

ABSTRACT

Teachers' Reasons for Including Field Trips in the Curriculum

Danielle Lea Shrock, Ed.D.

Mentor: Betty J. Conaway, Ph.D.

This dissertation examined the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum, whether increasing cultural capital, as defined by Pierre Bourdieu (1973), was one of their primary reasons, what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum, and what discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum. There is an existing achievement gap between Asian and White and Black and Hispanic students and studies have shown poverty is a primary cause of this gap. One aspect of poverty is not participating in out-of-school learning activities, such as visiting zoos, museums, or libraries, which contributes to cultural capital. Field trips are one way to increase cultural capital. This dissertation used Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital as the theoretical framework, and was a collective, multi-site case study using a constant comparative method for a cross case analysis. Three public school districts in Oklahoma, and three schools within each of those districts were used as sites for this study. Questionnaires were given to approximately 237 elementary teachers, and 88 were returned. Follow-up interviews were done with two teachers from each school, and relevant documentation related to field trips was collected from school and district

websites. The findings indicated teachers included field trips in the curriculum for many reasons, for both affective and cognitive gains. Teachers took students on trips that were both fun and educational—they chose places that covered skills and were popular attractions. Most places teachers took students on field trips favored science and history topics. Cost, timing associated with testing, and transportation discouraged teachers from taking field trips. Teachers did want to provide students with new experiences, but were unaware of the research on cultural capital. Recommendations included educating teachers about the latest research on cultural capital, providing bigger field trip budgets or concentrating resources to make a bigger impact, taking field trips throughout the year, especially before testing to truly connect with curriculum, and exploring more virtual or alternative field trips.

Teachers' Reasons for Including Field Trips in the Curriculum

by

Danielle Lea Shrock, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Larry J. Browning, Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Education

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Betty J. Conaway, Ph.D., Chairperson

Larry J. Browning, Ed.D.

Gretchen E. Schwarz, Ph.D.

Tony L. Talbert, Ed.D.

Kathy Whipple, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2014

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2014 by Danielle Lea Shrock

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
DEDICATION.....	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Theoretical Framework/Background of Problem.....	1
Researcher’s Work Setting, Role, and Experience.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Definitions of Terms.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Research Design.....	6
Selection of Sites and Participants.....	7
Description of Participants.....	8
Description of Sites.....	8
Data Collection.....	9
Data Analysis.....	10
Timeline.....	10
Limitations and Assumptions.....	11
Conclusion.....	11

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Achievement Gap and Poverty.....	14
Cultural Capital.....	16
Cultural Capital and Achievement.....	19
Field Trips and Learning.....	26
Teachers’ Reasons for Field Trips.....	30
Factors That Influence Field Trips.....	35
Alternative Field Trips.....	37
Conclusion.....	39
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	40
Introduction.....	40
Research Methodology.....	41
Research Questions.....	42
Research Design.....	42
Researcher’s Role.....	43
Participants and Setting.....	43
Permissions.....	48
Data Collection.....	49
Data Analysis.....	51
Conclusion.....	51
4. DATA ANALYSIS.....	53
Introduction.....	53

Questionnaires.....	53
Interviews.....	54
Relevant Documentation.....	55
Report of Data.....	55
Relevant Documentation.....	88
Conclusion.....	94
5. INTERPRETATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..	96
Introduction.....	96
Findings and Interpretations.....	97
Limitations.....	107
Recommendations.....	108
Implications.....	114
Conclusions.....	115
APPENDIX A.....	119
APPENDIX B.....	122
APPENDIX C.....	123
APPENDIX D.....	124
REFERENCES.....	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Districts by Type, Number of Students, and Number of Schools.....	46
Table 2. District 1 School Profiles.....	47
Table 3. District 1 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent.....	47
Table 4. District 2 School Profiles.....	48
Table 5. District 2 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent.....	49
Table 6. District 3 School Profiles.....	50
Table 7. District 3 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent.....	50
Table 8. Questionnaire Distribution and Return Numbers.....	56
Table 9. Responses to Question 1.....	58
Table 10. Responses to Question 2.....	59
Table 11. Responses to Question 3.....	61
Table 12. Question 4.....	63
Table 13. Responses to Question 5.....	65
Table 14. Responses to Question 6.....	65
Table 15. Responses to Question 7.....	66
Table 16. Responses to Question 8.....	68
Table 17. Responses to Question 9a.....	69
Table 18. Responses to Question 9b.....	70
Table 19. Responses to Question 9b.....	71
Table 20. Responses to Question 10.....	73

Table 21. Responses to Question 11.....	75
Table 22. Responses to Question 12.....	78
Table 23. Profiles of Teacher Interview Participants.. ..	80
Table 24. District 1 Selected Comments about New Experiences.....	82
Table 25. District 1 Selected Comments about Culminating or Focus Activities.....	83
Table 26. District 2 Selected Comments about New Experiences.....	84
Table 27. District 2 Selected Comments about Culminating or Focus Activities.....	84
Table 28. District 3 Selected Comments about Culminating or Focus Activities.....	86
Table 29. Summary of Field Trip Type Choices by Grade Level.....	87
Table 30. District 1 Selected Comments about Particular Field Trips.....	88
Table 31. District 1 Selected Comments about Virtual Field Trips.....	89
Table 32. District 2 Selected Comments about Particular Field Trips.....	90
Table 33. District 2 Selected Comments about Virtual Field Trips.....	91
Table 34. District 3 Selected Comments about Why Particular Field Trips.....	92
Table 35. District 3 Selected Comments about Virtual Field Trips.....	92
Table 36. District 1 Selected Comments about Costs and Policies.....	94
Table 37. District 1 Selected Comments about Testing.....	95
Table 38. District 1 Selected Comments about Cost and Policies.....	96
Table 39. District 2 Selected Comments about Testing.....	97
Table 40. District 3 Selected Comments about Cost and Policies.....	98

For Chris and our bear cubs

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Theoretical Framework/Background of Problem

The premise behind the book series *The Magic School Bus* by Joanna Cole is a bus that takes students on field trips to places they would never see in their everyday lives. They visit outer space, the time of the dinosaurs, and even inside the human body. Going to places like these may not be possible in real life, but taking students to museums or planetariums can still provide experiences that they might not have in their everyday lives. Students from middle and high socioeconomic homes may not need a magic school bus to expand their experiences, but those from disadvantaged homes may. According to the *National Center for Education Statistics 2010 Condition of Education* there is still an achievement gap in reading scores between (a) Asian/Pacific Islander and White students and (b) Black and Hispanic students (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] 2010). There is good reason to think that a primary cause of this gap is poverty (Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, and Maxson, 2009). Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds do not have financial resources to participate in out-of-school learning activities. The NCES found that children in households with low SES were least likely to engage in activities that reinforce school learning or broaden knowledge, such as visiting zoos, museums, or libraries (NCES, 2004). These types of activities contribute to a student's "cultural capital."

Cultural capital has been found to be a significant contributor to academic achievement (Tramonte & Willms, 2010; Barone, 2006; DiMaggio, 1982; Kalmijn & Kraaykamp, 1996). One's cultural capital is the combined experiences that one has had to learn traditions, skills, and knowledge of culture, and this generally contributes to a positive view of school. Along these lines, Pierre Bourdieu defined cultural capital as knowledge, relationships and skills obtained through cultural activities that enable someone to obtain educational and vocational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1973). Families with high socioeconomic status often encourage children to participate in extracurricular activities and can afford to visit informal learning venues, while most families with low socioeconomic status do not. According to Bourdieu the educational system favors those with high cultural capital, and what results is a strong correlation between academic success and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1973). Thus, there is good reason to think that the racially manifested achievement gap is in fact indirectly caused by poverty, because poverty prohibits the accumulation of the cultural capital that is often necessary for high academic achievement.

Although ending poverty is a laudable goal, one might also approach the achievement gap in terms of improving the cultural capital of low SES students. One way to increase the amount of cultural capital a student has is by taking field trips. Falk & Dierking (1997) found that 100% of individuals who were interviewed could recall at least one thing they learned on an elementary school field trip, and most could relate three or more things. This is, no doubt, an excellent result. As the authors put it, "How many other one-day school experiences would measure up as well?" (Falk & Dierking, 1997).

Believing that field trips contribute to cultural capital and that cultural capital can help solve the achievement gap raises an empirical question about whether teachers take the accumulation of cultural capital into account when planning and executing field trips. Kisiel (2005) found that exposing students to new experiences was a motivation for secondary science teachers to plan field trips. However, other concerns such as connection to the curriculum, time associated with testing, funding, administrators, and testing are primary factors teachers list as reasons to conduct field trips and to decide what type of field trips they take (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006). Moreover, most research regarding field trips and teachers' reasons for taking field trips has focused on secondary education, especially secondary science and history (DeWitt & Storksdiel, 2008). This study aims to help educators better understand (a) the reasons that elementary school teachers, who teach all subjects, include field trips in the curriculum, (b) the types of field trips they include, (c) the factors that discourage them from including field trips, and (d) is the development of cultural capital a primary reason teachers include field trips in the curriculum.

Researcher's Work Setting, Role, and Experience

The researcher taught for four years in the elementary setting in two different states. During this time the researcher experienced the planning and implementation of field trips for various grade levels. The researcher has taken several graduate level courses related to reading instruction and the achievement gap. The researcher was involved with conducting the questionnaires and interviews, as well as collecting documentation. The researcher's prior experience with planning field trips may have affected the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to better understand the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum, and what discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum. There is a lack of recent literature on elementary teachers' rationales for field trips, what types of field trips they take, and whether the economy, testing, or other factors, such as increasing cultural capital of students, impact their curricular practices concerning field trips. This study provides valuable insight into these areas.

Statement of the Problem

There is an achievement gap between Asian/Pacific Islander and White students and Black and Hispanic students (NCES, 2010). One factor that has been attributed as a primary cause of this gap is poverty (Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, and Maxson, 2009). One aspect of poverty that influences students' academic success is lack of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1973). This includes the ability to participate in informal learning activities such as attending zoos, aquariums, or museums (NCES, 2004). Field trips are one way to increase the cultural capital of impoverished students. Therefore, educators need to know whether this is already a primary reason teachers include field trips in the curriculum.

The recent literature on teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum indicated that connecting to the curriculum, testing, and funding are primary factors that influenced whether teachers take field trips, what types of field trips teachers planned, and what discouraged teachers from taking field trips (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006). However, most of

this literature focused only on secondary and science or history teachers' rationales for field trips. Therefore, more information is needed about the reasons elementary teachers, who teach all subjects, included field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they implemented, and what factors discouraged them from including field trips in the curriculum.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are employed throughout this work as technical terms.

- Cultural capital is the knowledge, relationships, and skills obtained through cultural activities that enable someone to obtain educational and vocational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1973). For elementary students this means knowledge, relationships, and skills obtained through participating in field trips.
- A field trip is a trip arranged by the school and undertaken for educational purposes, in which students go to places where the materials of instruction may be observed and studied directly in their functional setting; for example, a trip to a factory, a city waterworks, a library museum etc. *Syn.* instructional trip; school excursion; school journey (Good, 1973; Krepel & DuVall, 1981).
- Affective is the area of education that focuses on the attitudinal/emotional development of students, such as interests, attitudes, values, self-esteem, emotional and social adjustment, and political beliefs. Affective education encourages exploration, freedom of choice, creativity, nondirective learning, and emotional growth and development (Ellis & Fouts, 1996).

Research Questions

This study was concerned with elementary teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum. The main research question driving this study was: What were the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum? Some sub-questions of this study are: (1) What types of field trips did teachers include in the curriculum? (2) What discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum? And (3) was the development of cultural capital a primary reason for including field trips in the curriculum?

Research Design

This research study was a collective, multi-site case study to show many perspectives on the issue of the reasons teachers include field trips in the curriculum (Creswell, 2007). The study was multi-site because it examined the reasoning of teachers who work in three different school districts, which have different policies and practices regarding field trips (Creswell, 2007). The unit of analysis was the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum (Yin, 2009). The subunits of analysis were what types of field trips teachers include in the curriculum, what discourages teachers from including field trips in the curriculum, and is the development of cultural capital a primary reason teachers include field trips in the curriculum. Yin (2009) described a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2009). Since this project investigated elementary teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum, it was necessary to conduct the study within the boundary of a classroom or school where teachers are making

decisions about field trips. Teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they included in the curriculum, and what discouraged them from including field trips in the curriculum cannot be measured by standardized means; therefore, a qualitative study would reveal more than a quantitative study.

Selection of Sites and Participants

Participants were chosen from three public school districts in central Oklahoma. These sites were chosen for this study because of the differences in school population, socioeconomic statuses, and locations in relation to the researcher. School District 1 is a large suburban school district, which services 20,290 students in 23 schools. Whites comprise 75% of the student population, Blacks 12%, and approximately 23% qualify for free or reduced price lunch. School District 2 services 7,029 students in 10 schools. The district is 92% White, 3% Native American, and 2% Asian. Approximately 32% of students qualify for free or reduced priced lunch. School District 3 services 18,700 students in 26 schools. It is considered a large city district, which is 50% White, and 53% of students qualify for free or reduced price lunch. These factors contribute to a wide range in field trip policies and participation.

The researcher contacted the Elementary Education director for School District 1 per their policy regarding gaining permission for conducting research. The director provided information about the study to principals, and the principals at three elementary schools volunteered to participate in the study. The researcher also contacted the superintendent for School District 2, who identified three elementary schools to participate in the study. The researcher called School District 3 and was told to contact individual principals to gain permission to conduct research within the schools. The

researcher started with an alphabetical list on the district website and three elementary schools were selected based on their willingness to participate in the study. Convenience sampling was used to select the participants due to lack of time and their locations in relation to the researcher (Creswell, 2007). Questionnaires were distributed to all regular classroom teachers at each school. The sample size was approximately 237 elementary teachers. In order to collect more extensive details, certain participants were selected for in-depth interviews. The researcher chose these based on their answers to the questionnaire and their expressed willingness to participate in such an interview. The sample size for in-depth interviews was two teachers from each school, which ensured that each district was appropriately represented (Creswell, 2007).

Description of Participants

Approximately 237 teachers from three public school districts in central Oklahoma answered an open-ended questionnaire. The researcher used convenience sampling to select participants from each district (Creswell, 2007). Two teachers from each school were asked to participate in an in-depth follow-up interview. Participants for the in-depth interviews were selected based on their questionnaire responses, grades they taught, and willingness to participate in the interview. Information about each school was collected from school websites and the National Center for Education Statistics website.

Description of Sites

All three district sites are located in the central Oklahoma area but have distinct profiles. Demographic information was taken from the National Center for Education Statistics, school report cards and websites. School District 1 is categorized as a large

suburban district. About 75% of students are white, 12% are black, and 23% percent of students qualify for free or reduced price lunch. School District 2 is categorized as a mid-size suburban school and 82% of students are white. Approximately 32% of students qualify for free or reduced price lunch. School District 3 is categorized as a large urban district. The student population is 50% white, 26% black, and 15% Hispanic. Fifty-three percent of students qualify for free or reduced price lunch.

Data Collection

The central research question for this study is, “What are the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum?” The sub-questions for this study are, “What types of field trips do elementary teachers include in the curriculum?” “What discourages elementary teachers from including field trips in the curriculum?” and “Is the development of cultural capital a primary reason teachers include field trips in the curriculum?” To try to answer these questions an open-ended questionnaire was administered to elementary teachers in three school districts, follow-up interviews to the questionnaires were conducted, and relevant documents were collected. To control for internal validity and provide triangulation, evidence was collected from multiple sources (Yin, 2009). The researcher administered open-ended questionnaires to all regular classroom teachers at three schools for each of the three school districts. Using multiple sites increased the external validity of this study (Merriam, 1998). The questionnaires helped the researcher verify and corroborate information, as well as find opportunities for further investigation (Yin, 2009). After the questionnaires were analyzed the researcher conducted in-depth follow-up interviews with two teachers from each school to provide more insight into teachers’ reasons for including field trips in the curriculum (Yin, 2009).

The interviews were semi-structured and recorded when possible. Any documentation related to teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips teachers include in the curriculum, and factors that discourage teachers from including field trips in the curriculum were collected. This included e-mail correspondence and information from school websites regarding school and district policy.

Data Analysis

The primary theoretical framework for this study is Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital. The researcher used a constant comparative method to analyze the data by constantly comparing participants' responses on the questionnaires and interviews, and information from the relevant documents to find patterns (Merriam, 1998). These patterns, or units of data, were then classified to construct response categories (Merriam, 1998). The researcher was looking for units of data that are meaningful to the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they include in the curriculum, and what discourages them from including field trips in the curriculum. Because this study was a collective, multi-site case study, a cross-case analysis was conducted. The categories from each case were compared to make inferences about teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum.

Timeline

Approval from the three school districts was obtained in fall 2010. Copies of the approval letters can be found in Appendix A. The study began in spring 2011 after receiving approval from the Baylor University Institutional Review Board. Informed

consent forms were given to all teachers at each school first. A sample of the informed consent form can be found in Appendix B. The questionnaires were administered and collected at all schools in spring 2011. A sample of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix C. The questionnaires were analyzed and teachers for the in-depth follow-up interviews were selected. A sample of the interview protocol can be found in Appendix D. All interviews were conducted by the end of the spring 2011 semester. All relevant documentation was collected by the end of summer 2011. Data transcription was an ongoing process and once all transcriptions were completed, the final report was written.

Limitations and Assumptions

One assumption of this study was that the teachers answered questions accurately and completely. Another was that these districts represent typical districts of this size. A limitation of this study was that the sites and participants for this study were chosen using convenience sampling.

Conclusion

Bourdieu defined cultural capital as knowledge, relationships and skills obtained through cultural activities that enable someone to obtain educational and vocational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1973) and has been linked to academic achievement (Tramonte & Willms, 2010; Barone, 2006; DiMaggio, 1982; Kalmijn & Kraaykamp, 1996).

Students who live in low socioeconomic households have little opportunity to participate in activities, such as attending zoos, aquariums, and museums (NCES, 2004), which reinforce school knowledge and increase cultural capital. Because cultural capital has been shown to be positively related to achievement, increasing cultural capital through

field trips is a possible strategy for reconciling some of the effects of poverty and reducing the achievement gap. However, there is a lack of recent literature on whether cultural capital was a primary reason that elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum or whether other factors dictate teachers' rationales (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006). Rather, the majority of the literature on field trips and teachers' reasons for including them in the curriculum focused on secondary, and especially science and history. The following examination of relevant literature shows why there is a need for research about the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum, and what discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

Many researchers have claimed that poverty is a primary cause of the achievement gap between Asian/Pacific Islander and White students, and Black and Hispanic students (Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, and Maxson, 2009). Poverty limits students' abilities to participate in informal learning activities such as attending zoos, aquariums, or museums (NCES, 2004; Orr, 2003), which contribute to students' cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1973). Field trips can provide students with the ability to visit these and other educational centers where they can increase learning (Orion & Hofstein, 1994; Falk & Dierking, 1997; Knapp, 2000; Knapp & Barrie, 2001; DeWitt & Storksdiel, 2008; Davidson et al, 2009). So, in this respect, field trips can increase impoverished students' cultural capital (Nespor, 2000). Recent literature has suggested that at least some teachers described connecting to the curriculum, standardized testing, and funding as primary factors that influenced whether they take field trips (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006). However, most of this research focused only on science or secondary teachers. The purpose of this study was to examine what reasons elementary teachers had for including field trips in the curriculum and whether increasing cultural capital was a primary reason for teachers to include field trips in the curriculum. Other sub-questions

of this study asked what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum and what discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum.

Achievement Gap and Poverty

The Condition of Education 2011 showed an existing achievement gap between Asian/Pacific Islander and White students and Black and Hispanic students (NCES, 2011). The cause of the gap has been attributed to many factors. Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, and Maxson (2009) found poverty to be a primary reason for the gap in achievement scores for Black and White students, and ancillary reasons included lead exposure and parents' education. The researchers used data from the North Carolina Education Research Data Center and the North Carolina Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program to examine the relationship between environmental and social stressors and 4th grade end-of-grade reading tests. The results of the study showed that average tests scores were lower for students enrolled in free or reduced lunch programs, whose parents had lower levels of education, and who were exposed to more lead. Exposure to lead, parental educational attainment, and family poverty, which were combined factors for many economically disadvantaged students, seemed to decrease the end-of-grade test scores (Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, & Maxson, 2009).

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) found that children from different socioeconomic status groups had correspondingly different opportunities to engage in activities such as reading and visiting libraries or museums, which reinforce school learning or broaden knowledge (NCES, 2004). The NCES used data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K) to examine children from different socioeconomic status groups and their participation in

various activities during the summer after kindergarten, and in particular their use of the library. They found that children in households of low socioeconomic status were the least likely to participate in activities such as visiting a library, bookstore, state or national park, museum, zoo, historic site, concert or play, vacation, or camp. Children from households of high socioeconomic status were most likely to participate in these activities. The NCES chose to further examine children's library use because it is such an academically enriching activity. They found that low socioeconomic status children were the least likely group to go to the library and went less frequently than other groups; however, low socioeconomic status children attended library story time at rates as high as or higher than other groups (NCES, 2004).

Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson (2001) found that students of high socioeconomic status tended to continue advancing during the summer, while lower socioeconomic status students' scores stayed constant. They asserted that, for low-income students, schools played an important role in counterbalancing the results of out-of-school setbacks. Five years of achievement data from the Beginning School Study was used to examine whether learning differed on a seasonal basis. The researchers found that low socioeconomic status students started first grade behind their high socioeconomic status peers, and during the following summer they showed little improvement. Findings indicated inequalities in the students' "opportunities to learn." They called this the "faucet theory" of learning. When students were in school the faucet was turned on, and they received plenty of resources. But when schools broke for holidays or summer the faucet turned off and low-income families could not make up for the loss of educational resources (Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 2001). To help low socioeconomic status

students keep up with high socioeconomic status peers the researchers suggested that schools offer economically disadvantaged students extra resources and enrichment experiences, like those that middle class parents routinely provide (Alexander, Entwisle, & Olson, 2001).

Cultural Capital

Pierre Bourdieu coined the term “cultural capital” in *Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction* (Bourdieu, 1973). He defined cultural capital as relationships and skills that enable one to obtain educational and vocational qualifications, games and sports of high society, and manners and tastes from “good breeding.” Bourdieu discussed his findings after investigating the types of cultural activities favored by peoples of varying socioeconomic and educational levels. He identified three levels of socioeconomic status—low, middle, and high—to compare participation in cultural activities. He found that the amount of cultural capital a person possessed corresponded to the level of higher education and economic capital one possessed. According to Bourdieu, educational systems favor those who have cultural capital, and cultural capital is transmitted through family upbringing. He claimed that this explains why most students from households with low socio-economic status have low expectations about school. Wealth creates a cycle: the more cultural capital one possesses, the more interested in school one is; high interest in school yields high academic performance; therefore, the better one does at school, the more cultural capital one has to pass on.

Bourdieu gave a more detailed definition of cultural capital in his work *The Forms of Capital* (Bourdieu, 1986). He described the three forms of capital that a person can possess as economic, cultural, and social. Economic capital is anything that can be

directly converted into money, such as property. Social capital may consist of family connections or obligations, including titles of nobility. Cultural capital, on the other hand, is, in the broadest sense, one's accumulated educational qualifications. Bourdieu asserted that the best way to measure cultural capital is by the amount of time that has been devoted to acquiring it.

Bourdieu divided cultural capital into three subspecies—embodied, objectified, and institutionalized. Embodied cultural capital is transmitted through inheritance of culture or traditions. Parents who exposed their child to a culture with a broad amount of terms through speaking or reading books, and the child developing a large vocabulary is an example of embodied cultural capital. Bourdieu stated that embodied cultural capital influences the way one thinks or one's character (which Bourdieu calls *habitus*), which means that, unlike money, it cannot be transferred directly. Embodied capital depends on time and socialization; therefore, it is most often acquired unconsciously.

Objectified cultural capital is material objects, such as works of art, writings, or musical instruments (Bourdieu, 1986). There are two ways of having this type of capital—possessing the material object itself and possessing the ability to appreciate and use the object. To illustrate the latter, Bourdieu used the example of a painting. One can sell a painting, but what is difficult to sell is the ability to consume the painting or understand the effect the artist was intending.

Bourdieu defined the third form of cultural capital, institutionalized, as formal academic qualifications (Bourdieu, 1986). Institutionalized capital gives one a status of being culturally competent and makes it possible to compare her with others with similar qualifications.

Bourdieu's term *cultural capital* has been operationalized in more recent research. Lamont and Lareau (1988) defined cultural capital as "institutionalized, i.e., widely shared high status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviors, goods, and credentials)" used for exclusions from jobs, resources, and high status groups (p. 156). They give several examples, which include: being a good citizen (attitude), being thin and healthy (preference and behavior), having scientific expertise (formal knowledge), and owning a luxury car or a large house (possession of a good). Lamont and Lareau also stressed that Bourdieu's theory focused on the ways that cultural capital was communicated unconsciously and how the lack of capital could exclude individuals (Lamont & Lareau, 1988). Kalmijn and Kraaykamp (1996) said that cultural capital is socialization into an interest in art and classical music, attendance at theaters, and museums, and reading literature, which were considered highbrow activities (Kalmijn & Kraaykamp, 1996). DiMaggio and Mukhtar (2004) and Dumais (2002/2005) similarly used cultural capital to mean attendance at and participation in arts events and taste for high culture art forms. They considered arts participation to be attendance at events for classical music, jazz, opera, musical theatre, plays (not musical), ballet, art museum/gallery, art or craft fair, historic site, and dance (not ballet) (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Dumais, 2002/2005). Dandrow (2008) used the term to indicate knowledge that provides someone higher social status (Dandrow, 2008). Myrberg and Rosén (2009) called Bourdieu's cultural capital "a theoretical hypothesis and a conceptual tool that makes it possible to explain the unequal scholastic achievement of distribution of cultural capital between classes and class fractions" (p. 697). Tramonte and Willms (2010) described two forms of cultural capital: static, which includes

‘highbrow’ activities and practices and is an expression of the family’s socioeconomic advantage, and relational, which is concerned with the cultural interactions and communication between children and their parents—the resources and experiences that children use in society to interact strategically and to achieve their goals (Tramonte & Willms, 2010). Winkle-Wagner (2010) claimed that researchers have defined cultural capital in four common ways:

[A]s cultural knowledge or competence linked to highbrow elites status; as those cultural competencies, skills, or abilities valued in a particular context; as part of a Bourdieuan framework that aims to uncover the transmission of power and privilege; and as those cultural skills, abilities, knowledge, or competencies of nondominant groups (p. 92).

She also stressed, “Bourdieu’s theoretical framework is rooted in the notion that the real disparities in material wealth eventually result in differences in cultural capital that are rewarded and appropriated in education” (Winkle-Wagner, 2010, p. 109). It is clear that the contemporary use of cultural capital has followed Bourdieu’s insights.

Cultural Capital and Achievement

Lareau and Horvat (1999) found that race and social class affected the amount of cultural capital one gains, but these factors did not *determine* how much cultural capital one will possess or how one will use it. In a study of parents’ involvement with their third grade children, they found that setting determined the value of cultural capital and how it was “activated.” Lareau and Horvat used Bourdieu’s card game illustration to describe cultural capital as follows:

In a card game (the field of interaction), the players (individuals) are all dealt cards (capital). However, each card and each hand have different values. Moreover, the value of each hand shifts according to the explicit rules of the game (the field of interaction) that is being played (as well as the way the game is being enacted). In other words, a good hand for blackjack may be a less valuable hand

for gin rummy. In addition, to having a different set of cards (capital), each player relies on a different set of skills (habitus) to play the cards (activate the capital). By folding the hand, a player may not activate his or her capital or may play the cards (activate the capital) expertly according to the rules of the given game. In another game, the same player may be dealt the same hand, yet because of a lack of knowledge of the rules of the game play the hand poorly (Lareau & Horvat, 1999).

Lareau and Horvat suggested that race does not always determine whether a student has cultural capital, how much, or whether he uses it. They used the example of a wealthy white student. He is not guaranteed admittance into an elite college because of his race or social status, but rather his grades. Their study also showed that there are ways to influence a student's cultural capital, for example, a family who requests that their daughter be put in a gifted program (Lareau & Horvat, 1999). This is important because if schools can influence student's cultural capital, for example through field trips, then they can also affect student's academic achievement.

DiMaggio (1982) found that for male and female 11th graders cultural capital was positively related to grades. He measured students' attitude or interest in specific artistic activities and occupations, participation in artistic activities (such as creating, performing, or attending art events or reading literature), and knowledge of literature, music, and art. DiMaggio found that for students who had high socioeconomic status the returns on cultural capital were greater than for students with low socioeconomic status, confirming Bourdieu's original theory. Students from backgrounds of high socioeconomic status had higher amounts of cultural capital and had higher grades than those with low socioeconomic status. DiMaggio also found that the impact of cultural capital was different for males and females of different socioeconomic status groups. He divided male and female samples into three groups based on father's education—sons and daughters of college graduates, high school graduates only, and no high school diploma.

For females, cultural capital had a more positive impact on grades for those from high socioeconomic status than low socioeconomic status; however, for males the positive impact of cultural capital was restricted to low and middle socioeconomic status. The same 11th graders were resurveyed eleven years later, and DiMaggio and Mohr (1985) used this data to examine the effect of cultural capital on educational attainment. They found cultural capital had a positive impact on educational attainment and college attendance for both men and women. They also found that cultural capital had a positive effect on college completion, graduate education, and educational attainment for both genders.

Kalmijn and Kraaykamp (1996) asserted that cultural capital is a reason for the Black-White achievement gap and that most research has underscored the role it can play in influencing academic achievement. They used Bourdieu's (1973) definition of cultural capital—socialization into highbrow cultural activities, including an interest in things like arts and attending museums. Kalmijn and Kraaykamp (1996) believed that increasing cultural capital helped students be better prepared to master academic material, and to develop a taste for learning abstract and intellectual concepts, whereas a lack of cultural capital discouraged students from staying in school and hampered their scholastic accomplishments. They used the 1982 and 1985 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) on arts consumption, parental background, and cultural socialization to examine what part of the achievement gap between Blacks and Whites could be explained by differences in cultural capital. They specifically looked at whether parents attended performances of classical music, plays, and art museums and whether they encouraged their fifteen-year-old children to read books (not for school). They found that

there had been an increase in cultural capital for both Whites and Black; however, the increase occurred at a faster rate for Blacks. Over time there had been a decline in cultural capital as parental education had risen for Whites, and Black students had more cultural capital because of more highly educated parents. They also found that urban students had more cultural capital than rural students and women had more than men. Other findings indicated that the level of schooling for Whites would have increased faster had there been no decline in cultural capital. For both races, they found that more exposure to cultural capital is associated with higher levels of schooling, confirming Bourdieu's (1973) theory. They also observed that, as more Blacks were involved in traditionally Euro-American culture activities, the Black-White gap narrowed (Kalmijn and Kraaykamp, 1996).

Dumais (2002) studied the relationship between cultural capital and gender, and whether cultural capital had an effect on success in school. She found that students who had high socioeconomic status, as well as girls in general, were more likely to participate in cultural activities. She also found that cultural capital had a positive and significant effect on grades of both boys and girls, but at different levels. However, Dumais pointed out that students would benefit more by combining high expectations of school (*habitus*) and cultural capital. She also posited that as gender roles change in society cultural capital may have different effects on girls and boys. One aspect of this research focused on sports participation and revealed that both boys and girls benefited academically from athletic participation. Dumais suggested that sports might need to be included in the definition of cultural capital (Dumais, 2002).

Dumais (2005) also did a study to examine early childhood students' cultural capital, parental habitus, and teacher perceptions. Data was used from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class 1998-1999 (ECLS-K). The study found that as socioeconomic status increased, students were more likely to participate in a greater number and wider variety of cultural activities. The study also found that low SES students received greater benefits from participating in cultural activities; however, a student that had lower cultural capital did not sway teacher evaluations of the student. This study supported Bourdieu's theory that different classes of families transmit different types and quantities of cultural capital and habitus; however, unlike Bourdieu's original premise that teachers favor students with cultural capital, Dumais could find no evidence for such a bias. The study found that higher socioeconomic students benefited more from cultural capital, but this could have been because lower SES students were unable to participate in these kinds of activities. Dumais pointed out teacher perceptions are very influential in the classroom; therefore, she advised that more studies be done concerning the relationship between teacher perceptions and cultural capital. Dumais also recommended further studies, both quantitative and qualitative, to examine Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital (Dumais, 2005).

Orr's (2003) study on the effects of wealth on achievement supported Bourdieu's (1986) theory of cultural capital. Orr found that wealth had a positive effect on achievement and could partly explain the difference in Black and White reading scores. Wealth could be turned into cultural capital; therefore, the amount of cultural capital a child possesses could affect achievement. Orr used the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79) to measure the effects of wealth and cultural capital on achievement.

She found that families with little or no wealth scored lower on the mathematics tests and that as the gap in wealth between children increased so did the gap in scores. Orr also found that the more a child was exposed to cultural capital, the higher her mathematics achievement score. Orr concluded that wealth and cultural capital were positively and significantly correlated (Orr, 2003).

Lee and Bowen (2006) examined whether parental involvement determined the levels and effects on achievement based on Bourdieu's theory. Their sample consisted of 497 third through fifth grade students. The variables used for this study were race/ethnicity, participation in the free or reduced price lunch program, parent educational attainment, parent educational involvement at home and school, and student academic achievement. The racial/ethnic achievement gap was documented in their study, as well as an achievement gap between students who did not live in poverty and those who did. Students not living in poverty, White, and with more educated parents had significantly higher academic achievement. Parents who had characteristics such as: "at least a two-year college degree," "Caucasian," "no participation in free or reduced price lunches," and "similar lifestyle and culture to the school," reported more involvement and higher educational expectations for their children. This is consistent with Bourdieu's theory of educational expectations or habitus. Lee and Bowen found that parental involvement at school had a positive and significant association with achievement, yet poverty and race/ethnicity played more significant roles in predicting academic achievement (Lee & Bowen, 2006).

Barone (2006) used data from the Project for International Student Assessment (PISA) and found that cultural capital provides a significant explanation for school

inequalities. The PISA is a survey comparing learning outcomes of a random sample of students aged fifteen in industrialized countries. Barone found that cultural capital has a strong and positive influence on reading literacy in all countries, confirming Bourdieu's (1986) cultural capital theory. However, Barone also asserted that occupational aspirations, economic resources, ambition, and parental cognitive skills might also have been important factors for educational outcomes (Barone, 2006). Tramonte and Willms (2010) used the same data to examine the relationship between cultural capital and school outcomes. They found that relational cultural capital, and the cultural interactions and communications between parents and children had strong effects on students' reading literacy, sense of belonging at school, and occupational aspirations. They also found that the effects of static cultural capital, and participation in highbrow activities were statistically significant (Tramonte and Willms, 2010).

Myrberg and Rosén (2009) studied the effect of parents' education levels on the reading achievement of third graders in Sweden. They specifically focused on literacy practices as cultural capital that was transmitted from early on in a person's life. Myrberg and Rosén used the three aspects of cultural capital as outlined by Bourdieu, institutionalized, objectified, and embodied. For their study, institutionalized capital referred to school diplomas, objectified capital to home libraries, and embodied capital to personal dispositions. Their analysis found parents who were well-educated had more books at home and encouraged their children to participate in early reading activities, which continued to influence reading achievement into the third grade.

Harris and Graves Jr. (2010) also found that cultural capital had a positive influence on reading achievement. Specifically, going to places like museums, libraries,

and zoos were significantly related to reading achievement in 5th grade African American boys. Harris and Graves Jr. concluded that their study reflects the outcome predicted by social reproduction theory, as described by Bourdieu (1973). Reproduction theory says that students whose parents are academically or economically successful are more likely to be successful because parents transfer resources to their children. The researchers suggested that the public should be made aware of the benefits associated with visiting libraries, museums, plays, orchestras, and aquariums and provide more opportunities for underprivileged families to visit these places, such as increasing field trips.

Field Trips and Learning

Research has shown that students could acquire cognitive, social, and affective gains from participating in school trips, in particular. “Affective learning” refers to interests, attitudes, values, self-esteem, emotional and social adjustment, and political beliefs (Ellis & Fouts, 1996). However, a common thread in the research is that it focuses mostly on secondary and science teachers or facilities that cater to secondary and science audiences. Falk and Balling (1982) found 3rd and 5th graders learned more on a trip with hands-on activities and that the setting of the field trip mattered to the quality of learning. They randomly assigned a group of 3rd and 5th graders to go on a field trip at an off-campus nature center, while another group of 3rd and 5th graders remained on school grounds but took part in learning exercises similar to those of the off-campus group. Observers found that the 3rd graders were more on task while on the school grounds trip, but the 5th graders were more on task at the nature center. The 5th graders who visited the nature center also performed better on follow-up post-tests than their on-campus

counterparts. On the other hand, the 3rd graders who stayed at school did better on the post-test than those who went to the nature center (Falk & Balling, 1982).

Orion and Hofstein (1994) investigated factors that influence a student's ability to learn on a field trip. High school students in Israel were given a student background questionnaire, three attitude questionnaires, and an achievement test. Students were observed during a field trip, and the teacher was given a questionnaire and interviewed. All groups gained some knowledge from the field trip; however, students who performed better on the trip had higher achievement scores (Orion & Hofstein, 1994). Rix and McSorley (1999) found that students who visited science museums on field trips showed some knowledge gain from the experience, but they showed more improvement in their attitudes toward science (Rix & McSorley, 1999).

Knapp and Barrie (2001) evaluated the impact of field trips on the knowledge and attitude of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students from three school districts. Pre- and post-evaluations measuring knowledge, attitude, and behavior intent were administered to students before and after two field trips. Findings indicated significant gains in science related knowledge (Knapp & Barrie, 2001). Morrell (2003) did a study to determine whether third and fourth grade students would retain knowledge after a forestry field trip. She found that third and fourth grade students increased knowledge and retained the knowledge. In some ways this was an ideal study, because the teachers conducting the trip paid special attention to instructional needs. They gave students pre-trip instruction, students were actively involved during the trip, and teachers followed up on the field trip experience afterward (Morrell, 2003).

Research also showed that field trips make a long-term impact on student learning. Falk and Dierking (1997) interviewed 34 fourth graders, 48 eighth graders, and 46 adults about their recollections of school field trips. They found that all the fourth graders, ninety-six percent of eighth graders, and ninety-three percent of adults could recall at least one school field trip. Trips to natural sites or nature centers, farms, historical sites, zoos or aquariums, natural history museums, and science-technology centers were the most frequently recalled. Their findings showed that field trips produce important memories and long-term learning (Falk & Dierking, 1997).

Knapp's (2000) study of students' experiences on a science field trip showed that most participants could not recall the specific activity that was used to review a concept for either the 1-month or 18-month post-test. However, students expressed a desire to return to the science center even 18 months after the trip, so they gained a motivation to learning more about the topic (Knapp, 2000). Farmer, Knapp, and Benton (2007) found that an elementary field trip to the Smoky Mountains produced long term content retention and increased students' attitudes toward protecting and improving the environment (Farmer, Knapp, & Benton, 2007).

Piscitelli and Anderson (2002) found that children as young as four to six years old could recall what they saw at museums, science centers, and art galleries. They administered a protocol comprised of three sections—a free choice drawing about the museums, a semi-structured interview, and a series of four-point Likert-type items. From this data Piscitelli and Anderson found the children had powerful and detailed recollections of their experiences at the museums. In the affective domains, children

perceived museums as exciting, happy, and providing opportunities to learn and gain ideas about things they do not see in everyday life (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2002).

Pace and Tesi (2004) conducted a case study with eight adults to examine the memories and impacts that field trips had on their lives. They found twelve common themes among their interviews. From those themes, Pace and Tesi concluded that hands-on activities were an important factor of field trips, because they helped participants retain more information and have a positive experience. They also found that museums, historical sites, and zoos were the most common sites for field trips, especially to reinforce science and social studies, and provided a break from the classroom routine. Pace and Tesi concluded as well, “Insufficient exposure to various cultural activities seemed to make the experiences less valuable in terms of enhancing the participants’ education” (Pace & Tesi, 2004).

Davidson, Passmore, and Anderson (2009) studied the impact on learning of the agendas of teachers, zoo staff, and high school students during a field trip. They found that teachers who had high expectations of student learning had a positive impact on whether students gained learning from the zoo field trip. Even three months after the trip, students had “high learning outcomes in both the cognitive and affective realms” (Davidson et al, 2009). The trip with a teacher whose main expectation was for students to enjoy it produced low learning outcomes. The main implication of this study was that teachers who had a clear learning goal tied to classroom activities were best able to maximize student learning on field trips.

DeWitt and Storksdieck (2008) did an extensive review of literature on field trips. In their review they showed that field trips not only produced cognitive learning, but

maybe more importantly, also improved social and affective outcomes, such as increasing motivation or interest, sparking curiosity, or improving attitudes towards a topic. DeWitt and Storksdieck added that the research indicated that teachers have multiple reasons for taking field trips, both affective and cognitive. They also pointed out that recent field trip research showed that certain factors, such as education objectives, time constraints, planning, behavior issues, transportation, and cost, influenced the natures of teachers' field trip activities and whether they take field trips at all (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008).

Teachers' Reasons for Field Trips

Muse, Chiarelott, and Davidman (1982) found that Mason's (1980) annotated review of the history of field trip research did not give information from a teacher's perspective. Specifically, they were concerned with what types of field trips were most popular, what value they had, which subjects tended to use them more, and what factors tended to discourage elementary and secondary teachers from taking field trips. They found that elementary and secondary teachers averaged 6.59 and 3.8 trips per year respectively. For secondary teachers, no particular subject area took more field trips than any other. Among elementary field trips, social studies and science accounted for 70 percent of the trips. However, teachers could categorize only 24.9 percent into any subject. Muse, Chiarelott, and Davidman also discovered that many secondary field trips duplicated elementary trips—that is, students were significantly likely to visit the same place (or a similar place) at least twice. According to their study, elementary teachers would have increased the number of field trips they took if economic conditions were better. Elementary teachers reported cost as the main reason for not taking field trips, but secondary teachers were more concerned with the time involved. Teachers in this study

seemed not to be as concerned about student learning outcomes as those in other studies (Muse, Chiarelott, & Davidman, 1982).

