of an under-researched area in tourism, a starting point for future research, and a means to identifying links with previous research being done on exchange students. A convenience sample was chosen because it presented the opportunity to reach a large number of respondents and allowed for the author to avoid the difficulties and costs that probability sampling involves.
2.4.2 Snowball sampling
To increase the number of respondents the survey also made use of virtual snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is a non-probability sampling method that begins small and grows over time by letting a respondent identify other respondents of the population being studied (Bryman & Bell 2011; Smith 2010). It can help gain access to people who would otherwise never have been identified and is useful for reaching a sample of a population that can be hard to gain access to (Smith 2010).

After completing the survey the respondents were asked to spread the survey to other current or former exchange students that they might know. This is believed to have increased the total number of survey responses but the effect of the snowball sampling is not certain. The online nature of the survey makes it impossible to know how many respondents were in the original convenience sampling and how many were added by the snowball effect.

2.4.3 Facebook as a sampling platform
The survey was distributed online on the social medium Facebook. Using social media for surveys is useful for identifying a population that is hard to reach and for expanding the sample size (Gregori & Baltar 2013). This study’s use of Facebook allowed the author to reach people that could not have been reached in another way. Facebook was chosen as the distribution platform because of its large amount of members globally (Gregori & Baltar 2013) which creates access to respondents of multiple nationalities and geographical locations.

Another reason was that Facebook hosts virtual communities of people who share interests (Hill et al. 2014) and this simplifies the process of finding the target population, allowing identification of groups of exchange students instead of individuals. The author identified Facebook groups containing samples of the research population by searching for Erasmus Student Network (ESN) internal groups, which are aimed at or containing current and former exchange students and the link to the survey was then posted in Facebook groups. ESN is an international student organization that supports student exchange and international students on a voluntary basis (ESN http://www.esn.org).
How many of the members of the communities chosen that actually were or had been exchange students and thereby potential respondents is unknown however. The unknown number of potential respondents reached means that it is impossible to know the response rate of the survey. This makes drawing definite conclusions difficult but was nevertheless chosen as the best method of distribution for this study because of the large number of potential respondents that were reached.

The survey is limited to people who have both a Facebook account and is a member of a group identified by the author as containing the target population. However, students tend to be relatively young and younger people use Facebook in greater proportions, with 24% of 18-24 year olds and 23% of 25-34 year olds in the United States having a Facebook account (Hill et al. 2014).

Using Facebook as the platform for distributing the survey minimises problems with the survey being perceived as “spam”, which is often a problem with surveys distributed by e-mail that leads to a lower response rate (Gregori & Baltar 2013). Another advantage of using social media, and Facebook in particular, for surveys is the possibility and ease of expanding the sample by virtual snowball sampling (Gregori & Baltar 2013), which was utilized in this study in order to increase the sample size.

Furthermore, because most people use Facebook during their free time it increases the level of participation, the quality of the information and the possibility of respondents answering the survey the first time they access it (Gregori & Baltar 2013). When doing an online survey there is an issue of how true the information in the respondents’ answers is but previous research has argued that information shared by individuals on Facebook is high in quality (Gregori & Baltar 2013). The possibility of overlap existed, as a person may be a member of more than one of the communities in which the survey link was posted or might come in contact with the survey more than once through the snowball effect. This constituted a risk of a single person answering the survey multiple times, which would lead to data error. To minimize the risk of such errors the respondents were asked to answer the survey once only.
2.5 Survey distribution and collection of data
The survey link was active for 5 days after being distributed in the Facebook groups after which the survey was closed and no more data collected. A total of 157 respondents answered the survey, of which 151 had been on a student exchange at a higher education institution and were eligible for the study. The sample size should allow for a ratio of at least 1:4 or 1:5, that is 4 or 5 respondents per question (Smith 2010). With 157 responses to 17 questions, the ratio is about 1:9, with 9 respondents per question, meaning this survey exceeded the recommended minimum ratio and almost reached the more conservative ratio of 1:10 that is also sometimes used (Smith 2010). A tight time frame for data collection may constrain the sample size (Smith 2010) but in this case the number of respondents is deemed satisfactory.

2.6 Analysis
To analyse the data collected through the online survey, the author used a google spreadsheet to which the data had been automatically downloaded. The answers to each question were sorted into their respective answer categories and the number of answers for each answer alternative, the percentage of each alternative against the total number of answers as well as the non-response rate for each question was calculated. Furthermore, connections, patterns and disparities between questions were identified by analysing more than one survey question at a time and the survey answers as a whole.

