Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education xxx (xxxx) xxxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jhlste

Exploring 'deep learning' during an international tourism field school

Stuart Hayes[a,*], Hazel Tucker[a], Clinton Golding[b]

[a] Department of Tourism, School of Business, University of Otago, P O Box 56, Dunedin, 9054, New Zealand
[b] Higher Education Development Centre, University of Otago, Dunedin, 9054, New Zealand

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Tourism education
Field schools
Cognitive and affective learning outcomes
Deep learning

ABSTRACT

Arguably, in an increasingly 'supercomplex' tourism world, tourism graduates must be prepared to think about and act in the best interests of multiple stakeholders. In order to develop such graduates, tourism programmes are therefore tasked with encouraging learning that is both thought provoking/changing and affective; this is deep learning. International tourism field schools, as a form of experiential learning, appear to have considerable potential for encouraging deep learning. However, there is little research about what type of learning, as well as how this learning, actually occurs. This research investigated the learning experiences and learning outcomes of students who, as part of their Master's degree, participated in an international tourism field school in Northern Thailand. We found that international tourism field schools offer a potent opportunity for deep learning, in that students develop a heightened awareness of, and are affected by, tourism's supercomplexities. Such changes may, in turn, lead to more ethical and sustainable actions in the future.

1. Introduction

Tourism may be particularly susceptible to the messiness of what Barnett (2000) refers to as a 'supercomplex' world. Within the context of a globalized society, multiple layers of governance, socio-economic and environmental relationships, and power characterize supercomplexity (Barnett, 2000). Therefore, as Airey (2015) acknowledges, the tourism world requires graduates who can critically navigate these multiple layers of complexity in order to make decisions that are driven by principles of sustainability and fairness. Arguably, such graduates will need to have an understanding of how tourism 'works' but they will also require the will to act ethically and sustainably (Airey, Tribe, Benckendorff, & Xiao, 2015; Pritchard, Morgan, & Ateljevic, 2011; Tribe, 2002). This requires that tourism students be opened up to experiences that have the potential to encourage deeper, more critical ways of thinking about tourism, and that may also affect students and thereby their potential to act (more) sustainably. This is the essence of what Säljö (1979) terms 'deep learning', that which is both cognitive and affective (e.g. Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956).

International tourism field schools represent one form of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; 2014) that may have the potential to successfully nurture deep learning (Säljö, 1979; Warburton, 2003). Indeed much of the literature on international experiential education highlights the important and often potent role that real-world experiences can play in developing students' global citizenry outlook, one that is underpinned by cognitive and personal change. However, despite the potential that may exist for international tourism field schools to play a pivotal role in encouraging deep learning, empirical research into the learning outcomes experienced

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: Stuart.hayes@postgrad.otago.ac.nz (S. Hayes), Hazel.tucker@otago.ac.nz (H. Tucker), Clinton.golding@otago.ac.nz (C. Golding).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2019.100229
Received 6 February 2019; Received in revised form 21 July 2019; Accepted 15 October 2019

by students during such programmes remains limited. Accordingly, there is limited understanding about what kind of learning happens during an international tourism field school and whether, if at all, such experiences do indeed provide fertile ground for deep learning.

The purpose of this research is, therefore, to contribute to this evolving area by investigating what students learned during an international tourism field school. In particular, we explore the potential of international tourism field schools in encouraging deep learning that can be simultaneously cognitive and affective. Before going on to introduce our case study, the following sections will review the theoretical links between cognitive, affective and deep learning, as well as the relevance of this to the international field school context. Specific attention is paid to exploring the term 'affect' and how this may be differentiated from other terms such as emotion and feeling.

2. Higher order learning, cognition and affect

Arguably, tourism programmes need to provide learning opportunities that enable students to develop deep knowledge and understanding about tourism, along with the ability to apply this knowledge and understanding to complex situations. These types of learning outcomes are situated in the cognitive, or knowledge-based, domain of learning (Bloom et al., 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1964; Anderson et al., 2001; Tarrant, Rubin, & Stoner, 2015). Such learning may encourage the development of higher levels of understanding and awareness about, for example, the complex socio-cultural and environmental relationships that exist within the tourism world.