Griffin and Symington (1997) examined the learning purposes, preparation, interactions with students on field trips, and follow-up activities offered by Australian teachers of grades Year Five to Year Ten to their students upon taking field trips to museums and science centers. They also examined whether there was a connection between these trips and the classroom curriculum. When asked about the purpose of the trip, teachers were hesitant to respond, indicating that they may not have thought about it before asked by the researchers. Griffin and Symington found that only half of the teachers were able to give a purpose that related to students' learning of content or skills. Teachers generally did little preparation, and what was done was mostly organizational, such as collecting money and permission slips and distributing worksheets. Teachers also reported little or no follow-up activities. There was no link between the museum topics and the classroom curriculum for more than half of the school groups (Griffin & Symington, 1997).

Michie (1998) investigated the factors influencing secondary science teachers in Australia to organize and conduct field trips. The first phase of the qualitative study was an open-ended questionnaire that was given to ten secondary science teachers. The second phase involved interviews with twenty-five secondary science teachers. The teachers believed that the main purpose of field trips was to give students hands-on experiences, enhance students' understanding, add variety, and motivate and improve attitudes towards science. Teachers listed museums, science centers, aquariums, zoos, field centers, habitats, and industrial sites as field trip destinations. Antagonism from

other teachers, administrative procedures, transportation, money, large class size, safety issues, timetable inflexibility, and time and effort on the teachers part were listed as negative factors that affected whether teachers took field trips (Michie, 1998).

Lucas (2000) studied one Year Seven science teacher's agenda for taking students to a science center. Lucas observed the pre-visit lesson, interviewed the teacher and students, taped the class trip, conducted a follow up interview with the teacher, and observed the post-visit lesson. The pre-visit lesson consisted of a discussion of how people learn and some administrative details about the trip. The post-visit lesson consisted of the class ranking the trip, listing as many of the exhibits as they could remember, and completing a worksheet. Lucas found that the teacher's agenda for the field trip was to have students have opportunities to learn about topics that they had studied in class and to have fun while on the trip (Lucas, 2000).

Kisiel (2003) studied teachers' intentions and other factors that might influence the field trip experience. He examined twelve worksheets from twelve different school groups of grades 3 through 11 that visited a natural history museum. Kisiel also interviewed the teachers and observed groups from eight of the schools. The teachers in this study fit into two categories of agenda—survey the entire museum or focus on one concept in the museum. Both the worksheets and teacher interviews in this study yielded data that suggested that teacher agendas lacked a solid connection to their classroom curriculums. Based on examination of the worksheets, the paramount goal for teachers in the survey category was to have a good learning experience. Teachers also reported plans to briefly discuss the museum visit, but otherwise had limited plans for follow-up activities (Kisiel, 2003).

Anderson and Zhang (2003) sought to understand K-7 teachers' perceptions of planning and implementing field trips to museums in Vancouver. They used a two-phase approach—the first surveyed 93 K-7 teachers and the second involved a focus group interview and discussions with 6 teachers. Teachers were asked to rank order thirteen issues according to their respective importance. According to the responses, curriculum fit was the issue most considered when planning field trips. Perceived value of the experience, venue entry costs, amount of enjoyment, and transportation costs were also important. However, even though, according to the survey, curriculum fit was the top issue, teachers did not evidence this in their reports of how they implemented field trips or in how they integrated the experience after the trip. As the researchers interpreted the reports, the top five most critical factors for the success of field trips were pre-planning/pre-lessons, curriculum fit, interactive/engaging/hands-on for students, sufficient parent volunteers/drivers/easy transportation, and enthusiastic/friendly/helpful/skilled staff (Anderson & Zhang, 2003).

Kisiel (2005) found similar results when he investigated teachers' motivations for conducting field trips to science museums and similar informal learning institutions. Participants were 115 upper elementary teachers in the Los Angeles area. The first phase involved a survey of closed and open-ended questions to identify teacher motivations for field trips. Teachers identified with eight motivations. These motivations and the percentages of teachers who identified with them were “connect with curriculum” (90%), “provide a learning experience” (39%), “promote lifelong learning” (30%), “foster interest and motivation” (18%), “expose to new experiences” (17%), “provide a change of setting” (13%), “provide enjoyment or reward” (11%), and “satisfy school

expectations” (3%). A chi-square analysis comparing motivations revealed a significant relationship between “provide a learning experience” and “expose to new experiences.” This suggests teachers who are motivated to provide experiences to broaden students’ understandings were also more likely to be motivated to provide opportunities that students may not have had otherwise. Teacher surveys indicated limitations of taking field trips were testing and lack of funding, especially due to transportation expenses. Teachers also listed indicators of a successful field trip. The success indicators and percentage of teachers who identified with them were “positive experience” (61%), “demonstrate new knowledge” (41%), “connect to classroom curriculum” (23%), “increased student motivation or interest” (17%), “good student behavior” (17%), “quality/quantity of student questions” (8%), “trip completed without incident” (5%). Even though “connect with curriculum” was the top motivation teachers identified with, teachers only ranked it third as an indicator for a successful field trip. To better understand what the motivations look like in context, phase two involved in-depth interviews and observations of ten teachers who conducted a field trip to a natural history museum. The interviews provided further clarification of what teachers meant by “expose to new experiences.” Teachers suggested that they were motivated to take students on field trips because their parents could not afford the time or money to take them to a museum or similar place. Teachers indicated on the surveys and through the interviews that testing, administration, limitation of time or choice for field trips, and collaboration were conflicts with their motivations (Kisiel, 2005).

Munday (2008) studied secondary geography teachers’ perceptions of field trips. For this study, a 39-item survey was used to assess the perceived purpose and value of

field trips. Teachers responded that field trips were useful for knowledge retention, student enjoyment, and overall effectiveness. About 87 percent of teachers believed that field trips were worth teachers' time and effort. They also reported that they conducted between one and two field trips per year and collaborated to plan these trips.

Transportation, cost, and student behavior were reported as negative factors of field trips. Munday found that teachers were concerned about cost because of the expense for low-income students, paying for a substitute, and the cost of transportation. Scheduling transportation was also reported as a discouraging factor. Half of the teachers reported student behavior issues as stress inducing. Munday concluded that teachers believed that field trips were beneficial, especially for student learning, despite the discouraging factors of cost, transportation, and student behavior (Munday, 2008).

Factors That Influence Field Trips

Some common factors, such as standardized tests, cost, policies, and parental involvement, influenced teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. Nespor's (2000) ethnographic study of a fourth grade trip to an art museum and a fifth grade trip to Thomas Jefferson's Monticello found that teachers often have poor learning goals. She found this to be because of the timing of field trips, which were usually near holidays or the end of the school year, and the time to travel to the field trip site. Nespor also found teachers chose not to include field trips because of the costs of transportation and insurance, at five dollars, were too high for some students. Student misbehavior was also a discouraging factor for some teachers (Nespor, 2000).

DuVall and Krepel (1975) studied school board policies for conducting field trips in 149 cities in the United States. They asserted the policies about field trips are evidence

that the board values field trips. In DuVall and Krepel's study, 88 percent of the districts had policies about field trips, and 69 percent of these were written policies. In these policies, the school principal was mentioned most often as the person to approve field trips, and the most common criterion for determining the acceptability of a field trip was "educational significance and/or suitability." Specific mention of acceptable transportation was included in 70 percent of the board policies. DuVall and Krepel concluded that school boards considered field trips to be integral to their instructional programs because field trips were permitted, written policies were in place to facilitate them, and individual schools determined the acceptability of proposed trips (DuVall & Krepel, 1975).

Burtnyk and Combs (2005) found that parents were confused about their roles as chaperones for field trips. Teachers and chaperones were given a questionnaire upon arrival at a science center. The questionnaire was designed to compare teachers and chaperones' perceptions of the role of the chaperone on the trip. Chaperones were also observed as they took students around the science center. Based on the questionnaire results, Burtnyk and Combs found that 50 percent of chaperones believed their job to be the facilitation of learning, compared to the 14 percent of teachers who felt the same way. The other 86 percent of teachers thought that the role of the chaperone was to supervise, lead or guide, baby-sit, or provide safety for students. They also found that little or no discussion about the exhibits occurred between chaperones and students (Burtnyk & Combs, 2005).

Alternative Field Trips

As costs have become a major concern in determining whether to include field trips in the curriculum, teachers have increasingly turned to alternative field trips. An exact definition of an alternative field trip is difficult to find, but most examples found one common alternative field trip is the virtual field trip. There is not much empirical research on virtual field trips among elementary schools. But one thing is clear from the research literature—the definition of a virtual field trip could be clearer. Cassady and Mullen (2006) said that there is no universal definition for electronic field trips (EFT) or virtual field trips (VFT) (Cassady & Mullen, 2006). Woerner (1999) defined a virtual field trip as “a journey taken without actually making a trip to the site” (as cited in Cox & Su, 2004). But other studies show that the term *virtual* can mean reading books, play acting, or using technology to simulate a field trip (Wetterlund, 2008; Blachowicz & Obrochta, 2005; Morris, 2003). What is also not clear is whether virtual field trips are true alternatives to traditional field trips.

Cox and Su (2004) found no significant difference in cognitive mastery between university students who went on a traditional field trip and those that went on a virtual field trip (Cox & Su, 2004). Garner and Gallo (2005) compared traditional and virtual field trips taken by undergraduate science students and discovered little difference in mean achievement and attitude scores, even when considering various learning styles. In particular, achievement scores for both types of field trips increased. On the other hand, while students’ attitudes toward science increased slightly for physical field trips, attitudes towards science decreased slightly for virtual field trips (Garner & Gallo, 2005). Puhek, Perse, and Sorgo (2012) also found that secondary school students’ knowledge

increased after participating in both traditional field trips and virtual field trips; however, some learning outcomes were better realized by traditional field trips and others by virtual field trips (Puhsek, Perse, & Sorgo, 2012).

Placing and Fernandez (2001) agreed that virtual field trips cost less and do not require as much work to organize; however, they asserted, virtual field trips do not have the same impact as a traditional field trip (Placing & Fernandez, 2001). Cassady and Mullen (2006) did an evaluation of the Ball State University electronic field trips. They found that teachers could select electronic field trip materials that were more learner-based by sorting them into Bruce and Levin's (1997, 2001) categories. The categories were derived from Dewey's (1943) proposed natural impulses of children and included inquiry, communication, construction, and expression (Cassady and Mullen, 2006). Stoddard (2009) did a critical case study of an electronic field trip "to" Colonial Williamsburg, the most famous electronic field trip option, in order to determine the nature of an effective virtual field trip. The trip itself had some problems: it did not connect with state or school curriculum standards, nor was it flexible enough for teacher schedules. Plus, teachers lacked sufficient training to make the virtual field trip worthwhile. On the other hand, Adedokun, et al. (2012) found that some virtual field trips reduced the stereotypes of scientists and provided educational resources and career exploration experiences that would not have been available otherwise (Adedokun, et al., 2012). The research in this area is limited and more work needs to be done to determine what an alternative or virtual field trip is, if they can be a true substitution to traditional field trips, and how teachers use alternative field trips.

Conclusion

Studies have shown that cultural capital is an important factor for academic achievement (Bourdieu, 1973,1986; DiMaggio, 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985; Kalmijn and Kraaykamp, 1996; Dumais, 2002, 2005; Orr, 2003; Barone, 2006; Tramonte and Willms, 2010). However, recent literature about teachers' rationales for field trips has indicated that secondary teachers, and especially science and history teachers may not consider increasing cultural capital as a primary justification for conducting field trips. Rather, they are concerned with testing, funding, and connecting to the curriculum (Muse, Chiarelott, & Davidman, 1982; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Michie, 1998). If attending places that increase cultural capital, such as zoos, museums, and libraries, would help bridge the achievement gap, then teachers may need to reconsider their reasons for implementing field trips. There also needs to be more information on the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they include in the curriculum, and what discourages them from including field trips in the curriculum.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

The Condition of Education 2011, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics, showed that there was an achievement gap between Asian/Pacific Islander and White students and Black or Hispanic students (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011). Research has suggested that, historically, this gap has been tightly linked to socioeconomic status. End-of-grade test averages have been lower for students from impoverished families (Miranda, Kim, Reiter, Overstreet Galeano, and Maxson, 2009). These students have also been less likely to participate in activities that reinforce school learning or broaden knowledge, such as visiting zoos, museums, and libraries (NCES, 2004). On the other hand, knowledge-broadening institutions have tended to be chosen frequently as field trip destinations (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006), because they provided students with new experiences and increased cultural capital.

Perhaps one reason that high socioeconomic students perform better on academic assessments is that these students tend to possess more cultural capital than other students. Cultural capital has been a significant contributor to academic achievement (Tramonte & Willms, 2010; Barone, 2006; DiMaggio, 1982; Kalmijn & Kraaykamp, 1996). As defined by Pierre Bourdieu, cultural capital is a cognitive asset gained by experiences in learning traditions, skills, and knowledge of culture, which contribute to a

positive view of school and that enables one to obtain educational and vocational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1973). Families of high socioeconomic status have traditionally encouraged their children to participate in supplemental learning activities and can afford to visit informal learning venues, while most families of low socioeconomic status have been more limited.

Traditionally, all students in elementary school are taken each year to an informal learning venue through teacher planned school field trips. Recent literature has suggested that teachers have reported connecting to the curriculum, testing, and funding as some of the primary reasons that they conducted field trips, and these factors have determined what type of field trips they have taken or whether they have taken them at all (Michie, 1998; Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Kisiel, 2005; Anderson, Kisiel, & Storksdiel, 2006). What is lacking is an analysis of data that helps explore elementary teachers' reasons for conducting field trips in the current economic and standardized testing environment, and whether cultural capital is one of those primary reasons. This qualitative case study will provide data that will contribute to this area. This chapter is an overview of the research design and methodology behind this study.

Research Methodology

This study was best suited for a qualitative design because the central research questions cannot be answered by traditional quantitative methods. Rationales teachers gave for including field trips in the curriculum lend themselves more to a qualitative investigation because analytical generalizations need to be made of the data rather than statistical generalizations (Yin, 2009). Creswell (2007) has emphasized that a qualitative approach should be used whenever we need a complex detailed understanding of an

issue, and this was precisely the aim of the study. The best way to get this detailed understanding was to conduct open-ended questionnaires, follow-up interviews, and review relevant documentation from the researched schools.

Research Questions

The main research question driving this study was: What are the reasons that elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum? Sub-questions of this study were: 1) What types of field trips did elementary teachers include in the curriculum? 2) What discouraged elementary teachers from including field trips in the curriculum? And 3) was the development of cultural capital a primary reason elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum?

Research Design

The goal of this study was to better understand teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum by making inferences from themes that emerged from the data (Yin, 2009). In order to show many perspectives on this issue, this study was a collective, multi-site case study (Creswell, 2007). The study was collective because several cases from three different school districts were used to generate understanding. Creswell (2007) has described a multi-site case study as one in which the sites for the "case" are located at different geographical areas (Creswell, 2007). This was a multi-site study because three separate school districts in central Oklahoma were used.

Yin (2009) has described a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2009). The

phenomenon that this study investigated was that of elementary teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. The real-life context where this phenomenon happened was within the boundary of a classroom where teachers were making decisions about field trips.

Researcher's Role

The researcher was working on a doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction with a specialty in reading. The researcher collected and analyzed the data from each of the three data sources for this study: eighty-eight questionnaires, sixteen follow-up interviews, and relevant documentation, which included email correspondence and district and school policy information.

Participants and Setting

All sites used in this study were located in central Oklahoma. Convenience sampling was used to select the participants due to lack of time and their locations in relation to the researcher (Creswell, 2007). All sites were average public school districts and elementary schools. During this study, all of the researched schools followed a traditional school calendar. Most offered grades pre-kindergarten through fifth grade; however, some schools still offered half-day rather than full-day kindergarten. All classrooms were traditional one-teacher, self-contained rooms. The schools were all located such that they had a wide range of field trip options, including traditional sites such as zoos, museums, theaters, and historical sites.

This study was conducted at eight public elementary schools within three separate school districts in central Oklahoma. Basic statistical information for these institutions

was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data for the 2009-2010 school year. The NCES uses information from the Common Core of Data (CCD), which is collected from State Education Agencies (SEAs) annually (<http://nces.ed.gov/>). The particular schools and districts addressed in this study were classified by the NCES as “large city schools/districts” or “large suburban schools/districts.” For the NCES, large city districts and schools were in a territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with a population of 250,000 or more. Large suburban schools and districts were in a territory outside a principal city but inside an urbanized area with a population of 250,000 or more. The districts and schools for this study varied in school population, socioeconomic status, and racial makeup. Some schools qualified for Title I services. The NCES described a Title I school as:

designated under appropriate state and federal regulations as being high poverty and eligible for participation in programs authorized by Title I of P.L. 107-110. A Title I eligible school is one in which the percentage of children from low-income families is at least as high as the percentage of children from low-income families served by the LEA as a whole or that the LEA has designated as Title I eligible because 35 percent or more of the children are from low-income families. Title I School-Wide Title I Eligible Program: A school that is a Title I eligible school and its percentage of low-income students is at least 40 percent.

Table 1 presents a summary of basic statistical information for all three districts. District 1 was a large suburban school district, which serviced 20,290 students in 23 schools. District 2 was a large suburban district with 10 schools, servicing 7,209 students. District 3 was a large city district with 26 schools and 18,700 students.

In this study, School 1-A was a large city school with approximately 753 students from pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. The racial makeup of the school was approximately 60% White, 18% Black, 11% Asian/Pacific Islander, 8% Hispanic, and 3% American Indian. Approximately 25% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch.

Table 1. Districts by Type, Number of Students, and Number of Schools

District	District Type	Number of Students	Number of Schools
District 1	Large Suburban	20,290	23
District 2	Large Suburban	7,209	10
District 3	Large City	19,213	26

School 1-B was a large city school and serviced approximately 836 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth. The racial makeup of the school was approximately 62% White, 17% Black, 14% Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% Hispanic, 3% American Indian. The school qualified for Title I services and approximately 24% of students were eligible for free or reduced lunch. School 1-C serviced about 621 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth and was a large suburban school. It was a Title I school and approximately 36% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch. The racial makeup of the school was approximately 72% White, 11% Hispanic, 7% Black, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3% American Indian. A summary of information for District 1 schools can be found in Table 2, and racial data for each school is in Table 3.

Table 2. District 1 School Profiles

School	School Type	Number of Students	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Title I School
1-A	Large City	753	Pre-K to 5th	25	No
1-B	Large City	836	Pre-K to 5th	24	Yes
1-C	Large Suburban	621	Pre-K to 5th	36	Yes

Table 3. District 1 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent

School	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	American Indian
1-A	60	18	11	8	3
1-B	62	17	14	4	3
1-C	72	7	7	11	3

In this study, School 2-A was a large suburban school that serviced about 543 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth. The racial makeup was approximately 85% White, 5% Asian/Pacific Islander, 5% American Indian, 4% Black, and 2% Hispanic. At School 2-A, 27% of students qualified for free or reduced price lunch. School 2-B was a large suburban school that serviced 515 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth. The racial makeup of the school was about 81% White, 6% Hispanic, 5% American Indian, 4% Black, and 3% Asian/Pacific Islander. Approximately 38% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch. School 2-C was also a large suburban school with 423 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth. The school qualified for Title I services and 53% of students were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. The racial makeup for the school is approximately 72% white, 17% Hispanic, 6% American Indian, 3% black, and 2% Asian/Pacific Islander. A summary of information for District 2 schools can be found in Table 4, and data concerning racial makeup is in Table 5.

School 3-A was a large suburban school, which serviced 411 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. The racial makeup of the school was approximately 40% White, 26% Hispanic, 26% Black, 5% American Indian, and 3% Asian/Pacific Islander. The school qualified for Title I and has a school-wide Title I program. At the time of this study, 92% of students were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. School

3-B was a large city school with 529 students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth. The racial makeup of the school was about 59% white, 22% black, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 5% Hispanic, and 4% American Indian. Approximately 52% of students were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. School 3-C was a large city school with 583 students in pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. The school's racial makeup was 57% white, 26% black, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6% Hispanic, and 4% American Indian. At School 3-C, 44% of students qualified for free or reduced price lunch. A summary of information for District 3 schools can be found in Table 4 (6 if you keep two), and data concerning the schools' racial profiles is in Table 7.