2.7 Ethical considerations
In this study ethical considerations were made to ensure that the respondents’ participation in the survey was voluntary and that they remained anonymous. At the beginning of the survey the respondents were informed of the purpose of the survey, how their answers would be used and that their answers would not be used for any other purpose than that which was stated. They were also informed that participation in the survey was strictly optional and that they could choose not to participate in the survey at all, as well as that they were free to stop answering questions at any point in the survey. That their answers were to be confidential was guaranteed and the survey contained no questions that might identify a single individual.

These considerations ensured that the survey followed the ethical guidelines of the Swedish research council. The ethical guidelines of the Swedish research council have an informational requirement, where those affected should know about their
participation in the study, and a requirement of consent, where the participants should have the freedom to decide if, how and how long to take part in the study (Markham & Baym 2009). In order to create a further sense of safety for the respondents, they were also informed that their answers would be disposed of after the study had finished.

2.8 Methodological considerations
Because the survey was conducted after the students’ study abroad destination had been chosen, their answers might be affected by the outcome of the decision, rather than the decision itself (Eder et al. 2010). Their answers may be influenced by positive or negative events during the study period, there can be post-purchase dissonance, or they might try to justify their decision (Llewellyn & McCabe 2008). A study made closer to the date of choosing a study abroad destination might generate more reliable results.

3 Theoretical framework
This chapter presents previous research done on international and exchange students and presents theories on the decision-making process, the pull and push factors of the study abroad decision and links between education and travel in the form of a conceptual framework.

3.1 Previous Research
Previous tourism research on international students have focused on travel behaviour and characteristics (Babin & Kim 2001, Gardiner et al. 2013; Glover 2011a; Hsu & Sung 1996; Michael et al. 2003; Davidson et al. 2010), destination image (Glover 2011b), and although research on international students’ destination choice have been done in the international education field, they have failed to take tourism into account (Cubillo et al. 2006; Lee 2014) or only touched upon it indirectly (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002). Research in the tourism field however has recently touched upon international students’ destination choice (Eder et al. 2010; Glover 2011b).

Research on exchange students has dealt with the tourism impact (Martínez-Roget et al. 2013) and tourism demand (Cerdeira Bento 2014; Rodríguez et al. 2012) and although there has been research done one the destination choice (Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) the literature tends to focus on the higher education institution in itself and disregarding the influence of the country choice when it comes to student’s decision-making process (Cubillo et al. 2006).
Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) found that “It was a good opportunity to travel” was the second most important reason for studying abroad among the students in their study on exchange students, with the most important factor being “It was a good opportunity to live in another culture” and the third most important being “I liked the country my exchange program was located in”. This corresponds with the study by Llewellyn-Smith and McCabe (2008) which found that the attraction of the host country was more important for exchange students than the attraction of the higher education institution.

3.2 Decision-making process & push and pull factors
According to Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) the decision to study abroad consists of three distinct stages:

1. the student decides to study abroad
2. the choice of country
3. the choice of institution

Their study on international students in Australia concluded that the study abroad choice is influenced by so-called push and pull factors, with push factors motivating students into a travel decision and into studying abroad while pull factors make a country and a higher education institution attractive to international students (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002). Push factors operate in the home country and influences the decision of “whether to go”, while pull factors operate in the host country and influences the decision of “where to go” (Kim et al. 2006; Mazzarol & Soutar 2001). Push factors tend to be intangible and inherent wants to travel while pull factors tend to include tangible resources that result in a perceived attractiveness of a destination that pulls the traveler towards it (Baloglu & Uysal 1996 in Eder et al. 2010).

Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) further identified six factors that influence the selection of a host country: knowledge and awareness of the host country; personal recommendations; cost issues; environment; geographical proximity; and social links. The overall knowledge and awareness of the host country is influenced by the availability of information about the potential study destination country in the student’s home country as well as how easy or difficult it is to obtain this information (Mazzarol
& Soutar 2002). The destination’s reputation for quality education was also a part of this factor.

The factor personal recommendations are referrals about the study destination that the student gets from parents, relatives, friends and others such as recruitment agents, by word-of-mouth (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002). The factor related to cost issues includes cost of fees, living expenses and travel costs. Cost issues also include social costs such as crime, safety, racial discrimination and if there is an established presence of students from the student’s home country or not (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002). The possibility of part-time work also played an important part as a financial cost.

