College of Education Theses and Dissertations

College of Education

Spring 6-2014

Urban adolescents' field trip experiences: a phenomenological perspective

Julia Elizabeth Anne Borst Brazas
DePaul University, julia@uchicago.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://via.library.depaul.edu/soe_etd

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Borst Brazas, Julia Elizabeth Anne, "Urban adolescents' field trip experiences: a phenomenological perspective" (2014). *College of Education Theses and Dissertations*. 73.
https://via.library.depaul.edu/soe_etd/73

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at Via Sapientiae. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Education Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Via Sapientiae. For more information, please contact digitalservices@depaul.edu.

DePaul University

College of Education

URBAN ADOLESCENTS' FIELD TRIP EXPERIENCES:

A PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A Dissertation in Education
with a Concentration in Curriculum Studies

by

Julia Elizabeth Anne Borst Brazas

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

June 2014

Signatory Page

We approve the dissertation of Julia Borst Brazas.

(signature)   6. 5. 14

Amira Proweller, Ph.D.   **Date**
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Educational Policy Studies and Research
College of Education
DePaul University

(signature)   6-5-14

James Duignan, M.F.A.   **Date**
Associate Professor
Visual Arts and Secondary Education
College of Education
DePaul University

(signature)   6-5.14

Therese Quinn, Ph.D.   **Date**
Associate Professor and Chair of Art History
Director, Museum and Exhibition Studies
University of Illinois at Chicago

ABSTRACT

Evidence is mounting that field trips are vanishing from school life, as districts across the nation report reductions and eliminations of these outings because of funding concerns. The matter is of special importance in urban areas, where a wealth of museums are situated nearby neighborhoods in which poor and minority children live and attend school. These children are absent from the museum, less likely to visit with family because of the powerful exclusionary effect that educational attainment and income level have on museum socialization, making school the place where a connection to the museum is formed. However, opportunities for learning in museums are diminished in multiple ways for urban students, who receive less arts and humanities instruction and more instruction emphasizing basic literacies intended to improve achievement on high-stakes standardized tests. Further, the social, emotional, and educational value of field trips are underappreciated by the formal education community because of epistemological differences in what constitutes learning, which tend to emphasize cognitive gains that are common to the school environment, while ignoring the motivating and satisfying aspects of learning in out-of-school settings. The purpose of this phenomenological inquiry is to explore what meaning or significance urban students derive from their field trip experiences in the context of educational opportunities provided at school. Using a critical lens, this study problematizes field trips as a curriculum issue to shed light on what is lost to students as learners when these experiences are not offered by school. The participants in this study are nine middle-school students and two teachers from two schools located in a large Midwestern city. Through qualitative procedures of interviews and observations, three key findings emerged that describe students' field trip experiences: 1) students gain appreciation and empathy from their field trip experiences; 2) students desire more autonomy in their learning experiences and perceive

iv

learning as defined by classroom routines, and 3) students value learning as a social activity, in which interaction with peers is paramount to their experience of learning. These findings contribute to a better understanding of the meaning and significance of field trip experiences to students.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Amira Proweller, Chair; Professor James Duignan; and Dr. Therese Quinn for their provocative questions, invaluable advice, and generous gifts of time and moral support on this journey.

From my first course at DePaul University to my last, I have been fortunate to meet so many faculty members in the College of Education who inspired me to think deeply and passionately about issues in education. Each of them has brought me a step closer to this moment.

I am deeply grateful to the students and teachers who participated in this inquiry, humbled as I am by the candor and generosity of time they afforded me as I undertook this research.

To my colleagues in the doctoral program, who cheered me on, held me up, and kept me close during the years I have enjoyed at DePaul, thanks to you all.

Without the support of my family and friends, this dissertation could never have been written—Alicia Derrah, Debbie Jackson, and Jonathan River, especially. Everyone who ever gave me an afternoon to think or write are contributors to this work.

To Carlo, thank you for telling me that astrophysics is simpler than human subject research. It was the inspiration I needed to keep going.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to John W. Brazas (1952-2010),

and to our shining son, and my daily inspiration, Vincent.