However, tourism students must also be moved to *act* in the best interests of the tourism world (Pritchard et al., 2011; Tribe, 2002). This notion of students being 'moved' by their learning talks to the idea of 'affect' and affective learning. For authors such as Bloom et al. (1956) and Krathwohl et al. (1964) affective learning is that which encourages a shift in values and attitudes toward, for example, acting in a more socially just manner. This process may be characterised by a change in a student's personal values to accommodate a heightened pro-social and environmental outlook, all of which may ultimately lead to more responsible and altruistic behaviours (Landon, Tarrant, Rubin, & Stoner, 2017).

A shift in values and attitudes speaks directly to the term 'affect' which, according to Shouse (2005), is different from 'feeling' or 'emotion', most notably because the former cannot be represented through language, whereas feelings or emotion can. In other words, a feeling or an emotion can be named or labelled (e.g. happy, sad), but affect cannot. As Pile (2010) notes, therefore, affect is non-representational. In this vein, affect is akin to what Massumi (2002, p. 30) describes as "a realm of *potential*". This suggests that affect happens before consciousness; before it can be named or labelled. Affect, therefore, is an antecedent to 'something' or, as Shouse (2005) notes in his reading of Massumi, it is the "body's way of preparing itself for action" (p. 1). Here, then, thought and affect are somehow separated, as affect occurs before consciousness and is therefore non-cognitive.

In many ways, a separating of thought and affect is evident in much of the research into different types of learning outcomes, whereby cognitive and affective learning outcomes are often dichotomised. The implication here is that learning is either knowledge-based or emotions-based. However, Shephard (2015) provides an important critique of this dichotomy:

> It appears unlikely that any higher order ... higher education learning outcome can be purely cognitive or purely affective (p. 71).

Instead, Shephard suggests, cognition and affect *interact*. This is likely to occur when students who have developed some knowledge and understanding about different perspectives (cognitive) through listening and responding (affective) are inspired to modify or even change their own point of view/value system and perhaps even be 'moved' to behave differently. In essence this type of combined cognitive and affective learning embraces critical thinking, critical reflection and ethical reasoning, all of which, despite traditional associations with the cognitive domain, also fit with the affective domain. This is because, as Shephard (2015) notes, they may have the propensity to influence decision-making and behaviour. In essence, then, a change in thinking may simultaneously serve to prepare the body for action (Shouse, 2005) through affect. Such change is likely to be important if tourism graduates are to be well equipped to navigate tourism's 'supercomplexities' in order to deliver just and sustainable outcomes.

3. Deep learning in the cognitive and affective domains

The idea that learning may be simultaneously cognitive and affective is an interesting one and suggests, in contrast to an earlier point, that there may be no split between conscious thought and affect. As Pile (2010) notes, "Affect is strongly associated with the unconscious ... but this does not mean that it cannot 'leak' into other systems" (p. 13-14). Within the context of higher order learning, therefore, affect may have the propensity to 'leak into' conscious thought, and vice-versa..

This sort of learning is similar to what Säljö (1979) has termed 'deep learning'. Deep learning involves students actively engaging with arguments and counter-arguments in order to make sense of knowledge, construct their own arguments and ultimately develop as a person. It is learning that is characterised by a willingness and curiosity to seek meaning in a subject and to make connections with new and existing knowledge (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983; Säljö, 1979). Opportunities for contextual interpretation (i.e. applying concepts/knowledge/understand/values to real-life scenarios) also play a vital role in deep learning (Warburton, 2003).

Deep learning is different from surface learning which is learning knowledge to simply pass assessments/exams. Deep learning is not easily forgotten and can be continually drawn upon by graduates in the face of different contexts, challenges, or problems (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999), such that maybe faced in a 'supercomplex' tourism world (Airey et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2011; Tribe, 2002). This sort of learning can be encouraged through a deep approach to teaching, where teachers engage students in active

learning and seek to connect new theories and concepts to students' prior knowledge (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983; Säljö, 1979).

According to Warburton (2003), deep learning is more likely to happen when a course provides opportunities for mastery learning or discovery learning (which involves student self-directed learning and the teacher as facilitator) and self-reflection (where students contemplate their own values and attitudes in relation to issues and/or evaluate alternative courses of action based on values). This sort of learning environment provides time for students to assimilate new knowledge into their own values and belief system, and ultimately encourages a (re)consideration of how to act based on this new underpinning knowledge.