Table 4. District 1 School Profiles

School	School Type	Number of Students	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Title I School
2-A	Large Suburban	543	Pre-K to 5th	27	No
2-B	Large Suburban	515	Pre-K to 5th	38	No
2-C	Large Suburban	423	Pre-K to 5th	53	Yes

Table 5. District 2 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent

School	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	American Indian
2-A	85	4	5	2	5
2-B	81	4	3	6	5
2-C	72	3	2	17	6

Table 6. District 3 School Profiles

School	School Type	Number of Students	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Title I School
3-A	Large Suburban	411	K to 5th	92	Yes
3-B	Large City	529	Pre-K to 5th	52	No
3-C	Large City	583	Pre-K to 5th	44	No

Table 7. District 3 Schools Racial Makeup by Percent

School	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	American Indian
2-A	40	26	3	26	5
2-B	59	22	9	5	4
2-C	57	26	7	6	4

Permissions

Approval from the three school districts was obtained in fall 2010. Copies of the approval letters can be found in Appendix A. The researcher contacted the Elementary Education director for School District 1 per their policy regarding gaining permission for conducting research. The director provided information about the study to principals, and principals from three elementary schools volunteered to participate. The researcher contacted the superintendent for School District 2, who then identified three elementary schools to participate in the study. The researcher called School District 3 and was told to contact individual principals to gain permissions to conduct research within the schools. The researcher used an alphabetical list on the District 3 website and three elementary schools were selected based on their willingness to participate in the study. Convenience

sampling was used to select the participants due to lack of time and their locations in relation to the researcher (Creswell, 2007).

Data Collection

The central research question for this study was: “What were the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum?” The sub-questions for this study were: (1) “What types of field trips did elementary teachers include in the curriculum?” (2) “What discouraged elementary teachers from including field trips in the curriculum?” and (3) “Was cultural capital a primary reason elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum?” To try to answer these questions, control for internal validity, and provide triangulation multiple sources of evidence were consulted (Yin, 2009). Data for this study was collected from three main sources: questionnaires, follow-up semi-structured interviews, and other relevant documentation related to the reasons teachers included field trips in the curriculum. Data collection was conducted from spring 2011 to fall 2011. The researcher was the only individual with access to the data, which was locked in the researcher’s office at her residence. Districts, schools, and interview participants were given pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. Participants signed and were provided a copy of an informed consent form (see Appendix B) before completing the questionnaires. A copy of the questionnaire and interview protocol can be found in Appendices C and D.

The questionnaire items were created using the central and sub research questions of this study. Examining other questionnaires from similar research about teachers’ reasons for including field trips in the curriculum helped develop items for this study. Specifically, the research of Griffin and Symington (1997), Michie (1998), Lucas (2000),

Kisiel (2003/2005), Anderson and Zhang (2003), and Munday (2008) were consulted for questionnaire items. The researcher also sent a draft of the questionnaire to particular individuals—that is, elementary teachers and graduate students with teaching experience—who were not otherwise involved with the study in order to gather feedback about each question. Their comments helped the researcher decide whether any questions needed to be added, deleted, or clarified.

The researcher administered open-ended questionnaires to all regular classroom teachers at three schools from each of two school districts, as well as two additional schools from a third district. The questionnaires were paper format and delivered to the schools by the researcher. Most administrators directed the researcher to give the questionnaires to the office staff for distribution to teachers via their campus mailboxes. The researcher handed out questionnaires to teachers at two schools during faculty meetings. Using multiple sites increased the external validity of this study (Merriam, 1998). The questionnaires verified and corroborated information, as well as found inferences for further investigation (Yin, 2009). After the questionnaires were analyzed the researcher conducted in-depth, follow-up interviews with two teachers from each school to gain more insight into teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum (Yin, 2009). The interviews were semi-structured and recorded when possible. Documentation related to teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum and what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum. Evidence concerning factors that discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum was also collected. This included email correspondence between interviewees and the researcher as well as documents from school websites. The documentation from school

websites was public information that could be accessed by doing a general search on the school website.

Data Analysis

Data transcription and analysis was ongoing throughout the study. The questionnaires were transcribed first because they drove the interview process. The researcher used a constant comparative method to analyze the data by constantly comparing participants' responses on the questionnaire and interviews to find patterns (Merriam, 1998). These patterns, or units of data, were compared and then classified to construct categories (Merriam, 1998). The researcher looked for units of data that were meaningful to the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they included in the curriculum, and what discouraged them from including field trips in the curriculum. The primary theoretical framework for this study was Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital. Therefore, the researcher also looked for units of data related to whether teachers considered accumulation of cultural capital as a primary reason for including field trips in the curriculum. Because this study was a collective, multi-site case study, a cross-case analysis was conducted. The categories from each case were compared to make inferences about teachers' rationales for including field trips in the curriculum.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to better understand the reasons that elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum and whether increasing cultural capital was one of their primary reasons. Other purposes of this study were to examine what types of

field trips elementary teachers included in the curriculum and what discouraged teachers from taking field trips. This study was a qualitative case study using the constant comparative method of data analysis. This chapter gave a detailed description of how the research study was designed, the researcher's role, the participants and setting, and how the data was collected and analyzed. The next chapter will give a report of the data collected from the questionnaires, interviews, and relevant documentation.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of the data collection methods used for this study. The next section is a report of the data from the questionnaires organized by case. A report of the data from the semi-structured follow-up interviews and emails follows and is organized by research question. The final section is a report of the data obtained from the relevant documentation, such as information from websites and email correspondence.

Questionnaires

Regular classroom teachers at nine schools were given a 12-item questionnaire in the spring of 2011. A sample of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix C. It was distributed to approximately 260 teachers in three different districts. A total of 88 teachers returned the questionnaire for a return rate of 33.8 percent.

Questionnaires Distributed and Returned

Table 8 shows the number of questionnaires distributed and returned for each school. The school originally designated School 3-C had agreed to participate, but withdrew from the study once the researcher started distributing questionnaires. The researcher looked for a replacement school and formed a participation agreement with the finally-designated School 3-C in late May of 2011. However, one week after

questionnaires were distributed to School 3-C the researcher tried to contact the principal about picking up completed questionnaires. The principal could not be reached through phone calls or email, and the school secretary informed the researcher that no questionnaires had been returned to the office by the last day of school. The responses from the other eight schools were coded and used to generate questions for the follow-up interviews.

Table 8. Questionnaire Distribution and Return Numbers

School	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned
1-A	33	2
1-B	40	4
1-C	38	10
2-A	28	14
2-B	30	22
2-C	25	14
3-A	23	12
3-B	23	10
3-C	20	0

Interviews

Follow-up interviews were conducted with two teachers each from eight of the schools. School 3-C was unresponsive to the researcher's attempts to follow up, and the school year ended before the researcher could collect questionnaires or schedule interviews. Among the other schools, participants for the follow-up interviews were selected based on their responses to the questionnaire and their willingness to participate in an interview. Interviews were conducted in spring 2011. The researcher took notes during the interviews and recorded them as well. Interviews were transcribed and compared with patterns that emerged from the questionnaire.

Relevant Documentation

Following the interviews several teachers were contacted through email by the researcher to clarify responses or provide further information for the study. Documents from district websites regarding field trips were also collected. This correspondence and documents were analyzed in comparison with the questionnaires and interviews, both for content and to establish categories of analysis. The relevant documentation was collected from spring of 2011 to fall 2011. The relevant documents are cited in the data report.

Report of Data

Questionnaire Results

The purpose of the questionnaires was to gather broad information about teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. The twelve questionnaire items (Appendix C) were guided by the central research questions. The researcher also used the questionnaire to establish initial categories of analysis by analyzing emergent themes that were common in teacher responses. Questionnaires were distributed to three schools at each of the three school districts. The next section compares questionnaire responses across districts.

Teaching Assignments

Table 9 is a summary of grades teachers in each district taught and what type of classroom they taught in. All teachers who participated in the questionnaire taught grades Pre-K through 5th. The majority taught in a self-contained classroom, or all regular subjects for their grade level.

Table 9. Responses to Question 1: What grades and subjects do you teach?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
Pre-K	1	3	1	5
Kindergarten	7	6	2	15
1 st Grade	2	10	4	16
2 nd Grade	2	11	4	19
3 rd Grade	3	9	3	15
4 th Grade	9	5	4	18
5 th Grade	0	2	2	4
All subjects/self-contained	0	28	10	38
Compartmentalized	0	3	0	3

Field Trips in the Curriculum

Table 10 is a summary of the responses to question 2 for all districts. Most teachers did include field trips in the curriculum. Although the question was written for respondents to answer “yes” or “no,” some teachers responded that they did not currently take field trips due to the cost, or sometimes took field trips when the money was available.

Table 10. Responses to Question 2: Do you include field trips in the curriculum? (yes/no)

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
Yes	15	41	20	76
Sometimes, when there is money for field trips	0	2	0	2
Not currently, because of costs	0	4	0	4
No	0	0	0	0

Purposes of Field Trips by District

A summary of district responses to question 3, for what purpose teachers included field trips in the curriculum, are shown in Table 11. The majority of teachers in District 1 responded that they included field trips in the curriculum in order to (a) give students real world experiences; (b) reinforce or cover certain skills, including the Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS), which were the state standards for Oklahoma; and (c) expose students to new experiences. The most common answers for District 2 were to (a) extend or increase learning, (b) provide real-life experiences, (c) reinforce skills or apply knowledge, (d) enhance the curriculum, and (e) give low-income students experiences they might not otherwise get. The most common reasons that teachers from District 3 included field trips in the curriculum were to provide realistic experiences of what is taught in class and to extend learning. The categories of 1) reinforce skills, 2) expose students to new experiences, 3) enhance the curriculum, 4) provide hands-on or engaging activities, 5) for enjoyment, and 6) to provide real-life experiences were the most common reasons teachers from all three districts gave for the purpose of including field trips in the curriculum.

Field Trip Destinations by District

Table 12 summarizes teacher responses from each district concerning field trip destinations. The most common answers for District 1 were the local science and history museums, the zoo, and certain state buildings. District 2 teachers reported most often taking students to museums—such as history, science, art, or children’s museums—and the zoo. Some teachers reported special visitors to their schools, such as a travel dairy or a well-known author, as low-cost field trips. The most common places teachers took

Table 11. Responses to Question 3: For what purpose do you include field trips in the curriculum?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
Reinforce, cover, apply, or review skills (PASS) or knowledge	5	8	1	14
Expose (“low-income,” “some”) students to novel experiences	4	8	3	15
Enhance, enrich, or supplement curriculum	2	8	7	17
Provide hands-on activity/engagement	1	5	5	11
Provide end of unit/culminating activity	1	7	0	8
Introduce a lesson, vocabulary, or background knowledge	0	3	0	3
Provide enjoyment, excitement, or fun	2	1	3	6
Extend/increase learning	0	9	0	9
Provide different style or out-of-school instruction	0	5	1	6
Provide realistic experience, application, or connection/relevance to learning	6	9	7	22
Reward/motivate	0	1	2	3
Make affordable	0	1	0	1
Correlates with subject—art, science, social studies	0	3	3	6
Observation/explore	0	1	1	2
Understand community	0	0	1	1

students on field trips were the science, art, or history museums, the zoo, farms, and government buildings, such as the state capitol. Teachers from all three districts mentioned that they took students to the zoo, museums, historical sites or government buildings, plays, fire stations, farms, and public outdoor areas, like parks. The most common places teachers in District 3 took students were the zoo and museums.

Table 12. Question 4: What types of places do you take students on field trips?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
zoo	6	25	6	37
tiger safari/wild animal park	0	3	0	3
museum- science, history, art, children's	14	34	12	60
festival-art, Greek	0	4	0	4
historical sites/government buildings	5	4	4	13
plays/theater	3	7	2	12
music hall/symphony/orchestra/concert	2	9	0	11
educational films/movie theater	0	3	1	4
fire station	1	4	1	6
police station	1	2	0	3
library	0	1	1	2
restaurant	0	2	0	2
post office	0	1	0	1
store-antique, Apple	0	3	0	3
pumpkin patch	2	4	0	6
farm/barn	3	7	5	15
travel dairy on campus	0	1	0	1
outdoors/park- city, nature/lake	2	6	4	12
indoor aquatic center	0	1	0	1
ballet	0	1	0	1
baseball game	0	4	0	4
gym	0	1	0	1
bowling	0	1	0	1
author visit at high school	0	4	0	4
career and technical center	0	1	0	1
hands-on	0	2	0	2

(continued)

Table 12. Question 4: What types of places do you take students on field trips?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
foster inquiry	0	0	2	2
science camp	0	0	2	2
fun and educational	0	0	1	1

Responsibilities for Planning and Paying for Field Trips by District

Tables 13 and 14 are summaries of teacher responses to questions about who planned field trips and who paid for them. Overall, teachers in all three districts responded that they, either as individuals or as grade level teams, were the ones who planned the field trips. One teacher in each of Districts 1 and 3 and four teachers in District 2 mentioned that the principal or administration had to also approve the trip. The most common answer from all three districts concerning who paid for the trip was that students, parents, or families were responsible for paying for the trip in general or

Table 13. Responses to Question 5: Who plans the field trips?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
teacher(s)/grade level team	14	45	20	79
approved by principal or administration	1	2	1	4
secretaries	0	0	1	1

specifically the admission. Another common response indicated that the Parent/Teacher Organization or Association (PTO/PTA) paid, specifically for the transportation costs, which included the bus, driver fee, and fuel. Some teachers in each district reported that

the school paid for the transportation and that, if some students were unable to pay, the teachers or school made up the difference. A couple of teachers from each district also mentioned that the field trip was free or had no cost.

Table 14. Responses to Question 6: Who pays for the field trips?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
parents/families/students- admission	15	36	17	68
Parent/Teacher Organization or Association (PTO/PTA)-bus, driver, fuel	4	13	5	22
school/district/activity fund/teachers/principal- bus, cover students who can't pay	4	9	6	19
free/no cost	2	2	2	6
grants	1	7	0	8
fundraiser	0	3	1	4
donations	0	5	0	5
organizations/foundations/sponsors	0	3	0	3

Pre-Field Trip Activities by District

The following table (Table 15) is a summary of teacher responses about what types of activities they did before the field trip. The most common responses involved conducting a unit or lesson and discussion activities. District 2 teachers also frequently reported doing some type of reading activity before going on a field trip.

Post-Field Trip Activities by District

Table 16 is a summary of teacher responses from each district about the activities that they do after a field trip. The most common responses from each district involved

Table 15. Responses to Question 7: What types of activities do you do before the field trip?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
unit/lessons- background/activate prior knowledge	12	28	9	49
discussion- topic, behavior, rules, safety, expectations, predictions, preparation, procedures, observing, goal, directions, questions, activities	6	19	9	34
writing- essay, journaling, coloring	0	5	2	7
reading- books, about site, novel, stories	0	12	4	16
presentation- projects, research, instrument petting zoo	1	5	0	6
technology- video, music, smartboard, online activities	0	5	1	6
charts/map/diagrams/lists	0	4	2	6
hands-on centers/puzzles/games	0	3	0	3
field trips is extension of instruction/culminating activity	0	2	0	2
preview- museum virtual tour	1	1	2	4

discussions about or review of the trip and some type of writing activity. At least one teacher from each district also reported finishing the unit after the field trip.

Value of Field Trips by District

Table 17 shows a summary of teacher responses to the question of whether teachers believed that field trips were worth the time, expense, and effort and why they felt the way they did. Most teachers answered that field trips were worthwhile, but they offered several different reasons as to why. A summary of these reasons can be found in

Table 16. Responses to Question 8: What types of activities do you do after the field trip?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
discussion/review/sharing- learning, activity, skills, answer questions, likes/dislikes, compare, findings, favorite activities, reflection	9	30	6	45
write: notebooks, journal, essay, reflection, evaluation, story, book report, thank you notes, report, summary, response, field trip book	10	23	12	45
quiz	0	1	0	1
finish/continue unit/lessons	2	1	2	5
reading- books, stories	0	5	0	5
project/research/presentation/oral report/reenactment of OK land run	0	4	3	7
nothing	0	2	0	2
charts/diagrams/checklist	0	3	2	5
art/drawing/photos	0	4	5	9
play baseball	0	1	0	1
enrichment activities	0	0	1	1
out-of-school learning	0	0	1	1

Table 18. Teachers reported most often that they think field trips were worth the time, expense, and effort because they provided new experiences for students who would not otherwise have had that experience. Other common responses were that field trips were worth it because they provided students with enjoyment, real world examples of teaching, or hands-on activities. Some teachers from District 2 gave the responses that they “most of the time,” “sometimes,” or did “not usually” feel field trips were worth the time, expense, and effort. A summary of the reasons that teachers gave for these responses can be found in Table 19.

Table 17. Responses to Question 9a: Do you feel field trips are worth the time, expense, and effort?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
yes	14	35	18	67
not usually	0	2	0	2
most of the time	0	3	0	3
sometimes	0	2	0	2

Factors that Discourage Field Trips by District

Teachers were also asked on the questionnaire what factors discouraged them from taking field trips. Table 20 shows a summary of teacher responses from all districts. Overwhelmingly, the most common discouraging factor was cost. Not enough parent involvement or poor parent behavior, student behavior or discipline, and time were also common discouraging factors for all districts.

Examples of a Successful Field Trip by District

Table 21 is a summary of examples that teachers from each district gave of a successful field trip. Teachers responded in terms of specific field trip destinations or by naming certain success-making characteristics of a trip. The most common places teachers named as examples of successful field trips were the zoo and the science museum or planetarium. The most common characteristics that teachers reported were being conducive to offering good experiences to students, being conducive to learning, and safety.

Table 18. Responses to Question 9b: Why? (yes)

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
enjoyment- fun team building activity/bonding, kids love it, excitement, gives/creates purpose and motivation, interest, fun atmosphere to learn	4	4	4	12
parental involvement	1	0	0	1
new experience for some/low-income students, wouldn't get experience otherwise, don't have luxury, never attend places, enrich learning by being exposed	6	16	5	27
connect classroom/curriculum to real world/need realistic/ real-life/real world experiences/shows learning has purpose	3	5	4	12
hands-on/experience with 5 senses	3	4	2	9
build on/use/reinforce prior knowledge	0	3	0	3
paper and books only go so far/out-of-the classroom activities	0	3	0	3
memorable/invaluable	0	3	1	4
provide cultural experiences	0	1	0	1
good length, inexpensive, and easy to plan	0	1	0	1
develop vocabulary	0	1	0	1
focus on testing, science and social studies on "back burner"	0	0	1	1
extend and provide inquiry	0	0	1	1
learning can take place in areas other than a classroom/different ways to learn	0	0	2	2

Table 19. Responses to Question 9b: Why? (not usually, most of the time, sometimes)

Teacher Response	District 2
times when beneficial to exposing less fortunate children to experience	1
if the presenter communicates well, or activities are age appropriate	1
expose the kids to other cultures	1
certain field trips are worth it	1
if adequate planning has been done	1
not worth the expense now	1
added benefit, but not required	1
extension of the classroom	1

Examples of a Less Than Successful Field Trip by Districts

The last item on the questionnaire was to give an example of a less than successful field trip. Table 22 is a summary of teacher responses from all districts. Again teachers either named a specific field trip site or a characteristic, which contributed to a less than successful trip. The most common factor teachers named was bad weather. Other responses included activities that were unstructured, irrelevant, unprepared, not age-appropriate, or disorganized. They also said that the field trip’s being for fun rather than an educational purpose undermined success. At least one teacher in every district responded that an unsafe trip or one on which a child got sick or lost was a less than successful trip.

Table 20. Responses to Question 10: What factors discourage you from taking field trips?

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
not enough parent involvement/poor parent behavior/support	5	7	6	18
cost: bus fees (driver, fuel), extra cost for families, limited on choices, admission	5	38	13	56
student behavior/discipline/crowd control,	3	4	4	11
transportation	0	1	2	3
work, organizing, collecting money	2	0	0	2
time: planning, schedule conflicts, learning objectives, away from instruction, preparation	3	6	2	11
testing	1	1	1	3
educational purpose/district policies	0	1	2	3
security/supervision/safety	0	3	1	4
distance/bus ride/location	1	2	2	5
weather	0	1	1	2
science camp	0	0	1	1
stress: effort, paperwork, accounting	0	0	3	3

Interviews

Two teachers from each school were selected for follow-up, semi-structured interviews. Participants were selected based on their questionnaire responses, grades taught, and willingness to participate in the interviews. If participants had interesting answers on the questionnaire The researcher attempted to interview both upper and lower elementary teachers from each school. The purpose of the interviews was to examine the themes that emerged from the questionnaires and further investigate for what purposes

Table 21. Responses to Question 11: Give an example of a successful field trip.

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
zoo: staff, organized, hands-on, safe, fun and educational, students love it	2	5	3	10
tiger safari: small groups with parent involvement, safe, easy-to-learn atmosphere	0	1	0	1
police station	1	0	0	1
fire station	1	0	0	1
water taxi	1	0	0	1
planetarium	2	0	0	2
science museum: educational and keeps children engaged, fun and learn, Titanic experience	2	4	3	9
farm	0	1	4	5
pumpkin patch	0	2	0	2
park/nature park- incorporated nearly all science vocabulary	0	1	1	2
art museum/festival	0	4	0	4
orchestra: test instruments, instrument “petting zoo”, engaged, answer questions correctly	0	3	0	3
history museum: activities connect to Little House on the Prairie books, dinosaur unit then visit, organized, work stations, students engaged, nice area/historical sites	0	5	2	7
restaurant	0	1	0	1
one-room school house	0	2	0	2
the Apple store- use current technology, made podcasts, creativity, work in small groups	0	1	0	1
local career and technical center- explore other careers, trades, met adults returning to school	0	1	0	1
overnight trip throughout Oklahoma	0	1	0	1
Wizard of Oz performance	0	1	0	1

(continued)

Table 21. Responses to Question 11: Give an example of a successful field trip.

