



Universitetet
i Stavanger

**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,
NORWEGIAN SCHOOL OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT**

MASTER'S THESIS

STUDY PROGRAM:
International Hotel and Tourism Leadership

THESIS IS WRITTEN IN THE FOLLOWING
SPECIALIZATION/SUBJECT:
Tourism motivation

IS THE ASSIGNMENT CONFIDENTIAL?
No

TITLE: International students as part-time tourists: A case study from Stavanger,
Norway

AUTHOR

ADVISOR:

Student number:
227422

Name:
Vaidas Leparskas

Dr. Jens Kristian Steen
Jacobsen

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF 2 BOUND COPIES OF THESIS

Stavanger,/..... 2016

Signature administration:.....



**International students as part-time tourists: A case study
from Stavanger, Norway**

Author:

Vaidas Leparskas

Norwegian School of Hotel Management

Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Stavanger

Master's thesis
2016

Advisor:

Dr. Jens Kristian Steen Jacobsen

Abstract

The reasons that motivate students to study abroad are important to the tourism industry. This study has a descriptive research design. To answer the main research question the study uses a quantitative methodology. The research question is: What is the main motivation for students to study abroad: to study or to travel? The identified study abroad motives reflect students' needs for education, cross-cultural, novelty seeking, stimulation, and career objectives. This paper identifies study and travel abroad choice motives of 210 international students at the University of Stavanger. The most importance motives: "To see more of the world"; "to get a new experience"; "to increase knowledge." Conclusions suggest, that the blurred distinction, between international students study, and travel motives. The research found that younger and single international students go to study abroad with significant stronger social relationship motivation reasons than older and "in relationship" students.

Keywords: international students, study abroad motivation, student travel motivation

Acknowledgements

I would like to say big thank you to my supervisor Professor Dr. Jens Kristian Steen Jacobsen for his guidance and support, encouragement and inspiration, personal insights and patience. This helped me to create a sustainable and successful process to complete this research. In addition, I want to thank all my respondents who participated in a survey, which helped to accumulate statistics to validate my research. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all the lecturers of Norwegian School of Hotel Management for gained knowledge and experience.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	6
2. Literature review.....	7
2.1 Hypotheses.....	14
3. Methodology.....	15
3.1 Sample profiles.....	19
4. Results.....	21
4.1 Study motivation analysis.....	21
5. Discussion.....	30
6. Conclusion.....	33
6.1 Limitations and future research.....	34
7. References.....	35
8. Appendix.....	41

1. Introduction

The main purpose for this research is to examine study and tourism motivation categories, between international students, from University of Stavanger. The main questions for this research is: What is the main motivation for students to study abroad: to study or to travel?

Developing higher education to international students has become a raising tendency in many countries as a growing number of young people temporarily move away from their home country to pursue part of their foreign degree or to gain a tertiary qualification in an abroad country. The provision of education and training services for people from overseas has become an increasingly important source of income for certain countries (Mazzarol, 1998). Despite the economic downturn, international student and educational travel is becoming a stable ongoing industry that might outperform recreation and tourism business in terms of its annual growth rate, student and educational travel account for over 20% of international arrivals, which equals 207 million arrivals and 194 billion dollar industry in year 2012 (Student Marketing, 2012). On the one hand, Chen and Barnett (2000) determines that the economically powerful countries, which hold resources and expertise necessary for higher education, absorb international students in significant numbers and stay at the core over many years. On the other hand, lesser-developed countries, lacking both economic and education capabilities, attract limited numbers of students and stay at the periphery (Chen & Barnett, 2000). Growing needs for more international experiences, more reasonable transportation prices, less political and cultural barriers and ease of travel, are only some of the aspects motivating the students' and academic travel market.

In Norway from 2012 to 2016, the number of international students increased by 30% (table 1). At the University of Stavanger, from 2012 to 2016, the number of overseas students grew by 37%. This study is limited to international students at the University of Stavanger.

Table 1.

International students in Norwegian higher education institutions

Institution	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
North University	–	–	–	–	897
Norway's Environment and Nature Sciences University	–	–	737	826	975
University of Nature Science	689	738	–	–	–
University of Norwegian science and technology	1853	2017	2077	2100	2901
University of Agder	412	424	623	678	738
University of Bergen	1392	1438	1453	1599	1664
University of Nordland	583	684	602	609	–
University of Oslo	3139	3299	3451	3527	3646
University of Stavanger	811	881	970	1137	1291
University of Tromsø	737	844	1319	1260	1618
Total sum	9616	10325	11231	11735	13730

Source: Database for statistics on higher education (NSD), at www.dbh.nsd.uib.no, accessed 02 May 2016

The European Union has developed several international exchange programs such as ERASMUS, Grundtvig, Leonardo da Vinci, CEEPUS and Comenius, to offer students opportunities for cultural, academic and personal exchange. Students arrive at a sense of the extent to which their own cultural values and norms differ from those of their counterparts in their host country (Roberts, 1998, p. 65). Stangor, Jonas, Stroebe, and Hewstone (1994) determine that living in another culture changes one's preconceptions of other cultures.

2. Literature review

International students are important contributors to the international tourism industry (Kim, Jogaratnam, & Noh, 2006; Kim, Noh, & Jogaratnam, 2006; Michael,

Armstrong, & King, 2003; Richards & Wilson, 2003; Ryan & Zhang, 2007). The changes in the tourism industry over the past two decades, coupled with the change in education, have seen the convergence of these two industries, with education facilitating mobility and learning becoming an important part of the tourist experience (Ritchie, Carr, & Cooper, 2003). The fast growth in international student numbers around the world highlights a worldwide phenomenon. According to Urry (1990), international students hold an anthropological gaze, since they are to be found in large numbers in foreign countries, learning new languages and encountering other cultures.

The EU-funded ERASMUS program is a crucial factor in the growth of student mobility. Empirical evidence indicates relating motives of student's participation in the short-term study abroad reflect that objectives pertaining to individual development benefit needs. Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) found personal development as the only consistently highly rated benefit of spending one or two semesters at a North American university. Students who participate in exchange programs tend to be a little more mature than their peers who did not (Frisch, 1990). On the one hand, Gonzalez, Masanza, and Mariel (2011) determine that student mobility is influenced by economic variables, such as the prices in host countries or the geographical distance as a proxy for transport costs, a finding that links student mobility to migration flows. Since they share similar characteristics, and students will attempt to find the most suitable destination taken into consideration their prospects of employment and career promotion (Gonzalez et al., 2011). On the other hand, the observed tendency to choose countries whose climate is warm, leaves us the notion of student mobility as a leisure activity, as if European students collectively were trying to enjoy the experience of living abroad (Gonzalez et al., 2011).