A deep approach, as Stefani (2009) notes, also requires the development of meaningful and holistic learning outcomes that encompass both the cognitive and affective. The possible interplay between thought and affect may be especially prominent during deep learning experiences due to deep learning's propensity for encouraging cognitive disequilibrium (i.e. a discrepancy between students' prior knowledge/experience and the task/experience at hand). As Graesser and D'Mello (2011. p. 12-13) argue, "Cognitive disequilibrium occurs when there are ... contradictions, anomalous events, dissonance, incongruities, ... uncertainty, deviations from norms, and novelty", all of which are simultaneously accompanied by an affective state such as 'confusion'. It is in such affective states where deep learning happens, as students are forced to (re)think their worldview, (re)evaluate their values and possibly, after Shouse (2005), (re)prepare their bodies for (different) action. Given their propensity for including a raft of new and 'confusion-inducing' experiences, international tourism field schools, as a form of experiential or 'hands on' learning, may be especially conducive to deep learning.

4. Field schools and deep learning

Field schools are a form of experiential learning, an umbrella term used to describe a range of learning activities that can bring students into direct contact with the subject being studied (Keeton & Tate, 1978; Kolb, 1984, 2014). According to Keeton and Tate (1978) experiential learning is:

> Learning in which the learner is directly in touch with the realities being studied. It is contrasted with the leaner who only reads about, hears about, talks about, or writes about these realities but never comes into contact with them as part of the learning experiences (as cited in Kolb, 2014, p. xviii)

Kolb (1984; 2014) identifies experiential learning as a context sensitive recursive process where students reflect on concrete experiences for the purpose of developing abstract conceptions and a reimaging of the world as lived. The emphasis is on experiencing 'reality', which may be achieved using a number of different classroom and non-classroom learning activities including, for example, simulations, role play, case studies, field trips and international field schools. International field schools are distinct from similar forms of experiential learning activities, such as field trips, primarily because they involve an extended period of time overseas and 'in the field'. For example, field schools tend to last one month or more, but field trips are generally shorter and, as Scarce (1997) notes, may be regarded as "short-term experiential learning" (p. 219).

In the context of international tourism field schools, 'concrete experiences' (Kolb, 1984; 2014) may refer to "substantive learning about [tourism] ... as experienced and dealt with by different social actors" (Hirsch & Lloyd, 2005, p. 322) within a destination. These actors may include tourism workers, tourists or the host society. Such learning may provide not only rich opportunities for contextual interpretation (after Warbuton, 2003), but they may also be rich with uncertainty, ambiguity and contradictions, all of which may lead to cognitive disequilibrium and confusion (Graesser & D'Mello, 2011). In these affective states of confusion and uncertainty, field school students may develop 'abstract conceptualisations' that may lead them to change their future behaviour towards, for example, a heightened sense of social justice.

Research into the learning experiences and learning outcomes of international field schools is most prominent in disciplines such as anthropology and geography. Gmelch and Gmelch (1999) outline the raft of positive learning outcomes accrued by U.S. students undertaking an international anthropology field school in Barbados. Their findings suggest that a "deeper immersion ... in the culture forces students to actively examine and make sense of the host society in ways that do not happen in a classroom" (Gmelch & Gmelch, 1999, p. 225). This 'deeper immersion' in culture was coupled with "regular surprises and predicaments" (Gmelch & Gmelch, 1999, p. 224), all of which led to cognitive (e.g. acquiring new knowledge about the local society) and affective (e.g. acquiring new 'sensibilities') changes in students. Similarly, and perhaps more strikingly, Owens, Sotoudehnia and Erickson-McGee's (2015) analysis of an international geography field school highlights how direct engagement with places and people "can invigorate students with hope to enact positive change" (p. 325). Here, the notion of being 'invigorated' with hope speaks explicitly to affect, whilst these affective changes are also closely intertwined with cognitive learning and the 'mobilisation of new knowledge' (Owens, Sotoudehnia and Erickson-McGee's (2015), p. 325).

Yet, despite their obvious potential for encouraging deep learning, research into the learning outcomes and learning experiences of international tourism field schools remains limited. Where research does exist, the focus tends to be on student motivation prior to a field school and satisfaction after a field school (e.g. Arcodia & Dickson, 2009), or otherwise on the generalised benefits of field schools (e.g. Ettenger, 2009). Further, there is scant research specifically exploring the link between international tourism field schools and deep learning. Our study is therefore intended to make a contribution to this under-researched area, principally through investigating the following questions: What do tourism students learn from an international tourism field school?; and, What do students' experiences tell us about the potential for international tourism field schools to provide opportunities for deep learning? The following sections provide an overview of the research context and the methods employed to pursue the research questions.