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
baseball game	0	1	0	1
bowling	0	1	0	1
community center	0	1	0	1
science camp: hands-on , outdoors, organized, builds relationships between teachers and students	0	0	1	1
Disney movie: studied oceans before and helped bring the information to a more meaningful level	0	0	1	1
good experience/student learning/apply knowledge/use vocabulary/obtain goal	3	10	3	16
good parent involvement	1	2	1	4
traveling exhibit to see constitution	1	0	0	1
good weather	1	1	1	3
safe	2	0	1	3
good student behavior/attendance	0	3	1	4
engaging/hands-on activities	0	3	0	3
structured/organized	0	2	0	2
fun/students love the trip/enjoyable/excited/interest	0	6	3	9
expose to other cultures	0	1	0	1
explore	0	2	0	2
someplace students may not go very often	0	1	0	1
ensures further study and inquiry	0	0	1	1
lots of time: planning, reflection	0	0	2	2
integrates learning into real world experience	0	0	1	1
buses on time	0	0	1	1

Table 22. Responses to Question 12: Give an example of a less than successful field trip.

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
historical museum: above level and children bored, self-guided	0	2	0	2
farm: not in small groups, open pond, too many open-ended activities	0	1	0	1
trolley ride	0	1	0	1
zoo: busy, groups not together, difficult to educate, little preparation, no culminating activities, most kids have been there	0	3	1	4
science museum: admission high, not enough activities, rude employees, long wait, children not interested	0	1	1	2
pumpkin patch: no pumpkins left in the field	0	1	0	1
outdoors/park-field day	0	1	2	3
musical/play: bad performance, didn't enjoy, not organized, started late	0	1	1	2
skating	0	0	1	1
pizza farm: money far in advance, parents unable to attend, not very nice people	0	0	1	1
bad weather	6	5	3	14
unstructured/irrelevant/ not age-appropriate/unprepared/disorganized activities	3	3	2	8
not hands-on/engaging	1	0	2	3
poor student behavior	1	4	2	7
not enough parent involvement/poor parent behavior	0	5	2	7
students didn't enjoy trip/boring activities	1	5	0	6

(continued)

Table 22. Responses to Question 12: Give an example of a less than successful field trip.

Teacher Response	District 1	District 2	District 3	Totals
not educational/does not promote critical thinking/not related to learning goals/just for fun, play, entertainment	2	0	8	10
bus problems/travel time	1	1	0	2
unsafe/sickness/student lost	2	1	1	4
students don't look at what they want, don't explore	0	2	0	2
haven't had an unsuccessful trip/most or all have been successful	0	3	3	6

teachers included field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips they included, and what discouraged them from taking field trips.

Interview Participant Profiles

Table 23 shows a summary of characteristics of teachers who participated in the follow-up interviews. Pseudonyms were assigned to the sixteen teachers who participated in the interviews to comply with the Institutional Review Board (See the Informed Consent Form, Appendix B). The following table refers to teachers using the pseudonyms assigned to them.

Interviews were semi-structured and a sample of the interview protocol can be found in Appendix D. Questions for the interviews were based on the central research questions and the categories and themes that emerged from the researcher's analysis of the questionnaire responses (Creswell, 2007). Some teachers were contacted through their school emails for further clarification of interview responses. Responses from the interviews and emails were analyzed and compared to questionnaire responses to further

focus the results of the study. The following sections report teacher comments from the interviews and emails and are organized around the central research questions.

Table 23. Profiles of Teacher Interview Participants

Participant	Grade Currently Teaching	Years Taught
Ms. Cole	1 st	5
Ms. Degen	Kindergarten	10
Ms. Tomlin	1 st	8
Ms. Jamal	4 th	11
Ms. Perlstein	2 nd	13
Ms. Tennelli	5 th	6
Ms. Ann	3 rd	7
Ms. Li	1 st	3
Ms. Terese	2 nd	15
Ms. Ramon	1 st	2
Ms. Franklin	2 nd	11
Ms. Liz	5 th	12
Ms. John	3 rd	13
Ms. Gregory	4 th	8
Ms. Florrie	4 th	25
Ms. Shirley	Pre-Kindergarten	15

Interview Results

The purpose of the interviews was to gather more detailed information about teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. The interview questions were guided by emerging themes in the questionnaire data, and the central and sub research questions. Interviews were done with two teachers from each of the three schools in each district. The next section reports data from the interviews by research question.

Research Question 1: What Are the Reasons Elementary Teachers Include Field Trips in the Curriculum?

District 1. The participants were asked on the questionnaire for what purpose they included field trips in the curriculum. A summary of teacher responses from the questionnaires can be found in Table 11 above. The most common responses were to give students real-life experiences; reinforce skills, including the Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS); enhance curriculum; and expose students to new experiences. Teachers whose responses fit in the category “to expose students to new experiences” were asked in the interviews to elaborate on this reason. Table 24 shows District 1 teacher comments—in their own words—about exposing students to new experiences.

One teacher responded on the questionnaire that the purpose of including field trips in the curriculum was that they were a culminating activity to a unit. To establish whether this was a pattern, teachers were asked in the interview whether the field trip was a culminating activity or the focus of the unit. All teachers responded that field trips were a culminating activity to a unit of study. Table 25 shows teacher comments from the interviews.

District 2. Teachers from District 2 responded most often that the purpose of including field trips in the curriculum was to extend or increase learning, provide real-life experiences, reinforce skills or apply knowledge, enhance the curriculum, and give low-income students experiences they might not otherwise have gotten. Interview participants were asked to elaborate on what they meant by give low-income students experiences

Table 24. District 1 Selected Comments about Exposing Students to New Experiences

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Cole	The lower income students are not exposed to community helpers. It's an experience that they do not get.
Degen	Some low-income students don't get to experience [going to the zoo].
Jamal	For the actual experience of going to a theatre or hearing the orchestra. Many have never seen the theatre or heard an orchestra. Mostly because of their financial status. Their parents don't think that that's a necessity to take them and introduce them to any sort of art. Many of them have never seen an art book.

Table 25. District 1 Selected Comments about Field Trips as Culminating or Focus Activities

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Degen	Culminating—we do a unit on animals before we go. The week of the trip we are learning about the zoo.
Cole	Culminating—to go with community helper unit.
Tennelli	It's culminating or an introductory activity, but supplemental.

they might not get otherwise. Table 26 shows District 2 teacher responses about exposing low-income students to new experiences.

Similar to District 1, a teacher from each school within District 2 responded on the questionnaire that they included field trips in the curriculum as end-of-unit or culminating activities. Based on this recurring pattern teachers who were interviewed were asked whether field trips were the culminating activity or focus of a unit. Responses from this district varied and are included in Table 27.

District 3. The most common reasons that District 3 teachers offered for including field trips in the curriculum were to provide realistic experiences of class subject matter and to extend learning. Other common responses were to provide hands-on

Table 26. District 2 Selected Comments about Exposing Students to New Experiences

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Ann	For example were going to see African Cats for Earth Day. Some of them in here, their parents don't take them to the [educational] movies. They don't think it's a big deal or don't get exposed to things like that.
Terese	The field trip enriches their cultural experiences. The exposure to arts is the difference between public versus private. My daughter went to [a public school] and my niece went to [a private school]. They both offered academic classes, but the private school could expose them to fine arts.
Liz	Some of them have never been to downtown. Some of them just don't have those experiences and I think what we teach them comes to life a lot more and it makes sense when they experience some of that. Some of them have never been to the mall. I know one year we did a hockey game and some of our kids I know would never have had the opportunity to do that.

Table 27. District 2 Selected Comments about Field Trips as Culminating or Focus Activities

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Li	In 1 st grade, it's culminating. Then learn and then go do in the field, build up.
Terese	Both, it depends on how you teach and where you go. If you go to the [history] museum that might be the focus of the lesson.
Ramon	Focus—it goes with our theme.

experiences, science or social studies skills, fun and excitement, or experiences students would not typically have.

On the questionnaire, Ms. Gregory responded that some students never got to attend places and activities that others did and that it opened their eyes to possibilities and culture. When asked to elaborate on this in the follow-up interview she described taking a field trip to a local college. She said that the students in her school are never exposed to college or what “other” people do, so they were excited. Likewise, Ms. Florrie commented that the field trip was worthwhile because many of her students would never

get to go to the state capitol otherwise. When asked why, she responded that it was not a priority for the demographics of the school.

The other two districts had teachers respond to the questionnaire that the field trip was a culminating activity. To discern a pattern, teachers from District 3 were asked in the follow-up interviews whether they used field trips as a culminating activity or the focus of a unit. Most participants responded that field trips were a culminating activity. Table 28 shows District 3 teacher comments from the interviews about whether a field trip was culminating or the focus activity.

Research Question 2: What Type of Field Trips Do Teachers Include in the Curriculum?

Teachers were asked on the questionnaire what types of places they took students on field trips. Table 29 shows the types of places teachers from all districts indicated on the questionnaire and how many participants in upper or lower elementary grades listed that type of field trip.

Table 28. District 3 Selected Comments about Field Trips as Culminating or Focus Activities

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
John	Culminating—not the focus, we try to incorporate it into what we’re studying.
Shirley	Usually culminating. It goes along with the instructional focus. I don’t believe I ever done a field trip at the beginning of the unit. I can say, ‘See we talked about....’
Florrie	Culminating—we study Oklahoma history first so they know what they are looking at [when at the capitol building].

District 1. Teachers were asked in the follow-up interview why they chose to take field trips to the specific places they named on the questionnaire. The most common reasons why District 1 teachers chose those particular places included: 1) location went with a particular unit or subject, 2) covered the PASS skills, or 3) offered students experiences that they might not otherwise have had. Participant responses from District 1 are included in Table 30.

Teachers were also asked in the interview whether they had considered taking virtual field trips. Table 31 is a selection of teacher responses to this question.

Table 29. Summary of Field Trip Type Choices by Grade Level For All Districts

Field Trip Site	Upper Elementary Grades 3 to 5	Lower Elementary Grades Pre-K-2
animal: zoo, safari, barn	5	33
museum: science, history, art, children's	25	25
performance: play, orchestra, educational film, theater, ballet, concert	6	14
agricultural: farm, pumpkin patch	1	15
community: fire station, police station, library	0	5
government site- state capitol, court house, historical site	9	4
park: nature, city	1	7
athletic: baseball game, bowling, gym	4	1
science camp	2	0

District 1. Teachers were asked in the follow-up interview why they chose to take field trips to the specific places they named on the questionnaire. The most common

reasons why District 1 teachers chose those particular places included: 1) location went with a particular unit or subject, 2) covered the PASS skills, or 3) offered students experiences that they might not otherwise have had. Participant responses from District 1 are included in Table 30.

Teachers were also asked in the interview whether they had considered taking virtual field trips. Table 31 is a selection of teacher responses to this question.

District 2. Table 32 lists participant responses from District 2 about why they chose the types of places listed on their questionnaires. The most common reasons teachers gave were to accompany a unit or subject of study and to enrich learning. Table 32 gives participant responses to the question about whether they had considered virtual field trips.

Table 30. District 1 Selected Comments about Why Teachers Choose Particular Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Degen	[The zoo] goes with our spring unit on animals. We take both morning and afternoon kindergarten so it is a big enough place that we can spread out.
Cole	We chose the fire station and police station because we were learning about community helpers at school so it tied into the curriculum we were teaching at the time. Actually that is mainly how we choose them all... they all normally go along with the PASS skills and curriculum units that we are teaching about during that time period.
Jamal	Most of them have never been to a theater where you dress up and go and just that culture, that cultural thing. So we talk about that. It's really foreign to a lot of them to go and sit down. They've just never been in an environment like that. So it gives them that experience. Not to mention classical music that many of them have never heard.
Tomlin	[The science museum] covers the PASS skills. We are very focused on reading and math, so it gets in more science and social studies that we cover, but kind of quickly cover.
Tennelli	The science museum offers hands-on activities, experiments and gives the students a better understanding. The state buildings go with teaching government and social studies.
Perlstein	Some students never have a chance to go. Some families go to the zoo, but they are not exposed to performing arts. We go to plays so they can see characters from the stories. It's fun and hands-on.

Table 31. District 1 Selected Comments about Consideration of Virtual Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Degen	We watched penguins on a website and observe them. A lot of sites are blocked.
Cole	I haven't considered them.
Jamal	We have not. We go to the computer lab twice a week and do things there.
Tomlin	Some teachers do. Some years we didn't go to the museum but we did the virtual trip to cover the PASS skills.
Tennelli	No, but that's a good idea!
Perlstein	No, we haven't done virtual field trips.

Table 32. District 2 Selected Comments about Why Teachers Chose Particular Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Li	We choose the zoo and/or farm because it is enjoyable for our age group (first grade). There are a variety of cross-curricular lessons we can do for these places also.
Ann	Educational films and historical and science museums are trips that enrich an educational concept that we have studied.
Terese	The one thing that all of these places (zoo, museums, historical sights, the ballet, plays, and the symphony) have in common is their ability to teach beyond the actual field trip. Field trips need to be used as an extension or enrichment of learning that goes on in the classroom. I feel like there needs to be a purpose to the field trip other than just going to have fun, although that is certainly an outcome of most of them. By choosing museums, the arts, historical sites, etc, we are allowing students of all socio-economic backgrounds to have exposure to what often is neglected in public education. It kind of is the great equalizer of public versus private schools.
Ramon	We choose the zoo because it goes along with our animal unit.
Franklin	We go to the zoo because it correlates with the unit we do in science and social studies. However, we took them bowling, to a barn, and a local gymnasium last year due to cold temperatures in May. We may do this trip again because...the cost of fuel was minimal.
Liz	Last year we went to the [history museum]. We've tried to focus a little bit more on social studies the last few years. Because I think that's one thing that there's so much of and they don't get a lot of exposure to it. Life experience or hands-on helps out.

District 3. Themes from the District 3 teacher interviews that emerged when they were asked why they chose particular places included incorporating a subject, covering

PASS skills, or taking students someplace they typically did not go. Table 34 shows participant responses about why District 3 teachers chose the types of field trip destinations that they listed on the questionnaire. Teachers in District 3 were also asked whether they had considered taking virtual field trips. Table 35 is a selection of teacher comments regarding virtual field trips.

Table 33. District 2 Selected Comments about Consideration of Virtual Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Li	No, and I don't know anyone that has. We've had things come to us. This year we had the 'Farm To You' come. That was great! We had a cow come...and that was for the whole school.
Ann	I use the Smart Board to show students the White House or Williamsburg.
Ramon	We don't—I hadn't considered them. We do a trunk show for our career day instead.
Franklin	No, I haven't tried. The sites are usually blocked.
Liz	We have the electronic field trips through the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Where they are little movie clips of certain topics in social studies. And then the actors or interpreters will come on and answer questions. And you can do that live and call in and ask questions or if you have Skype capabilities you can Skype in....

Research Question 3: What Discourages Elementary Teachers from Including Field Trips in the Curriculum?

Teachers were asked on the questionnaire about what factors discouraged them from taking field trips. The most common responses from teachers in District 1 were cost and lack of parent involvement. Teachers were asked in the interviews about costs as a discouraging factor and how cost affected the curricular inclusion or exclusion of field trips. In the interviews, teachers were also asked about the district or school policies on

Table 34. District 3 Selected Comments about Why Teachers Chose Particular Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
John	We choose to go [to the park] to teach vocabulary and incorporate science because we have to put more emphasis on reading and math.
Gregory	We have to stress math and reading so much, the [science museum] is hands-on, and the students can explore and they are at a good age to go. The lower socioeconomic status students don't go so it's an opportunity to be exposed. It covers the PASS skills and because of the time of year.
Shirley	The farm is related to PASS skills. [The trips] have to go along with our unit. They have to be close—they have to be affordable. I also think we would have to consider it a fun place, and that they would be in a safe environment.
Florrie	The state capitol goes with the curriculum. Most students have never been.” and they love it. It has all kinds of things.

field trips. Responses reflected the teachers' views concerning the relationship between cost and the types of field trips included in the curriculum. Table 36 shows teacher comments from the interviews.

Research Question 3: What Discourages Elementary Teachers from Including Field Trips in the Curriculum?

Teachers were asked on the questionnaire about what factors discouraged them from taking field trips. The most common responses from teachers in District 1 were cost and lack of parent involvement. Teachers were asked in the interviews about costs as a discouraging factor and how cost affected the curricular inclusion or exclusion of field trips. In the interviews, teachers were also asked about the district or school policies on field trips. Responses reflected the teachers' views concerning the relationship between cost and the types of field trips included in the curriculum. Table 36 shows teacher comments from the interviews.

Table 35. District 3 Selected Comments about Consideration of Virtual Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
John	We use websites like the science museum. The organization Mad Science came to school or we will walk to the park or stations instead.
Gregory	I have done shorter ones on websites. Kids love them and the principal encourages us to do alternatives like virtual field trips.
Shirley	We've gone onto things on United Streaming to look see different things. Like this week we went to a zoo. The other day [a mascot] was coming and some of my friends were apprehensive so we got on to look at and see that he was friendly.
Florrie	I never have, and haven't considered doing them. It doesn't usually fit in the curriculum.

Teachers from District 1 were also asked in the interview how testing affected the inclusion of field trips in the curriculum and how testing might have discouraged teachers from taking field trips. Most teachers replied that testing affected field trips because testing and field trips were often scheduled for the same time of year. Teacher comments from the interviews are included in Table 37.

District 2. District 2 teachers often listed on the questionnaire that cost discouraged them from including field trips in the curriculum. Teachers noted expenses associated with buses, drivers, and fuel; extra costs to families; limited choices of field trip destinations; and admission prices as particularly discouraging factors. Teachers from District 2 were asked in the interview to elaborate on how these costs affected whether

Table 36. District 1 Selected Comments about How Costs and Policies Affect Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Degen	The price has to be reasonable. We charge five dollars for kids and six dollars for parents. The [Parent/Teacher Organization] gives money for the bus. We also have families use their zoo passes and ask students to bring \$1.00 for the bus.
Cole	We have to have two permission forms, we can only go on one trip per year, and the price has to be under \$10. This year we got to go on three because of a grant. If a family can't pay, the office or the PTO will cover. We couldn't go see a Junie B. Jones play because it cost more. We had to cancel because it cost too much.
Jamal	We can have one field trip a year and it can't be very expensive. We have to pay for the bus, gas, and the bus driver. So we have to include that in whatever the kids have to pay. I think ours costs \$1.75, but if someone can't afford it then we just take care of it. Because you know teachers! We buy whatever needs to get done. There's probably a mileage policy somewhere, but I'm not sure what it is. We've done different things over the year, but they've always been close by.
Tomlin	The parents pay for it—they cover the bus expense, they cover the bus driver, getting in and then whatever [extras] we do. Kids have to ride the bus there. They can leave with their parents if they sign an early release form. The gas and mileage has gone up. I've planned it for six years and I think it started around \$6.00, but it's gradually gone up.
Tennelli	We can go on one trip per year and it has to be approved. We have to ask for money for buses and it has to be academically related. We have a lot of low income students so the cost affects the places we go.
Perlstein	The policy is one trip per year and it has to align with PASS skills. We have to be back early, 1:00, so that limits our choices because we have to schedule with the buses. As places increase prices we can't do it. We pay for kids that can't go. I was a single mom so I try not put pressure on parents or try and be sensitive. We usually charge \$2-\$3.00.

field trips were included in the curriculum. Teachers were also asked about the district or school policies concerning field trips and, again, a common theme in responses focused on cost. Table 38 shows District 2 teacher interview responses from the interviews concerning factors that discouraged field trips.

Teachers were also asked specifically about how testing affected the curricular inclusion or exclusion of field trips. Similar to District 1, teachers responded that testing affected the time of year they took field trips. Table 39 shows District 2 teacher comments regarding the affects of testing on including field trips in the curriculum.

Table 37. District 1 Selected Comments about How Testing Affects Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Degen	It doesn't really affect us. We go at the end of the year so we don't interfere and we use it as a fun kick-off to the summer.
Cole	I know it affects the upper grades. I know 5 th grade tries to spread the trips out after testing to do something fun in May.
Jamal	We wait to go until after testing, especially if it is not in PASS skills.
Tomlin	[Testing] affects it in that we're gone on one of the testing days on purpose. So it clears out about 150 kids.
Tennelli	Testing discourages us from taking field trips because we have so much pressure and a calendar to follow.
Perlstein	We try to be gone when the big kids test. [Field trips] fall down the list of priorities because of other tests—benchmark, etc. Unfortunately, this is not the way I would have it.

District 3. The most common discouraging factor for teachers in District 3 was cost of field trips. Table 40 shows District 3 teacher comments from the interviews about how cost affected the inclusion of field trips in the curriculum, as well as district and school policies about field trips.

