



**Simm, D. and Marvell, A. (2015) 'Gaining a “sense of place”:
students’ affective experiences of place leading to
transformative learning on international fieldwork.' *Journal
of Geography in Higher Education*, 39 (4): 595-616.**

*This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in Journal of
Geography in Higher Education on 29/9/2015, available online at:*

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03098265.2015.1084608>

ResearchSPAcE

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.

Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the
ResearchSPAcE Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have
permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

Gaining a 'sense of place': Students' affective experiences of place leading to transformative learning on international fieldwork

Abstract

This paper reveals the extent to which undergraduate students demonstrate transformative learning whilst on international fieldwork in Barcelona, Spain. Groups of students create a series of discrete active learning situations that allow them and their peers to engage more fully with their locale and in turn experience a deeper understanding of 'place'. Reflective fieldtrip notebooks are used to capture the experiences of students. Results show that through the use of the affective domain (Krathwohl's taxonomy) and applying cyclic experiential learning (Kolb) combined with critical reflection (Mezirow), students demonstrate progression and, in some cases, regression along Krathwohl's taxonomy.

Keywords: Place, affective domain, experiential learning, international fieldwork, transformative learning, Krathwohl

Introduction

International fieldtrips are a distinct and integral feature of most geography degrees in the UK. Increasing opportunities for international travel have enabled students to benefit from experiencing other places, landscapes and cultures (McGuinness & Simm, 2005). The benefits of fieldwork for academic development, skills acquisition and practice and social integration are well rehearsed (Kent, Gilbertson & Hunt, 1997; Fuller, Edmondson, France, Higgitt & Ratinen, 2006; Fuller, 2011; Stokes, Magnier & Weaver, 2011), but there are significant academic and personal challenges associated with international fieldwork, such as logistics (Marvell, 2008) and encountering the 'other' (Smith, 2008; Robson, 2002). An on-going debate focuses on the extent to which students begin to comprehend and understand how that place functions. Can students unravel the often complex and changing geographies from secondary sources, a limited time spent in-the-field and, most critically, limited contact with local people, often with language barriers? Or does it remain an artificial and superficial experience hampered by the voyeuristic perspective of the 'tourist gaze' (Urry, 2012)? How do students' perspectives change by encountering an unfamiliar and often challenging environment? As Smith (2008: 79) describes, "fieldwork practice itself is an intensely embodied and experiential form of learning and teaching" that requires engagement with that locality. Not only do students have to comprehend the geography of an unfamiliar environment, but often have to deal with their own relationships towards that place. Fieldwork, particularly in unfamiliar and challenging places, is both intensive and emotionally-charged (Glass, 2014). Studies have focused on the affective domain and how the learning and teaching strategies adopted can influence students' engagement with the fieldwork locality (Boyle *et al.*, 2007; van der Hoeven Kraft, Srogi, Husman, Semken & Fuhrman, 2011).

Savin-Baden (2008: 7) describes learning spaces as places of engagement where "often disconnected thoughts and ideas, that have been inchoate, begin to cohere" as a result of being in a place or

position that stimulates a creative shift in perception or understanding. In other words, academic situations are viewed with a new and fresh perspective. New and unfamiliar localities are often liminal in nature, requiring the student to create their own relationship within that place. Often, the appropriation of space for a specific group, such as tourists, is challenged when student groups are 'plunged' into more unfamiliar and challenging cultural environments or districts (Nieto, 2006). Such spaces of learning can be viewed as disruptive spaces that challenge the individual student to 'make sense' of what they are experiencing (Savin-Baden, 2008). International fieldtrips clearly fit into this classification; the direct experience of being *in situ* offers multi-sensory exposures to environments (Tuan, 1977), and the opportunities for exploration create a greater sense of adventure and discovery. Such experiential learning leads to greater interaction with that environment, which can lead to transformative learning at both personal and academic levels (Marvell, 2008). Being *in situ* also enables theory to be better linked to reality, principally an appreciation of interconnectivity and scale and, by applying a geographer's 'eye', to unravel the palimpsest of geography, history, society and culture in order to better understand that place. First-hand experiences enable more relevant and contextualised learning, resulting in active and deep learning, which is often transformative (Marvell, Simm, Schaaf & Harper, 2013). However, as della Dora (2011) recognises, it is not just international fieldtrips that offer unfamiliar localities; students may encounter unfamiliar environs in their own country. In addition, some commentators suggest that there is a tendency for fieldtrip destinations to gravitate towards English-speaking nations (McGuinness & Simm, 2005), whilst others make use of representatives with some English competence (Smith, 2006).

Using Krathwohl's taxonomy of the affective domain (Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia., 1964), which deals with the processes of emotions, feelings and values, can help us to understand better the academic and personal issues encountered by students undertaking international fieldtrips. The immediacy, relevance and emotional engagement of being *in situ* can capture students' attention and increase motivation (Ballantyne, Anderson & Packer, 2010). During immersion in an unfamiliar and challenging environment or situation these attributes are heightened to strongly influence the affective domain (van der Hoeven Kraft *et al.*, 2011), often resulting in different individual responses (Ishii, Gilbride & Stensrud, 2009). Wright & Hodge (2012: 355) describe the emotional geographies of cross-cultural experiences on fieldtrip as a "profound learning experience redolent with emotion" which is transformative and challenges students' own perspectives of societal connections and diversity. Boyle *et al.* (2007) report that, whilst experiencing some apprehension and anxiety, students recognise the positive outcomes of being challenged by an unfamiliar environment. This is further explored by Glass (2014), examining how local and external factors can generate positive and negative experiences that may affect students' experiences of a particular place or trip. Students respond in different ways to field stimuli and learning and teaching methods (Dunphy & Spellman, 2009). Van der Hoeven Kraft *et al.* (2011) discuss different affective domains, examining how self-efficacy, prosocial opportunities and place attachment influence students' motivations to engage and learn.

The ways in which students and staff encounter a particular place are important. Traditional teaching approaches of 'stop-and-look' at a location often only provide a segmented and blinkered perspective, but the whole fieldtrip experience, from start to end, should be recognised as part of the learning experience. 'Mobile geographies', whereby place can be experienced by transiting through that space, changes temporally as well as spatially, has been under-recognised by the pedagogic literature on fieldwork. Undertaking 'slow geography', involving taking slower forms of

transit, such as walking (Bassett, 2004; Lorimer, 2010; Degen and Rose, 2012), can immerse participants in their surroundings because they observe more at a steady pace or 'drift' (Anderson, 2013), and enhance their spatial connectedness through exercising navigational skills. This counteracts the sense of geographical 'unconnectedness' and temporary disorientation caused by, for instance, emerging from a station on an underground transport network into an unfamiliar locality (Wagenknecht, 2011).

The use of appropriate learning and teaching strategies is important to facilitate engagement and understanding of a particular locality or experience. Different media have been trialled to encourage students, firstly, to observe and critique their surroundings in a more academic manner and, secondly, enable communication of the identified geographical narratives of that place. These media have included posters (Saunders, 2010), repeat photography (Lemmons, Brannstrom & Hurd, 2013), podcasts (Anderson, 2013) and audio-guided tours (Wissmann, 2013). Saunders (2013) critiques the use of one-way audio-guides, and argues that self-authorship is important for engaging students with their environment. In particular, student-led teaching, coupled with critical (self-) reflection, can be used effectively to facilitate engage and empower students during fieldwork (Coe & Smyth, 2010; Marvell *et al.*, 2013). Scholarship and self-authorship can be used as a vehicle for influencing the affective domain and thereby facilitating transformative learning, leading to a more critical engagement with place. Reflexivity using diaries or travel journals offer a vehicle for students to make sense of their observations and experiences (Warkentin, 2011; Glass, 2014) A reflective and metacognition approach, focusing on self-awareness, is viewed as essential for self-awareness and deeper learning (Moon, 1999; Ballantyne *et al.*, 2010). Self-reflexivity, with appropriate scaffolding by tutors, becomes particularly important when faced with unexpected and uncomfortable encounters (Glass, 2014). Field journals and reflective notebooks and diaries are often the most effective way of facilitating this (Dummer, Cook, Parker, Barrett & Hull, 2008).