5. Research context and methods

The Tourism and Development Ethnographic Field School is a Master's level programme and is organised and delivered by tourism academics at a New Zealand University. It is a residential, month-long programme that takes place in Chiang Mai, Northern Thailand, a popular region for international and domestic tourists. Of particular interest in the region are the hill-tribe villages that promote authentic hill-tribe experiences, as well as elephant camps and other cultural/religious/historical sites. Subsequently, this region is an excellent base from which students are able to immerse themselves in the multiple, inter-related, and at times provocative and uncertain, worlds of tourism.

The field school seeks to provide practical experience in designing, conducting and critically evaluating ethnographic research. In addition, the field school has been designed to provide students with real world experiences (e.g. visiting an elephant camp) of tourism in a developing country. The aim here is to show students, in a very intimate and practical way, some of the cultural, ethical and global issues surrounding tourism, and to encourage them to be more aware of their role, as tourists, researchers and future tourism leaders. In essence, the aim is to develop critical reflection, which Fisher defines as "a process attached to looking at one's own positioning" (as cited in Wilson, 2015, p. 205). Broadly underpinned by a critical pedagogy, the fieldschool is aimed at encouraging critical reflection. This occurs by explicitly alternating and linking fieldtrips to tourist attractions and bazaars, elephant camps and hill-tribe villages, with guided group discussions and individual reflective assessments (e.g. students complete a reflective fieldwork diary).

The field school therefore provides a way for students to ground their previous learning in a real world context. In particular, any student wishing to enrol in the field school must complete a Tourist Culture paper, the focus of which is on examining contemporary tourism mobilities. In addition, all students will have undertaken the compulsory Advanced Tourism Concepts paper where they learn about tourism as a multi-faceted phenomenon. Some may also have completed papers on tourism and the environment and tourism destination development. From these different papers, students are introduced to high-level concepts aimed at illustrating the multiple complexities that exist within and through tourism (see Sharpley, 2011; Sharpley & Telfer, 2014), and the myriad of ways that one can achieve sustainable ends.

Through the provision of real world experiences and a critical pedagogy (see 'Discussion and conclusion' section), the field school aims directly at producing the intended learning outcomes of the Master of Tourism programme, of which the field school is an optional part. These intended learning outcomes are: Students will 1. Have a holistic view of tourism; 2. Be critically engaged global citizens; 3. Have an understanding of self in society; 4. Value and engage in research; 5. Adopt an ethical approach in tourism practice. Thus, the research upon which this article is based endeavoured to investigate: what, and how exactly, students learn during the international tourism field school. Moreover, given that the intended learning outcomes stated above appear to rely on deep learning, we wanted to explore what students' experiences can tell us about the potential for international tourism field schools to encourage such learning.

In order to answer the research questions, a qualitative approach was chosen primarily in order to generate a rich and detailed picture about students' experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and learning outcomes (Buissink-Smith, Mann, & Shephard, 2011). Our study was seeking to probe, rather than to measure, students' experiences of learning and a qualitative, rather than a quantitative, approach was considered the best way to achieve this. The cohort were all 'international students' from China, and all were undertaking the field school as an optional part of their Master of Tourism degree. It is also worth noting that most were from non-tourism backgrounds (i.e. most had not completed undergraduate tourism studies and few had experience of working in tourism).

Students completed an open-ended survey designed to allow them individually to describe the ways in which the intended learning outcomes had/not been experienced during the fieldschool. The survey asked students to reflect on each of the five intended learning outcomes and then comment on how, if at all, each had been developed. Students were also asked to provide specific examples of their learning in relation to each of the intended learning outcomes. Twelve students completed the survey and this number represents all those that participated in the field school that year. Whilst a case study of this nature justifies a convenience sampling approach, we acknowledge that the sample size is small. As such, we were not seeking to make generalised conclusions from our findings.