Lauring, Selmer, and Jacobsen (2014, p. 170), point out that “international relocations have habitually treated holidaymakers, sojourners, and immigrants as quite discrete categories while developments in global mobility patterns have assumingly amplified blurring of such categories”. Several researchers found relations between leisure tourism and studies abroad. Wiers-Jenssen (2003, p. 396), found that two factors -- “interesting to study in a foreign environment” and “love of adventure” - play a dominant role in students’ reasons for studying abroad. Nyaupane, Paris, and Teye (2010, p. 263) identify four study abroad motivation dimensions, the strongest being international travel, followed by academic motives, social, and escape. Stone and Petrick (2013) claim that students are motivated to study abroad by personal and professional skills development, career, opportunities, leisure, relaxation and other benefits. Waters, Brooks, and Pimlott-Wilson (2011) suggest that the pursuit of education and fun, enjoyment and adventure are not always incompatible. Going to study abroad entails an element of long-distance travel, enabling students to escape, through mobility, their former lives and start anew (Conradson & Latham, 2005). Waters et al. (2011) argues that some students quite specific about what they hoped to achieve from going abroad for study (i.e. a more flexible, less pressured educational system), others had more sentimental and emotive goals in mind, tied to an underlying feeling that they would be somehow ‘happier’ overseas. The international students understand the seriousness and inevitability of life after graduation (hard work, career and involving responsibility) at the same time, desiring to delay this transition to adulthood. Private rationales suggest that personal choices of students in academic, social, cultural, environmental domains (e.g., interest concerning academic field, climate preference, the preference to live in a metropolitan city, the preference to be close to cultural and entertainment facilities) are largely shaped by their affects, that is, by they personal likes and dislikes (Altbach & Knight, 2007). When asked what

they saw as the greatest benefits of studying abroad, students said that it had brought them a greater understanding of other cultures, that it had helped them appreciate their own culture more, that it enabled them to learn more about themselves, and that it had enriched them personally (Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Students may go abroad not only to complement their studies in the host university, but also to improve their knowledge of foreign languages (Gonzalez et al., 2011). According to Teichler (2004), students gave the following reasons for studying abroad: self-development, to gain academic learning in another country, to improve their understanding of the host country, to improve career prospects, to travel, and for a break from their usual surroundings.

Gonzalez et al. (2011), examining motives and intentions for pursuing an international degree abroad, indicate that students see more employment opportunities after graduating from foreign universities. From the point of view of developing countries international students flows heading abroad can be a double-side dilemma. On the one hand, a skilled workforce is considered important to development and a number of developing countries, fund students to study abroad (Cantwell, Luca, & Lee, 2009). On the other hand, many international students have not returned home at the finish of their studies. Teichler (1999) argues that students move to a country and an institution where the academic quality seems to be higher than at home. The belief that the move to study to a new country will result in higher rate of remuneration in return to individual human capital characteristics (e.g., education, experience, training, language skills) increases the probability of international migration (Castles & Miller, 1998). This idea has been appropriated by scholars investigating international students study abroad, who argues that students move to economically developed countries for improving skills and abilities and ultimately maximize the economic returns for their potentials (Chen & Barnett, 2000). Prior empirical data

shows that real wages and unemployment rate difference between home and host's countries are significant drivers to study abroad. Gonzalez et al. (2011) determine that the prospects of higher real income, associated with labor market employment in the host country, are the main anticipated benefits associated with student migration. Kondacki (2011) found that students from Western European countries are more interested in personal growth, while students from Eastern European countries more frequently report financial and educational motives. However, Cantwell et al. (2009) indicated that while European and American students are motivated by better job opportunities, European students hoped that this experience would increase their chances of employment outside their home country while Americas students hope for better employment opportunities within their home country. Ingraham and Peterson (2004) point out that students' personal growth encompasses self-confidence, self-reliance and widening their horizon by meeting and experiencing new people and environments. Findlay and King (2010) indicated most important UK students' abroad motivations such as attending a world class university, opportunity for a unique adventure, and taking the first step in an international career.

Based on Findlay et al.'s (2006) surveys of UK students, cited in Gonzalez et al. (2011) considered that two factors emerge as pre-eminent barriers to study abroad: finance and language, they emphasize the social backgrounds of students, in which the parents' educational level seems to be more relevant than their occupation. Students from working-class and non-white backgrounds "stand much less chance of engaging in international student mobility because of the financial and linguistic constraints of the environments in which they are embedded and because of the socioeconomic and mobility cultures from which they are drawn" (Findlay, King, Stam, & Ruiz-Gelices, 2006).

According to Min-En (2006, p. 460) the findings suggest that motivation to come to Australia to study had little to do with the opportunities for travel. (Glover, 2011; Michael et al., 2003) found that when two-thirds of overseas students travel while studying in Australia and nearly as many intend to take holidays in Australia. According to Stronkhorst (2005, p. 304), students' initiatives to study abroad are predominantly geared toward having fun and adventure and much less to the academic growth or developing competencies.

Iso-Ahola (1982, p. 261) suggests that tourism motivation is a dialectical process because it provides an outlet for avoiding something and for simultaneously seeking something. Richards and Wilson (2003, p. 17) cite four motivating factors for student travel: experience seeking, relaxation seeking, sociability and contributing to the destination. According to Richards and Wilson (2004, p. 57), motivations reflecting a desire for experience are prevalent among student travelers, particularly in terms of exploring other cultures. Jarvis and Peal (2008, p. 164) mention students' positive feedback from friends, the personal challenge, the opportunity to broaden their awareness of the world, to meet people, to break from routine, to experience another culture, and opportunity to enhance career prospects. Kitsantas (2004) suggests a desire to enhance understanding of the host country, the desire master the subject being studied abroad and the opportunity to establish ties with family or ethnic heritage.

Dann (1977) found that in order to explain why students study abroad one can distinguish "push" from "pull" factors. Gonzalez et al. (2011) argue that "push" factors are initiatives that operate in the home country of the student whereby they stimulate the student to study abroad; "pull" factors are initiatives of a host country that attract a student to study abroad. On the one hand, Dann (1981, p. 191) argues that "push" factors are "escape from a perceived mundane environment, exploration

and evaluation of self, relaxation, prestige, regression, enhancement of kinship relationships and facilitation of social interaction; 'pull' factors of the host country (e.g., sunshine, relaxed tempo, friendly natives) both respond to and reinforce "push" factors". On the other hand, students' motives to study abroad occurs when they are "pushed" from their home country by factors like lack of educational and employment opportunities and political instability and are "pulled" toward destinations by specific educational opportunities and general economic and social dynamism (Altbach, 2004). However, Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) indicated that knowledge about academic institutions and programs, cultural awareness, and social relationship as factors in choosing an institution abroad.