Prologue

From my field notes:

(…) The amount of content covered in the tour was enormous, and the emotional impact was intense. At one point the docent pointed to a large black-and-white photo of a woman clutching a baby. A German soldier stood behind her with a gun pointed at her back, a plume of smoke rising from the muzzle. We were told the picture was taken a second before the woman and baby were murdered, and that a trove of similar images was discovered belonging to a Nazi soldier, who seemed to collect these for some reason (ostensibly, pleasure). As she told the group this, I felt overcome. I had seen a lot on the tour at this point, but could no longer fathom the evil. I shook my head, unaware of my surroundings—my purpose for being there! I looked down and saw a student half-sitting against the wall. He was part of the crowd that seemed pretty disengaged and lagging behind. Our eyes met, and then, he, too, shook his head. He got it. He felt it. After that, it was hard for me to withhold tears. I didn't expect to have a reaction like this to the museum content, that surprised me. Or maybe it was, in part, my reaction to him, to his acknowledgment of my distress. I will never forget the quiet connection that took place, when a kid looking so thoroughly checked out and bored made eye contact with me and let me know: "I feel as you do."

Chapter 1. Introduction

> *. . . [T]he present of past things is memory, the present of present
> things is attention, and the present of future things is expectation.*

> — St. Augustine, *Confessions* (397-398 B.C.E.)

Absent from the Museum

Museums are storytellers *par excellence*. They present specimens, artifacts, images, objects, and other evidence from the story of our shared natural and cultural history. The past that museums show us is not one limited to a mere few thousand years of recorded history, but a vast one, stretching back on an unimaginable time scale. Not content to house a dusty and irrelevant past, museums use exhibits to address contemporary issues by adding new chapters to our collective story through the lens of the present, reminding us that our work is never done, our history together is unfinished business. Museums hint at a future, sometimes positivistically, that will be better, or at least different from today. The future consequences of our present choices are a call to action for the next generation, and museums tell this story, too. Sometimes they simply remind us that we have failed, again. Even while they can be problematic purveyors of official knowledge and dominant cultural values, museums aim to be a democratic space in which all citizens gather to play in the realm of ideas.

Museums and schools are long-standing partners, sharing a common mission of socializing the public into cultural and civic life through the aims of education. This relationship has an especially long history in urban areas, where there have always been greater numbers of museums to serve the nearby public schools. Traditionally, the lynchpin of the museum-school relationship has been the field trip, an outing that aspires to be both educational and social in its

purposes. The school field trip policy is largely an unwritten one, a covenant of understanding between schools and museums that young learners should explore the natural and cultural history of our planet through first-hand encounters with authentic objects and images. In this way, museums offer a priceless curriculum resource unlike any other available in the classroom. More than a place to extend classroom learning into the real world, museums also enable intellectual and aesthetic experiences that confer social and emotional benefits to visitors, such as opportunities for self-discovery, socializing, relaxation, restoration; increased self-confidence; a sense of social inclusion; and attainment of cultural capital (Falk & Dierking, 1992; Höge, 2003; Prentice et al., 2007; Jermyn, 2001). These benefits are gained over a lifetime, making museums a place for both the recreation and re-creation of individuals.

However, decades of research examining levels of arts participation generally among the American public, as well as museum visitor studies, confirm that museum visitors[1] are typically highly educated, Non-Hispanic, Whites (Bradshaw & Nichols, 2004; Bradshaw et al., 1998; Prince, 1990). Various explanations for differences in racial and ethnic museum attendance have been explored, including perceptions of discrimination among minority visitors (Hood, 1983; Philipp, 1999); perceived lack of specialized knowledge, or the cultural capital, required to understand and appreciate museum exhibits (especially at art museums) (Schwarzer, 2006; Walsh, 1991); and lack of childhood socialization into museum visiting (Falk, 1993; Wilkening & Chung, 2009). Yet race and ethnicity are not good predictors of who visits museums and who does not. Research reveals that arts participation rates rise significantly with education, and is especially high for individuals with college and graduate school attainment (Bradshaw & Nichols, 2004; Williams & Keen, 2009). Because income level is linked to educational attainment, it, too, becomes another highly predictive factor for museum visiting (Bradshaw et

al., 1998). Children living in affluent households are three times more likely to visit a museum

than children in poor households (Swan, 2013), and they are more likely to have educationally

enriching experiences and challenging academic content as part of school life (Darling-

Hammond, 2004). Differences in academic achievement according to race and socioeconomic

status, which have held across many national surveys, further illustrate that economically

disadvantaged students do not get the arts instruction and the richness of course offerings

compared to their more affluent peers (Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012; Keiper et al., 2009).