After they completed the survey, the students, working in small focus groups of between three and five, discussed the following questions: How and in what ways has the field school influenced the way you now think about a) tourism, and b) your role in tourism (as tourists/future tourism leaders)? The purpose of these focus group discussions was to encourage some open-ended conversations among students about their field school experiences, or, in other words, to provide an opportunity to "think aloud" (Buissink-Smith et al., 2011, p. 108). In particular, the focus group discussion questions were organised to elicit responses that would help us to better understand: 1) What knowledge and understanding students had learned, 2) how they had been affected by their learning, and 3) the ways in which this learning might act as a precursor to future tourism action/decision making. Rather than asking questions directly about the learning outcomes, the questions were deliberately kept broad so that students were not restricted to simply 'talking to' the outcomes.

The focus group discussions were recorded, fully transcribed and later analysed using an abbreviated version of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Two main themes emerged: 'The field school encourages new ways of thinking and feeling about tourism', and 'New ways of knowing and feeling are potential precursors to action'. Both relate to how students experienced deep levels of cognitive and affective learning. The findings and discussion sections that follow integrate quotes from the students with relevant literature. The quotes presented were chosen because they best illustrate each theme being discussed.

6. Findings

6.1. Field school encourages new ways of thinking and feeling about tourism

Firstly, students were able to apply tourism theories and concepts to real-world tourism contexts and this helped them to engage with the subject at a deeper level:

This is a rare chance for us to apply our knowledge into practice.

We applied the theory of worldmaking and authenticity into practice.

Such comments are indicative of higher order thinking (e.g. Bloom et al., 1956) as they demonstrate the ways in which students were evaluating and applying knowledge. Applying theories such as 'worldmaking' (Hollinshead, 2007), for example, to the real tourism world speaks to the idea of contextual interpretation which, as Warburton (2003) notes, is important for deep learning.

Learning such as this appeared to be primarily cognitive, although there were indications that as students began to think about tourism at a deeper level they were also affected in someway. The comment below illustrates this:

Before the course I just thought of tourism as a business between travel agencies and tourists but in Thailand I noticed that … tourism is their [some peoples'] only way of making a living.

As the student spoke she revealed the ways in which she was cognitively re-evaluating existing knowledge in light of real-world experiences, a process that was also prompting an emotional engagement. The passionate tone in her voice appeared to be an expression of sympathy for those striving to make a living from tourism in what, based on her experiences of tourism in Northern Thailand, she had come to recognise were challenging conditions. This sort of learning, wherein students were affected by their learning as new knowledge and understanding emerged (e.g. Biggs & Tang, 2011; Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983; Säljö, 1979), demonstrates interplay between the cognitive and affective domains (Shephard, 2015; Pile, 2010; Graesser & D'Mello, 2011).

This interplay was evident in other experiences of learning wherein previously held conceptualisations of tourism were challenged by exposure to real-world events. One student, for example, suggested that the real-world experiences in the field school had helped him develop a better understanding about tourism as a multi-faceted and complex phenomenon (Airey, 2015; Barnett, 2000). He commented:

I found that tourism is more complicated than I had imagined in the past.

Here, the student may be experiencing a form of cognitive disequilibrium (Graesser & D'Mello, 2011), whereby his lived experiences of the field school serve to contradict and interrupt a hitherto simpler view of tourism. In complicating things for this student, the field school experiences do indeed appear to have created a situation where thinking differently about tourism is also accompanied by an affective state of confusion. Of importance too, when the student spoke of his changed thinking there was, in his voice, a definite sense of wonderment about the complicatedness of the tourism world 'as lived'. For this student the affective state of confusion appears, therefore, to also be accompanied by what Graesser and D'Mello (2011) refer to as an affect state of curiosity, wherein the student appears to want to 'dig deeper' into the complicated world of tourism. Again, experiencing the complicatedness of tourism brings thought and affect together within a broad framework of deep learning.

Furthermore, opportunities to connect with different people from around the world, including classmates and other tourists, opened up other spaces for students to enter into affect states:

Seeing and talking with people from other cultural backgrounds … inspire[s] me.

In the context of this discussion the use of the word 'inspire' is particularly powerful as it suggests the student had entered into an affect state of curiosity, wherein she was becoming more open-minded as a direct result of thinking about and reflecting on different worldviews. This sort of deep learning, which again is both cognitive and affective, is important as it may help foster what Pritchard et al. (2011) refer to as a global citizenry and democratic outlook.

The quotes presented so far illustrate how students described their learning and the ways in which their thoughts and feelings toward tourism had changed. In the following section we explore the ways in which such changes may prompt future changes in behaviour.