Huang (2008, p. 1017) suggests that the motivation for international students coming from developing countries to the UK was to have a better understanding of Western culture. The study regarding work and leisure tourism, blurring motivation boundaries categories, between expatriates. Luring et al. (2014, p. 180) point out that expatriates go abroad not only for work reasons but that they are also motivated by tourism-related incentives – especially seeking reasons or pull motives.

According to Pearce and Lee (2005, p. 236), studies strongly suggest that travel motivation patterns can be described as having motives related to novelty, escape/relaxation, and relationship, and self-development.

According to Hsu and Sung (1997) the students in general, and international students in particular, are attractive targets for travel-related consumption for a number of reasons. Llewellyn-Smith and McCabo (2008) point out that students' desire to travel and the opportunity for fun and excitement are the primary motivators for undertaking an educational exchange, along with the host country's weather, natural environment and tourist attractions. Teichler (2004) found that when students returned, they rated the cultural experiences, the improvement of language

proficiency and the contribution to personality development more favorably than the academic value of the temporary time abroad.

Iso-Ahola (1982, p. 259) suggests a social psychological model of tourism motivation, and identifies two motivations: the desire to leave the everyday environment behind one-self, and the desire to obtain psychological (intrinsic) rewards through travel in a contrasting (new or old) environment.

2.1 Hypotheses

Nationality

Nationality is likely influence international students' study abroad desires. (Dann, 1981; Luring et al., 2014) argues that students of different nationalities have different push-and-pull factors for going abroad. According to Stroud (2010), students from diverse backgrounds prioritize motives according to their economic situation, culture, education opportunities and length of the study abroad programs offered.

Hypotheses 1 (a-i): Motivation to study abroad is stronger for EU international students than for non-EU international students with regards to (a) novelty seeking/stimulation, (b) career, (c) escape, (d) education, (e) cross-cultural, (f) social-relationship, (g) autonomy, (h) nature, and (i) isolation.

Age

Age might affect international students' motivation to study abroad. Achievement motivation appears to decline with age and younger people are more inclined towards adventure and risk-taking (Burns, Reid, Toncar, Anderson, & Wells, 2008; Luring et al., 2014). Younger travelers (under 26) place more emphasis on social relationship and stimulation, while older ones prefer individualized, safer experiences (Stroud, 2010).

Hypotheses 2 (a-i): Motivation to study abroad is stronger for younger international students than for older international students with regards to (a) novelty seeking/stimulation, (b) career, (c) escape, (d) education, (e) cross-cultural, (f) social-relationship, (g) autonomy, (h) nature, and (i) isolation.

Relationship status

Relationship status is associated with a significant difference in tourism motivation (Kang & Hsub, 2005; Luring et al., 2014).

Hypotheses 3 (a-i): Motivation to study abroad for single international students is significantly different than for international students in relationships with regards to (a) novelty seeking/stimulation, (b) career, (c) escape, (d) education, (e) cross-cultural, (f) social-relationship, (g) autonomy, (h) nature, and (i) isolation.

Travel experience level

Pearce and Lee (2005, p. 236) found that when exploring the relationship between the identified motivation dimensions and travel experience levels, the three most important motivational factors – novelty seeking, escape-relaxation, and social relationship - showed no significant difference in their importance between levels of travel experience.

Hypotheses 4 (a-i): Motivation to study abroad is stronger for international students with less travel experience than for international students with more travel experience with regards to (a) novelty seeking/stimulation, (b) career, (c) escape, (d) education, (e) cross-cultural, (f) social-relationship, (g) autonomy, (h) nature, and (i) isolation.

3. Methodology

This study has a descriptive research design. It investigates the content of study abroad motivations. To answer the main research question the study adopts a

quantitative approach. All indicators measure multiple study and travel motivations, using the seven-point Likert-scale and responses ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (7) *strongly agree*. The questionnaire (appendix A) was consisting of based on the literature (Chirkov, 2007; Jarvis & Peal, 2008; Luring et al., 2014; Nyaupane et al., 2010; Pearce & Lee, 2005; Richards & Wilson, 2004; Snepenger, King, Marshall, & Uysal, 2006).

The data was collected from February 28 to April 13, 2016 by distributing a two-page self-administered questionnaire on the University of Stavanger campus (international student dormitories, library, canteen) and an identical online questionnaire posted on Facebook group pages for UIS international students (https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1uG36mMjRsL9hhlxU2EKWgwIo_M8eK7FxTUWgX5tDM5k/viewform). The international students were asked to agree or disagree with 60 reasons to study abroad. The questionnaire comprised three sections: study abroad motives (13 items); travel abroad motives (47 items); and demographics (7 items). The items included in international students study abroad motivation scale were to develop my skills and abilities; to increase my knowledge; to learn a foreign language; to get a good education; to get the opportunity to broad awareness of the world; to get the personal challenge of the academic experience; to get a positive feedback on the experience from acquaintances from my home country; to challenge my abilities; to expand my career opportunities; a foreign university degree will open good employment opportunity for me; to do the “right” thing for my career; to save money; to get a well-paying job.

The travel motivation scale consists from seeking motivation, escape, nature, novelty, stimulation, social-relationship, cross-cultural, and isolation motivation. The items included in seeking motivation scale were to have an adventure; a new challenge; to get a new experience; to see more of the world. The items included in

escape motivation scale were to escape from my current situation; bored with my home country; to get away from a stressful social environment; to escape from home area social norms; to travel independently without family; to get away from everyday psychological stress/pressure; to overcome a bad mood; to avoid people who annoy me; to avoid interactions with other people in home country; to get away from the usual demands; to rest and relax physically; to get from daily routine in my home area. The items included in autonomy motivation scale were to do things my own way; to be obligated to no one; to be independent, also nature motivation scale were to be harmonious with nature; to get a better appreciation of nature; to be close to nature; to view a different scenery. The items included in novelty motivation scale were to visit places related to my personal interests; to feel the special atmosphere like the vacation destination; to have fun; to experience something different, as well as stimulation motivation scale were to have a daring-adventuresome experience; to have a unpredictable experience; to feel excitement; to experience thrills. The items included in social-relationship motivation scale were to travel with new acquaintances; interested in shopping in the host country; to be with others who enjoy the same things as I do; to meet new people; to tell others about my experience; to be closer to friends/family; to have a good time with friends; to develop close friendship with new acquaintances. The items included in cross-cultural motivation scale were to learn more about the host country; to interact with locals in the host country; to understand the host culture on a deeper level than the average “tourist”; to explore another culture, also isolation motivation scale were to be away from the crowds of people; to experience the open space; to avoid interpersonal stress and pressure; and to experience peace and calm.