Environment as a motivational factor includes the study climate in the country, as well as the physical climate, environment and lifestyle. Geographic proximity relates to the physical distance between the student’s home country and the host destination, and also included time difference. Social links as a factor means having friends or family already studying or living in the host destination, which can increase the perceived attractiveness (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002).

Exchange students might not follow the stages of deciding to study abroad, choosing a country and then choosing an institution in this set chronological order, as they are limited by the exchange partnerships that their higher education institution has with other institutions and a specific host country might in some cases not offer more than one or a few institution choices.

3.3 Links between study and travel
Glover (2011b) has, through her study on international students in Australia, developed a conceptual framework for how information sources help create a destination image which influences the decision to study abroad. International students form an image about a country before going to study there and the temporary nature of their stay suggests that their tourism activities in the host country may be guided by information obtained both before and after arrival (Glover 2011b). The study destination choice is equally as complex as the choice of holiday destination and the image of the study destination is affected by a range of information sources, including tourism-related materials (Glover 2011b).
The information sources can include general information sources and as well as tourism-specific information (Gunn 1997 in Glover 2011b), media, previous visits and word-of-mouth (Um & Crompton 1990 in Glover 2011b) and education-specific resources (Goldbart et al. 2005; Mazzarol et al. 2001 in Glover 2011b). Each of these can contribute to the formation of the study destination image, either independently or in a combination with any of the others (Glover 2011b). As such Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework identifies tourism marketing, education marketing, media, word-of-mouth and previous visits as information sources that influence the destination image.

The destination image that these information sources help create is composed of three aspects that partly overlap with each other: general country awareness, views on education in the country, and perception regarding tourism. Based on this image of the study destination, prospective international students make their decision (Glover 2011b). As based on Ritchie’s (2003) decision continuum, either of these aspects of the destination image may take precedence over the other, placing the decision on a motivation spectrum that ranges between “tourism only” and “education only” (Glover 2011b).

Ritchie’s (2003) continuum is a sequence for explaining the motivation of educational tourism, which encompasses students of higher education who study abroad. According to Ritchie (2003) educational tourists are motivated either by “education first” with tourism being of less importance or by “tourism first” with education being the less important motivating factor. He argues that different types of educational tourists
belong to these different motivations and that international students as a group are
motivated by education first, with tourism being a contributing factor but a secondary
one. Glover (2011b) deviates from the notion of international students as motivated
primarily by education, claiming that they can also be motivated by tourism first or be
situated anywhere along the spectrum and that some international students are more
motivated by tourism opportunities than others when choosing their study destinations.

The destination image is composed of several different aspects and their relative
importance when it comes to choosing a destination differs between individuals
(Sirakaya et al. 2001 in Glover 2011b). Tourism-related material has been identified as
a contributing factor for international students’ study destination choice and some
reasons for choosing a country to study abroad in are connected to the available tourism
opportunities (Glover 2011b). Glover (2011b) also says that tourism-related motivations
are more particular for exchange students than for full-degree student studying abroad
because of their shorter period of time in the host country.

Tourism marketing can contribute to a student’s knowledge and awareness of a
destination, which was identified by Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) as an important factor
when choosing a study location. Michael et al. (2003) also suggests that tourism
marketing has a great potential to affect the desire to study in a certain country, not only
through making the destination more appealing for studying in but also less directly by
making the study destination seem like an attractive place to invite family and friends to
visit during their study abroad period.

However, both higher education institutions and tourism destination managers have
often failed to make the connection that tourism choices can influence educational
choices (Weaver 2003 in Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) and according to Glover
(2011b) higher education institutions can no longer rely on only promoting its academic
benefits but need to broaden their marketing to include other advantages of choosing the
academic institution and the destination for studying abroad. This is also shown in the
conceptual framework model where the destination image is not formed by the study
aspect alone but by general and tourism aspects as well. Glover (2011b) states that it’s
essential for higher education institutions to provide potential international students
with a positive destination image both of the educational institution and of the study
destination, which corresponds with Llewellyn-Smith and McCabe’s (2008) study which found that city and the physical environment often was more important than the university when choosing where to study abroad.