6.2. New ways of knowing and feeling are potential precursors to action

A key purpose of the field school is to provide students with experiences that would encourage them to think about how they might act and/or change their behaviour. Hence, the critical pedagogy adopted within the field is aimed at confronting students' ideas, stereotypes and possible misconceptions (Wilson, 2015) in relation to the tourism world. In the previous section we provided some examples of how learning experiences led to changes in thinking and, at the same time, to students entering into different affect states.

Students' reflections about the ethical dimensions of tourism appeared to have had a similar effect. The quote below, for example, highlights one of the ways in which reflecting on, and confronting, one's own moral lens affected students:

My experience … made me realize that there are contradictions that cannot or are very hard to solve, like the animal rights and the survival of the tour guide and mahouts [elephant trainer]. *So I should not judge these people from the moral high ground. If there is a chance, I*

would very much like to help improve … this kind of contradiction in tourism.

In this example, the student is referring to her experiences of visiting an elephant camp. By bearing witness to the complex, and at times conflicting, needs of human and non-human stakeholders, the experience appears to have produced a subtle shift in the student's moral compass. Crucially, in this example, there is something more going on than the student simply entering into different affect states as a result of some form of cognitive disequilibrium (after Graesser & D'Mello, 2011). Instead, this example points to a shift on the part of the student to (re)consider how they might *act* in the future when faced with multiple and potentially conflicting issues in tourism (Airey, 2015; Pritchard et al., 2011; Tribe, 2002).

Indeed, students made a strong connection between ethics and personal responsibility. The experiences of the field school had encouraged the students to actively think about the ways in which adopting an ethical approach in tourism practice could support sustainable outcomes, and the personal changes that may be needed to achieve such outcomes. Subsequently the field school appeared to provide students with the chance to (re)consider their own ethical responsibilities as tourists and potential tourism leaders:

If I'd never been here I would have thought my primary aim as a tourism leader is to make profit, make money. Now I think it's much more important to share the profit with the local people.

Previously I travelled as a tourist and didn't really think about ethical problems … but in the past few weeks I know that there are some tensions and dilemma's existing [between various stakeholders]. This changes my perception … so every time I travel I will think a lot more, rather than just be a tourist.

In these examples there is a cognitive shift underpinned by affect. More than that, though, these students were also able to articulate the actions that they might take to contribute to a better (tourism) world in the future. Students also suggested how they might attempt to resolve ethical dilemmas in the future. The quote below shows how one student was able to demonstrate how she might act to counter marketing campaigns that often skew the reality of people and places in the process of worldmaking (e.g. Hollinshead, 2007):

If I start working in tourism … I will try to portray a real picture of the place. [W]e see the advertisements and the marketing campaigns and they over hype the place … it is [not] ethical … you are fooling the tourists.

Drawing on concrete experiences of the marketing activities in Northern Thailand, and by evaluating these with reference to complex theories (e.g. 'worldmaking', Hollinshead, 2007), the student was able to consider alternative, perhaps more socially just, courses of action. She was, in short, beginning to appreciate her potential future role as a tourism 'worldmaker', and the responsibilities that come with that.

Given that future tourism leaders will be required to hear, appreciate and act upon the complex and contested needs of all those with a vested interest in tourism, this type of learning, wherein the cognitive and affective interact (Shephard, 2015), appears to have encouraged students to question who might benefit, and who may lose, as a result of their individual decisions. In turn, this may serve as a precursor to future action, where matters of ethics are positioned more prominently in students' thoughts and feelings.

7. Discussion and conclusion

Our findings tentatively suggest that international tourism field schools do have the propensity to actively influence the way students think *and* feel about tourism. This is arguably essential if, as Airey et al. (2015) suggest, tourism education is to effectively serve as,

a vehicle, not just for students' immediate employment needs but for bringing together a whole range of challenges that are present in the practice of tourism, from ecological and environmental issues to effective managerial practice and ethical behaviour (p. 148).

Here, tourism education becomes about developing the sort of graduates that can 1) enhance the sustainability of the industry by internalizing a moral obligation to the tourism world and 2) who can act as stewards for the resources and communities with which tourism interacts. The findings from this study provide a valuable illustration of the ways in which an international tourism field school can achieve these ends by encouraging deep learning that is at once cognitive and affective. Students are able to ground their knowledge in concrete experiences and, at the same time, are affected by these experiences. This interplay between cognitive and affective learning within deep learning points to the inseparability of thought and affect. This aligns with Shephard's conceptualisation of higher-order learning and further challenges the idea that, when thought of as non- or pre-cognitive, thought and affect can only ever be separate (as discussed in Pile, 2010).