A seven-point Likert-style scale measured students’ study and travel motivation. Respondents were asked to mark the importance of each travel initiative

and each reason for studying abroad. Prior to finalizing the survey, five students reviewed and discussed the questionnaire in order to validate the questions and to improve reliability. Some unreliable statements were changed or discarded. From the 80 hard copies of the questionnaire that were distributed, 51 valid responses (64%) were returned. There were 159 online responses, giving a total of 210 valid responses.

Based on Luring et al.'s (2014) study, respondents were divided into those from EU and non-EU countries. Respondents were divided into five age groups: 20-25, 26-30, 31-35, and older than 35 years of age. After SPSS analysis those five age groups were reduced to 25 and younger, and 26 and older. Respondents were divided into five groups based on the number of countries they had visited: 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-20, and more than 20. Conducting SPSS analysis those five groups, based on Peace and Lee (2005) were recoded as students with low travel experience (having been to up to 10 countries) and those with high travel experience (having been to 11 or more). Students' relationship status was classified as "single," "in relationship," and "living with spouse". For SPSS analysis those three groups were recoded as "single" and "in a relationship".

The primary data were analyzed using SPSS beginning with descriptive analysis, skewness and kurtosis analysis, principal component analysis, Cronbach's alpha analysis, cross-tabulation, and MANCOVA and ANCOVA (table 2).

Table 2.

Analysis Procedures

Statistical Methods	Objectives
Descriptive analysis	To explore the overall profile of the samples and detect which motive items were regarded as most important or unimportant.
Skewness and kurtosis analysis	To identify values of skew and kurtosis and indicate distributions, how values far or close

		from normal and flat distributions.
Principal component analysis		To discover the underlying motive dimensions of 60 motive items.
Cronbach's analysis	alpha	Internal consistency between the items in the factors was measured using Cronbach's coefficient alpha.
Cross-tabulation analysis		To investigate the differences of profiles international students' from EU and non-EU countries.
MANCOVA and ANCOVA analysis		To test the hypotheses.

Descriptive statistics analysis was applied to the collected data to explore the overall sample profile. Principal component analysis (PCA) was next used to identify the underlying motive dimensions.

3.1 Sample profiles.

Of 210 respondents, 55% were from the EU countries and 45% were not. Twice as many of the respondents (67%) were female as male (33%). In terms of age, 2% were younger than 20 years old. 64% were 20-25, 25% were 26-30, 5% were 31-35 years old and 3% were more than 35 years old. Sixty-two percent were master's students, 36% were undergraduates and 2% were doctoral students. Nearly two-thirds (58%) of the students were single, 32% were in a relationship and 11% were living with a spouse. Fifty-two percent of the students did not have a job, 20% worked 1-8 hours per week, 12% worked 9-16 hours, 10% worked more than 24 hours per week and 5% worked 17-24 hours per week. Thirty-one percent of the respondents had visited 6 to 10 countries, 24% had visited 11-20 countries, 20% had been to 3 to 5 countries, 13% had been to more than 20 countries and 12% had been to 1-2 countries (table 3).

Table 3.

Selected respondent characteristics (percentages)

Sample profile	Frequency	Percent
Nationality		
EU country	116	55
Non EU country	94	45
Educational level		
Bachelor student	76	36
Master student	130	62
PhD student	4	2
Age		
Under 20	4	2
20-25	135	64
26-30	53	25
31-35	11	5
More than 35	6	3
Gender		
Male	70	33
Female	140	67
Relationship status		
Single	121	58
In relationship	67	32
Living with spouse	22	11
Number of countries visited for pleasure		
1-2	25	12
3-5	42	20
6-10	64	31
11-20	50	24
More than 20	27	13
Paid work besides studies, work hours per		

	week	
0	110	52
1-8	41	20
9-16	25	12
17-24	11	5
More that 24	21	10

4. Results

4.1 Study motivation analysis.

This study explores the characteristics of 60 motive items. International students were asked to agree or disagree with a list of reasons for studying abroad. The most important study abroad motives pertained to novelty-seeking stimulation such as “to see more of the world” (6.47) or “to get a new experience” (6.46); education such as “to increase knowledge” (6.29) or “to develop skills and abilities” (6.17); cross-cultural aspects such as “to explore another culture” (6.01), or “to interact with locals” (5.73). As well as, career aspects such as “to expand career opportunities” (6.15) or “the personal challenge of the academic experience” (5.62), and social relationship motives such as “to meet new people” (5.93) or “to develop close friendship” (5.17). The less important study abroad motive items represented in the escape construct were “to get away from the usual demands” (3.03), “to overcome a bad mood” (3.10), and isolation such as “to be away from the crowds” (3.58), and “to avoid interpersonal stress” (3.80). Of the 60 items, “to avoid interactions with other people in home country” (2.44), “to save money” (2.55), “to avoid people who annoy me” (2.57) and “shopping in the host country” (2.71) withal had mean scores lower than 3.00. Because the objective of this study was to identify the major study abroad motivational dimensions, these four items were considered to be unimportant by and were excluded from analysis.

Most of the variables are negatively skewed which means that the scores are clustered to the right at the high values. The variables show both positive and negative kurtosis values, the highest negative kurtosis values of -1.34 and -1.43 indicating a flat distribution with many outliers. Nevertheless, the numbers are not too high, indicating a normal distribution.

Before analysis proceeded, the appropriateness of sample size was verified using the Keiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) Measurement. The KMO score was .86, indicating adequate sample size. According to Kaiser (1974) the measure was perfect, indicating that it was safe to proceed with the factor analysis.

Following this, to identify the underlying dimensions of the 56 selected study abroad motive items, PCA was applied, and through verification of the statistical validity from the produced results. Varimax rotation was used because it redistributes the variance among factors more evenly and produces less complex factors (Kass & Tinsley, 1979, p. 134). According to Child (1970) only those factors with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0 were extracted. The PCA produced 13 factors. The percentage of variance explained by this solution was 71.22%. Two factors have only one item and were discarded for lacking reliability. After measuring internal consistency among the items in the factors using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, = two factors with 2 and 2 items have a low (0.7) coefficient alpha. Experience factor with two items were .54 coefficient alpha and novelty factor with two items were coefficient alpha was .67. Therefore, these five items were excluded. Autonomy factor with four items had .771 coefficient alpha and after "to travel independently without family" was deleted, the coefficient alpha was .777. Education factor had three items and coefficient alpha was .573; after removal of "to learn a foreign language" the coefficient alpha was .825. These two items were excluded.

After reliability and validity analysis, 48 items remained. PCA was used again and produced nine factors; the percentage of variance explained by this solution was 70%. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), only items with factor loadings of at least .40 were retained. These factors was as follows: “education” (mean = 6.12); “cross-cultural” (mean = 5.78); “novelty-seeking stimulation” (mean = 5.76); “career” (mean = 5.44); “social relationship” (mean = 5.04); “autonomy” (mean = 4.76); “nature” (mean = 4.42); “isolation” (mean = 4.10); and “escape” (mean = 3.52). All factors had a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha score greater than .77, which indicated strong consistency among the items in each factor. The results are shown in table 4.