Because childhood socialization into museum visiting is key to developing a long-term

appreciation for museums (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997), it is important

that children experience these settings. Of course, children do not visit museums alone; they

attend with family or as part of a school group. While more affluent families may visit museums

as part of family leisure activities, "less-advantaged students are less likely to have these

experiences if schools do not provide them" (Greene et al., 2014, p. 79).

      The matter of field trips is an important educational equity issue. The culture of

education reform and its legacy of continual movement toward essential subjects and academic

basics (Pinar et al., 1995) threatens to erode the historic relationship between museums and

schools as partners because the primary mission of schools that serve high numbers of poor and

minority students has become attaining federally mandated achievement measures on

standardized tests (Noguera, 2004). School districts and administrators have enacted measures

that undermine the education and social well-being of students by increasing instructional time

devoted to the skills of test-taking and eliminating activities that are the hallmarks of the

elementary education experience, such as field trips, art and music instruction, and even recess

(Kohn, 2000). Among the many, damaging effects of sanctions on school culture is that they

create an immediate demand for "solutions" aimed at moving students toward meeting goals on an array of standardized tests, which siphon off resources of time and money that could be used to enrich student learning. Educational resources needed to teach the arts incur costs that put these programs at-risk for elimination as budgets contract, and they are "often first on the chopping block due to outside mandates to focus on improving standardized test scores in reading and math" (Mehta, 2009, para. 4). Even with measures intended to reduce significantly the expense of visiting museums, for example, free admission and subsidized bus programs, and proximity to out-of-school programming that requires a less burdensome investment of travel time, funding becomes the catch-all justification for withholding outings, obscuring how decisions are really made in terms of offering curriculum knowledge.

As a public space, museums introduce children into the larger social context of being-in-the-world. Studies addressing the long-term impact of museum field trips indicate that they are consequential experiences for children, resulting in highly salient and indelible memories that join together both cognitive and affective learning (Falk & Dierking, 1995). Such early positive experiences are believed to foster lasting relationships with museums (Kindler & Darras, 1997, p. 125). However, in urban areas, where the majority of potential museum visitors are not "typical", we see a de facto form of segregation in the audience for museums reinforced by a culture of school reform that restricts opportunities to learn. As a result, for urban minority and poor children who live in close proximity to museums, opportunities for learning in museums are diminished in multiple ways, further deepening the equity gap in the availability of curricular knowledge that is offered to children in high-poverty schools.

Problem Statement

Urban centers are home to a wealth of museums located within a few miles of many low-income neighborhoods where children live and attend school. These museums attract visitors from around the world, yet museums in urban areas also have a special relationship with their local communities, offering programs that invite citizens to engage in civic life. For example, in Chicago, public school groups enjoy free admission to the large museums, a benefit underwritten by the individual institutions to encourage field trips. The monetary value of these subsidized visits is approximately 2 million dollars annually, per institution, but the social and educational value of field trips is not as easily quantified. Yet even with this incentive, public school field trips to the Art Institute of Chicago declined approximately 15% in the period from 2010 to 2013, according to Museums In the Park, a coalition of Chicago museums located on Chicago Park District property (R. Schejbal, personal communication, May 1, 2014). Sadly, the number of students visiting was already surprisingly small, 20,173 in 2010, the peak period of the last five years.[2] Even at the Shedd Aquarium, where far greater numbers of public school students were recorded on field trips (59,607 in 2010, by comparison), attendance has also slipped by approximately 14% for Chicago students and 30% for students from other Illinois communities (Shedd Aquarium, 2011; Shedd Aquarium, 2013). Elsewhere evidence is mounting that field trips are seen as unimportant educational experiences and are increasingly vanishing from school life. Urban school districts across the country in Boston, New York, Miami, and Los Angeles have reduced or eliminated field trips as a result of reduced funding (Terrero, 2012; Sauerwein & Bosch, 2003; Nassauer, 2009), and the "growing need for 'seat time' to cover all the material on state tests" (Lewin, 2013, para. 3). A survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (Ellerson & McCord, 2009) showed that the percentage of