The sort of deep learning discussed in this article is potentially profound in that it encourages higher order thinking that overlays intense emotional reactions. This is particularly the case where opportunities for contextual interpretation encourage emotional engagement and an active (re)consideration of one's own and others values. Moreover, the findings point to some degree of change in students, most notably in the way that ethical reasoning, when thought about in relation to complex and uncertain situations, prompts a (re)consideration of more appropriate courses of action. In this sense, one can speculate that the deep learning that takes place during a field school may indeed serve as a precursory influence on students future decision-making (Shephard, 2015).

Whilst the quotes presented throughout the previous section illustrate the ways in which the field school encourages deep learning, it remains somewhat unclear as to whether this sort of learning will actually serve to change students future behaviour. This raises the question as to whether it is all just 'talk' on the part of students. In an attempt to partially respond to this question, it is worth pausing to reflect on the critical pedagogy implemented during the field school. In particular, critical pedagogy plays a key role

in developing students' critical reflection, rather than just critical thinking. According to Wilson (2015), critical thinking and critical reflection mean slightly different things. The former is about understanding the assumptions that underpin *another's* positionality. Therefore, because of a lack of focus on one's own positionality, critical thinking is more likely to manifest as questioning rather than action. In other words, critical thinking is somehow less active. Critical reflection, on the hand, refers specifically to the process of understanding one's *own* positioning. It places the individual at the centre of tourism's supercomplexity. Accordingly, critical reflection is more likely to bring about change and action (Wilson, 2015).

During the field school we, the academics running the programme, implement critical pedagogy as a means to encourage deep critical reflection. Based on the work of Paolo Friere (e.g. Friere, 2018), critical pedagogy refers to a teaching approach that aims to help students recognise connections between themselves as individuals and the wider (tourism) society. Essentially, therefore, critical pedagogy is about placing students at the centre of that which is being studied (in this instance 'tourism') in order that they may become critically conscious - or critically reflective – of their role in effecting positive change.

Critical pedagogy was engaged in the field school by first encouraging students to adopt multiple interrelated roles (e.g. researchers/tourists/observers) and this allows those students to become more self-aware of their own assumptions, beliefs and attitudes in relation to tourism. More specifically, implementing critical pedagogy also involves helping students think through the complexities of tourism by exposing them to vivid and provocative experiences (e.g. a touristic elephant camp). We then encourage frank discussions about one's positionality in relation to such experiences, thereby helping students to become more aware of how their own values and attitudes, and those of others (Tucker & Hayes, 2019), manifest in different ways of thinking and acting.

In adopting a critical pedagogy such as that described, we have found that by the end of the field school there is a genuine and palpable sense of change, in particular in the ways that students talk about what they will *do* in the future. To some degree, it is as if the students have become more aware "of their power to shape the kind of world in which they want to live, engaging them in the project of expanding social justice" (Belhassen & Caton, 2011, p. 1395). Thus, students' "own power ... [and] human agency, including moral agency" (Belhassen & Caton, 2011, p. 1395) is awakened. Additionally, it is worth reiterating that most of the students involved with this research came from a limited background in tourism prior to the field school (either academically or professionally). Accordingly, this further points to the powerful and profound role that international field schools may play in producing *substantial* transformations in students. Of course, further research is needed in order to gain empirical understandings about the extent to which, if at all, students' experiences of the field school do lead to actual behavioural change. This will invariably come down to understanding what students do with what they learned during the field school, in particular in terms of how they promote, or otherwise, positive and sustainable change within the (tourism) world.

There is also another question that remains unanswered, and that is to what extent the claim for deep learning is valid given that the students had already completed a number of courses that involved high-level concepts, or higher order learning, prior to the field school. Here, future research might also focus on comparing the learning experiences and outcomes of students who complete the field school with those who do not (i.e. those whose learning experiences are predominantly classroom based). Overall, though, it seems apparent that international tourism fieldschools may, through their proximity to the real (tourism) world, significantly enhance cognitive and affective learning and hence promote deep learning in tourism education.

References

Airey, D. (2015). 40 years of tourism studies–a remarkable story. *Tourism Recreation Research, 40*(1), 6–15.