Table 4.

PCA results ranked by factor mean scores

Factors	Motive Items	Means	Std. Deviations	Loadings
Novelty- seeking, stimulation $\alpha = .90$ mean=5.76	To see more of the world	6.47	1.01	.63
	To get a new experience	6.46	0.85	.73
	To experience something different	6.23	0.92	.65
	A new challenge	6.08	1.15	.66
	To have an adventure	6.01	1.28	.68
	To have fun	5.59	1.42	.59
	A daring/adventuresome experience	5.55	1.43	.73
	To feel excitement	5.48	1.51	.74
	A unpredictable experience	5.02	1.74	.73
Education $\alpha = .83$ mean=6.12	To experience thrills	4.75	1.70	.75
	To increase knowledge	6.29	1.00	.75
Career	To develop skills and abilities	6.17	1.13	.69
	To expand career opportunities	6.15	1.28	.64

$\alpha = .81$ mean=5.44	The personal challenge of the academic experience	5.62	1.32	.50
	A foreign university degree	5.53	1.54	.61
	The "right" thing for career	5.08	1.76	.72
	To get a well-paying job	4.83	1.97	.67
Cross-cultural $\alpha = .92$ mean=5.78	To explore another culture	6.01	1.25	.80
	To interact with locals	5.73	1.38	.82
	To understand the host culture	5.71	1.52	.81
	To learn more about the host country	5.68	1.45	.78
Social-relationship $\alpha = .80$ mean=5.04	To meet new people	5.93	1.14	.66
	To develop close friendship	5.17	1.61	.69
	To travel with new acquaintances	4.92	1.59	.53
	A good time with friends	4.74	1.80	.62
	To tell others about experience	4.72	1.83	.58
	To be with others who enjoy the same things	4.71	1.76	.54
Autonomy $\alpha = .78$ mean=4.76	To be independent	5.30	1.65	.74
	To do things own way	5.13	1.67	.76
	To be obligated to no one	3.86	1.91	.68
Nature $\alpha = .92$ mean=4.42	To view a different scenery	5.26	1.70	.63
	Close to nature	4.21	2.02	.88
	A better appreciation of nature	4.15	1.94	.90
	Harmonious with nature	4.07	1.90	.87

Isolation	To experience peace and calm	4.60	2.01	.73
$\alpha = .87$	To experience the open space	4.44	1.94	.68
mean=4.10	To avoid interpersonal stress	3.80	1.91	.79
	Away from the crowds of people	3.53	1.95	.67
Escape	To escape from current situation	4.22	2.17	.71
$\alpha = .90$	Bored with home country	3.98	1.98	.67
mean=3.52	From daily routines in home area	3.68	1.90	.67
	To get away from a stressful social environmental	3.68	2.16	.74
	To get away from everyday psychological stress/pressure	3.41	2.06	.75
	To escape from home area social norms	3.30	2.00	.71
	To rest and relax physically	3.27	1.92	.73
	To overcome a bad mood	3.10	1.98	.69
	From the usual demands	3.03	1.81	.55

The nine study abroad motivation factors, in order of importance, were novelty-seeking stimulation, education, career, cross-cultural, social-relationship, autonomy, nature, isolation, and escape motivation.

Using cross-tabulation analysis, a profile of the EU country students and non-EU country students groups was identified (table 5). The chi-square statistic was used to determine if there were any statistically significant differences among the groups. The analysis revealed significant differences between the two groups for “paid work besides studies” categories with resulted with $p < .001$ level of significance, “age” categories with resulted with $p < .005$ level of significance, “education occupation”

resulted with a $p < .01$ level of significance, and “gender” and “relationship status” categories with resulted a $p < .05$ level of significance. The group of students from EU countries, were 15% male and 41% female and the non-EU students group male 19% and 26% female. There were twice as many students from EU countries age 20-25, from outside of the EU. The “number of countries visited for pleasure” (1-2) group, non-EU students were 11% are ten times more than EU students 1%, (6-10) countries group, EU students were nearly double more 20%, than non-EU students 11%, (11-20) countries group, were EU students more what double 17%, than non-EU students 7%, and (More than 20) visited countries group, EU students were three times more 10%, than non-EU students 3%. There were twice as many bachelor’s degree students from the EU than non-EU. The “relationship status” categories significant difference “in relationship” category, EU students group were more than double 22%, than non-EU students 10%.

Table5.

Cross-tabulation-profiles of EU and non-EU international students

Profiles	Categories		Nationality		Total
			EU country	Non EU country	
Educational level***	Bachelor student	%	25%	11%	36%
	Master student	%	29%	33%	62%
	PhD student	%	1%	1%	2%
	Total	%	55%	45%	100%
Number of countries visited for pleasure*	1-2	%	1%	11%	12%
	3-5	%	8%	13%	20%
	6-10	%	20%	11%	31%

	11-20	%	17%	7%	24%
	More that 20	%	10%	3%	13%
		Total			
		%	56%	44%	100%
Age**	Under 20	%	1%	1%	2%
	20-25	%	42%	22%	65%
	26-30	%	10%	16%	25%
	31-35	%	1%	4%	5%
	More than 35	%	1%	1%	3%
		Total			
		%	56%	44%	100%
Gender***	Male	%	15%	19%	33%
	Female	%	40%	26%	67%
		Total			
		%	55%	45%	100%
Relationship status***	Single	%	29%	29%	58%
	In relationship	%	22%	10%	32%
	Living with spouse	%	4%	6%	10%
		Total			
		%	55%	45%	100%

Note: *p< 0.001; **p< 0.005; ***p< 0.05.

Hypotheses were tested with multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs) (table 6). Background variables with significant inter-category differences were used as covariates as required. There was a significant overall effect for nationality ($F = 2.63$; $p < .01$), and analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) indicated a

significant between-group difference for cross-cultural ($F = 4.02$; $p < .05$), with higher mean score for EU international students. There was a significant multivariate effect for relationship status ($F = 2.84$; $p < .01$), indicating a significant between-group difference for social relationship ($F = 11.98$; $p < .005$), with higher mean score for single international students, and education ($F = 3.75$, $p < .05$) with higher mean score for in relationship students. There was a significant overall effect for the travel experience level categories ($F = 1.31$; $p < .30$), indicating a significant between-category difference for isolation reasons ($F = 3.91$; $p < .05$), with a higher mean score for low travel experience international students. There was also a significant overall effect for age groups ($F = 1.18$; $p < .40$), indicating a significant between-group difference for social relationship ($F = 6.19$; $p < .05$), with a higher mean score for younger students.

Table 6.