This study examines the use of student-led learning and teaching presented by Marvell *et al.* (2013). Based on final year undergraduate fieldwork in Barcelona, Spain, this study examines, firstly, students' experiences of 'place' on international fieldwork; secondly, examines how and why student's feelings and emotions change from their preconceptions during the fieldtrip to acquire a sense of place; and, thirdly, to evaluate how transformative is the development of a sense of place to their learning, with the affective domain, and to explore the links. Through a series of staff- and student-led learning situations (Pawson and Teather, 2002), students were exposed to a series of active learning scenarios which have the potential to facilitate psychological change through self-awareness (Cook, 2008). This paper attempts to better understand how the learning and teaching strategies, combined by immersion in an unfamiliar environment, affect students' learning experiences through the affective domain (Krathwohl *et al.* (1964) and cyclic experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) combined with critical reflection (Mezirow, 1990) and transformative learning.

What is, and why consider, 'place'?

A place can be considered as a palimpsest, a multi-faceted landscape which exhibits multiple identities that may vary temporally, spatially and individually. Place consists of physical, social and cultural aspects, the site-specificity of the locales bound together by meanings, symbolism and a sense of belonging (Sampson & Goodrich, 2009). Whereas the terms 'environment' or 'locality' imply the quantification of geographical characteristics from a reductionist perspective, the term 'place' is interwoven with subjective interpretations of the 'outsider' and the 'insider' (Sampson &

Goodrich, 2009). Cresswell (2004, p.11) defines place as “a way of seeing, knowing and understanding the world. When we look at the world as a world of places we see different things. We see attachments and connections between people and place”. Tuan (1975: 164) argues that “to know a place well requires long residence and deep involvement”, whereas a short stay can only provide an instantaneous and mostly visual snapshot. However, gaining a ‘sense of place’ is central to the understanding of a geographer of a particular locality. Tuan (1975) further comments that time spent in a place does not ensure experience, but engagement with that place. The adoption of learning and teaching strategies to enable students (and staff) to ‘encounter’ and get ‘know’ a place better (Burgess & Jackson, 1992). For the student, the acquisition of a greater sense of place can, firstly, help to understand the characteristics and functioning of a particular locality; secondly, help to gain a fuller understanding of the complexity of geographical issues within the local context of a case study; thirdly, to reconcile academic knowledge and understanding with reality and practice. Although the visitor may not gain a comprehensive ‘knowing’ of a place, by employing academic skills it is hoped to reveal not only the symbolism and meanings of the place to the people (the ‘other’) who inhabit that space, as well as a more acute awareness of the influences on the visitor (the ‘self’) to that place.

Educational theory

How, as educators, can we understand the learning experiences of our students in a complex and challenging environment of an international fieldtrip? And how can we use theory to inform our learning and teaching strategies to enhance students’ learning from their experiences? Of the three domains, cognitive, kinaesthetic (or psychomotor) and affective, cognitive is the most commonly-used way of understanding of how learners acquire knowledge and develop understanding. Golubchikov (2015) argues that all three domains must be integrated for fieldwork to be effective. The foundational work of Bloom’s cognitive taxonomy of educational objectives (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill & Krathwohl, 1956), consists of the cumulative hierarchy of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) subsequently revised Bloom’s cognitive taxonomy, replacing *Knowledge* with *Remembering*, *Comprehension* became *Understanding*, and higher-order attributes further switched the focus to active nouns such as *Applying* and *Analyzing*. Krathwohl (2002) also conceptualised knowledge within factual, conceptual, procedural and metacognition dimensions. The affective domain, concerned with values or more correctly the importance learners place upon what is learnt, has received the least attention. Corresponding roughly with the Bloom’s cognitive domain stages, Krathwohl’s affective domain of learning (Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia, 1964) is similarly built on a hierarchy of steps, described as: firstly, *Receiving* describing the stage of being aware of or sensitive to the existence of new ideas and being willing to tolerate them; secondly, *Responding* referring to actively responding to a new challenge to one’s own knowledge, understanding or expectations; thirdly, *Valuing* meaning a willingness to engage with new ideas to make a value of judgement; fourthly, *Organisation* relating the new value to those one already holds and bringing it into a harmonious and internally consistent philosophy; culminating in, fifthly, *Characterization* referring to acting consistently in accordance with the values the individual has internalised. The interaction of Bloom’s and Krathwohl’s schemes suggests that learning is reinforced by knowledge building on experience by the learner adapting prior knowledge and understanding to new, often challenging, situations. Mezirow (1990) examined further how, as learners, we make sense of an experience, and subsequently use this interpretation to some purpose (such as decision-making or action) that results in meaning becoming learning. Mezirow (1990) recognises the educational ‘baggage’ that we

all carry, our frames of reference affecting the way in which we interpret our experiences. Such 'baggage' includes habitual and perspectives of meaning. The former are what we expect to see and think, whilst the latter are where new experiences are assimilated into one's own past experiences to frame interpretation (Mezirow, 1990). Central to resolving internal conflicts between our perception and cognition is critical (self-) reflection, a process by which epistemic, sociocultural and psychic distortions in our reasoning and attitudes can be acknowledged and new meanings validated. Such critical thinking can ultimately lead to transformative learning (Brookfield, 2012), especially when challenged by unfamiliar encounters. As Kolb states, "learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (Kolb, 1984: 38) and such experiential processes are cyclical involving experience, reflection, conceptualisation and experimentation (Healey & Jenkins, 2000).

Traditional geography fieldtrips mostly address the cognitive (e.g. knowledge being imparted by tutors to students on a traditional tour) or kinaesthetic (e.g. collecting data in the field under direct or semi-independent supervision). Such challenges are often mostly acutely encountered during residential fieldtrips particularly to distant and unfamiliar localities (involving short or long haul air travel). Integral to understanding students' responses to international fieldwork is for tutors to be aware of Pederson's (1995) culture shock model. The model suggests a linear progression through five stages from *Honeymoon*, *Disintegration*, *Reintegration*, *Autonomy* and *Interdependence* as the individual becomes increasingly familiar with a new culture. Although the students will not necessarily be able to demonstrate interdependence and fluency in understanding and applying the new culture, they will begin to reflect on observations, encounters and reactions and begin to incorporate aspects within their own understanding and awareness of place. Whilst traditional learning and teaching approaches typically fail to address the affective domain satisfactorily, innovative educational approaches on fieldtrips can be utilised to enhance students' learning.