Airey, D., Tribe, J., Benckendorff, P., & Xiao, H. (2015). The managerial gaze: The long tail of tourism education and research. *Journal of Travel Research, 54*(2), 139–151.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P., Cruikshank, K., Mayer, R., Pintrich, P., et al. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of bloom's taxonomy.* New York: Longman Publishing.

Arcodia, C., & Dickson, C. (2009). ITHAS: An experiential education case study in tourism education. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 21*(1), 37–43.

Barnett, R. (2000). Supercomplexity and the curriculum. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(3), 255–265.

Belhassen, Y., & Caton, K. (2011). On the need for critical pedagogy in tourism education. *Tourism Management, 32*(6), 1389–1396.

Biggs, J. B., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at University.* New York, NY: Open University Press.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives. *Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain, 19*, 56 New York: David McKay.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Buissink-Smith, N., Mann, S., & Shephard, K. (2011). How do we measure affective learning in higher education? *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development, 5*(1), 101–114.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1–20). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Entwistle, N. J., & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning.* London: Croom Helm.

Ettenger, K. (2009). Students as tourists and fledgling researchers: The value of ethnographic field courses for tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 9*(3-4), 159–175.

Friere, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (*50th Anniversary Edition*). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing Inc.

Gmelch, G., & Gmelch, S. B. (1999). An ethnographic field school: What students do and learn. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 30*(2), 220.

Graesser, A., & D'Mello, S. K. (2011). Theoretical perspectives on affect and deep learning. In R. Calvo, & S. D'Mello (Vol. Eds.), *New perspectives on affect and learning technologies. Explorations in the learning sciences, instructional systems and performance technologies: Vol. 3*, (pp. 11–22). New York, NY: Springer.

Hirsch, P., & Lloyd, K. (2005). Real and virtual experiential learning on the Mekong: Field schools, e-sims and cultural challenge. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 29*(3), 321–337.

Hollinshead, K. (2007). Worldmaking and the transformation of place and culture: The enlargement of Meethan's analysis of tourism and global change. In I. Ateljevic, N. Morgan, & A. Pritchard (Eds.). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 165–193). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Keeton, M. T., & Tate, P. J. (1978). The boom in experiential learning. *New Directions for Experiential Learning,* (1), 1–8.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kolb, D. A. (2014). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook II: Affective domain.* New York: David McKay.

Landon, A. C., Tarrant, M., Rubin, D., & Stoner, L. (2017). Beyond just do-it: Fostering higher-order learning outcomes in short-term study abroad. *AERA Open, 3*(1), 1–7.
Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Owens, C., Sotoudehnia, M., & Erickson-McGee, P. (2015). Reflections on teaching and learning for sustainability from the cascadia sustainability field school. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 39*(3), 313–327.
Pile, S. (2010). Emotions and affect in recent human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 35*(1), 5–20.
Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Hopeful tourism: A new transformative perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(3), 941–963.
Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Säljö, R. (1979). Learning about learning. *Higher Education, 8*(4), 443–451.
Scarce, R. (1997). Field trips as short-term experiential education. *Teaching Sociology, 25*(3), 219–226.
Sharpley, R. (2011). *The study of tourism: Past trends and future directions.* Oxon, UK: Routledge.
Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. J. (Vol. Eds.), (2014). *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues: Vol. 63*Channel View Publications.
Shephard, K. (2015). *Higher education for sustainable development.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
Shouse, E. (2005). Feeling, emotion, affect. *M/c journal, 8*(6), 26.
Stefani, L. (2009). Planning teaching and learning: Curriculum design and development. In H. Fry, S. Ketteridge, & S. Marshall (Eds.). *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 40–57). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
Tarrant, M., Rubin, D. R., & Stoner, L. (2015). The effects of studying abroad and studying sustainability on students' global perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 26*, 68–82.
Tribe, J. (2002). The philosophic practitioner. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 338–357.
Tucker, H., & Hayes, S. (2019). Decentring scholarship through learning with/from each 'other'. *Tourism Geographies,* 1–21.
Warburton, K. (2003). Deep learning and education for sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 4*(1), 44–56.
Wilson, E. (2015). Practice what you teach: Teaching sustainable tourism through a critically reflexive approach. In G. Moscardo, & P. Benckendorff (Eds.). *Education for sustainability in tourism* (pp. 201–211). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.