3.4 Framework for tourism’s effect on destination choice
Based on Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) and Glover (2011b) a theoretical framework for exploring to what extent a place as a tourism destination affects exchange students’ choice of study abroad destination was developed. Where to study abroad is decided by pull factors, aspects of a destination that pulls the exchange student towards it and the destination choice is influenced by countless such factors. The only pull factor examined in this study is tourism and to what degree it affects the study destination choice. As a pull factor tourism increases perceived attractiveness of a destination and increases the awareness and knowledge about a destination (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002) but tourism can also potentially play an important part on its own (Glover 2011b).

Instead of having an education-tourism continuum, focusing on either education or tourism as the primary reason for studying abroad, or any combination of these two factors, this study focused on the tourism aspect only. The decision continuum instead ranges between tourism as the only reason for studying abroad at a certain destination and tourism having no effect on the decision of where to study. The destination image that leads to the decision is affected by a touristic aspect which is formed by information sources that includes tourism marketing.

4 Tourism’s effect on study abroad destination
This chapter presents the data that was gathered through the online survey and its connection with the decision-making process, the push and pull motivation factors and the links between tourism and education when it comes to exchange students.

4.1 Respondent demographics and study abroad destination
The results from the survey have been rounded off to the closest integer, which has led to some figures adding up to 99 % or 101% instead of 100 %. The gender division of the respondents in the study was 24% male and 76% female, with 0% identifying as other.
Female respondents were clearly a majority. This is a higher ratio of females when compared to the 61% of students partaking in Erasmus student exchange in 2012-2013 who were female (European Commission 2014). This means that this study had a 15% higher female ratio than the actual exchange student population in 2012-2013 and there might have been a female gender bias among the respondents of the survey. However, no clear differences could be observed in the overall survey answers based on gender.

The respondents had 35 different nationalities and came predominately from Europe. The large number of nationalities ensures that the survey answers are not based on a certain country and their mainly European origin corresponds with the European Erasmus programme being the world’s largest programme for student exchange. The country from which most respondents came was Sweden with 23% followed by Germany with 17%, USA with 9% and France with 7%. Sweden’s place as the country with most respondents does not follow the normal dispersion of nationality in the Erasmus programme 2012-2013, where Sweden is on place 17 out of 33 countries when it comes to sending exchange students abroad (European Commission 2014). The percentage of Swedish respondents is however deemed low enough not to cause any significant nationality-bias in the answers, though there was a clear European bias. No clear differences could be observed in the overall survey based on a certain nationality.

The respondents had studied or were studying abroad in 79 different cities in 76 different geographical regions in 33 different countries. The countries in which most respondents studied were Sweden with 26%, Japan with 13% and Germany with 8%. The wide spread of study abroad destinations ensured that the answers were not based
on a single country or city, and differences based on the study abroad destination has not been found.

4.2 Is the study destination a tourism destination?
On the question if the country in which the exchange students are/were studying abroad was a tourist destination the vast majority answered yes, with 67% viewing the host country as a major tourism destination and 29% viewing it as a minor one, a total of 96%. Only 3% of the respondents answered that the country was not a tourism destination. There was a non-response rate of 1%.

The 3% who did not view their study abroad country as tourism destination consisted of 5 respondents who studied in 5 different countries, ruling out the possibility of a single country’s destination image being responsible for the answers.

Regarding if the respondents viewed the region in which they are/were studying as a tourism destination, 42% answered that it was a major tourism destination, 44% that it was a minor tourism destination and 13% that it was not a tourism destination. The non-response rate was 2%. As with the host country, we see that the majority of the respondents, 86%, viewed the region as a tourism destination
On the question if the city in which they are/were studying was viewed as a tourism destination, 59% of the respondents viewed it as such with 22% viewing it as a major one and 37% as a minor one. 39% answered that they did not view the city as a tourism destination. There was a 2% non-response rate.

Only 3 respondents, out of 154 complete answers regarding view of the study destination as a tourism destination, answered that neither the country, the region, nor the city in which they are/were studying was a tourism destination, with 86 people answering that that they viewed all three as a tourism destination.

That the respondents view the study abroad destination as a tourism destination corresponds with Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework where the destination image consists partly of the students’ perception regarding tourism. As much as 98% of the respondents viewed some part of their study abroad destination, either the country, the
region or the city, as a tourism destination, showing that the tourism aspect is indeed a part of the formation of a destination image. With 98% choosing to study in a place they view as a tourism destination, tourism marketing as an information source can have a big influence on the destination image, which according to Glover’s (2011b) model is what leads to and affects the decision to study abroad. When following Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework, the question of to what extent an exchange students’ choice of study abroad destination is affected by the place as a tourism destination, can be answered with that it has a very large effect when it comes to the formation of the destination image, as this study shows that 98% view tourism as a part of the destination image of the study abroad destination.