Testing was mentioned on the questionnaire but was not a common factor that discouraged teachers from taking field trips. However, because teacher comments from Districts 1 and 2 suggested a connection between testing and field trips, teachers from District 3 were also asked in the interview about how testing affected the curricular inclusion or exclusion of field trips in order to establish a cross-district pattern. Ms. John, a 3rd grade teacher, commented that testing affected the types of field trip that her class took. She explained, “Five years ago the administration started pushing reading and math, and we had to find a place for reading and math. One year we went to the zoo, but had to write a curriculum to include reading and math questions.” A 4th grade teacher, Ms. Gregory, commented that they usually didn't go on field trips before testing and that they

were required to choose places that stressed math and reading. Ms. Shirley, a Pre-K teacher, indicated that testing did not affect field trips at her level. And Ms. Florrie, who teaches 4th grade, commented that testing affected the timing of her class’s field trips.

Table 38. District 1 Selected Comments about How Cost and Policies Affect Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Li	This year we’re only taking one field trip. Funding for one thing, the expense has fallen so much on the parents that we need to limit the cost so we figured we’d rather do one and make it really count than do more because it’s more of quality not quantity. There’s just not enough money out there. We cannot put all that expense back on the parents. Towards the end of the year is usually when the field trips are. When you are talking \$10, \$12, \$15.00 per child per field trip that gets really expensive when they’re all in the same month. Schools used to be able to alleviate a little bit of that, even with the bus. We have to pass the bus cost onto the parent now also. Our PSO has raised money so they alleviate a little bit of that cost so we only have to give the remainder spread out against all of our grade. They allot us a little bit of money per grade level so that helps. District policy is the bus cost has to be incorporated into whatever the cost of the trip is. They don’t want us to take any field trip for any reason. They really want to it to connect to something we’re learning because it’s learning in the field.
Terese	The policies are economic driven and curriculum driven. We cannot mandate the cost of the field trip. No school money is provided. The cost for everything comes from parent donations. The time frame and distance are other discouraging factors. There are wonderful places to go on trips, but they are too far away.
Ramon	Cost is a discouraging factor because we have to ask parents for the money. We have to pay for the bus and charge the kids.
Franklin	I would say the only discouraging factor is the price of fuel for the bus and the hourly fee for the bus driver. Sometimes we are able to have parents or grandparents that have a CDL to drive our buses for us. I don’t want to have to ask parents to pay. We do donation only. Some pay more and PTO gives us money. We can only take one trip per grade level per year and it can’t take away from instruction.
Liz	Due to budget cuts—when I first started, 12 years ago, we could take 2 a year and they would cover your transportation cost. Now it’s down to one field trip per year and we have to find the money to pay for bus travel and the driver expense. We basically pay for our own transportation and then any fees, like entrance fees, the students are responsible for paying. We try to keep it around \$3.00 or \$4.00, at the most, just knowing some of our kids have a hard time coming up with some of that.

Through the questionnaire, transportation also emerged as a factor that tended to discourage field trips in all three districts. Many teachers, when mentioning the issue of

Table 39. District 2 Selected Comments about How Testing Affects Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
Ann	We always try to schedule ours after testing. [Testing] doesn't influence where we go because 3 rd grade only [tests] reading and math so there's no science or social studies.
Terese	When I was teaching 3 rd grade we usually went on field trips after the testing was over.
Franklin	We go two weeks after testing. [In second grade] we don't do state testing, but we have other types of testing.
Liz	We try to take them early in the year before testing or at the end of the year after testing. If it's more academic-based we like it to fall before testing because then it enhances what they're learning.

Table 40. District 3 Selected Comments about How Cost and Policies Affect Field Trips

Teacher	Teacher Comments from Interviews
John	We have to ask for donations and I feel guilty asking parents. We generally take one per year and we have to pay the cost of the bus.
Gregory	We have to have the field trip approved by the administration. It has to have an educational purpose, the students have to learn something and we have to show proof. There are guidelines about money and transportation. The kids have to pay. We ask them to donate \$1.00 for the bus so we typically take one trip per year. The economy has changed how we take field trips. I hate to ask the kids so we ask for a "donation."
Shirley	In our school it needs to be related to your pass skills, and it needs to be relevant to what you're teaching, and grade appropriate. Our principal suggests we do one a year. You may ask for donations for your trip, you may not require payment. The principal pays for the ones that can't or if we come up short. Up until this year, I don't know what it will be from here on out, PTA pays for our transportation. Because the gas price went up so high. I know, at this school in particular, that if it's something local it's going to be covered. And most all of the parents will donate for their children to go on a field trip.
Florrie	We don't have as many funds to take field trips. PTA pays for what we want to do. We usually go on one trip because of the funds.

cost as a discouraging factor, listed the costs of the bus, mileage, and the driver among the goods and services that were charged to students for field trips. Several teachers from District 1, commented, "The only thing that keeps us from going certain places is how long it takes, because we cannot leave until about 9:15 and then we have to be back here

by 1:30. We're such a big district, that we get back here and [the buses] leave to go pick up the middle school kids to take them home and then be back here to pick up our kids." In accordance with Ms. Tomlin's statement, the relevant document found on the website for District 1 included information regarding the question of why buses are not always available for field trips. The document states:

Answer: The first priority is to provide transportation to and from school. The school bus fleet does not contain a separate set of buses designated for field trips use. Therefore, whenever school buses are not in use for normal to and from school transportation, they are available for field trip use. For planning purposes, school buses are available on school days from 9:15 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. and again after 4:00 p.m. Occasionally in the spring, the demand for field trips can outnumber the drivers and buses available. Transportation staff and requesters of field trips discuss individual circumstances ("Frequently Asked Questions," n.d.).

Similarly, Ms. Gregory, a District 3 teacher, commented that scheduling conflicts due to fewer buses and dates, as well as not fixing broken buses, was a discouraging factor for including field trips in the curriculum.

Research Question 4: Is Cultural Capital a Primary Reason for Including Field Trips in the Curriculum?

Among teacher responses to the questionnaire, all three districts demonstrated patterns that indicate that providing students with new experiences was a principal reason to include field trips in the curriculum. Teachers who emphasized new experiences as a purpose for field trips were asked to elaborate on their responses in the interviews.

Teacher comments from District 1 and 2 regarding this theme may be found in Tables 24 and 25 above, and District 3 responses are also summarized above.

Teachers who did not respond on the questionnaire about providing new or unusual experiences for students were asked in the interview whether they considered this a reason to take field trips or include them in the curriculum. Some third and fourth grade teachers responded that they had done trips, which involved learning about minority or ethnic cultures, such as going to museums to learn about history or Native American or African American cultures. Ms. Florrie, a fourth grade teacher in District 3, responded that she considers providing her students with cultural experiences because many of them would not have such opportunities otherwise.

Teachers of younger grades indicated that these types of trips were not available for their grade levels. Ms. Li, a first grade teacher, remarked, “We’re not opposed to arts and culture; all those things are very interesting, too. It’s just when you have to choose something the kids of your age group would enjoy, and the majority of them would learn something from, then that’s what we do.” Ms. Ramon, a first grade teacher, commented that they don’t have the resources to take trips that provide cultural experiences. Ms. Shirley, a Pre-K teacher, responded that she considered it important but one must find something for her specific grade level. She also commented that there used to be an opportunity to go to a children’s theater to see free performances of traditional fairy tales or folk stories; however, those performances are no longer available. She summarized, “It’s very hard to find something that’s during the school day and that’s affordable. If you’re speaking culturally of the arts or music it’s that symphony trip for 4th grade and up. They’re for specific grades. For Pre-K it would put things out of our reach.”

Relevant Documentation

The researcher searched school websites for information regarding field trips. Documents from district policies, school handbooks, and other information found online was analyzed and compared to the questionnaire and interview responses. The relevant documentation provided a third source of data, which contributed to the validity of the study.

District 1 Website Documentation. At the time of this study a search of District 1's website for the term "field trip" yielded a list of "Frequently Asked Questions" under the transportation department link and a list of virtual field trips under the curriculum link. One of the "Frequently Asked Questions" was:

Why aren't buses always available for field trips?

Answer: The first priority is to provide transportation to and from school. The school bus fleet does not contain a separate set of buses designated for field trip use. Therefore, whenever school buses are not in use for normal to and from school transportation, they are available for field trip use. For planning purposes, school buses are available on school days from 9:15 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. and again after 4:00 p.m. Occasionally in the Spring, the demand for field trips can outnumber the drivers and buses available. Transportation staff and requesters of field trips discuss individual circumstances ("Frequently Asked Questions," n.d.).

Virtual field trips were listed on a table, which provided links to websites of twenty-four different virtual field trips and a brief description of each virtual field trip. For example, the featured link was George Washington's Mount Vernon, and the description read, "Tour all areas of the mansion and grounds. Learn about the history of Mount Vernon and its occupants" ("Virtual Field Trips," n.d.).

District 2 Website Documentation. On the District 2 website, the researcher found an elementary parent/student handbook as well as district policies related to

activity funds, transportation, and field trip and excursions. The handbook was for parents and students for the 2012/2013 school year. The policies outlined in the section on field trips were:

1. Must be outgrowth of curriculum.
2. Limited to a distance of 50 miles. Special exceptions may be granted by the Assistant Superintendent.
3. Sack lunches may be taken when it appears that the group cannot meet the school lunch schedule.
4. Students will have the opportunity to participate in field trips when they meet academic and behavioral expectations.
5. School age siblings cannot attend (“Pre-K-3 Elementary Parent/Student Handbook,” 2012).

The documents from the District 2 Board of Education that were examined for this study stated policies regarding activity funds, transportation, and field trips and excursions. Because several teachers mentioned that parts of the field trip would be paid by the activity fund, this section was searched for the term “field trip.” No information regarding field trips was found among the activity fund policies. The two sections of, “School Bus: Extracurricular Use Of” and “Transportation Management,” included policies regarding field trips. The policies found in these sections related to field trips were:

- Transportation may be provided for those events such as field trips and activities that are held during the normal school day.
- To allow, when practicable, the use of school buses for the transportation of students to school activities and on field trips within and without the district upon approval of the [District 2] Board of Education. The board may request that any expenses for such additional transportation be paid for by the students transported, by the school activity or school organization benefiting from such transportation, or from other private sources. Any money so collected will not be chargeable to or become a part of the school district's finances (“School Bus: Extracurricular Use of,” 2007; “Transportation Management,” 2002).

District 2 also had a section of policies for field trips and excursions. The policies in this section that were available on the district website at the time of this study were:

- Local field trips will be made only with the prior approval of the building principal. Advance consent of the student's parent or guardian is required for any excursion or field trip. Students will have the opportunity to participate in field trips when they meet academic and behavioral expectations.
- Trips for elementary students are limited to a distance of 50 miles. Special exceptions may be granted by the assistant superintendent. Sack lunches may be taken when it appears that the group cannot meet the school lunch schedule.
- Senior trips, except for local field trips, may not be taken during the regular 180-day school year.
- Individuals who solicit funds for participation in privately-sponsored trips may not do so as representatives of the school district. District equipment or facilities will not be used to advertise or promote such excursions during the school day. Requests for use of district equipment or facilities after school hours shall conform to established district policies.
- The board of education defines educational field trips as visits to an area industry, factory, shop or plant, courthouse, museum, theater, lecture or symposium, or farm, ranch, rock quarry, creek, river, park, etc., by a group of students pursuing academic or vocational study in a stated subject for the purpose of enriching their appreciation of, or acquiring additional knowledge in the subject. It does not refer to recreational outings or excursions, interscholastic contests, or extracurricular activities where students perform or compete.
- The board recognizes educational field trips as a part of the curriculum. The following criteria should be considered in deciding whether or not a field trip would be a profitable educational experience for students:
 1. Will this be a better experience for students than other activities which might be conducted within the school building?
 2. Should the trip be denied for safety reasons due to trip location and advisability?
 3. Would the students profit more from the field trip than they would from an available motion picture, videotape, slides, filmstrip presentation, model, experiment, resource person, etc.?
 4. Will the field trip enrich the lives of the students involved?
- Any school-sponsored trip exceeding 350 miles from [District 2] or outside the state of Oklahoma must have prior board approval. Any trip less than 350 miles must have approval of the superintendent or a designee. Distance, educational value, student safety, and expense will be taken into consideration before approval is given for any trip or activity (“Field Trips and Excursions,” 2006).

District 3 Website Documentation. The relevant documents found on the website for District 3 included a district policy manual, and various forms for administration, teachers, and parents. The district policy included information regarding field trips. Under the heading of “Student Activities” field trips were “considered appropriate

extensions of the classroom and should stimulate student interest and inquiry in the subject being taught.” The policy manual also included district regulations concerning field trips, which included the following information:

Educational field trips shall be planned and conducted in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The teacher shall review the educational value of the field trip with the principal and receive the principal's approval prior to making arrangements for the field trip.
2. The principal must receive transportation authorization and a purchase order to expend district funds, if such expenditure is required, prior to granting approval.
3. A parental permission slip is required for each student participating in the trip, including walking or bicycling excursions. Slips will be available in each school office.
4. The teacher will provide the parents with information concerning the purpose and destination of trip, transportation, and eating arrangements, date and time of departure, and estimated time of return.
5. Board of Education or activity funds will pay the cost of transportation, admission fees, etc.
6. One or more adults in addition to the teacher will accompany each class on field trips unless otherwise approved by the principal. Teachers are responsible for informing accompanying adults of their duties and responsibilities.
7. The teacher should review acceptable standards of conduct with the students in advance of the trip. The teacher has primary responsibility for the conduct of the student. Students who cannot be self-controlled or teacher-controlled may be excluded from field trips.
8. The teacher planning the trip will be responsible for arranging an appropriate educational experience and supervision for students who do not participate in the field trip.
9. Students' safety will be a primary consideration with first aid kits required on all field trips.
10. The buddy system, or partners, is recommended to assure constant awareness of each student's whereabouts, needs, and participation.
11. Should an emergency situation occur, the teacher is responsible for notifying the principal by telephone as soon as possible.
12. Walking or bicycling trips must be made under the personal supervision of the teacher. Employee vehicles may be used for field trips in the Oklahoma City area if approved by the building principal. Such practice should be authorized in only the most unusual circumstances.

13. Use of private vehicles should be discouraged in favor of district transportation.
14. Arrangements for buses are to be made through the transportation office with teachers ordering buses at least one week in advance of the trip.
15. Students will not be permitted to leave the field trip group during the trip unless prior written arrangements are made by parents.
16. If students return to the school from a trip after school hours, the teacher and the principal should make provisions for their safe departure home, taking into account the age of the students and the hour ("District Policy Manual," 2012).

Schools sending students on field trips and excursions shall be charged for all transportation costs. Such costs shall either be paid from the general fund or the local school activity fund at the discretion of the building principal. Procedures for payment of transportation costs are as follows:

General Fund

1. Director of transportation or the Director's designee, will complete a charge sheet for the trip and forward it to the business manager, copy to building principal
2. Business manager debits school site account for cost of trip and pays the driver(s).

Activity Fund

1. Director of transportation or the Director's designee, will complete a charge sheet for the forwards it to the business manager, copy to the building principal.
2. Business manager debits transportation account for cost of trip and pays the driver(s).

Building principal debits the local school activity fund and credits the clearing fund for the cost of the trip ("District Policy Manual," 2012).

The various forms that were available online for District 3 included two Transportation Requests, a Field Trip and Excursion Charge Sheet, a Pre-Approval Field Trip Request Form, and a Field Trip Permission Form. The first transportation request had three sections, the first one to be completed by the principal to provide specific

information about the field trip, such as the instructor, destination, number of students, buses needed, times for the bus(es), person responsible for discipline, and means of payment. The second section was to be completed by the bus driver and concerned starting and ending mileage, times, expenses, and student behavior. The third section was for office use only to show whether the request was approved, disapproved, or rescheduled and which drivers and buses were assigned, mileage, and confirmation. The charge sheet form was attached to the first transportation request and was for a particular school for a specific month that included a table to show dates, destinations, instructor names, which fund was used (general or activity), number of buses, drivers fee, mileage, and total. The form did not include a description of the form's purpose. The pre-approval request form was to be filled out by the teacher. The teacher had to include information about whether the trip would take place during the school day or overnight, his or her name, subject or grade, trip date, and a cellular telephone number. The teacher also had to give the following information:

1. List the PASS objectives that relate to the field trip. Or (1. List the PASS, CLEP and/or School Improvement Objectives that relate to the fieldtrip.)
2. List the date from your planning book that the objective is taught.
3. What is expected of the students before, during and after, to make this a meaningful field trip? (explain and attach the student's worksheets and assignments.)
4. How will the field trip be evaluated? (Attach evaluation sheet.)
5. Why can't the lesson be taught as affectively without the field trip?
6. How will the students be supervised on the bus and at your destination? (# of adults to students.)
7. Explain the cost and payment for the field trip.
8. Attach the completed bus request.
9. Attach a copy of the parent permission form. (This should include, destination, explanation, time of departure, return date, cost, type of transportation, parent volunteers, special instruction, lunch, medicine, health concerns and contact phone number of parent. Separate from permission form so parent can keep the information.

10. The Administrator should be given the Field Trip Request at least 10 days prior to trip date. (The sponsor would need to discuss with the Administrator if this is not possible.) (“District Policy Manual,” 2012)

The last section included a space for the administrators’ response. The second transportation request included in the policy manual was to be completed by the school. Information for the form included: school name; date of trip; who requested transportation; a phone number; the grade, class or club name; who would supervise the trip; destination; number of students, adults, and buses; whether the coach was driving; pick-up location and time; return time; who to bill the trip to, who to send the confirmation letter to; and special instructions or driver directions. The principal’s or financial secretary’s signature was required. The form stated that all requests must be received seven days prior to the trip, and buses were not guaranteed.

The permission form included a section for parents to give their consent for their child to attend the field trip and another about the taking of medications while on a field trip or special provisions for extraordinary medical conditions.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the data collection methods used for this study and reported the major themes and categories that emerged from each data source by research question and case. The data suggested that the main reasons that teachers from all districts included field trips in the curriculum were to extend learning; provide real-life experiences; reinforce skills, including the Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS); and to expose students to new experiences. The most common destinations that teachers chose for field trips were museums, animals, agricultural, a performance, or government buildings. The most common reasons why teachers chose those particular places is that

they complemented a unit or subject, covered PASS skills, or offered students experiences that they might not otherwise have. Increasing cultural capital, or “providing experiences for students that they would not normally have,” emerged as a main reason teachers included field trips in the curriculum.

Overwhelmingly, the factor that discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum was cost. School and district policies regarding field trips have also been influenced by cost. Testing was not a major factor that discouraged teachers from taking field trips; however, teachers did report that it affected when they took field trips and, in the case of District 3, what type of field trip they took. Transportation worries emerged as a consistent theme that discouraged teachers from taking field trips. The price of the transportation and bus scheduling were key obstacles to the inclusion of field trips in the curriculum. The next chapter discusses the data analysis and findings, as well as limitations, recommendations, and implications of this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

Interpretations, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to better understand the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum, what types of field trips teachers included in the curriculum, and what discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum. There is a lack of recent literature on elementary teachers' rationales for field trips, what types of field trips they took, and whether the economy, testing, or other factors, such as increasing cultural capital of students, impacted their curricular practices concerning field trips. This study provides valuable insight into these areas. This chapter summarizes the study's findings, identifies some of its limitations, and makes recommendations for future research. It also makes suggestions to teachers, principals, and administrators concerning field trip-related practices and policies.

The findings from this study were triangulated from three sources of data: eighty-eight questionnaires, sixteen follow-up interviews, and additional documentation. Questionnaires attempted to answer the research questions by asking directly about teachers' reasons for taking field trips, the types of trips they took, and the factors that encouraged or discouraged their taking them. Additionally, special attention was paid to whether teachers felt field trips were worth the time, expense, and effort, due to the theoretical framework of this study—that is, Bourdieu's account of cultural capital. Whether field trips were actually used within the curriculum was addressed indirectly by

asking about the types of activities teachers conducted before and after their trips. Semi-structured interviews, informed by questionnaire responses, sought to discover additional information about how teachers understood the significance of providing students with “experiences they would not have had otherwise,” why they chose the field trip destinations that they did, whether teachers used field trips as a culminating activity, and whether they considered taking virtual field trips. Moreover, because, on the questionnaire, teachers’ comments concerning who paid for field trips, what types of field trips they took, and what discouraged them from taking trips were interesting, the interviewer pressed interview subjects for information about district policies and the effects of cost and testing on field trips. The information from the questionnaires and interviews was used to analyze relevant documentation from school websites regarding field trips, specifically district policies. The policies were checked for details about transportation and cost. District forms and safety information were expected, but the lack of documentation on field trips from some of the districts was surprising. The information gained from the three sources of data was beneficial for answering the research questions and reaching some discoveries regarding field trips in general.

Findings and Interpretations

The central research question for this study was: What were the reasons elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum? Some sub-questions were: (1) What types of field trips did teachers include in the curriculum? (2) What discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum? And (3) was the development of cultural capital a primary reason for including field trips in the curriculum? An underlying question for this study was whether there is value in including field trips

outside of merely cognitive reasons. On this last question, the study found three different opinions. The teachers surveyed said, “Yes.” School districts in this study, as manifested in their policies, said, “No.” And the theoretical framework said, “Absolutely!” The following sections address how the theoretical framework, Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital, favored affective motivations for including field trips in the curriculum, the districts favored cognitive motivations, and teachers were torn between affective and cognitive reasons for taking field trips.