Background to the module

This study is based on the 'International Fieldwork' module offered as part of the BSc Geography course at Bath Spa University, UK. The aims and objectives of the module are that students attain a geographical sense of 'place' through conducting independent and advanced research. The module adopts an innovative form of student-led teaching, described and evaluated by Marvell *et al.* (2013), that is appropriate for (international) fieldwork at higher undergraduate levels. This is done through, firstly, placing responsibility on the students so that there is a vested interest in others as well as their own learning. Students are actively involved in logistical planning of the fieldtrip, and deliver a student-led field presentation and field activity (cf. Marvell *et al.*, 2013). They are expected to demonstrate teamwork and project management skills, develop the confidence and ability to cope with unfamiliar environments. Secondly, students undertake critical self-appraisal of their field experiences as a vital element for facilitating transformative change in personal and academic learning.

This optional module is delivered through a series of lectures and workshops, culminating in a 5-day fieldtrip to Barcelona, Spain. For a typical class size of 25-30, students work in 5-6 groups of 4-5 students per team. The remit is to deliver a 90-minute presentation supported by an activity in-the-field with the aim to encourage students to apply prior learning and understanding to a project in a new environment. Groups identify a topic to research, plan and prepare. Each group submits a pre-

placement report outlining their project, proposed itinerary and activity, which receives formative feedback from tutors. The structure of the fieldtrip consists of a staff-led familiarisation tour, then reconnaissance time, followed by two days of student-led tours (each group's presentation worth 40% of the module's credit total). Students are also involved in the logistics of fieldwork, to take possession, thereby making their learning more meaningful. Using a draft script with supporting handouts, groups make a reconnaissance trip to their field sites in order to amend, update and practice their presentation and activity. The field activity element is designed to encourage the student audience to participate fully in the presentation, to encourage increased engagement, thereby promoting more interaction and debate. Each morning, students are given a self-reflective question which is either written in their field notebooks or delivered in a group video-blog undertaken in-the-field (Garrett, 2011). Typical daily reflective notebook questions include: (i) What are your first impressions of the city?; (ii) what is 'place' and what gives Barcelona its sense of place?; and, (iii) how have your impressions/ perceptions of the city changed and why? At the end of the fieldtrip, an over-arching self-reflective theme is announced, which draws upon students' experiences and self-reflective entries during the field course. Students are given time after the fieldtrip to reflect and to consult the pedagogic literature leading to a Reflective Essay (20%). Students also write an Essay (40%) that allows individuals to explore a geographical issue of their choice in greater detail. The module attracts predominantly human geographers with some physical geographers and environmental scientists, so most students are familiar with the concept of 'place' from previous study. Consequently, theory about place was not taught; students were encouraged to read and think about the concept of 'place'. Principally, students were prompted to consider the term as part of reflection through daily reflective questions, and through student-led presentations in situ.

The teaching methods are designed to engage students more with their environment, affecting students across the multiple registers of learning. The cognitive, kinaesthetic and affective domains are all present within the fieldtrip and are manifest through the various learning and teaching activities. For instance, the cognitive domain is developed through background reading and secondary research; the kinaesthetic domain is encountered during the semi-independent familiarisation tour upon arrival with podcasts, the movement through the city between sites, and exploring the city by foot and public transport. During student-led field presentations, students are expected to include any transit time between sites as an integral part of learning of others, including devising strategies to get field participants to observe, discuss and report. Cognitive learning and kinaesthetic activities leads to affective learning, whether intended or not (Golubchikov, 2015). These domains are affected by two main types of 'experience': firstly, through immersion in the general environment of that place; and, secondly, the student-led teaching strategy whereby students learn from their peers about that place. For the latter, the cognitive domain (groups researching and teaching about the topic) and kinaesthetic domain (through the field activities) influence affective learning.

This study focuses on the students' general experiences influencing the affective domain during the fieldtrip. Self-reflection is an important tool for understanding changes in the affective domain, so the daily reflective notebook entries written during the fieldtrip were used. Self-reflection that is immediate or recent offers unique insights, most notably an immediacy, which can reveal freshness, emotion and honesty from being in an unfamiliar place and/or circumstances, that can yield moments of lucidity and self-awareness (Glass, 2014) before such feelings subside, blurred with subsequent experiences, or forgotten. Soliciting immediate reactions may reveal the personal

journeys of students during the fieldtrip, and whether the learning and teaching strategies encourage students to engage more with the field environment. There was also opportunity for post-fieldtrip consolidation and relating of thoughts to the academic and pedagogic literature. The reflective notebook also offers a contextualised perspective by taking place *in situ*, relevance (the there-and-then), it can be used to challenge perceptions and make sense of initial reactions, as well as being personal. A thematic and coded analysis was undertaken to identify recurring ideas within the sources and allowing triangulation of responses (see Marvell *et al.*, 2013). During data analysis, emphasis was focused on terms associated with students' experiences and understanding of place, rather than their experiences of the teaching method (which is evaluated in Marvell *et al.*, 2013). Whilst some of the quotes are generic, many can be attributed to specific stages in the learning and teaching strategy, in particular whether preparatory stage or delivering or receiving a field presentation. The experiences of student-led teaching and learning strategies were mapped against Krathwohl's taxonomy of the affective domain.

Students' reflective experiences of Barcelona

The reflective fieldtrip notebooks revealed a series of themes revealing the personal journeys of the students during the fieldtrip, and providing insights into the affective domain which lead to growing awareness and understanding of that place. The coding (e.g. A2, B3) refers to the mapping of the quotes onto the Krathwohl taxonomy, which is discussed subsequently.

Preconceptions and expectations

Preconceptions are informed by students' prior (travel and life) experiences. Preconceptions based on prior visits may be polarised, either 'rose-tinted' recollection or some negative experience entrenched internally over time, which may be or reinforced by preparatory activities such as navigating Google Streetview. Secondary sources such as guide books and marketing imagery of the destination will reinforce sanitised tourist images. The personal observations and advice of tutors may influence students in diverse ways as unintended messages (Cotton, Winter & Bailey, 2013).

Encountering the unfamiliar

Upon arrival at the destination, students are faced with a mix of emotions as they encounter the unfamiliar and vibrant locality such as the city centre of Barcelona. For some, Pederson's (1995) *Honeymoon* stage is short-lived, leading to disappointment and rejection. Even the time of arrival and weather can have a major impression. For instance, students comment on being "overwhelmed" and "quite stressful" and claustrophobic in crowded tourist areas (#1, Student 11, F, notebook, 2014) [B2 on Table 1], or disoriented by late arrival in the dark at an unfamiliar place. The typically high expectations, fuelled by the mix of excitement, anticipation and travel fatigue, are sometimes initially tarnished by negative impressions, such as littered streets or graffiti. Such a negative counter-reaction of disappointment appears to be most acute during the earliest stages of arrival at the destination, such as the journey through industrial and urban wasteland near the airport, or the crowded and over-commercialisation of tourist areas, equating to the *Disintegrated* stage of Pederson's (1995) model of culture shock:

“Wrongly, I now appreciate, I started to form my first impressions ... early on during the bus ride from the airport. How disappointing – just like any other European city.” (#2, Student 12, M, notebook, 2013) [A1 to D1, Table 2]

First impressions often focus on tourist aspects, relating to unexpected similarities and differences with their own society, such as the prevalence of menus written in English in tourist areas or the same chains of shops as their own local town. Initial experiences of the local people range from welcoming to hostile. Whilst recognising the cosmopolitan ‘feel’ to the city, cultural differences are sometimes initially expressed in a disparaging or even mildly xenophobic manner as “being different to me but not me” (#3, Student 10, M, notebook, 2013) [B2] or students’ display inappropriate behaviour causing offence to local people (cf. Glass, 2013). Internal conflicts may arise in the minds of students, triggered by their own expectations and immature relationship with that place, such as being “surprised to see animals being sold on the street [of Las Ramblas]” (#4, Student 20, F, notebook, 2012) [B2].