MANCOVA and ANCOVA for motivation to international students by demographics

MANCOVA and ANCOVA for motivation to international students by nationality						
	EU		Non-EU		Multivariate effect	Univariate F-ratios
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	n=116		n=93			
Novelty-seeking, stimulation	5.87	.94	5.64	.97	2.63**	1.31
Career	5.30	1.27	5.62	1.10		1.28
Cross-cultural	5.97	1.00	5.55	1.49		4.02*
Social-relationship	5.05	1.11	5.01	1.24		.30
Autonomy	4.93	1.36	4.56	1.54		2.57
Education	6.25	.91	6.20	1.07		.25
Escape	3.54	1.42	3.50	1.58		.11
Nature	4.27	1.72	4.61	1.66		2.65
Isolation	3.98	1.58	4.26	1.72		2.21

MANCOVA and ANCOVA for motivation to international students by relationship						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Single		In relationship		Multivariate effect	Univariate F-ratios
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	n=121		n=88			
Novelty-seeking, stimulation	5.82	.88	5.68	1.07	2.84*	1.65
Career	5.87	1.24	5.67	1.27		2.10
Cross-cultural	5.38	1.33	5.52	1.02		2.74
Social-relationship	5.25	1.08	4.73	1.23		11.98***
Autonomy	4.68	1.51	4.88	1.37		.40
Education	6.02	1.08	6.26	.77		3.75*
Escape	3.46	1.48	3.59	1.51		.07
Nature	4.12	1.88	4.18	1.87		.16
Isolation	4.19	1.72	3.99	1.55		.58

MANCOVA and ANCOVA for motivation to international students by travel experience level

	Low travel experience		High travel experience		Multivariate effect	Univariate F-ratios
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	n=130		n=77			
Novelty-seeking, stimulation	5.76	1.01	5.80	.87	1.31 ^o	.04
Career	5.67	1.33	6.00	1.07		1.45
Cross-cultural	5.52	1.20	5.34	1.20		.82
Social-relationship	5.09	1.18	4.93	1.15		.18
Autonomy	4.76	1.41	4.82	1.48		.08
Education	6.30	.88	6.16	1.09		2.04
Escape	3.56	1.55	3.45	1.38		.12
Nature	4.54	1.68	4.24	1.73		.56
Isolation	4.33	1.66	3.74	1.56		3.91*

MANCOVA and ANCOVA for motivation to international students by age

	Younger		Older		Multivariate effect	Univariate F-ratios
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	n=139		n=70			
Novelty-seeking, stimulation	5.86	.95	5.57	.97	1.18 ^o	2.53
Career	5.90	1.10	5.56	1.50		1.08
Cross-cultural	5.32	1.25	5.69	1.08		1.76

Social-relationship	5.19	1.10	4.72	1.25	6.20*
Autonomy	4.84	1.36	4.62	1.62	.29
Education	6.21	.97	6.28	1.03	.18
Escape	3.60	1.49	3.34	1.48	.96
Nature	4.43	1.68	4.39	1.74	.32
Isolation	4.17	1.66	3.98	1.63	1.13

Note: *p< .05; **p< .01; ***p< .005; °p< .40

^aCovariates: Education occupation, age, gender, and relationship status.

^bCovariates: Nationality, gender.

^cCovariates: Nationality, gender, age, and education occupation.

^dCovariates: Nationality, gender, and relationship status.

5. Discussion

The results confirm support for Hypotheses 1e, 2f, 3d, 3f, and 4i. Hypotheses 1a-d, 1f-i, 2a-e, 2g-i, 3a-c, 3e, 3g-i, and 4a-h were a rejected.

These findings indicate that international students go to study abroad not only for education and career reasons; they are also motivated by tourism-related reasons as a novelty seeking and stimulation. In addition, they have cross-cultural and social relationship motives. Among these domains, academic and education initiatives, is the most important. Increasing knowledge, developing skills and abilities suggest that that main purpose for international students to move to study abroad is academic education initiatives. The second most important motivation was cross-cultural. Exploring another culture, interacting with locals, understanding host culture, learning more about the host culture, these motives reflecting student curiosity for exploring host culture and people and increase their “world-mindedness”. The students wanted to meet people, to travel and to enjoy life in a diverse environment. Williams (2005) indicated that students who study abroad exhibit a greater change in intercultural communication skills after their semester abroad that students who stay on campus. Williams results reflect that exposure to various cultures was the greatest predictor of intercultural communications skills. Learning to perceive and appreciate diversity is the bridge between experiences of life spheres which we otherwise are more likely to consider as separate (Teichler, 2004). These results are consistent with prior

Nyaupane et al. (2010) and Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) empirical findings which show that two most important study abroad motivation factors is academic-education and cross-cultural. The findings also similar to previous Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) results which suggest that most important reasons for studying abroad identified opportunity to live in another culture and opportunity to travel. The third important motivation factor is novelty-seeking stimulation. Getting a new experience, seeing more of the world, experiencing something different, having an adventure, having fun, and feeling excitement. The fourth important factor is career, expanding career opportunities, the personal challenging of the academic experience, a foreign university degree. Whereas, were less important motivations: getting away from the usual demands, overcoming a bad mood, getting away from crowds of people, avoiding interpersonal stress.

The results indicated that tourism motivation was strongest among younger, single, EU, and low travel experience international students. These results are consistent with prior (Varasteh, Marzuki, & Rasoolimanesh, 2014) findings that shows that travel behaviors are strongly associated with demographic characteristics of international students. Age, marital status and nationality were the primary basis for segmentation because most of the students' preferences are based on these criteria.

However, stronger motivation to move abroad was found among younger, non-EU, and "in relationship" respondents. These findings are similar to Laurings et al.'s (2014) empirical results, which indicate that younger people are more adventurous travelers. These results also consistent with Richards and Wilson's (2003) empirical findings that social relationship initiatives as a "building close friendship" and "associating with other travelers" is an important motive among young international students.

The findings are consistent with those of Pearce and Lee (2005) who observed a relationship between the identified motivation dimensions and travel experience. The three most important motivational factors - novelty seeking, escape, and social-relationship - showed no significant difference in relation to travel experience. The results confirm the findings of Richards and Wilson (2003, p. 3). Richards and Wilson found that the main motivation tends to be exploring other cultures (cross-cultural), followed by excitement (stimulation), increasing knowledge (education), and the desire to encounter “different” people and places (social relationship). The students’ growing awareness that study abroad first and foremost realize needs them personally and that it helped them in becoming more mature and worldly adults, explore and know the cultural difference, and able to study and travel in environments that are not what they are accustomed to at home.

The research found that younger and single international students have significantly stronger social relationship motivations to study abroad than older and “in relationship” students. The results are similar to prior Stround’s (2010) empirical findings, which show that younger students-travelers place more emphasis on social relationship than older students do. The outcomes are also consistent with Kang and Hsub’s (2005) and Luring et al.’s (2014) results, which show, that relationship status indicate a significant difference to tourism motivation.