Field Trips to Increase Interest and Motivation

Recent literature has shown that affective gains, such as an increase in motivation for a subject or interest in science careers, are just as important as reinforcing skills. Ellis and Fouts (1996) defined the affective domain of a person as interests, attitudes, values, self-esteem, emotional and social adjustment, and political beliefs, and they associated affective learning with child-centered approaches, encouraging exploration, freedom of choice, creativity, nondirective learning, and emotional growth and development. Bourdieu’s theory on cultural capital aligns with this thinking. Bourdieu, and others who have operationalized the term “cultural capital,” have associated cultural capital with relationships, skills, attitudes, preferences, and interest and attendance in high culture or the arts, all of which contribute to an increase in knowledge and academic gains. As it applied to this study, cultural capital is gained through attending and participating in cultural activities, especially activities that low-income families cannot afford or, conversely, those that middle or upper class families can. Examples include attending art museums, libraries, zoos, aquariums, or performances at a theater or symphony. For those who receive such cultural exposure, these experiences may have long-term effects on

aspirations and interests, and field trips may be an avenue for this exposure. Going to the zoo or science museum would increase interest in science careers. Seeing a ballet or hearing an orchestra would provide students with exposure to the arts. So the theoretical framework would absolutely agree that field trips provide students with more than just cognitive gains. The important thing to note is that Bourdieu and other researchers have found value in increasing cultural capital because it correlates with improved academic achievement, not merely affective growth.

Reasons for Field Trips

This study found that elementary teachers included field trips in the curriculum to provide students with real life or new experiences, to enhance, enrich, or supplement the curriculum, and to reinforce skills. As Kisiel (2005) said, it is important to keep in mind that these reasons are not mutually exclusive. A majority of teachers in this study cited multiple reasons for taking students on field trips, including both affective gains and cognitive learning. This is similar to outcomes found by DeWitt and Storksdieck (2008). Even looking back at teachers' initial responses on the questionnaire, about half of the reasons they gave concerned cognitive gains and about half were affective. Clearly, using field trips to reinforce skills pays respect to the demand for cognitive gains. This reason reflected concern for performance on standardized tests. On the other hand, teachers did not specifically say what they hoped to gain by providing students (and low-income students in particular) with new experiences, but such responses are easily construed as interested in the affective side of this issue. For example, the highest response to why field trips are worth the time, expense, and effort was that they provided opportunities that certain students did not normally have (or that their parents did not consider a

priority). These reasons are affective because they do not focus on a specific skill but aim to generate interest in learning or to make students feel more comfortable in certain learning environments. The reasons of enhancing, enriching, or supplementing the curriculum and providing students with real life experiences seem ambiguous about whether they provide strictly affective or cognitive reasons. It is also unclear whether providing students with real life experiences was a means for making them appreciate or growing their interest in something, or whether it was the fulfillment of the curriculum unit.

Purposes for Field Trips

The reasons teachers in this study gave for including field trips were similar to other recent literature outcomes that found that teachers were concerned with more than just the cognitive gains. Michie (1998) found that secondary teachers included field trips for hands-on and real life experiences, to enhance students' understanding of processes, and improve their attitudes towards science. Anderson and Zhang (2003) concluded that curriculum fit was important to K-7 teachers in Canada, but they were also concerned with the perceived value of the experience and amount of enjoyment by the students. Lucas (2000) found that the teacher's purposes for taking year 7 students to science centers in Australia were to extend their knowledge and have fun. Griffin and Symington (1997) found only half of the teachers for year 5-10 students in Australia gave a purpose for field trips that could be considered related to the students' learning of content or skills.

Kisel (2005) also found that upper elementary teachers took students to science museums for a mix of affective and cognitive reasons. In his study, teachers' purposes for

taking field trips were to connect with curriculum, provide learning experiences, promote lifelong learning, foster interest and motivation, expose to new experiences, provide a change of setting, provide enjoyment or reward, and satisfy school expectations.

However, he also found that 61% of teachers reported that students having a positive experience was the sign of a successful field trip over 41% who thought that students must demonstrate new knowledge or 23% who emphasized the trip's connection with the curriculum. This study revealed a similar conflict. The reasons that teachers gave for why field trips were worth the time, expense, and effort were more often linked to affective areas, such as the students' enjoyment and providing them with new experiences. The two characteristics teachers in this study said made for a successful field trip were fun and educational, and these were the characteristics that teachers valued when choosing the places that they took students. When giving specific examples of successful field trips, teachers often cited the zoo and science museum. Teachers mentioned on the questionnaire that these places are both fun and educational. However, when asked in the interview why they chose the destinations they did, teachers said in order to go along with a particular curriculum unit. The researcher had hoped to corroborate these claims with the teachers' explanations for field trip destinations, but, oddly, questionnaire answers seemed inconsistent with interviews. The details of the potential inconsistency are discussed in another section.

While elementary teachers said they included field trips for both affective and cognitive reasons, it may be that teachers only included a cognitive aspect to respect school policies. When teachers were specifically asked in the interviews about school or district policies regarding field trips some mentioned that in order to take a field trip it

had to be academically related to or cover the PASS skills. DuVall and Krepel (1975) found that the most frequently indicated criterion for field trips is that it must be “educationally significant.” Moreover, in that study, the principal was found to be generally responsible for determining the acceptability of a field trip, and the teacher handbook usually provided information regarding policies and administrative procedures about field trips. In contrast, this study found that while teachers referred to policies about the field trips, there was a considerable lack of organized information about where these policies were available for teachers. What was also clear from teacher comments and district documentation was that school districts only see value in field trips for cognitive reasons, since the criterion for taking them is that they cover curriculum skills. It is not wrong for districts to demand cognitive gains, but if this is the only way they measure student success, then perhaps they are missing out on the value that affective gains can contribute to academic achievement—for example, boosting standardized test scores higher than if teachers just focused on covering skills. Even if field trip policies were unwritten, teachers called attention to them by saying that the reason they chose particular field trip places was to cover the PASS skills.

Teachers choosing places that covered the PASS skills would explain why, in this study, the places that elementary teachers took their students focused on science and history, and it explains why teachers said that they chose places that go along with their curriculum unit. As a whole, teachers in this study reported a wider variety of field trip destinations, but the most popular places reported were similar to those in the research by Griffin & Symington (1997), Michie (1998), Lucas (2000), and Kisiel (2005), which were science and history centers and museums as well as zoos and aquariums. As noted

in a previous section, the most common places that teachers in this study took students on field trips were museums and zoos. Other popular places included farms, historical sites and government buildings, outdoor venues, and performances (for example, plays and concerts). The sites used in this study were close to a metropolitan area with an above average number of museums, a large zoo, and state buildings (including a state capitol). So it is unsurprising that a large number of teachers in this study would choose such field trip destinations—they are obvious options. As noted earlier, teachers looked for places that were both fun and educational. Choosing places that are popular attractions and that offer educational programs to visitors would satisfy both affective and cognitive areas. This would explain why there may appear to be a conflict of interest. Teachers want to satisfy school policies, but they also want to go someplace worthwhile. The local zoo and museums also have discounted rates for school groups, and some admit chaperones for free (Group Information, 2013.; Tickets, n.d.; School Tour, n.d.; Schedule a Group, 2013; School Tours, 2012; Education, n.d.; Field Trips, 2013; Plan Group Visit, n.d.). Even though cost was not the most common response teachers gave to explain why they chose to take field trips to certain places, it is clearly something teachers considered when choosing field trip destinations. As the next section notes, cost was the most common factor that teachers reported among factors that discouraged them from taking field trips.

Alternative Field Trips

Teachers initially reported a few alternative field trips that they did because of cost; however, overall, teachers did not utilize alternative or virtual field trips very often. Half of the elementary teachers in this study reported that they took them, and half responded that they did not or had not considered taking virtual field trips. It seems that

some considered just visiting websites, not a virtual tour of a place, to be a field trip. It is unclear whether the teachers used the term “virtual field trip” consistently. Interestingly, at least one of the school districts is supportive of virtual field trips because they included a list of suggested virtual field trips options for teachers on their website. Also, some of the websites that teachers used for field trips included pages with supplemental materials or had programs available that could count as alternative trips (Outreach Programs, 2013; Children’s Website, 2002). A couple of teachers mentioned that certain sites were blocked. All in all, this study left several questions about virtual field trips unanswered. However, it also highlighted the need for further studies about why teachers do or do not use alternative or virtual field trips, especially since there are so many logistical barriers to taking actual trips.

Reasons That Discouraged Field Trips

Cost, poor parent involvement, student behavior, and time are what discouraged teachers from taking field trips. These were similar to factors that Muse, Chiarelott, and Davidman (1982), Michie (1998), Anderson and Zhang (2003), and Munday (2008) found. From the questionnaires and interviews it is obvious that cost is the factor that most influenced whether teachers took field trips, how many they took, and where they went. Most teachers reported that because of district policies and the fact that families were responsible for paying for field trips they were limited to one per year. The cost was also kept low to accommodate for families having to pay. As noted above teachers more frequently chose the zoo or science museum, and these places provided discounts for school groups, which seems ideal for teachers who need to keep the cost low. Even though poor parent involvement and student behavior were reported as discouraging

factors and characteristics of unsuccessful field trips, these were not mentioned during interviews. Cost, testing, and timing seemed to be more important to teachers in this study. A surprising difficulty that teachers frequently mentioned in questionnaires and interviews, and seemed to be represented in relevant documentation, was transportation. Michie (1998), Anderson and Zhang (2003) and Munday (2008) also found that transportation, and specifically scheduling conflicts associated with transportation, discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum. In this study, families were responsible for paying not only admission to field trips sites but also the costs associated with transportation—bus, driver, and gas fees. Teachers also reported that scheduling buses for field trips limited when and where they could go on trips. With a limited number of buses for districts (because of current economic conditions), teachers were restricted to going on trips between pick up and drop off times, going only to places near by, and sharing transportation with other classes and schools within the districts.

Although economic conditions influenced whether teachers included field trips in the curriculum, current testing trends did not seem to be a primary factor that discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum. However, testing did seem to affect when teachers planned field trips, and for some, what types of trips they took. Some teachers planned field trips early in the year before testing, but the majority took them late in the school year. Teachers in this study did not find testing a discouraging factor for taking field trips, only for the scheduling of the actual trip around standardized testing dates. This result is similar to the research done by Kisiel (2005) who found that testing and limitation of time were conflicts for teachers' motivations to plan field trips.

Teachers did not report testing as a discouraging factor, but according to the teachers in this study, a common feature that made for a less than successful field trip was bad weather. The fact that bad weather is a major concern for teachers in this study is unsurprising. Teachers reported taking field trips in the spring after testing. According to the Oklahoma State Department of Education, elementary school testing took place during the month of April (“Oklahoma School Testing Program (OSTP) Frequently Asked Questions,” 2013), which is also the start of tornado season.

Most teachers used field trips as culminating activities, so they did little to follow-up on the trip. This is similar to the research done by Kisiel (2003) and Griffin and Symington (1997) who found teachers had little or no plans for follow-up activities. If teachers were mostly planning trips at the end of year, then what would be the motivation for having follow-up activities or a curriculum connection? This seems to be in contradiction to the fact that teachers chose field trips that go with curriculum units and to cover PASS skills to satisfy school requirements.

As explained above, teachers’ motives for including field trips do accord with the theoretical framework of this study. However, the data about how teachers became discouraged from taking field trips—money and scheduling—suggests that teachers may not have been deeply invested in increasing cultural capital. If they were, then they would have worked harder to overcome the discouraging factors. Teachers did consider giving students, especially low-income students, experiences they would not otherwise get as a primary reason to take field trips. But there is a stark contrast in the language used by Bourdieu versus that used by the subjects of this study. Even though teachers were concerned about providing experiences for low-income students, it is not clear that

teachers related this motivation to the deeper significance of cultural capital for Bourdieu's theory. Never once in the course of answering a questionnaire or interview question did a teacher use the term "cultural capital." An analysis of the data revealed teachers were concerned with the novelty of providing experiences for students, but they were unfamiliar with the research associated with Bourdieu's (1973) theory. And they were unaware of the academic implications— affective gains yield cognitive gains (including higher test scores).

In summary, teachers included field trips for students to learn and have fun. They chose places where they can help students reinforce PASS skills, especially for science and history subjects. Because factors such as cost, transportation, and scheduling have to be taken into consideration this limited their choices. Teachers wanted to provide students with new experiences, but this was overshadowed by other factors related to transportation and testing climates. Moreover, teachers failed to understand how these experiences can increase test scores in the long run.

Limitations

This study is limited in its generalizability because it is a case study (Creswell, 2007). In order to strengthen the external validity this study used multiple cases to study the same phenomenon. The cross-case analysis included predetermined questions and specific coding and analysis procedures (Merriam, 1998). It is also limited because of the number of participants and sites used. Sites were chosen based on their proximity to the researcher, and their willingness to participate in the study. The principals or other school administration chose the specific schools that participated. Interview participants were

chosen based on their questionnaire answers, grades that they taught, and willingness to participate in the study.

Recommendations

After analyzing 88 questionnaires and other data, conducting 16 interviews, and reviewing relevant documentation from districts and schools, the researcher developed some suggestions based on the findings of this study. This section is divided into three parts: recommendations for district and school administration and teachers, recommendations for further research, and additional recommendations based on the researcher's experiences as a teacher, parent, and observer at sites when field trips were taking place.

Recommendations for District and School Administration and Teachers

Teachers used the field trip to give some students, in particular low-income students, opportunities to experience places they were not normally exposed to. This seems to be in line with Bourdieu's (1973) conceptual apparatus of cultural capital; however, teachers did not use this term when discussing their reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. Most teachers apparently consider increasing cultural capital as a primary reason for including field trips in the curriculum; however, they did not associate a deeper understanding of the concept or research with their reasoning. Educating teachers, possibly through professional development opportunities, about research on cultural capital and its benefits to academic achievement, as well as the latest research on other topics relevant to the classroom, would be beneficial in the future.

There seems to be a contradiction in teachers' reasons for taking field trips. Most teachers reported that they included field trips in the curriculum in order to expose students (especially low-income students) to new experiences, but they also chose places that kept the costs low (because students were responsible for paying for the field trip). If the purpose of the field trip were to give students, specifically low-income students, an experience they would not have otherwise, then it would make more sense for teachers to take them to places they could not otherwise afford. If teachers and the theoretical framework were correct, then field trips would be especially worth it if low-income students were to go somewhere novel. Perhaps teachers should have bigger field trip budgets or concentrate their resources to focus on places that would make a bigger impact.

There also seems to be a contradiction in teachers' motivations to include field trips as ways to reinforce or cover skills when the majority of trips are taken after testing. Teachers should find other times of the year to take students on field trips so that they can truly connect these real world experiences to the curriculum. Even if field trips have traditionally been used as culminating activities, more follow-up instruction should be done to make more of a connection back to the curriculum. Districts should also encourage field trips before testing if they are truly concerned about whether they directly reinforce the curriculum.

In the end, the teachers' reasons for including field trips, types of trips they chose, and times that they went on trips took a backseat to the factors of cost, timing, testing, and transportation. Districts should find ways to provide funding for field trips so that teachers can focus on providing quality trips for students. If higher costs are unavoidable,

then exploring virtual or alternative field trips should be encouraged to provide more cultural exposure that students may not get to experience in their everyday lives. Overall, a wide variety of types of field trips taken by teachers were reported, but they were still mainly focused on science or museums. Teachers should also look for trips that would reinforce skills such as math, reading, or the arts, especially those that would most increase cultural capital.

Even though poor parent involvement was a factor teachers were concerned about on the questionnaire, it was not mentioned in interviews. However, teachers should find ways to actively involve parents in the learning process, rather than just for safety or discipline, which may improve parent willingness to attend the field trips.

Districts should have clearly defined policies regarding field trips and make them accessible to teachers and other important stakeholders of the school. In this study, District 1 did not have any policies related to field trips on their website. However, they did have information about policies regarding activity [school organization] or athletic trips. District 2 had policies regarding transportation and field trips, but not a specific section regarding all field trip policies. Teachers in each district mentioned how policies influenced costs, transportation, types of trips, and timing of trips, but no one had a teachers' manual or specific resource they were able to reference concerning these policies. Clearer policies would help to overcome these simple communication failures.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is literature available on field trips, and specifically teachers' reasons for including field trips in the curriculum. However, most is focused on secondary and science or history teachers. More educational research is needed like this case study to

help better understand how elementary teachers are utilizing field trips, and how the current economic and testing climates, which are radically different from those of the 1990s, are affecting field trip policies. There may also be a gap in the recent literature about cultural capital, specifically about whether the definition should be broadened, or its significance in the classroom with all types of students. The findings from this study have highlighted several areas for further research:

- Connecting teachers in the classroom with the latest research in education should be a primary goal in the future. More research needs to be done on teachers' understanding of cultural capital and its potential for narrowing the academic achievement gap for impoverished elementary students.
- More research is needed connecting the work of Bourdieu and others on cultural capital, and research on culturally responsive teaching like that of Gay (2013). Her definition of culturally responsive teaching may mesh well with the concepts of cultural capital to make teaching, including the use of field trips to increase cultural knowledge, more relevant to groups of students from low SES households.
- Teachers included field trips for a variety of reasons— affective and cognitive. More research should be done on how field trips impact students' affective gains, such as increasing interest in a subject, motivation for learning in and out of the classroom, and students' attitudes and values about subjects or school. Also, more studies should be done about how focusing on improving the affective domains impacts students' cognitive domains.

- The most frequent places teachers reported taking students were the zoo and museums. While there were a wide variety of types of places initially reported on the questionnaire, it was not investigated whether teachers choose the same place each year, or whether there was overlap between grade levels. More research about whether certain grade levels are limited (or should be limited) regarding where they go to avoid overlap should be conducted.
- Cost, transportation, limited time and choices, and testing negatively affected how teachers included field trips in the curriculum. Further research should be done on why field trips and the costs associated with them are not included in the school budget. More research should also be done on the effectiveness of field trips that are taken before rather than after testing.
- Teachers were asked in the interviews whether they take or have considered taking virtual field trips. Most of the teachers responded that they did not or had not considered taking them. Future research is needed on why teachers do or do not use virtual field trips in the curriculum, especially if cost is a primary factor that discourages teachers from taking field trips. Some teachers reported that sites were blocked. There should be more research on quality virtual field trips, what properly qualifies as a virtual field trip, how teachers get access to them, and how teachers should integrate these into the curriculum. Similarly, further research

should be done on other alternative field trips, such as those that come to the school.

- Poor parent involvement was the second highest reported factor on questionnaires that discouraged teachers from taking field trips. While not addressed by more teachers in the interviews, it is obviously an important factor. There should be more research on how parents can become actively involved in the learning process as chaperones on field trips. Poor student behavior was also a frequently reported as a factor that discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum and of a less than successful field trip. More educational research should be conducted to find out how teachers can actively engage students in the field trip and avoid poor student behavior. Still more research should be done to investigate possible links between low parent involvement and poor student behavior.
- Most teachers took field trips at the end of the school year, and most teachers did little to follow up on what students got out of the field trip. More research should be done on student knowledge before and after the field trip, as well as student achievement if field trips are taken before or after standardized testing.

Recommendations for Field Trip Sites

The researcher has participated in field trips as a teacher and has casually visited field trip sites, such as zoos and museums, while field trips were being conducted. Based on these experiences and the findings of this study, the researcher has several

recommendations for sites that host field trips. Most schools bring the entire grade level, including students, teachers, and chaperones, to one location, and this means a relatively high number of visitors for the site. If teachers are short on chaperones, then this creates an environment for more student behavior issues to occur. Sites may want to consider having policies that regulate numbers and chaperones a little better. This would also allow sites to focus on the field trip guests, which requires a different kind of attention than regular patrons. Some field trip sites provide different activities for field trips than those for regular patrons, but most sites do not. Providing tailored educational experiences would provide a higher quality field trip rather than students being let loose in the facility.

Large crowds and unruly children also decrease the enjoyment of casual visitors to these sites. Perhaps field trip sites should designate certain days of the week as field trip days and make it common knowledge among schools and regular patrons. Sites should also post signs or helpful information for regular guests when a field trip is taking place that day.

Implications

The findings of this study contribute to educational research on field trips and early childhood reading in several ways.

- Teachers in this study included field trips in the curriculum to provide students with real-world experiences they might not have had otherwise, but they do not have a deep conceptual understanding of cultural capital. Teachers need to be connected with the latest educational research on cultural capital, and other topics

that are related to the classroom. Universities should find ways to effectively communicate their findings from studies with classroom teachers.

- Teachers in this study chose field trip sites that covered or reinforced skills, and these were more frequently science or museum settings. Teachers should include more field trips associated with the arts, which would also provide low-income students with experiences they do not get in their everyday lives.
- Teachers' field trip choices were largely affected by cost, timing, and transportation. Districts need to help teachers find more money to provide field trips and clearly outline field trip policies for teachers and other stakeholders.
- Most teachers do not utilize virtual field trips. Teachers should find quality virtual and alternative field trip programs to offset costs.