The results show that the study abroad country is viewed more like a tourism destination than the region, which in turn is viewed more like a tourism destination than the city. This indicates that the touristic part of the destination image of a country is clearer than that of a region or a city and that there is a distinct hierarchy when it comes to awareness. When viewing this through Glover’s (2011b) model, the reason might be that the students have access to information sources about the study abroad country than the region and the city when it comes to not only tourism marketing but also education marketing, media, word of mouth and previous visits.

Tourism is a pull factor that increases the attractiveness of a destination and the students recognizing that their study destination is a tourism destination implies that tourism affects their destination choice, not only because it’s a part of the general destination image but as a factor in itself.

According to Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) the student first decides to study abroad, then the study abroad country and third the institution. When applied to this study it shows the importance of the view of a study abroad destination as a tourism destination, as 96% of the respondents answered that they view the country where they are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination. The comparatively lower rate of 59% viewing the city as a tourism destination could possibly be explained by an awareness hierarchy, but might also be the result of the limited partnerships of their higher education institution.
4.3 The effect of tourism opportunities on the choice of study abroad destination

When the respondents were given a 4-point ordered category scale to rate how much they thought tourism opportunities affected their choice of where to study abroad with one representing not at all and four representing very much, 26% answered that tourism opportunities had no effect on their choice, 16% answered that it affected them very much and 32% and 26% of the respondents’ answers were placed on point two and three respectively.

With 26% answering that tourism opportunities had no effect on their choice of where to study abroad, Jarvis and Peel’s (2008 in Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) conclusion that studying abroad is just an excuse to travel, more about tourism than education, cannot be assumed to apply to all exchange students. And although studying abroad might not be more about tourism than by education, as was also claimed by Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005), it is clear that tourism does have an impact as a motivational factor when a student chooses where to go on a student exchange.

The relatively even spread of the answers on all points on the ordered category scale shows that the effect of tourism on the exchange students’ choice of study abroad destination varies between individuals but that it clearly is a contributing motivation. This supports Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework with the decision of where to study abroad being a continuum between tourism being the only or the main motivator and education being the only or the main motivator. When viewing this through the
theories of Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) this also shows that tourism is a pull factor that makes a study abroad destination attractive, but that the extent of its effect on the study abroad decision varies between individuals and that there are some who are not motivated by tourism at all. This was however a minority of the respondents in this study, as 74% answered that they were motivated by tourism to some extent.

On the question if the tourism opportunities in the country where the exchange students are/were studying abroad was a factor influencing their choice to study there, 61% said it was a factor, 24% saying it was a major one and 27% saying it was a minor one. 39% said that the tourism opportunities in the host country were not a factor for their decision.

The effect of the tourism opportunities in the region was a factor for 47% of the respondents when choosing where to study abroad, 11% saying it was a major factor and 36% saying that it was a minor factor. 52% of the respondents said that it was not a factor and there was 1% that did not answer the question.
When it comes to the tourism opportunities in the city where the respondents are/were studying abroad only 7% percent said that it was a major factor influencing their decision. 20% answered that the tourism opportunities were a minor factor and 72% said that it was not a factor. There was a non-response rate of 1%.

The answers to these questions show that tourism does indeed have an effect when it comes to choosing where to study abroad although the extent varies and not everyone is motivated by tourism. Tourism opportunities is only one factor that motivates where to study abroad but with over half of the respondents (61%) being motivated by the tourism opportunities in the country, almost half (47%) when it comes to the region and almost a third (27%) for the city it makes it a major factor that can have a significant effect on the decision. The range between the answers supports Glover’s (2011b) theory.
about a decision continuum with tourism being viewed as a major or minor factor as well as not a factor at all.

The tourism opportunities in the host country had the largest effect on the students’ study destination choice, with the region having less effect and decreasing further when it comes to the tourism opportunities in the host city. Tourism opportunities having its largest influence on the choice of host country gives tourism a significant role as a study abroad country is chosen before a study abroad institution according to Mazzarol & Soutar (2002). This hierarchy when it comes to being motivated by tourism mirrors the awareness hierarchy when viewing a study abroad destination as a tourism destination, and a possible explanation is that the students have more awareness and knowledge of the host country than the region or the city and that they have access to more information sources about the country in the form of tourism marketing.