However, as students spend more time in the city, the reflective notebooks reveal growing awareness that it is themselves, as visitors, who are ‘out-of-place’ in relation to both the environment and local people, corresponding to Pederson’s *Reintegration* stage (1995). The initial perceptions of being branded as a tourist and ‘not fitting in’ evolve into a wrangling with a self-perceived stigma and even guilt of being a tourist. Students bemoan the saturation of the locality with tourists but recognise that they are part of the issue:

“I felt myself feel out of place, and even a little embarrassed about looking like a tourist, which seems an unusual notion as I was surrounded by tourists.” (#5, Student 10, M, notebook, 2013) [B2]

A sense of ‘self’ and ‘other’ became a recurring theme. There is a tendency to consider the ‘self’, with sentiments such as “felt welcoming, safe” common in notebook entries. For some a sense of otherness is affirmed by experiences, reinforcing the perceived threat of the ‘other’ to the security of ‘home’. Regardless of gender, feelings of discomfort, and sometimes fear, are expressed in relation to the crowded tourist areas (such as Las Ramblas), the dimly lit maze of narrow streets (typical of the Barri Gotic and El Raval districts), particularly at night, or graffiti on the shutters of shops. In particular, disquiet was expressed about the demographics and gender imbalance of the El Raval district, particularly in the evenings. Such concerns are reinforced by prior warning provided by previous visitors, guide books or tutors feeling “I only felt less safe because I had been warned about pickpockets before I arrived.” (#6, Student 13, F, notebook, 2012) [A2 to A3]. This may result in over-cautiousness and distraction from their studies:

“I felt conscious of my safety at all times as I was entering a foreign environment and had perceived notions ... it was hard to take in all the events and culture.” (#7, Student 5, F, notebook, 2013) [A3 to B2]

Prior warnings about personal security are reinforced when, in tourist areas, concerned local people offer advice and warnings. Often, a contradiction arises in fieldtrip notebook commentaries where the student feels more comfortable in tourist areas but remains concerned about the risk of petty crime.

The desire for ‘authenticity’ of experience

Some students clearly yearn for a perceived more 'authentic' experience, bemoaning that the tourist areas are too tourist-oriented and English-speaking. Students' own preconceptions of what should be a 'real' and 'authentic' experiences are projected on to that place. In particular, there was the blurring of what is 'real' for local people and what is aimed at tourists, for instance:

"The little alleys [and] buildings were typical of what I had expected but was slightly annoyed by the fact they were now home to some tackie [sic] tourist shops and bars." (#8, Student 8, M, notebook 2012) [A3 to D3]

A recurring theme is that students quickly recognise that venturing away from tourist areas is important for gaining more representative insights of what the city is really like for the inhabitants:

"My guide book ... appeared to 'rank' sites around the city in order of importance, forcing a particular impression on a generic tourist, but I'm glad we saw a mix ...and not just [what] we 'had' to see." (#9, Student 11, F, notebook, 2014) [A1 to C1]

The demarcation between tourist (familiar and 'safe') and non-tourist (unfamiliar, threatening) areas that exists in the minds of some students is only broken down by exploration of those environs, either independently or through staff-led activities.

Exploration and (self-) discovery

The structure and schedule of the fieldtrip was designed to offer opportunities for students to explore the city. Firstly, the staff-led familiarisation exercise upon arrival in city provides a structured and supported way of gaining confidence to navigate the city, whilst starting to break away from a tourist perspective. On the first day, during self-navigated group tours around contrasting central districts of the city, students filmed a video blog to encourage more observant and critical geographical perspectives of the geographical issues they discovered:

"At first the task of creating a short video seemed daunting but ... filming meant I took [in] more of what was around me." (#10, Student 25, F, notebook, 2011) [B1]

This group activity clearly enabled students to feel more confident and to start to understand the place by adopting a more critical academic perspective of their new surroundings. As their confidence to navigate grows, their ability to make sound judgements about exploring the city clearly improves and "after a few minutes of walking around, we started to understand the layout and felt confident enough to use smaller back streets" (#11, Student 3, M, notebook, 2012) [B2 to B3].

Secondly, the reconnaissance day is important for each group to exploring their study sites. Students comment on how different the place actually turns out from preconceptions based on secondary sources. Finally, allowing students free time to explore the city independently cannot be underestimated as part of the learning process and experience of the city, initially staying close to the hotel but, with growing confidence, exploring other areas:

"The north of El Raval, on the other hand I felt at ease, ... the bars are full of students. However, we came across some saying no tourists allowed! – Unwelcoming, but I think it's good in a way." (#12, Student 13, F, notebook, 2012) [D2 to D3]

When given the opportunity to explore the city, students clearly gain confidence and start to feel more comfortable and secure with their environment. Exploration and a sense of discovery clearly enhanced their sense of place:

“Being let ‘loose’ as it were, and being left to discover an area on our own [reconnaissance day] without influence from tour guides or those in the know (lecturers) ... allowed us to effectively bond with ... [our locations] and left ... us with feelings of excitement.” (#13, Student 2, M, notebook, 2011) [B2]

Once students become more familiar with the destination, such initial ‘culture shock’ appears to subside, and students expressed a growing sense of feeling comfortable with their surrounding urban fabric such as the historic buildings or eclectic collection of specialist shops found in some districts (Pederson’s *Autonomy* and *Interdependence* stages). Students may be distracted by differences such as visual statements of discontent and territorial expression, namely graffiti which may be re-conceptualised in an over-romanticised perspective. There was initial surprise for local issues, such as the patriotism displayed by the Catalan flags on the households, and a growing awareness and empathy for the political issues:

“The yellow/red flag surprised me ... I hadn’t realised how important this seems to be for the locals.” (#14, Student 4, F, notebook, 2014) [C2 to C3]

In particular, recent political events have significant influence on students’ perceptions and experiences. For instance, students quickly notice and enquire of tutors about the commonplace Catalan pro-independence flags. One year students encountered an austerity demonstration by retired people; the next day the cohort thought the noise emanating from street was another demonstration but were surprised when they discovered it to be a cultural procession led by school children. Encountering the unfamiliar can prove a liberating but also a threatening experience and needs to be carefully managed. Some concerns can be reinforced by negative experiences, such as “it felt as if we were not quite welcome, we were obviously tourists ... and so it felt a little awkward” (#15, Student 20, M, notebook, 2012) [B2 to B3].

Gaining a ‘sense of place’

The reflective notebooks reveal how students’ start to engage with the city as they encounter different districts during the group presentations. Spatial differences are a common theme, recognising the varied characters of districts of the city, acknowledging “multiple identities ... making it difficult to conceptualise Barcelona as a whole one city” (#16, Student 20, F, notebook, 2011) [C4 or D4]. Urban change and transformation, usually referring to building constructions, is another key theme, but the “mix of old and new” architecture is, perhaps surprisingly, not mentioned too frequently.

There was an increased awareness of history and, more perceptibly, of layers of representation and symbolism in the urban fabric and culture, such as the monumentalisation of public spaces with art or street names celebrating historical Catalan figures. Students started to recognise issues of national identity, often stimulated by the profusion of Catalan (pro-independence) flags, often describing it with “pride” and “community”. Strongly influenced by academic and tourist sources, students try to make sense of the Catalan identity through architecture and art. A “sense of

belonging” is often mentioned in association with the historic, although the term is poorly conceptualised in students’ accounts.