school districts eliminating field trips almost doubled, from 9 percent in 2008-2009 to 16 percent in 2009-2010, and more than half of American schools eliminated planned field trips in the 2010-2011 school year as a result of funding concerns (p. 15).

The funding issue often cited as the reason for reducing or eliminating field trips can be linked to education reform measures that require Title I schools[3] that are already pressed for resources to devote what little they have in the interest of raising test scores. Title I schools must annually demonstrate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on academic goals under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) or face sanctions that increase in severity each year the targets are not reached. For example, in Chicago there are 480 Title I public schools in the district, 442 of which are in "Federal Improvement Status", meaning that these schools have not made progress for at least two years towards AYP goals (Illinois State Board of Education, 2014). In urban areas where there is a concentration of high-poverty schools, students miss out on field trips and other enriching experiences that are readily available in their local community in order to address the demands of education reforms, and as a result, the social gap in museum audiences mirrors the achievement gap identified by No Child Left Behind. For children who are not socialized into museum visiting through family activities, school becomes the place where a connection to the museum is formed. The field trip represents a significant learning opportunity for urban children, many of whom do not have family resources for museum memberships or admissions fees, which are frequently in the range of $20 per person, and become out-of-reach for visiting low-income families. As a result, the museum as a world apart, the dream space for ideas, information, human connection, future careers, play, pleasure, social interaction, lifelong learning, and cultural participation—the symbolic capital offered by museums as social and educational settings—is not shared equitably.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this exploratory, phenomenological inquiry is to present urban middle-school students' perspectives about their field trip experiences to deepen understanding of *What is lost?* when field trips are not offered as a part of school life. My primary research question seeks to understand what meanings and significances do students derive from their field trip experiences, in the context of the learning opportunities available to them within the boundaries of school? The meaning of these experiences is explored through sub-questions that seek to reveal what aspects of field trip experiences are most memorable to students; how students view learning in the museum compared to learning at school; what attitudes, beliefs, and feelings students hold about museums and their visitors; and how students see themselves as learners, now and in the future. In addition, I examine the role of teachers as advocates for field trips, and inquire into teachers' perceptions of the role of museums in the overall intellectual and social development of their students. Why do teachers choose to use museum resources with students? Does school culture support, or discourage, this practice? What value do such resources bring to instruction? While the focus on this inquiry is to describe students' experiences, I include teachers' voices to provide a richer context for understanding the problem of what is lost when field trips are not supported. These teachers are able to create rich learning experiences for their students in spite of the constraints of education reform mandates. How teachers were socialized into museums themselves and whether their school culture supports using museum resources are sub-questions that help illuminate the motivations and obstacles at work when it comes to making curriculum decisions involving out-of-school learning opportunities. Their perspectives offer insight into the significance of museums as important social and educational experiences for children.

Rationale and Significance

I come to this topic as an outcome of my personal and professional experiences. I have a lifelong interest in museums, one that is rooted in childhood experiences, but my attachment to them did not really solidify until I was in college. As a student of art, the museum was my library. Looking at art and the experience of making sense of it, then, as now, filled me with a vast sense of wonder, possibility, and joy. Over the years as I explored history and science themes as part of my museum venturing habits, I discovered that, while each type of museum gave me a particular kind of "buzz" related to the subject matter, there was something common about the experience overall that was uniquely satisfying. My appreciation for these experiences accumulated over time and deepened as an adult, reviving connections to memories of visiting museums as a child and causing me to wonder about the museum experiences of others.