On the question of whether the tourism opportunities in a neighbouring country(ies) affected their choice of study abroad destination 17% claimed it was a major factor, 32% that is was a minor factor, 50% that it was not a factor and there was a 1% non-response rate.

This shows that tourism has an effect not only from the study abroad destination but also the tourism opportunities in other countries that are enabled by choosing a certain study abroad destination.
Only 22% of the respondents answered that neither the tourism opportunities in the country, region, city nor the neighbouring country(ies) affected their choice of where to study abroad. This means that 78% of the exchange students who answered the survey found tourism opportunities to be a minor or major factor in some way when deciding their study abroad destination. The extent of the effect of a study abroad destination’s role as a tourism destination on exchange students’ choice of where to study abroad can therefore be seen as great.

Surprisingly, 8% claimed that the tourism opportunities in the host country, region and city had not affected their choice, but that the tourism opportunities in a neighbouring country(ies) had, with 9 people saying it was a minor factor and 3 saying it was a major one. This data could give some support to Jarvis and Peel’s (2008 in Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) claim of studying abroad being just an excuse to travel, with students having no touristic interest in the country in which they are studying abroad but being motivated by travel outside the host country. This study confirms travelling to and in another country to be a motivating factor for some exchange students, though for far from all. These 8% studied abroad in 8 different countries, which eliminates the chance of the answers being because of a single country’s tourism opportunities.

4.4 Travel in connection with studying abroad
When it comes to travelling in connection with the student exchange, 25% answered that wanting to travel before the start of their student exchange was a major factor influencing their choice of study abroad destination and 28% saw travelling after the end of their student exchange as a major factor. 21% of the respondents said that wanting to travel before their student exchange was a factor but a minor one and 55% said that it was not a factor. Travelling after the end of their student exchange was seen as a factor but a minor one by 30% and was not seen as a factor influencing their study destination choice by 40%. For travelling after the end of one’s student exchange there was a 1% non-response rate.
Only 34% of the respondents answered that neither traveling before nor after the end of the student exchange was a factor when choosing their study abroad destination, with 66% claiming that wanting to travel during the time adjacent to their student exchange had affected their choice, either as a minor or a major factor. This follows Weaver’s (2003 in Llewellyn-Smith & McCabe 2008) claim that students might be motivated by travelling in their host country not only during their student exchange but also before and/or after. This study shows that the intention to travel in connection to their student exchange is a motivational factor when deciding where to study abroad. It is however, unknown to what degree this intention to travel manifests in actual travel before and after the student exchange.

This indicates that not only is the study abroad destination a pull factor that attracts exchange students but tourism opportunities in neighbouring countries are also pull factors to some extent. For Mazzarol and Soutar’s (2002) theory about influencing
factors, this shows that in addition to knowledge and awareness of the host country, knowledge and awareness of neighbouring countries also play a role when choosing where to study abroad. When viewing this through Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework we can speculate that the destination image also includes an image of neighbouring countries and that the information about them is part of the tourism marketing available to the student that helps form the destination image.

With a majority of the respondents being motivated by tourism opportunities in their study destination as well as traveling in connection with their student exchange, tourism is a motivation factor cannot be ignored. It is indeed a pull factor that attracts exchange students and affects the choice of study abroad destination to a great extent.

4.5 Higher education institutions providing tourism information
The final survey question asked if the higher education institution at which the exchange students were studying abroad had information about tourism opportunities on their website. The answers showed that 60% of the websites had information about tourism opportunities, with 12% of the respondents saying there was a lot and 48% saying there was a little. 38% of the respondents said there was no such information on the website of the higher education institution where they were studying abroad. There was a 2% non-response rate on this question.

Glover’s (2011b) claim that higher education institutions have to promote not only the academic institution itself but the study destination as well seems to be something that at least some institutions have acknowledged with 60% of the websites also providing
tourism information. That 38% of the websites had no information about tourism opportunities at the study destination shows however that some higher education institutions have indeed failed to see the connection between tourism and education and the influence that tourism can have on the decision-making process. This means a relatively large percentage of higher education institutions are missing out on being an active part of tourism marketing as an information source that helps form the destination image and leads to the decision of where to study abroad, according to Glover’s (2011b) model.