Conclusions

This study examined the reasons elementary teachers, who teach all subjects, included field trips in the curriculum. Subsequently, it examined the types of field trips teachers included, what factors discouraged teachers from including field trips in the curriculum, and whether the development of cultural capital was a primary reason they included field trips in the curriculum. From teacher responses on the questionnaire this study found that teachers included field trips in the curriculum to (1) provide students with real life experiences, (2) enhance or enrich the curriculum, (3) expose students—and low-income students in particular—to novel experiences, and (4) reinforce skills. Teachers most commonly took students to museums or zoos. Cost, time associated with testing, transportation, lack of parent involvement, and poor student behavior were the

factors that discouraged teachers from taking field trips. Yet the majority of teachers responded that it was worth it to take students on field trips.

The interviews this study found that teachers did consider providing experiences students would not have otherwise to be a reason they included field trips, but teachers were unfamiliar with the research concerning cultural capital and its positive influence on the achievement gap and other academic implications. Field trips were considered culminating activities to units of study, which is evidence of teachers' reasons for using trips to enhance or enrich the curriculum. Teachers more often chose field trip sites that covered or reinforced skills, but their choices were limited by the factors of cost, time associated with testing, and transportation, which explains why they chose to take students to the zoo or museums. Most teachers did not utilize virtual field trips even though they were concerned about costs.

Relevant documentation showed that some districts provided policy information about field trips while others did not, and some had detailed information and forms, while some did not. Documentation also reflected districts' preoccupation with costs and transportation regarding field trips.

This qualitative multi-site case study explored the reasons that teachers included field trips in the curriculum. The theoretical framework supports the idea that there are benefits to including field trips for affective gains. Teachers in this study seemed torn between providing field trips for affective reasons, such as providing new experiences for low-income students, and cognitive reasons, such as covering or reinforcing skills. District policies and current economic and testing climates heavily influenced how many field trips and what kind of trips teachers included in the curriculum. Teachers in this

study did want to provide students with experiences like that of a magic school bus, taking students to places that they would not experience in their everyday lives. However, as long as teachers are having to contend with higher costs, low budgets, and scheduling difficulties involving transportation and testing agendas, then they will have to do some magic to provide these experiences.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

Copies of Approval Letters

Ms. Shrock: You have permission to do your research at Ralph Downs Elementary. We will be breaking for Christmas on December 17, so please have your surveys to me by the end of this week. Thank you, Nona Burling

Dr. Nona Burling
Principal
Ralph Downs Elementary School
405-721-4431
FAX 405-728-5625

James L. Dennis Elementary

Thank you for responding to my questions. I would be happy to send out your survey to my staff.

Thanks,
Ashley Hoggatt

>>> "Shrock, Danielle L" <Danielle_Shrock@baylor.edu> 10/04/10 2:30 PM >>>

I am planning to have my proposal ready to submit to the review board at Baylor by the end of this month. I've been told they take about 1-2 months to get it through the committee because of the large number of proposals they receive. I'm hoping to be ready to give the surveys in December and then start conducting interviews in January.

I'm interested in the reasons why teachers plan field trips and what kind of field trips teachers plan. I'm studying this topic because I have an interest in how teachers expand the experiences of young children through field trips. I want to learn if the emphasis on testing and accountability has decreased the number of field trips teachers include each year. I want this information for my dissertation. After the dissertation is written I may make presentations summarizing what I learned and I may write some articles about what I learned. No teachers, schools, districts or

administrators will be identified by name. I will identify the schools that I'm surveying as "public schools in central Oklahoma."

If you have any other questions I'm happy to answer them.

Thank you,
Danielle

From: Ashley Hoggatt [ahoggatt@putnamcityschools.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 12:17 PM
To: Shrock, Danielle L
Subject: Re: dissertation research survey

A couple me questions...

1. When do you think you will be ready to survey my teachers?
 2. Can you send me a bio of what you are studying and why you want to have this information?
 3. What are you going to do with this information once you have this?
- Ashley Hoggat

Yukon Public Schools

Re: dissertation information

Kent Mathers [kent.mathers@yukonps.com]

You replied on 11/8/2010 12:15 PM.

Sent: Monday, November 08, 2010 8:47 AM
To: Shrock, Danielle L
Cc: [kristin kilpatrick \[kristin.kilpatrick@yukonps.com\]](mailto:kristin.kilpatrick@yukonps.com)

Ranchwood has already volunteered to participate. Yow will like their staff and principal, Kristin Kilpatrick.

Please know that funding cuts have sharply curtailed the # of field trips elem schools take. Plus we have a 50 mile on imitation placed on these trips.

Look forward to working w/ you.

Re: any other schools?

Kent Mathers [kent.mathers@yukonps.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 12:56 PM

To: Shrock, Danielle L

Yes and they are Parkland and Shedeck. Lance Haggard is the principal at Parkland (405-354-7786)
and Mark Park at Shedeck (405-354-6601)

On Tue, Nov 16, 2010 at 12:19 PM, Shrock, Danielle L <Danielle_Shrock@baylor.edu> wrote:
Mr. Mathers,

Are there any other elementary schools that would be willing to participate in my research?

I would really like to have at least two more to have a good representation of the district.

Thank you for your time!

Danielle

APPENDIX B

Sample Informed Consent Form

Purpose of the Study

This study intends to provide a better understanding of the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum. The primary research question that will guide this study is: *What are the reasons teachers include field trips in the curriculum?* The study involves answering a questionnaire and some teachers will be asked to participate in a follow-up interview. All data will try to be collected at the teachers convenience. The data collected in this study will be used to draw conclusions to help teachers and other educators better understand the reasons teachers include field trips in the curriculum.

Subject's Understanding

- I agree to participate in this study that I understand will be submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Baylor University.
- I am aware that this study will be conducted during the Spring 2011 semester.
- I understand I will complete the questionnaire and the researcher may contact me for a follow-up interview.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary.
- I understand that all data collected will be limited to this use or other research related usage as authorized by Baylor University.
- I understand that I will not be identified by name in the final product and all names will be changed to pseudonyms or assigned code numbers.
- I am aware that all records will be kept confidential in the secure possession of the researcher.
- I acknowledge that the contact information of the researcher and her advisor have been made available to me along with a duplicate copy of this consent form.
- I understand that the data I will provide are not be used to evaluate my performance as a teacher in any way.
- I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time with no adverse repercussions.
- I understand any inquiries regarding my rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to my participation as a subject, can be directed to Baylor's University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Michael Sherr, School of Social Work, One Bear Place #97334, Waco, Texas 76798-7334, (254) 710-4483

Subject's Full Name: _____

Subject's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher: Danielle Shrock
Graduate Student, Baylor University
401 E Park Place, OKC, OK 73104
danielle_shrock@baylor.edu
918-497-8514/405-522-1919

Advisor: Dr. Betty Conaway
betty_conaway@baylor.edu

APPENDIX C

Sample Questionnaire

1. What grade and subjects do you teach?
2. Do you include field trips in the curriculum? (yes/no)
3. For what purpose do you include field trips in the curriculum?
4. What types of places do you take students on field trips?
5. Who plans the field trips?
6. Who pays for the field trips?
7. What types of activities do you do before the field trip?
8. What types of activities do you do after the field trip?
9. Do you feel field trips are worth the time, expense, and effort? Why?
10. What factors discourage you from taking field trips?
11. Give an example of a successful field trip.
12. Give an example of a less than successful field trip.

APPENDIX D

Sample Interview Protocol

Date:
Time:
Location:
Title:
Researcher:
Participant:

Introduction

The main focus of our interview session today is your perceptions of field trips and cultural capital. The goal is to be able to get a more in-depth understanding of how teachers think about field trips and cultural capital given the current testing pressures and state of the economy. I consider you to be an expert in planning field trips so there are no wrong answers to any of my questions. I will be asking general questions such as how long you have been teaching, specific questions such as what you think about when planning field trips, and some follow-up questions.

Everything you tell me is strictly confidential as described in the interview consent form (show interview consent form and obtain signature). If you do not understand any of my questions please feel free to ask me to repeat or rephrase them. If you have questions you would like to ask me, or other topics that you believe are pertinent to your research focus please feel free to ask or tell me. You also do not have to answer any of the questions I pose and you are free to end the interview at any time.

Before we start I want to describe the context/setting of my research to help you focus on the information that you can offer in relationship to my questions. Students who participate in more cultural activities do better academically. However, I am interested in finding out if that is what teachers take into consideration when planning field trips. In order for me to find this out I feel it is important to talk to teachers who are currently teaching and planning field trips. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Follow-Up Interview Questions

Overarching Research Question:

What are the reasons elementary teachers include field trips in the curriculum?

1. How many years have you been teaching? What grade level do you teach? How many students do you have? What are your students' ages? What is the demographic makeup of your class?

2. Do you include field trips in the curriculum? Have you taken any field trips this year? How many field trips do you include in a typical year?
3. What field trips do you plan or take?
4. Do you take virtual field trips?
5. Why do you choose these field trips?
6. How do you prepare students for field trips? What do you do to follow-up the field trip?
7. Who pays the expenses of the field trip?
8. What type of field trip policies does your school or district have?
9. How do you define cultural capital?
10. How do you incorporate this understanding into your planning of field trips?

Closing, Feedback, and Wrap-up Questions

1. Is there anything you did not understand?
2. Is there anything else regarding the reasons you include field trips in the curriculum that you would like to add?
3. Would you be willing to be contacted with follow-up questions?
4. Can you suggest a person to interview who would have similar insights and expertise as you on this topic?

Thank you for sharing you insights and expertise with me during this interview. As a reminder all information is confidential and you may request a transcript of the interview once I've completed the research. You may also request a copy of the final research report/manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adedokun, O. A., Hetzel, K., Parker, L. C., Loizzo, J., Burgess, W. D., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). Using virtual field trips to connect students with university scientists: Core elements and evaluation of ziptrips. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21(5), 607-618.
- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2001). Schools, achievement, and inequality: A seasonal perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 171-191.
- Anderson, D. & Zhang, Z. (2003). Teacher perceptions of field-trip planning and implementation. *Visitors Studies Today*, 7(3), 6-11.
- Anderson, D., Kisiel, J., & Storksdieck, M. (2006). Understanding teachers' perspectives on field trips: Discovering common ground in three countries. *Curator*, 49(3), 365-386.
- Barone, C. (2006). Cultural capital, ambition and the explanation of inequalities in learning outcomes: A comparative analysis. *Sociology*, 40(6), 1039-1058.
- Blachowicz, C. L. Z. & Obrochta, C. (2005). Vocabulary visits: Virtual field trips for content vocabulary development. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(3), 262-268.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.), *Knowledge, Education, and Cultural Change: Papers in the Sociology of Education* (71-112). London: Tavistock.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H., Brown, P., and Stuart Wells, A. (Eds.), *Education: Culture, Economy, Society* (46-58). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruce, B.C. & Levin, J. A. (1997). Educational technology: Media for inquiry, communication, construction, and expression. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 17(1), 79-102.
- Bruce, B. C. & Levin, J. A. (2001). Roles for new technologies in language arts: inquiry, communication, construction, and expression. In: J. Flood, D. Lapp, J.R. Squire & J. R. Jensen (Eds) *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd edn) (619-657), Mahway, NJ: Lawrend Erlbaum Associates.
- Burtnyk, K. M. & Combs, D. J. (2005). Parent chaperones as field trip facilitators: A case study. *Visitor Studies Today*, 8(1), 13-20.

- Cassady, J. C. & Mullen, L. J. (2006). Reconceptualizing electronic field trips: A Deweyian perspective. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(2), 149-161.
- Children's Website. (2002). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://cowboykids.nationalcowboymuseum.org>
- Cole, J., and Degen, B. (1996). *The magic school bus*. New York: Scholastic.
- Cox, E. S. & Su, T. (2004). Integrating student learning with practitioner experiences via virtual field trips. *Journal of Educational Media*, 29(2), 113-123.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dandrow, G. (2008). Painting social inequality: Social class, gender, and the creation of cultural capitol in the visual arts. *College of Saint Elizabeth Journal of the Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 25-30.
- Davidson, S. K., Passmore, C. & Anderson, D. (2009). Learning on zoo field trips: The interaction of the agendas and practices of students, teachers, and zoo educators. *Science Education*, 94(1), 122-141.
- Dewey, J. (1943). *The child and the curriculum: The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DeWitt, J. and Storksdieck, M. (2008). A short review of school field trips: Key findings from the past and implications for the future. *Visitor Studies*, 11(2), 181-197.
- DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review*, 47(2), 189-201.
- DiMaggio, P. (2004). Gender, networks, and cultural capital. *Poetics*, 32, 99-103.
- DiMaggio, P. & Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(6), 1231-1261.
- DiMaggio, P. Mukhtar, T. (2004). Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982-2002: Signs of decline? *Poetics*, 32, 169-194.
- District Policy Manual. (2012). Retrieved June 2013 from <https://www.putnamcityschools.org/Portals/0/docs/District%20Policy%20Manual.pdf>
- Dumais, S. A. (2002). Cultural capital, gender, and the school success: The role of habitus. *Sociology of Education*, 75, 44-68.

- Dumais, S. A. (2005). Early childhood cultural capital, parental habitus, and teachers' perceptions. *Poetics*, 34, 83-107.
- DuVall C. R. and Krepel, W. J. (1975). School board policies related to field trips. *Education*, 95(4), 331-334.
- Education. (n.d.) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.okhistory.org/historycenter/education>
- Ellis, A.K. & Fouts, J. T. (1996). *Handbook of educational terms and applications*. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., and Olson, L. S. (2001). Keep the faucet flowing. *American Educator*, 25(3), 10-15, 47.
- Falk, J. H. and Balling, J. D. (1982). The field trip milieu: Learning and Behavior as a function of contextual events. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76(1), 22-28.
- Falk, J. H. and Dierking, L. D. (1997). School field trips: Assessing their long-term impact. *Curator*, 40(3), 211-218.
- Farmer, J., Knapp, D., & Benton, G. M. (2007). An elementary school environmental education field trip: Long-term effects on ecological and environmental knowledge and attitude development. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 38(3), 33-42.
- Field Trips. (2013). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.oklahomaheritage.com/GaylordPickensMuseum/FieldTrips.aspx>
- Field Trips and Excursions. (2006). Retrieved June 13, 2013 from <http://www.yukonps.com/Portals/0/docs/Policy%20Manual/EFD.pdf>
- Frequently Asked Questions. (n.d.) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.edmondschools.net/AboutUs/Departments/Transportation/FAQs.aspx>
- Garner, L. C. & Gallo, M. A. (2005). Field trips and their effect on students achievement and attitudes: A comparison of physical versus virtual field trips to the Indian River Lagoon. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 34(5), 14-17.
- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 48-70.
- Good, C. V. (1973). *Dictionary of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Griffin, J. & Symington, D. (1997). Moving from task-orientated to learning-orientated strategies on school excursions to museums. *Science Education*, 81(6), 763-79.

- Group Information. (2013) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.okczoo.com/plan-your-visit/group-information/?preview=1>
- Harris, T.S. & Graves Jr., S. L. (2010). The influence of cultural capital transmission on reading achievement in African American fifth grade boys. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 79(4). 447-457.
- Kalmijn, M. & Kraaykamp, G. (1996). Race, cultural capital, and schooling: An analysis of trends in the United States. *Sociology of Education*, 69(1), 22-34.
- Kisiel, J. (2003). Teachers, museums and worksheets: A closer look at a learning experience. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 14(1), 3-21.
- Kisiel, J. (2005). Understanding elementary teacher motivations for science fieldtrips. *Science Education*, 89(6), 936-955.
- Knapp, D. (2000). Memorable experiences of a science field trip. *School Science and Mathematics*, 100(2), 65-72.
- Knapp, D. & Barrie, E. (2001). Content evaluation of an environmental science field trip. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 10(4), 351-375.
- Krepel, W. J. & Duvall, C. R. (1981). *Field Trips: A Guide for Planning and Conducting Educational Experiences*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Lamont, M. & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural capital: Allusions, gaps and glissandos in recent theoretical developments. *Sociological Theory*, 6(2), 153-168.
- Lareau, A. & Horvat, E. M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and cultural capital in family-school relationships. *Sociology of Education*, 72(1), 37-53.
- Lee, J. & Bowen, N. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 193-218.
- Lucas, K. B. (2000). One teacher's agenda for a class visit to an interactive science center. *Science Education*, 84(4), 524-544.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Michie, M. (1998). Factors influencing secondary science teachers to organize and conduct field trips. *Australian Science Teachers' Journal*, 44(4), 43-50.
- Miranda, M., Kim, D., Reiter, J., Overstreet Galeano, M. A., & Maxson, P. (2009). Environmental contributors to the achievement gap. *NeuroToxicology*, 30(6), 1019-1024.

- Morrell, P. (2003). Cognitive impact of a grade school field trip. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, 15(1), 27-36.
- Morris, R. V. (2003). The nation's capital and first graders. *The Social Studies*, 94(6), 265-269.
- Munday, P. (2008). Teacher perceptions of the role and value of excursions in years 7-10 geography education in Victoria, Australia. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 17(2), 146-169.
- Muse, C., Chiarelott, L., & Davidman, L. (1982). Teachers' utilization of field trips: Prospects and problems. *The Clearing House*, 56(3), 122-126.
- Myrberg, E. & Rosén, M. (2009). Direct and indirect effects of parents' education on reading achievement among third graders in Sweden. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 6195-711.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004, September). *The summer after kindergarten: Children's activities and library use by household socioeconomic status* (Issue Brief No. 37). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *The condition of education 2010* (NCES 2010-028). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *The Condition of Education 2011* (NCES 2011033). Washington, DC: U.S. Education Publications Center.
- Nespor, J. (2000). School field trips and the curriculum of public spaces. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(1), 25-43.
- Oklahoma State Testing Program Frequently Asked Questions. (2013). *Oklahoma State Department of Education*. Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://ok.gov/sde/faqs/oklahoma-school-testing-program-ostp-frequently-asked-questions>
- Orion, N. and Hofstein, A. (1994). Factors that influence learning during a scientific field trip in a natural environment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 31(10), 1097-1119.
- Orr, A. J. (2003). Black-white differences in achievement: The importance of wealth. *Sociology of Education*, 76(4), 281-304.
- Outreach Programs. (2013). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.okczoed.com/outreach-programs>
- Pace, S. & Tesi, R. (2004). Adult's perception of field trips taken within grades K-12: Eight case studies in the New York metropolitan area. *Education*, 125(1), 30-40.

- Piscitelli, B. & Anderson, D. (2002). Young children's perspectives of museum settings and experiences. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 19(3), 269-282.
- Placing, K. & Fernandez, A. (2001). Virtual experiences for secondary science teaching. *Australian Science Teacher' Journal*, 48(1), 40-43.
- Pre-K-3 Elementary Parent/Student Handbook. (2012). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from [http://www.yukonps.com/Portals/0/docs/handbooks/ELEMENTARY%20HANDBOOK%202012-13%20\(PreK-3\).pdf](http://www.yukonps.com/Portals/0/docs/handbooks/ELEMENTARY%20HANDBOOK%202012-13%20(PreK-3).pdf)
- Puhek, M., Perse, M., & Sorgo, A. (2012). Comparison between a real field trip and a virtual field trip in a nature preserve: Knowledge gained in biology and ecology. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 11(2), 164-174.
- Rix, C. & McSorley, J. (1999). An investigation into the role that school-based interactive science centers may play in the education of primary-aged children. *International Journal of Science Education*, 21(6), 577-593.
- Plan Group Visit. (n.d.). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.oklahomacitynationalmemorial.org/secondary.php?section=4&catid=44>
- Schedule A Group. (2013). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.museumofosteology.org/schedule-a-group.php>
- School Bus: Extracurricular Use Of. (2007) Retrieved June 13, 2013 from <http://www.yukonps.com/Portals/0/docs/Policy%20Manual/CNA.pdf>
- School Tour. (n.d.) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.nationalcowboymuseum.org/education/tours/SchoolTour.aspx>
- School Tours. (2012). Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.okcmoa.com/visit/tours/school-tours/>
- Stoddard, J. (2009). Toward a virtual field trip model for the social studies. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(4), 412-438.
- Tickets. (n.d.) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from <http://www.sciencemuseumok.org/tickets.html>
- Tramonte, L. and Willms, J. D. (2010). Cultural capital and its effects on education outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 200-213.
- Transportation Management. (2002). Retrieved June 13, 2013 from <http://www.yukonps.com/Portals/0/docs/Policy%20Manual/CNA.pdf>

Virtual Field Trips. (n.d.) Retrieved November 27, 2013 from
<http://www.edmondschools.net/AboutUs/Curriculum/ElementaryResources/VirtualFieldTrips.aspx>

Wetterlund, K. (2008). Flipping the field trip: Bringing the art museum to the classroom. *Theory Into Practice, 47*, 110-117.

Winkle-Wagner, R. (2010). Revolutionary possibilities? The future of cultural capital in educational research. *ASHE Higher Ed Report, 36*(1), 91-111.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.