Defining place influenced by the affective domain

How do the students’ experiences influence the affective domain, facilitated by the fieldtrip’s structure and learning and teaching strategies and lead to better engagement with place and affect both their personal and academic development? A qualitative indicator is to consider student definitions of place. Students initially see place as the unique physical and social characteristics of a locality, but start to adopt a more critical interrogation of the concept. Interpretations include an emphasis of community and identity, which evolve into a sense of ‘meaning’ to the inhabitants and their utilisation of that space:

“It is more than just a geographical space, it evokes emotions and feelings, ‘place’ provides an understanding of the people who use an area and for what purpose.” (#17, Student 35, F, notebook, 2013) [B3 to B4]

“A place or sense of place can also be created by associations and stories of an area...” (#18, Student 36, essay, 2011) [C1 to C2]

There is often recognition of historical legacy, primarily in terms of architecture but also in terms of culture and identity. Students start to recognise that it is “subjective in nature and valued differently between different groups of people” (#19, Student 30, essay, 2011) [C3] with “a sense of attachment – idea[s] of blood and belonging” (#20, Student 1, essay, 2011) [C3] and “a sign of togetherness” (#21, Student 4, notebook, 2014) [C3], as manifest through political symbols such as Catalan flags.

For some, place is seen as a personal perspective, which clearly shows a maturing awareness of how an individual student perceives a place. Such recognition was then extended to how others, whether local people or tourists, may perceive that place differently and uniquely, leading to “multiple and contested meanings” (#22, Student 26, notebook, 2011) [C5 or B5]:

“It is clear that different people can have very different feelings towards a place, and although each ‘space’ may appear the same for everyone, each ‘place’ can be very different.” (#23, Student 35, F, notebook, 2013) [B5]

The recognition of the student’s role as ‘other’ in that place may often develop an awareness of place from different perspectives, and a more acute self-awareness of the transient nature of the character of places:

“[On the reconnaissance day] we found a ... playground ... it was full of children playing happily and gave a positive sense of place. However, when we came back on our tour the children had gone and two very seedy men were in their place. Instantly, the sense of place had changed.” (#24, Student 15, notebook, 2013) [B3 to B2]

A sense of a student’s relationship with the place, and their reconciliation with theory, clearly evolves with emotional maturity during the fieldtrip. For instance, drawing upon Massey’s (1993) ideas one student recognises that connections are created and broken: “Place is a fluid entity, constantly changing its appearance to the observer” (#25, Student 12, M, notebook, 2013) [B5 or C5].

Changing relationships with place

By the end of the fieldtrip, there is clear evidence of the realisation that preconceptions are invalid. This may, in part, be to a growing sense of feeling comfortable in that environment, but also to a personal maturing through influences on the affective domain. A more nuanced sense of place starts to evolve through this process, but deep-rooted concerns of personal security or gender issues may persist. For some, there is recognition of the naivety of the tourist perspective:

"After touring El Raval on one group's presentation, I felt my eyes were opened to a whole new side of the city – darker, more dangerous and more conflicting." (#26, Student 4, M, notebook, 2013) [C2]

For some this awareness is associated with a particular occurrence, whilst others report that their "changing perceptions have been gradual" (#27, Student 4, M, notebook, 2013) [C2] through progressive exploring of the city challenging preconceptions gained from secondary sources. A sense of place is undoubtedly created by the overall novelty of the field experience (Cotton & Cotton, 2009), but powerful memories can also be created by individual occurrences:

"Incredibly I managed to glimpse a street parade on the last day of a Catalan tradition where people wearing giant masks of kings and queens were surrounded by people playing music." (#28, Student 17, F, notebook, 2014) [D1]

As students' confidence in being in that locality grows, their perceptions of that place develop. In particular, students have developed as the various aspects and layers of the urban palimpsest are discovered, with the recognition of a city in constant flux and transformation:

"I definitely underestimated the textural [sic] nature of the city. There are so many more layers and contrasts and histories than I could ever have imagined." (#29, Student 9, notebook, 2012) [B5 or C5]

They also start to compare what they see to their own surroundings back at home and growing awareness of social and political issues facing the city such as housing inequality or the pro-independence movement.

"My initial impressions ... [were of] a homogenised city that has experienced cultural dilution as a result of its focus on tourism ... soon faded as I experienced more areas of the city." (#30, Student 10, M, notebook, 2013) [C3 to C5]

Increased awareness of the environment also typically means that students become more aware of their relationship with that environment, recognising their own intrusion in that place and, most notably, as a researcher:

"[Whilst in El Raval] I sensed hostility towards us and windows were shut as we walked past and took notes." (#31, Student 13, F, notebook, 2013) [C1]

"I felt a heightened level of hostility ... our group were heard discussing together by a local in their residence who peered out over their balcony and abruptly slammed closed their window. This made me slightly edgy." (#32, Student 7, M, notebook, 2012) [B1 to B2]

Most students express a more positive experience as their time in the city progresses, but the intensity of the field experience, combined with the responsibility of presenting in situ (cf. Marvell *et al.*, 2013) resulted in increasing levels of fatigue. However, for a minority of students, their affective experiences appear to induce negative sentiments. One student continued to find the city “overbearing” and sensing “the darker side and powerful gothic of the city ... with increased intensity as time went on” (#33, Student 9, M, notebook, 2013) [B3 to B2]. Another student acknowledged that he had set “his expectations were initially too high as [he] wasn’t completely connecting with any of the districts” (#34, Student 9, M, notebook, 2013) [B2 to B1]. Perceptibly, one student recognises that the viewer’s empathy is important:

“I have realised that some peoples’ sense of place is undeveloped as they may find it difficult to connect with their emotions. Because of this they cannot relate a place with personal feelings.” (#35, Student 4, M, notebook, 2011) [C5]

Synthesis: applying students’ experiences to theory

In order to better understand how students’ learning experiences are transformed during this model, Table 1 maps the learning activities prior to and during the fieldtrip onto Krathwohl’s taxonomy of the affective domain.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

As revealed by personal reflection, transformative learning occurs in different ways at different stages for individuals. Students can show progression through the hierarchy of Krathwohl’s stages (progressing vertically down Table 1) or through experiencing the learning and teaching strategy (progressing horizontally across Table 1). Table 1 identifies several cycles at which transformative learning can occur and be reinforced by subsequent or different learning experiences. The student-led teaching strategy employed by Marvell *et al.* (2013) means that all students will encounter each cycle. The first affective cycle (A1-5) occurs prior to the fieldtrip, during planning and preparation for the group presentations, when students acquire expectations and challenge their preconceptions mainly from secondary sources. The second affective cycle (B1-5) occurs during the reconnaissance and field delivery of the group’s presentation, and the third affective cycle (C1-5) refers to the experiences as the audience of each field presentation. A fourth, and generic, affective domain (D1-5) is experienced during non-formal teaching times, when students are travelling through or exploring the city. During each cycle, students are affected by all domains and, dependent upon an individual’s level of engagement, each student can be challenged at any of these stages. For example, students visiting their field sites for the first time will often discover that place to be different from their expectations and preconceptions [B2 of Table 1], and a student listening to a field presentation may more critically question what a fellow student says (cf. Marvell *et al.*, 2013) [C3 of Table 1]. Thus students may progress either collectively as a group through discussion of their experiences or individually. Students will also progress through Krathwohl’s hierarchy at different stages, routes and rates of progression through the learning and teaching cycles. To illustrate this, Table 2 maps the quotes from this paper onto this model. For Table 2, the categories for delivering (B) and receiving (C) a group field presentation are clumped together as both are experienced by all students at some point during the field trip, and so the desired learning outcomes are more important than the route. Natural progression can occur up the hierarchy during a cycle (e.g. Quote