The destination image is formed by general, study and tourism aspects according to Glover’s (2011b) conceptual framework and excluding tourism information from the institution’s website decreases the chance of the student having a positive perception of tourism at the study destination. Tourism marketing also adds to a student’s general knowledge and awareness of a destination, which increases the chance that the student will choose to study there (Mazzarol & Soutar 2002). Glover (2011b) promotes cooperation and synergies between tourism and education authorities and the websites of higher education institutions provides an underexploited platform for such collaborations.

5 Conclusions
This chapter summarises the conclusions and implications made about the links between tourism and education and to what extent a place as tourism destination affects an exchange student’s choice of study abroad destination.

No matter if the exchange students themselves thought that the tourism opportunities affected their choice of study abroad destination or not, this study shows that 98% of the responding exchange students choose to study in a place they considered a tourism destination. To view a place as a tourism destination the students will have had contact with information sources that help form the destination image. The more knowledge a student has about a destination and the more a student is aware of a destination, the more likely that he or she will choose to study there, and though tourism might not be identified as motivating factor for all exchange students, tourism materials and marketing will still increase knowledge and awareness of a place and shape the student’s image of the study destination.
This study has proven that as theorised by Glover (2011b) in her conceptual framework, the decision of where to study abroad falls on a continuum where the effect of tourism on the destination choice varies from individual to individual. The decision is neither motivated only by education nor only by tourism. However, it cannot be denied that the majority of exchange students are in some way motivated by tourism opportunities when choosing where to study abroad and that tourism is a clear contributing motivation. This study concludes that the study abroad destination as a tourism destination effects the exchange student’s choice of where to study abroad to a great extent.

The study showed that tourism opportunities in the chosen host country were far more important than tourism opportunities in the region or in the host city itself, meaning that higher education institutions who want to take advantage of the attraction of tourism to attract exchange students have to promote not only the immediate physical environment but the country as well. Tourism opportunities in neighbouring countries influenced the choice of almost half of the respondents showing that studying abroad is connected with a desire to travel. Wanting to travel as motivation could also be seen in that a majority of the exchange students planned on travelling in the host country either before or after their student exchange.

The websites of higher education institutions have been established to be underexploited opportunities for collaboration between education and tourism, where information about tourism opportunities can be published in order to attract those students who are mostly or partly motivated by tourism, but also to increase the knowledge and awareness of a destination in general, which raises the chance that the destination will be chosen for a student exchange.

Although many nationalities were represented in the study there was a clear European bias and a study with a broader or more even range might generate different results. Future research on tourism as a motivator when choosing where to study abroad could focus on synergies of education and tourism and how they can make use of each other.
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7 Appendices
7.1 Appendix A: Survey

Tourism's effect on the choice of study abroad destination

This is a survey for a university bachelor's thesis in tourism studies; exploring the effect a place as a tourism destination has on an exchange student's choice of study abroad destination.

The answers gathered through the survey will be used for this bachelor's thesis only and for no other purpose.

Participation in the survey is strictly optional and you can choose if you want to participate or not. You are free to not answer a question and you can quit the survey at any time. Your answers will remain anonymous.

All answers will be disposed of when the study has finished.

The survey will only take a couple of minutes to complete.

---

Page 1

- Are you currently or have you ever been on a student exchange at a higher education institution? *
  If you have been to more than one student exchange, please answer the questions based on the most recent one.

  - Yes
  - No

---

Page 2

- What is your gender?
  - Female
  - Male
  - Other

- What is your nationality?
  If you have multiple nationalities, please choose one over the other.
• In which country do/did you study abroad?

• In which region do/did you study abroad?
The region can be a state, county or any wider geographical area.

• In which city do/did you study abroad?

Page 3

• Do you view the country where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?
  • Yes, it is a major tourism destination
  • Yes, it is a minor tourism destination
  • No, it is not a tourism destination

• Do you view the region where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?
  • Yes, it is a major tourism destination
  • Yes, it is a minor tourism destination
  • No, it is not a tourism destination

• Do you view the city where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?
  • Yes, it is a major tourism destination
  • Yes, it is a minor tourism destination
  • No, it is not a tourism destination
Page 4

- How much did tourism opportunities affect your choice of where to study abroad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 5

- Were the tourism opportunities in the country where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?
  - Yes, it was a major factor
  - Yes, but it was a minor factor
  - No, it was not a factor

- Were the tourism opportunities in the region where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?
  - Yes, it was a major factor
  - Yes, but it was a minor factor
  - No, it was not a factor