In 2000, I joined a university-based outreach group to facilitate a curriculum partnership between urban museums and public schools, in which I worked with teachers to develop curriculum based on museum exhibits. My education and training at this point included experience as a museum educator; I quickly realized how much freedom I had enjoyed teaching in the museum context compared with classroom teachers. Our work together was often constrained by the requirements of standards, or learning objectives, or other limitations that seemed to move our attention away from free exploration of subject matter to focus only on the technical skills of learning. I also saw teachers struggle to escape the classroom with their students through field trip experiences and succeed at this venture through force of will. The culture of continuous, high-stakes testing stole time away from learning and doing other things at school and drew off financial resources that could be used for providing rich and meaningful educational experiences for all students. The obsession with measurement makes casualties of

those educational experiences that cannot be quantified. In undertaking this inquiry, I hope to give voice to students by describing the importance of field trip experiences as a counter-narrative to the outcome-driven culture of urban public schools.

In my fourteen years as an educator at-large, working in the space between schools and museums, I discovered that there is very little cross-talk between the two communities. Both school-based and out-of-school educators need to come together as advocates sharing a set of common concerns and leverage these to subvert the reform culture of public education, with curriculum as our common ground. Given what we know about educational outcomes for urban, minority children, what is the responsibility of school to facilitate access to educational experiences outside of the classroom? Can the structure of school be implicated in perpetuating race- and class-based differences in museum audiences? These are the concerns that underlie my interest in problematizing field trips as a curriculum issue. Conceptualizing museum field trips this way provides a common language for describing the educational and social purposes of field trips in terms that can be understood by educators in different settings, thus promoting cross-talk. More importantly, understanding the experience from the perspective of middle-school students will remind us of the human aspects of education that are often lost in discussions about curriculum decisions.

This effort will result in increased understanding of the value of field trips from the perspective of students' experiences, filling a gap in the existing literature addressing children's perspectives of museums. Few research studies present the voices of children, especially minority children, in directly expressing their opinions about their museum experiences (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Jensen, 1994); in particular, there is a significant lack of research involving adolescents (Lemerise, 1995). Much of the research addressing children's experiences

in museums examines their visits as part of a family group; however, given that museum audiences have a typical profile unlike the population I address in this study, this area of the literature is limited in views from diverse audiences. Another area of research related to children and museums addresses field trip experiences aimed at examining the effectiveness of museum visits in communicating classroom-based learning goals, while less attention has been given to exploring the broader social and educational impact of museum visiting as part of school life.

There is also a lack of critical perspective in the literature that challenges how the structure of school is complicit in reproducing disparities and unequal learning opportunities with regard to the museum-school relationship, and few studies problematize limited access to museums in light of educational reforms that have altered this long-term partnership in education. The convergence of museums and school reform has not been examined as it affects students; as such, this inquiry will shed light on the significance of field trips and provide a platform on which teachers and non-school educators can assert their importance by providing a deeper understanding of the value of learning in museums to students' overall intellectual and social development for more effective advocacy.

Definition of Terms and Key Concepts

Museum is used in its broadest sense to include any out-of-school learning environment, such as zoos, aquaria, parks, etc.; and addressing any range of subject matter, such as art, history, or science. Education is a key mission of museum environments.

Field trip refers to an outing led by a classroom teacher with his or her students. Field trips are educational activities that may be undertaken at museums or in non-museum

environments.

Formal and **informal learning** refer to educational experiences in school (formal) and outside of school (informal). While it is a highly artificial way of viewing learning (as if it stops in one place and begins in another), it is a distinction that sets educational research on museums apart from educational research on schools.

Museum Experience is a model for understanding how learning occurs in museums as the continuous interplay among the personal, social, and physical contexts for the museum visit. Together, these contexts influence learning in the museum in unique and important ways.