The findings echo Salma’s (2002) conclusion that international students also contribute to the economy through part-time work. Almost half of the students in this study have a part- or full-time job. Viewing international students as sources of revenues, countries also see international students as a potential source of skilled migration and are adjusting immigration polices in order to make it easier for more international students to maintain residency and work in host countries after their studies have been completed (Tremblay, 2005).

The results of this study are applicable to the travel industry in general and specifically to students' travel marketing, which is one of the largest and fastest-growing tourism segments (Jarvis & Peal, 2008).

6. Conclusion

The study reflects the blurred distinction, between international students study, and travel motivations. The research identifies some similarities with Luring et al. (2014) blurred distinction among sojourners, migrants, and holidaymakers.

This research contributes to increasing the knowledge and understanding of international students' study and tourism initiatives and supports earlier qualitative findings, by taking a micro-level survey-based approach. According to Teichler (2004) the importance of leisure or vacation-related motives among international students is increasing. The fact that students' and young travellers indicate that the main benefit they gain from their travel is a thirst for more travel indicates that growth will continue (Richards & Wilson, 2005).

With the dynamic changing demographics of international travel, international students will comprise a growing part of international travel. The tourism business needs to pay more attention to this segment, and more detailed research on the characteristics of this group would certainly be very important for the tourism industry when setting up a plan to attract this target group. Davidson et al. (2010) indicate that international students contribute to the domestic tourism industry.

The outcomes of this study deliver understanding for leaders of study abroad programs, and student tourism business. University managers and study abroad leaders can use these findings to improve their market understanding and create the programs for students that take into consideration the fact that students who want to study abroad are looking for more than just education or a chance to travel. The

increasing professionalization and flexibility of the student and youth travel industry should see this market coming of age in the near future (Richards & Wilson, 2005).

6.1 Limitations and future research

There are apparent limitations to this study. Given the diverse characteristics of Norwegian universities, the results may not be appropriate to international students in all Norwegian universities. This study does not examine the socioeconomic status of the respondents due to resource constraints and restrictions on the gathering of sensitive data. Future researchers are recommended to investigate the socioeconomic status of international students. To verify the proposed study abroad and travel motives, future researchers can also compare Norway's universities. It is also advisable to use qualitative research designs to understand why students want to study abroad and how this desire is associated with their travel motives.

7. References

- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10, 3-25.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- Burns, D. J., Reid, J., Toncar, M., Anderson, C., & Wells, C. (2008). The effect of gender on the motivation of members of generation Y College students to volunteer. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 19(1), 99-118.
- Cantwell, B., Luca, S. G., & Lee, J. J. (2009). Exploring the orientations of international students in Mexico: Differences by region of origin. *Higher Education*, 57(3), 335-354.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (1998). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. New York: Palgrave.
- Chen, T., & Barnett, G. A. (2000). Research on international student flows from a macro perspective: A network analysis of 1985, 1989 and 1995. *Higher Education*, 29(435-453).
- Child, D. (1970). *The essentials of factor analysis*. New York: Holt.
- Chirkov, V., Vansteenkiste, M., Tao, R., Lynch, M. (2007). The role of self-determined motivation and goals for study abroad in the adaptation of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Repations*, 31(2), 199-222.
- Conradson, D., & Latham, A. (2005). Friendship, networks and transnationality in a world city: Antipodean transmigrants in London *Journal of Ethnic and Migration*, 31(287-305).

- Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4*(4), 184-194.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research, 8*(2), 187-219.
- Davidson, M., Wilkins, H., King, B., Hobson, P., Craig-Smith, S., & Gardiner, S. (2010). *International education visitation - Tourism opportunities*. Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre Pty Ltd.
- Findlay, A., & King, R. (2010). *Motivations and experiences of UK students studying abroad* (Vol. Research Paper No.8). BIS: University of Dundee.
- Findlay, A., King, R., Stam, A., & Ruiz-Gelices, E. (2006). The changing geographies of UK students studying and working abroad. *European Urban and Regional Studies, 13*(4), 291-318.
- Frisch, N. C. (1990). An international nursing student exchange program: An educational experience that enhanced student cognitive development. *Journal of Nursing Education, 29*(1), 10-12.
- Glover, P. (2011). International students: linking education and travel *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 28*, 180-195.
- Gonzalez, C. R., Masanza, R. B., & Mariel, P. (2011). The determinants of international student mobility flows: An empirical study on the Erasmus programme. *Higher Education, 62*(4), 413-430.
- Hsu, C. H. C., & Sung, S. (1997). Travel Behaviours of International Students at a Midwestern University. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(Summer), 59-66.
- Huang, R. (2008). Mapping Educational Tourists' Experience in the UK: understanding international students. *Third World Quarterly, 29*(5), 1003-1020.

- Ingraham, E. C., & Peterson, D. L. (2004). Assessing the impact of study abroad on student learning at Michigan State University. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10(Fall), 83-100.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Towards a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.
- Jarvis, J., & Peal, V. (2008). Study backpackers: Australia's short-stay international student travellers. . In K. A. Hannam, I. (Ed.), *Backpackers tourism: Concepts and profiles* (pp. 157-173). Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
- Kang, S. K., & Hsub, C. H. C. (2005). Dyadic consensus on family vacation destination selection. *Tourism Management*, 26(4), 571-582.
- Kass, R., & Tinsley, H. (1979). Factor analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11(2), 120-138.
- Kim, K., Jogaratnam, G., & Noh, J. (2006). Travel decisions of students at a US university: Segmenting the international market. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(4), 345-357.
- Kim, K., Noh, J., & Jogaratnam, G. (2006). Multi-destination seggmentation based on push and pull motives: Pleasure trips of students at a U.S. university. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Mareketing*, 21(2/3), 19-32.
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Study abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 441-452.
- Kondacki, Y. (2011). Student mobility reviewed: Attraction and satisfaction of international students in Turkey. *Higher Education*, 62(2), 573-592.