- Were the tourism opportunities in the city where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?
  - Yes, it was a major factor
  - Yes, but it was a minor factor
  - No, it was not a factor

- Were the tourism opportunities in a neighbouring country(ies) where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?
  - Yes, it was a major factor
  - Yes, but it was a minor factor
  - No, it was not a factor
Was your choice of study abroad destination affected by you wanting to travel before the start of your student exchange?
- Yes, it was a major factor
- Yes, but it was a minor factor
- No, it was not a factor

Was your choice of study abroad destination affected by you wanting to travel after the end of your student exchange?
- Yes, it was a major factor
- Yes, but it was a minor factor
- No, it was not a factor

Did the website of your study abroad higher education institution have information about tourism opportunities?
- Yes, there was a lot
- Yes, but only a little
- No, there was none
7.2 Appendix B: Figures

**Question 1.** Are you currently or have you ever been on a student exchange at a higher education institution?

![Pie chart showing 76% Yes and 24% No for question 1.]

**Question 2.** What is your gender?

![Pie chart showing 76% Female, 24% Male, and 0% Other for question 2.]

**Question 3.** What is your nationality?

![Bar chart showing the number of responses for various nationalities.]

**Question 4.** In which country do/did you study abroad?

![Country Distribution Chart]

- USA: 40
- Turkey: 3
- Thailand: 1
- Sweden: 3
- Spain: 3
- South Africa: 1
- South Korea: 1
- Slovenia: 1
- Serbia: 1
- Portugal: 1
- Norway: 1
- Nicaragua: 1
- New Zealand: 1
- Netherlands: 3
- Mauritius: 3
- Macau: 1
- Lithuania: 1
- Japan: 19
- Italy: 2
- Ireland: 2
- Hong Kong: 1
- Greece: 1
- Great Britain: 11
- Germany: 12
- France: 7
- Finland: 7
- Ecuador: 1
- Denmark: 1
- China: 1
- Canada: 1
- Bulgaria: 1
- Belgium: 10
- Australia: 1

**Question 5.** In which region do/did you study abroad?

**Question 6.** In which city do/did you study abroad?
**Question 7.** Do you view the country where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 7]

- Yes, it is a major tourism destination: 67%
- Yes, it is a minor tourism destination: 28%
- No, it is not a tourism destination: 3%
- No response: 1%

**Question 8.** Do you view the region where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 8]

- Yes, it is a major tourism destination: 41%
- Yes, it is a minor tourism destination: 13%
- No, it is not a tourism destination: 44%
- No response: 2%
**Question 9.** Do you view the city where you are/were studying abroad as a tourism destination?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 9]

**Question 10.** Question 3. How much did tourism opportunities affect your choice of where to study abroad?

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 10]

X
**Question 11.** Were the tourism opportunities in the country where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

![Pie Chart 11](chart.png)

- Yes, it was a major factor: 24%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 39%
- No, it was not a factor: 37%

**Question 12.** Were the tourism opportunities in the region where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

![Pie Chart 12](chart.png)

- Yes, it was a major factor: 1%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 11%
- No, it was not a factor: 52%
- No response: 36%
Question 13. Were the tourism opportunities in the city where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

13. Were the tourism opportunities in the city where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

- Yes, it was a major factor: 7%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 20%
- No, it was not a factor: 72%
- No response: 1%

Question 14. Were the tourism opportunities in a neighbouring country(ies) where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

14. Were the tourism opportunities in a neighbouring country(ies) where you are/were studying abroad a factor when you chose to study there?

- Yes, it was a major factor: 17%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 50%
- No, it was not a factor: 32%
- No response: 1%
Question 15. Was your choice of study abroad destination affected by you wanting to travel before the start of your student exchange?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 15]

- Yes, it was a major factor: 25%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 55%
- No, it was not a factor: 21%

Question 16. Was your choice of study abroad destination affected by you wanting to travel after the end of your student exchange?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 16]

- Yes, it was a major factor: 28%
- Yes, but it was a minor factor: 40%
- No, it was not a factor: 30%
- No response: 1%
Question 17. Did the website of your study abroad higher education institution have information about tourism opportunities?

17. Did the website of your study abroad higher education institution have information about tourism opportunities?

- 38% No there was none
- 48% Yes, but only a little
- 12% Yes, there was a lot
- 2% No response
- 0% No response