Museums are spaces for the transmission of knowledge and collective memory of those who preceded us. They provide a public sphere for presenting multiple viewpoints, stimulating critical thought and imagination in an immersive environment that offers direct experience with authentic objects and images. Museums are civic spaces for all citizens to gather in, but we know that museum audiences are not representative of our nation as a whole. This is, in part, due to a legacy that has kept museum audiences segregated through differences in the social and educational opportunities afforded to them while still children. The onetime partnership between museums and schools helped bridge the gulf, but the educational aims of each in the present day have increasingly diverged as reform and accountability efforts in schools have circumscribed notions of learning to measurable units. The effects of this are especially troubling in urban areas where there are diverse populations living near many large museums. Why do these disparities in museum audiences persist? Although taking up such opportunities is strongly influenced by family habits, socialization into museum visiting through school groups is an

important mechanism for introducing students to the museum as a world apart, a place like no other.   While it may seem trivial to uphold the field trip as vitally important to one's overall education and social development, it is the ease with which this experience is so readily dismissed, along with a history of disparities in museum audiences, that warrants a closer look.

In the chapters that follow, I present my dissertation research. Chapter 2 offers a review of the relevant literature informing this inquiry to acquaint the reader with the conceptual differences between formal and informal contexts for learning. I discuss how these are understood to be illustrative of differences between school and non-school environments and elaborate separately on the social contexts for learning in school and in museums and their connections to curriculum theory. I also present research on learning in museums and the museum experience to establish what is known about these phenomena as background for understanding the interpretation and analysis of students' field trip experiences. In Chapter 3, I outline the steps of methodology in detail and elaborate on phenomenology as an appropriate choice of qualitative inquiry, as well as discuss the relevance of the conceptual frameworks employed in this study. Findings are presented in Chapter 4, and analyzed and synthesized in Chapter 5, where I summarize and discuss the findings through a critical lens. In Chapter 6, I present conclusions of this inquiry and offer recommendations based on key themes that emerged from the findings.

Chapter 2. Review of the Relevant Literature

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the reader with an overview of the educational landscape upon

which school- and museum-based educators reside. I begin with a critical analysis of the

ideological and social underpinnings of both schools and museums as educational institutions

and the publics they serve, highlighting how educational inequalities affecting students in urban

areas shape their relationship to museums. I follow with an overview of the epistemological

differences between formal and informal contexts for learning, presenting the primary

differences from which distinctions between in-school and out-of-school learning can be made.

In the sections that follow, I elaborate on how museum learning is conceptualized and explain

elements of the museum experience that provide the framework for understanding how learning

occurs in the out-of-school setting. The final portion of this chapter focuses on children's

experiences in museums, particularly the processes of childhood socialization into museum

visiting through family and school groups.

The Social Context for School Learning

Scholarship critiquing the content and structures of public schooling highlights the

manner in which the democratic aims of public education are undermined by multiple forces,

with implications for examining the museum-school relationship. School is not a neutral place

where all opportunities are offered or taken up equally, nor are the content, structure, and goals

of school shaped or distributed to render equally promising outcomes for all students. The

curricula and activities of school represent a set of ideas and practices, which can be critically analyzed as "structures" that preserve existing (unequal) social relationships (Apple, 2004). School plays a central role in reproducing these unequal social relationships by offering both different types of curriculum knowledge and educational experiences according to race and class. Hochschild (2003) offers further insight into the structural arrangement of public education, describing it as a system of "nested inequalities" (p. 823) that exist at the state-, district-, school-, and classroom levels. These inequalities include lower per capita expenditures, fewer qualified teachers, and the practices of sorting poor and minority students into low-ability or non-academic tracks (Darling-Hammond, 2004). Overlaying this arrangement are federal educational reforms that attempt to address problems of low achievement and poor performing schools as a "technical" issue (Apple, 2004) through the policies of accountability and innovation.[4] These multiple forces come to bear heavily upon the educational experiences of children, especially so in urban areas where inequalities are deepened by education reform mandates.