- Lauring, J., Selmer, J., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2014). Business or Pleasure? Blurring Relocation Categories and Motivation Patterns among Expatriates. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 14*(2), 170-186.
- Llewellyn-Smith, C., & McCabo, V. S. (2008). What is the attraction for exchange students: the host destination or host university? Empirical evidence from a study of an Australian university. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 10*(6), 593-607.
- Mazzarol, T. (1998). Critical success factors for international education marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management, 12*(4), 163-175.
- Mazzarol, T., & Soutar, G. N. (2002). "Push-pull" factors influencing international student destination choice. *The International Journal of Education Management, 16*, 82-90.
- Michael, I., Armstrong, A., & King, B. (2003). The travel behaviour of international students: The relationship between studying abroad and their choice of tourist destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10*(1), 57-66.
- Min-En, A. T. (2006). Travel Stimulated by International Students in Australia. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 8*, 451-468.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Paris, C. M., & Teye, V. (2010). Why do students study abroad? Exploring motivation beyond earning academic credits. *Tourism Analysis, 15*, 263-267.
- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. I. (2005). Developing the Travel Career Approach to Tourist Motivation. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*, 226-237.
- Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2003). *New Horizons in Independent Youth and Student Travel*. Retrieved from Amsterdam:

- Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2004). The International Student Travel Market: Travelstyle, Motivations and Activities. *Tourism Review International*, 8(2), 57-67.
- Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2005). Youth tourism - Finally coming of age? In M. Novelli (Ed.), *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases* (pp. 39-46). Oxford, England: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ritchie, B., Carr, N., & Cooper, C. (2003). *Managing Educational Tourism*. Clevedon: Channel View.
- Roberts, E. H. (1998). The innocents abroad. Do students face international internships unprepared? *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 64-69.
- Ryan, C., & Zhang, Z. (2007). Chinese students: Holiday behaviours in New Zealand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(2), 95-105.
- Snepenger, D., King, J., Marshall, E., & Uysal, M. (2006). Modeling Iso-Ahola's motivation theory in the tourism context. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45, 140-149.
- Stangor, C., Jonas, K., Stroebe, W., & Hewstone, M. (1994). Influence of student exchange on national stereotypes, attitudes, and perceived group variability. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 663-675.
- Stone, M. J., & Petrick, J. F. (2013). The educational benefits of travel experiences: A literature review. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(6), 731-744.
- Stronkhorst, R. (2005). Learning outcomes of international mobility at two Dutch institutions of higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(4), 292-315.
- Stroud, A. H. (2010). Who plans (not) to study abroad? An examination of U.S. student intent. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(5), 491-507.

- Student Marketing. (2012). *Market trends and overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.student-market.com/youth-travel>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). London, England Pearson.
- Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a challenge to higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 5, 5-23.
- Teichler, U. (2004). Temporary study abroad: The life of ERASMUS students. *European Journal of Education*, 39(4), 395-408.
- Tremblay, K. (2005). Academic mobility and immigration *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 196-228.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Van Hoof, H. B., & Verbeeten, M. J. (2005). Wine is for drinking, water is for washing: Student opinions about international exchange programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(1), 42-61.
- Varasteh, H., Marzuki, A., & Rasoolimanesh, S. M. (2014). Factors affecting international students' behaviour. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 21(2), 131-149.
- Waters, J., Brooks, R., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2011). Youthful escapes? British students, overseas education and the pursuit of happiness. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 12(5), 455-469.
- Wiers-Jensen, J. (2003). Norwegian students abroad: Experiences of students from linguistically and geographically peripheral European country. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(4), 391-411.
- Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the Impact of Study Abroad on Students' Intercultural Communication Skills: Adaptability and Sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(4), 356-371.

8. Appendix A

Why do you choose to study abroad?

By answering this survey you help to obtain a better understanding of student's interest in studying abroad. The survey questionnaire it is totally anonymous.

(1) - Strongly disagree; (2) - Disagree; (3) - Disagree somewhat; (4) - Undecided; (5) - Agree somewhat; (6) - Agree; (7) - Strongly agree.

1a. I wanted to develop my skills and abilities.

2a. I desired to increase my knowledge.

3a. I wanted to learn a foreign language.

4a. I wanted to get a good education.

5a. I wanted to get the opportunity to broaden awareness of the world.

6a. I wanted to get the personal challenge of the academic experience.

7a. I think I will get a positive feedback on the experience from acquaintances from my home country.

8a. I desired to challenge my abilities.

1b. I wanted to expand my career opportunities.

2b. A foreign university degree will open good employment opportunities for me.

3b. I wanted to do the "right" thing for my career.

4b. I wanted to save money.

5b. I wanted to get a well-paying job.

1c. I desired to have an adventure.

2c. I wanted a new challenge.

3c. I wanted to get a new experience.

4c. I wanted to see more of the world.

- 1d. I wanted to escape from my current situation.
- 2d. I was bored with my home country.
- 3d. I wanted to get away from a stressful social environment.
- 4d. I wanted to escape from home area social norms.
- 5d. I wanted to travel independently without family.
- 6d. I desired to get away from everyday psychological stress/pressure.
- 7d. I wanted to overcome a bad mood.
- 8d. I wanted to avoid people who annoy me.
- 9d. I wanted to avoid interactions with other people in home country.
- 10d. I desired to get away from the usual demands.
- 11d. I wanted to rest and relax physically.
- 12d. I wanted to get from daily routines in my home area.
- 1e. I wanted to do things my own way.
- 2e. I desired to be obligated to no one.
- 3e. I wanted to be independent.
- 1f. I wanted to be harmonious with nature.
- 2f. I wanted to get a better appreciation of nature.
- 3f. I wanted to be close to nature.
- 4f. I wanted to view a different scenery.
- 1g. I wanted to visit places related to my personal interests.
- 2g. I wanted to feel the special atmosphere like the vacation destination.
- 3g. I wanted to have fun.
- 4g. I desired to experience something different.
- 1h. I wanted to have a daring/adventuresome experience.
- 2h. I desired to have a unpredictable experience.

- 3h. I wanted to feel excitement.
- 4h. I desired to experience thrills.
- 1i. I wanted to travel with new acquaintances.
- 2i. I was interested in shopping in the host country.
- 3i. I wanted to be with others who enjoy the same things as I do.
- 4i. I wanted to meet new people.
- 5i. I wanted to tell others about my experience.
- 6i. I wanted to be closer to friends/family.
- 7i. I desired to have a good time with friends.
- 8i. I wanted to develop close friendship with new acquaintances.
- 1j. I wanted to learn more about the host country.
- 2j. I wanted to interact with locals in the host country.
- 3j. I desired to understand the host culture on a deeper level than the average 'tourist'.
- 4j. I desired to explore another culture.
- 1k. I wanted to be away from the crowds of people.
- 2k. I wanted to experience the open space.
- 3k. I wanted to avoid interpersonal stress and pressure.
- 4k. I wanted to experience peace and calm.
1. Nationality. _____ EU country _____ Non EU country
2. Educational occupation. _____ Bachelor student _____ Master student
 _____ PhD student
3. Number of countries visited for pleasure. 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-20
 More that 20

4. Paid work besides studies, work hours per week. 0 1-8 9-16 17-24

More that 24

5. Age. Under 20 20-25 26-30 31-35 More that 35

6. Gender. _____ Male _____ Female

7. Relationship status. _____ Single _____ In relationship

_____ Living with spouse