#6 shows progression from A2 Responding to A3 Valuing) or as a student moves from one learning and teaching phase to another (e.g. Quote #8 progresses from A3 to D3 revealing clear application to being *in situ*). Most quotes show a single-step progression in Krathwohl's hierarchy, suggesting logical development, but some reveal a 'jump' by employing higher-level cognitive skills (e.g. Quote #30 moves from C3 to C5 of Table 1). However, whilst most of the selected quotes reveal clear progression following Krathwohl's taxonomy, some can display retrogression in their academic understanding; for instance, Quotes #24 and #33 show negative reinforcement of preconceptions (moving from B3 to B2). However, the situation is complex, for instance with a peer audience reacting not only to what the presenting group is telling them, reacting with their immediate environs, and resolving these with his/her own knowledge, understanding, experiences and preconceptions.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

As the quotes reveal transformative change can occur in different ways and at different times: for some it arises from a dramatic event (Quote #28), gradual, fast or slow, or even subconscious. As such the quotes often reveal more about the individual than about the place. There is little evidence to suggest that students are writing what they believe tutors want to read; tutors provided a framework for self-reflection (mostly facilitated through the daily reflective questions issued on the fieldtrip) within which students had freedom to express themselves. However, some students clearly struggle to articulate why their observation is important (e.g. Quote #36). However, the quotes evidence that metacognition and critical reflection are clearly achievable by either the delivering (B) or receiving (C) field presentations, whilst the lack of A4 or A5 indicates the experiential value of fieldwork.

How and why do changes in the affective domain happen?

From the responses of student experience, an experiential model of how students encounter and develop their understanding of place can be formulated. Although many of the experiences reflect stages of Pederson's model, the educational strategies and facilitation by tutors add a significant and influential dimension that extends beyond culture shock in understanding place. Students' preconceptions of a locality are subjectively loaded with their touristic expectations (Smith, 2008). During the encounter stage (equating to the *Receiving* stage of Krathwohl's taxonomy), there is an initial sense of discovery, where feelings may range from awe to feeling uncomfortable and disconnected which may reinforce or challenge preconceptions (*Responding* stage). Through immersion in that environment, experiencing the sights and sounds undoubtedly influences the affective domain to create a 'feel' of that place. Familiarisation with the environment is gradually attained. Students start to feel more comfortable during the time spent there, facilitated by exploration or repeated visits to localities (*Valuing* stage). Students then begin to 'make sense' of that place by understanding the geography that surrounds them. A relationship has the potential to develop which may remain superficial but it is a relevant and contextualised connection of the individual to that place at that time (*Organisation* stage). This may be stimulated both through the learning and teaching strategies and through personal experience. For instance, a connection and attachment may develop with the study sites or topics for each group's project and talk, in which they have invested considerable time and effort (cf. Marvell *et al.*, 2013) or from a memorable discovery or event. Reflection of experience is an important vehicle for dealing with the immediate reactions of culture shock (cf. Glass, 2014) and consolidating in the student's mind the issues and

challenges faced. Typically students begin to acknowledge the links between self and other in a more constructive manner and critically examine the feelings for and relationship with that space. Students perhaps start to feel that they are no longer an outsider but entitled to share that space (*Characterisation* stage). This may be further reinforced by students reading relevant pedagogic literature after the field trip. Finally, the student reframes their experience into better understanding of that place, where theory is reconciled into reality and practice, and may only be achieved after a period of consolidated thought and reflection.

Thus the structure of the fieldtrip and the learning and teaching strategies (see Marvell et al., 2013) appear important in facilitating students' experiences of place. Firstly, being *in situ* and the value of cultural immersion cannot be underestimated (Pederson, 1995; Nieto, 2006). Students acknowledge that seeing the locations for first-hand was important. When planning and preparing their group talks, students use reconnaissance tools (such as Google Earth and Street View) and reading (e.g. local history and guide books, journal articles). However, students commonly report that the reconnaissance visit to each group's study site is different from expectations. Often, students are surprised by the opportunities that were not previously spotted during the planning stage before the fieldtrip. This means that students have the opportunity to adapt new examples and materials into their talks. The particular day or time a locality is also visited is also important, and can often have a significant influence on personal views of the city. Secondly, interacting with a place also appears important for understanding connections, and unravelling how that place functions. In particular, visiting non-tourist areas gives students insights into the broader functioning of the city and its people. Students start to differentiate between different sections of society, and between tourists and local people, displaying a keener eye for observation and growing awareness and understanding of the inter-relationships in that place. Thus students start to make links between, for instance, identity and a sense of place. Such feelings are often expressed in subjective terms, such as "a good feel *for the city*" [italics inserted for emphasis], whilst some students clearly start to relate their prior research to the geographical contexts that they discover *in situ*. Some students express a growing desire to take something away from the experience that will inform not only their academic studies, but develop them personally:

"Learning to appreciate a different culture and way of life of people is important to take away with me." (#36, Student 6, notebook, 2011) [B3 or C3]

Thirdly, creating an affinity with a place appears to be important to this process. Students undertake projects on a topic developed semi-independently as a group which are delivered *in situ*. Having taken control of a section of the fieldtrip not only creates a sense of 'possession' (cf. Marvell et al., 2013) but also an affinity with that particular place. An integral part of this is the growing emotional attachment that students appear to develop. This is facilitated, firstly, by the translation of time and effort planning and preparing to the intense, shared experience of the delivery of the group talks:

"When participating in a field activity, ... I found myself becoming far more involved and emotionally attached than I would be in a lecture." (#37, Student 3, notebook, 2011) [C2]

As Saunders (2013) notes, self-authoring is important for creating a sense of 'possession' of the fieldtrip. The function of leading the field class, presenting a group talk and activity to peers *in situ* leads to students becoming more involved, partly because of the investment of their time and effort in preparing and planning talks but also because of being *in situ* and mutual respect of each group's contribution (Marvell et al., 2013). Furthermore, the intensity and compatriot nature of the student-

led teaching element results in an emotional attachment with the study site, which is then conveyed through their presentations and activities.

Staff-led and delivered tours are typically restrictive and may lead to limited or selective engagement by students. However, providing students with the opportunities to navigate and explore the city for themselves can be a liberating experience for them. The benefits of informal learning through free time to explore the city should not be underestimated, but it is important to allow students to record and reflect on their experiences their fieldtrip notebooks. For instance, some students may develop a passion for local attributes, such as support for the local football team following a tour of the stadium or, more effectively, as a spectator attending an atmospheric evening game. Thus an affinity with place can also manifest itself through the informal spaces of learning.