Differences in how curriculum knowledge is conferred are clearly linked to socioeconomic differences (Anyon, 1981; Oakes, 1985) that also reflect how school as a socializing mechanism for future workers creates classrooms where the distribution of activities are used as a means of controlling student autonomy, engagement, social contact, and physical movement (Anyon, 1981). Students with higher-class status receive instruction that allows for greater autonomy, opportunities for meaning-making through artistic, creative, and linguistic forms, and access to high-status knowledge and skills befitting their expected future roles as professionals. In contrast, the structure and content of school learning for working-class students is marked by a high degree of physical and social control in the classroom, an emphasis on repetitive and mechanical behaviors, and curriculum that stresses practical knowledge (Anyon,

2006). The cultivation of students as passive learners engaged in unchallenging, rote work

tacitly communicates what is anticipated of them, which, Anyon argues, matches the expectation

that these children will enter "jobs [that] entail primarily carrying out the policies, plans and

regulations of others … [because] [t]hese children were not offered cultural capital—knowledge

and skill at manipulating ideas and symbols in their own interest" (Anyon, 1981, p. 32). This

type of workplace socialization is characteristic of school beginning in kindergarten (Apple,

2004). The school day has a routine that becomes familiar to children and shapes their

expectations of the "real world" by internalizing the message of school as work, through

dictating what is to be learned and how it is to be learned according to the teacher's expectations.

Emphasis on student test performance leads to differences in the curriculum knowledge

and educational experiences offered, as well. Standardized assessments are the bases upon

which instructional choices are made, leading to track designations for students. Schools with

greater numbers of low-income students offer fewer academic tracks and more remedial and

vocational programs compared with more affluent communities, where only academic tracks are

offered (Oakes & Lipton, 1992). The academic program offered, in turn, influences instructional

processes in the classroom, including how educational resources are allocated, the type of

instruction offered, and the quality of student-teacher interactions. Students in lower-level tracks

have fewer opportunities to engage in stimulating learning activities; their classroom

relationships are less likely to foster engagement with teachers, peers, and learning; and they

have less access to highly valued knowledge (the kind that identifies its possessor as educated)

(Oakes, 2008). High-status curricular knowledge does not appear on high-stakes standardized

tests aimed at basic literacies, but it is important for academic placement tests and aptitude tests

that evaluate college readiness. Such differences in the curriculum knowledge and educational

experiences offered to students are "everyday practices of school that are linked to economic, social, and ideological structures outside of school buildings" (Apple, 2004, p. 62), making school an important distributor of cultural capital (ibid).

School offers few intrinsically motivating opportunities to learn, especially in the context of schooling aimed at raising standardized test scores. Emphasis on grades and measurements are forms of extrinsic motivation, which are known to be ineffective incentives (if not outright academic barriers) for many students. Indeed, success in school is linked to enjoying learning for its own sake rather than external rewards (Schroeder, 1994). If the experience of learning is ruled by external performance measures rather than intrinsic motivation, it

> (…) exacerbates the gap between how students experience learning, cope with success and failure, and come to know themselves as learners. Motivation is the product of student dispositions toward participation in school [and] learning opportunities are key to student motivation. Unfortunately, the motivational fuel of reform is fear (McCaslin, 2006, pp. 484-485).

McCaslin's research offers insight into the demotivating qualities of the high-stakes testing environment and points to the stress that students experience when their test performance is explicitly linked to the school's (and teacher's) "failure". This arrangement places the responsibility of "saving the school" on children, a terrible burden that comes with little to inspire, motivate, or meaningfully educate them. Schooling that reinforces a practical, results-oriented expectation of education threatens to bracket students' view of the larger world so that they do not see the intrinsic value or meaning in studying subject matter not perceived as relevant to school-based outcomes. Learning comes to be understood as encompassing an array of rote activities aimed at basic subject matter and task completion. Such conditions create intellectually impoverished schools that do not prepare children academically or socially to

participate fully in our global society.

The multiple education reform measures now in place have created a system of punishment and reward, linking students' standardized test performance to teachers, resulting in a series of cascading effects not only for schools, but for public education as a whole. Poor performance on standardized tests leads to classroom practices and narrowed curriculum centered on test preparation in order to raise test scores. Ultimately, poor test performance results in school closures and the expansion of charter schools, which siphon off both students and state funding from public education. Selective enrollment and retention policies in charter (and private) schools have the effect of controlling access to education and leaving high-need students concentrated in neighborhood schools (Working Group for School Transformation, 2012). When these neighborhood schools fail, students are relocated, typically, to other failing schools (New York City Coalition for Educational Justice, 2010). As a result, children in such schools get re-circulated into a broken system where notions of education and learning have become thoroughly distorted as human endeavors.