Placing students out of their 'comfort zone' into borderland spaces of learning (Savin-Baden, 2008) is important, but must be carefully managed. Some students may have concerns and fears reinforced, and may try to resist any transformative learning, whilst others will find the process liberating and display personal affective growth that will often be translated into more critical awareness and a maturing of academic understanding. Factors which may restrict enhancement of the affective domain include: firstly, preconceptions and the level of preparedness; secondly, the level of confidence to explore and interact with the environment beyond tourist areas; thirdly, the potential 'bubble effect' where the group's own presentation and assessment becomes all-consuming focus, limiting openness to experience other things; and, finally, the intensity of experience may heighten the senses, but may lead to feelings of being overwhelmed or fatigue, and so reflective time is needed. Marvell *et al.* (2013) critique that, whilst student group presentations and activities may be of variable quality and may compromise students' learning, their value in stimulating mutual respect and interest cannot be underestimated. Sharing their observations and experiences can prove effective for reflective and metacognitive understanding (Ballantyne *et al.*, 2010). Careful facilitation by tutors and the variety of learning strategies results in freedom of expression and less on writing what students believe their tutors expect to hear. However, tutors must be wary of the (indirect) messages conveyed to students in both formal and informal teaching contexts. During a short stay in a location, the opportunities for major transformations in perceptions will be limited, but there are clear shifts in the affective domain in students' experiences. Thus there is a growing awareness of the student's own personal sense of place, but also the recognition that the changing sense of place for others. However, most comments focus on the 'self' or on visual signifiers such as architecture or culture, rather than on the 'other' and what it is like to live and work in that place.

Conclusions

As Burgess & Jackson (1992: 153) surmise, encountering an unfamiliar place requires the student "to open yourself up to the urban experience, and to describe and interpret the symbols and meanings that are conveyed through that experience." They offer sound advice that whilst, as an 'outsider' the student is not familiar with the local ways and subtle nuances of how society works, the students' perceptions may be more acute than the insider's habitual experience. Thus it is possible, even during a short stay fieldtrip, for the student to observe and make realistic interpretations of that place (Burgess & Jackson, 1992). However, this study has shown that students' experiences of fieldwork are complex and varied, and an understanding of these experiences can assist in the

designing of effective learning and teachings strategies on international fieldtrips. Preconceptions are tempered with planning and preparation, but mild culture shock is common. Individual students respond very differently, displaying different stages of Pederson's (1995) model of culture shock. A limitation of the short-duration fieldtrip is that some students may be unable to progress fully through the stages of the model, and so their reflective statements both during and after the fieldtrip reveal that some remain stranded at a particular stage, such as the *Disintegration* stage, or even regress along the Krathwohl's taxonomy. This highlights how tutors must be wary of the intended and unintended messages conveyed to students, as well as monitoring students' development through, for instance, informal discussions during the fieldtrip.

Exploring the locality, either independently (free time), semi-independently (reconnaissance day) or staff-led activities are powerful agents for evolving personal relationships with the locality. This can be focused through self-authorship (Saunders, 2013). Taking responsibility for part of the field trip – delivery of a presentation and a field activity *in situ* - means the groups need to be well versed in the academic application of knowledge and understanding of geographical issues, as well as dealing with logistical issues, encountered at that locality. This naturally tends to create a greater sense of affinity and engagement with that place, which often translates to more involved learning. In addition, transit spaces, moving from locality to another, as well as 'free time' to explore and discover are often important but under-utilised spaces of learning, and need to be better integrated into the learning and teaching strategies adopted for fieldtrips.

A reflective and metacognitive approach clearly increases not only self-awareness but also facilitates deeper levels of learning that can be truly transformative with the study of a place offering a medium through which student learning is focused. Reflexivity may often be self-centred rather than empathetic. This may be an artefact of the self-reflection process, and emphasises the need for training and practice in reflective writing. However, students clearly show progression through either or the combination of routes of delivering or receiving field presentations, coupled with the general exploration of the environment of that place. Whilst not all students attain an existential perspective of place, all demonstrate an increased understanding of their relationship with that place. Students' experiences on international fieldwork combine cognitive, kinaesthetic and affective domains. The cyclic nature of the learning and teaching strategy, involving student-led field presentations and activities, means that learning is experiential and promotes critical engagement. Also important are the facilitation of reflection of the learning and teaching methods, the physical environment, and the students' experiences and reactions to both of these aspects. The themes identified from the quotes show clear progression in the Krathwohl taxonomy of the affective domain, combined with Kolb's cycle of experiential learning, indicating that the student-led teaching approach presented by Marvell *et al.* (2013) is an appropriate strategy that facilitates transformative learning through experiential learning and critical reflection, and demonstrating that meaningful learning about a place can be gained even during a fieldtrip of short duration.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the constructive comments of the reviewers, and the students that have participated in teaching their peers on the Barcelona field course over the years.

References

- Anderson, J. (2013) Evaluating student-generated film as a learning tool for qualitative methods: geographical 'drifts' and the city. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(1), 136-146.
- Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D.R. (2001) *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Ballantyne, R., Anderson, D. & Packer, J. (2010) Exploring the impact of integrated fieldwork, reflective and metacognitive experiences on student environmental learning outcomes. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 26, 47-64.
- Bassett, K. (2004) Walking as an aesthetic practice and a critical tool: some psychogeographic experiments. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 28(3), 397-410.
- Bloom, B., Englehart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W. & Krathwohl, D. (1956) *Taxonomy of educational objectives: the classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green.
- Boyle, A., Maguire, S., Martin, A., Milsom, C., Nash, R., Rawlinson, S., Turner, A., Wurthmann, S. & Conchie, S. (2007) Fieldwork is good: the student perception and the affective domain. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 31(2), 299-317.
- Brookfield, S.D. (2012) Critical theory and transformative learning. In: Taylor, E.W. & Cranton, P. (eds.) *The handbook of transformative learning: theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, ch.8, pp.131-146.
- Burgess, J. & Jackson, P. (1992) Streetwork – an encounter with place. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 16(2), 151-157.
- Coe, N.M. & Smyth, F.M. (2010) Students as tour guides: innovation in fieldwork assessment. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 34(1), 125-139.
- Cook, V. (2008) The field as a 'pedagogical resource'? A critical analysis of students' affective engagement with the field environment. *Environmental Education Research*, 14(5), 507-517.
- Cotton, D., Winter, J. & Bailey, I. (2013) Researching the hidden curriculum: intentional and unintended messages. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(2), 192-203.
- Cotton, D.R.E. & Cotton, P.A. (2009) Field biology experiences of undergraduate students: the impact of novelty space. *Journal of Biological Education*, 4, 169-174.
- Cresswell, T. (2008) *Place: a short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Degen, M. and Rose, G. (2012) The sensory experiencing of urban design: the role of walking and perceptual memory. *Urban Studies*, 49, 3269-3285.
- della Dora, V. (2011) Engaging sacred spaces: experiments in the field. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(2), 163-184.
- Dummer, J.B., Cook, I.G., Parker, S.L., Barrett, G.A. & Hull, A.P. (2008) Promoting and assessing 'deep learning' in Geography fieldwork: an evaluation of reflective field diaries. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(3), 459-479.
- Dunphy, A. & Spellman, G. (2009) Geography fieldwork, fieldwork value and learning styles. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 18(1), 19-28.
- Fuller, I.C. (2012) Taking students outdoors to learn in high places. *Area*, 44(1), 7-13.

- Fuller, I., Edmondson, S., France, D., Higgitt, D. & Ratinen, I. (2006) International perspectives on the effectiveness of Geography fieldwork for learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 89-101.
- Garrett, B. (2011) Videographic geographies: Using digital video for geographic research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 521–541.
- Golubchikov, O. (2015) Negotiating critical geographies through a ‘feel trip’: experiential, affective and critical learning in engaged fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 39(1), 143-157.
- Glass, M.R. (2014) Encouraging reflexivity in urban geography fieldwork: study abroad experiences in Singapore and Malaysia. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 38(1), 69-85.
- Healey, M. & Jenkins, A. (2000) Kolb’s experiential learning theory and its application in Geography in Higher Education. *Journal of Geography*, 99(5), 185-195.
- Ishii, H., Gilbride, D.D. & Stensrud, R. (2009) Students’ internal reactions to a one-week cultural immersion trip: a qualitative analysis of student journals. *Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development*, 37, 15-27.
- Kent, M., Gilbertson, D.D. & Hunt, C.O. (1997) Fieldwork in geography teaching: a critical review of the literature and approaches. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21, 313-332.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Krathwohl, D. (2002) A revision of Bloom’s taxonomy: an overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.
- Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S. and Masia, B.B. (1964) *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook II: affective domain*. New York: David McKay Co.
- Lemmons, K.K., Brannstrom, C. & Hurd, D. (2013) Exposing students to repeat photography: increasing cultural understanding on a short-term study abroad. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 38(1), 86-105.
- Lorimer, H. (2010). Walking: New forms and spaces for the study of pedestrianism. In: T. Creswell & P. Merriman (eds.) *Geographies of mobilities: practices, spaces, subjects*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 19–34.
- Marvell, A., Simm, D., Schaaf, R. & Harper, R. (2013) Students as scholars: evaluating student-led learning and teaching during fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(4), 547-566.
- Marvell, A. (2008) Student-led presentations in situ: the challenges to presenting on the edge of a volcano. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 321-335.
- McGuinness, M. & Simm, D.J. (2005) Going global? Long-haul fieldwork in undergraduate Geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(2): 241-253.
- Massey, D. (1993) A global sense of place. Available at: http://www.aughty.org/pdf/global_sense_place.pdf [accessed 18th November 2014]
- Mezirow, J. (1990) How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In: Mezirow, J. et al. (eds.) *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, ch.1, pp.1-20.

- Moon, J. (1999) *Reflection in learning and professional development: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Nieto, J. (2006) The cultural plunge: cultural immersion as a means of promoting self-awareness and cultural sensitivity among student teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33, 75-84.
- Pederson, P. (1995) *The five stages of culture shock*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Pawson, E. & Teather, E.K. (2002) 'Geographical expeditions': assessing the benefits of a student-driven fieldwork method. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(3), 275-289.
- Robson, E. (2002) 'An unbelievable academic and personal experience': issues around teaching undergraduate field courses in Africa. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(3), 327-344.
- Sampson, K.E. & Goodrich, C.G. (2009) Making place: Identity construction and community formation through 'sense of place' in Westland, New Zealand. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22, 901-915.
- Saunders, A. (2010) Exhibiting the field for learning: telling New York's stories. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(2), 185-197.
- Saunders, A. (2013) Recovering the street: relocalising urban geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(4), 536-546.
- Savin-Baden, M. (2008) *Learning spaces: creating opportunities for knowledge creation in academic life*. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education/ Open University Press.
- Smith, F.M. (2006) Encountering Europe through fieldwork. *European Urban & Regional Studies*, 13(1), 77-82.
- Stokes, A., Magnier, K. & Weaver, R. (2011) What is the use of fieldwork? Conceptions of students and staff in Geography and Geology. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(1), 121-141.
- Tuan, Y-F. (1975) Place: an experiential perspective. *American Geographical Society*, 65(2), 151-165.
- Tuan, Y-F. (1977) *Space and place: the perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Urry, J. (2012) *The tourist gaze 3.0*. London: Sage.
- van der Hoeven Kraft, K.J., Srogi, L., Husman, J., Semken, S. & Fuhrman, M. (2011) Engaging students to learn through the affective domain: a new framework for teaching in the Geosciences. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 59, 71-84.
- Warkentin, T. (2011) Cultivating urban naturalists: teaching experiential, place-based learning through nature journaling in Central Park. *Journal of Geography*, 110(6), 227-238.
- Wegenknecht, T. (2011) The experiential teaching of Berlin – theoretical reflections and best practices from a study abroad site. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 20 (Spring), 137-153.
- Wissmann, T. (2013) Tuning the field trip: audio-guided tours as a replacement for 1-day excursions in human geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(4), 595-610.
- Wright, S. & Hodge, P. (2012) To be transformed: emotions in cross-cultural, field-based learning in northern Australia. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 36(3), 355-368.

Table 1. Krathwohl's taxonomy mapped onto the experiential learning and teaching activities of the module and fieldtrip.

| Krathwohl's taxonomy of affective domain | A: Pre-fieldtrip planning and preparation | B: Leading student-led teaching | C: Receiving student-led teaching | D: General exploring of the city |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1: Receiving | A1 – Background reading and research; informal discussions with tutors | B1 – Reconnaissance visit to sites | C1 – Listening to tutors and student group presentations | D1 – Exploring a new locality (day/night) |
| 2: Responding | A2 – Utilising acquired information to enhance knowledge and understanding of topic | B2 – Making changes as a result of being in situ | C2 – Active participation in activities, note taking, asking questions of peers during/after field talks | D2 – Sensory experience; judgements about personal safety and security |
| 3: Valuing | A3 – Evaluating what issues or aspects to focus the presentation on | B3 – Resolving expectations with reality of the site | C3 - Questioning the topic of peer groups | D3 – Awareness of local issues |
| 4: Organisation | A4 – Planning and preparing the presentation and activity | B4 – Clarifying own thinking by explaining to peers and tutors | C4 – Learning gained from peer groups | D4 – Growing confidence in navigation and interaction with local people |
| 5: Characterisation | A5 – Questioning by staff and fellow students develops the presentation | B5 – More refined understanding of topic questioning of preconceptions based on personal experiences | C5 – Increased awareness of geographical issues; reflecting on general experiences | D5 – Understanding and empathy for locality and its issues |

Table 2. Mapping of student quotes of pre- and during/post-fieldtrip stages onto Krathwohl's taxonomy of affective domain.

| Quote number | Pre-fieldwork (A) | | | | | During/ post-fieldwork (B, C and D) | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| | 1 Receiving | 2 Responding | 3 Valuing | 4 Organisation | 5 Characterisation | 1 Receiving | 2 Responding | 3 Valuing | 4 Organisat ion | 5 Characteris ation |
| #2, #9 | A1 → | → | → | → | → | → B1/D1 | | | | |
| #6 | | A2 → | → A3 | | | | | | | |
| #7 | | | A3 → | → | → | → | → B2 | | | |
| #8 | | | A3 → | → | → | → | → | → B3/D3 | | |
| #10, #28, #31 | | | | | | B1/C1/D1 | | | | |
| #18, #32 | | | | | | B1/C1 → | → B2/C2 | | | |
| #1, #3, #4, #5, #13, #26, #27, #37 | | | | | | | B2/C2 | | | |
| #11, #12, #14, #15 | | | | | | | B2/C3/D2 → | → B3/C3/D3 | | |
| #19, #20, #21, #36 | | | | | | | | B3/C3 | | |
| #17 | | | | | | | | B3 → | → B4 | |
| #16 | | | | | | | | | B4/D4 | |
| #30 | | | | | | | | C3 → | → | → C5 |
| #22, #23, #25, #29, #35 | | | | | | | | | | B5/C5 |
| #34 | | | | | | B1 ← | ← B2 | | | |
| #24, #33 | | | | | | | B2 ← | ← B3 | | |

Key (see Table 1): A – Pre-fieldtrip planning and preparation; B – Leading student-led teaching; C – Receiving student-led teaching; D – General exploring of the city