The Social Context for Museum Learning

Schools and museums have a long-standing partnership that originated in the 19th century, simultaneous with the growth of urban centers and advent of mass public education (Hein, 1998). Then, as now, the cities that were home to museums also attracted high numbers of non-English speaking immigrants, and were included among the agencies available to help people better themselves and appreciate modern, American life (p. 4). Through their orderly arrangement, museum displays were assumed to be capable of visually transmitting the ideas of

the dominant culture to viewers with limited or no English language skills. At the same time, the social aspect of museum visiting was believed to impress upon the newcomer proper behavior through an unspoken museum code. This transmission model of museum pedagogy was a form of visual communication through which, it was believed, the orderly arrangement of objects would reveal the structure of the world to the untrained observer. Objects were seen as sources of knowledge with fixed and finite meanings that would elicit universal responses in viewers. In this way, viewers would come to understand the inherent order of "things" and embrace the ideas and values of the dominant culture through the museum's hidden curriculum.

However, the social agenda of museums did not result in attracting and establishing diverse audiences, nor did the educational goals, expressed through a "public curriculum of orderly images" (Vallance, 1995) succeed in faithfully imprinting cultural messages. When American museums collectively declared education and equity as central to their institutional missions, they committed to achieving "the full pluralistic potential of museums by embracing the diversity of our society" (American Association of Museums, 1992, p. 16). This emphasis resulted in notions of broader access to museums by underserved audiences and highlighted interest in understanding motivations for museum visiting, as well as non-visiting. Yet, racial and ethnic patterns in museum attendance have persisted over many decades (Iyengar et al., 2009; Falk, 1993; DiMaggio & Ostrower, 1990). Almost 80% of visitors to art museums and galleries are Non-Hispanic Whites, while Hispanic (8.6%) and African-American (5.9%) visitors attend in far fewer numbers (Iyengar et al., 2009). These percentages are striking, in part, because they are dramatically disproportional to United States demographics overall.

Studies of infrequent and non-visitors to museums further illuminate the influence of socioeconomic status and level of education on museum visiting behaviors as adults. People

who visit museums are perceived as being upper-class individuals who have the education and knowledge necessary for understanding and appreciating the objects and images on view that non-visitors do not possess (Schwarzer, 2006). Museum visitors are thought to have the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that convey familiarity with high culture according to an unspoken museum code (Walsh, 1991). Collectively, these traits reflect how cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) is perceived to be an asset belonging to the middle- and professional classes and a necessary qualification for museum visiting. Lamont and Lareau (1988) describe cultural capital as the "institutionalized, i.e., widely shared high status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviors, goods and credentials) used for social and cultural exclusion" (p. 157). Using cultural capital as a basis for exclusion or inclusion clearly demarcates the boundary between "us" and "them" that gives rise to feelings of "belonging" or not in museums as a consequence of social class. As a form of cultural capital, museum visiting is a benefit chiefly obtained during childhood through socialization in family and school groups (Wilkening & Chung, 2009; Falk & Dierking, 1995). Children from more affluent households are more likely to visit museums with their family than children in poor households (Swan, 2013). In turn, adults who visited museums as children are much more likely to take their own children to museums than adults who did not visit museums in their youth (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 111).

According to some studies, race and ethnicity do not interfere with museum visiting in groups that share the same level of education and socioeconomic status (DiMaggio & Useem, 1978). Historic patterns of segregation, racism, and exclusion from museums contribute to enduring feelings of not belonging, being unwelcome, and being discriminated against (Philipp, 1999; Hood, 1983; Hood, 1993; Walsh, 1991), with fewer minorities than Whites socialized into

museum visiting as children (Falk, 1993; DiMaggio & Ostrower, 1990). Without opportunities to visit museums, however, perceptions about them cannot be altered. Greene et al. (2014) found that "students from disadvantaged backgrounds are more likely to have positive feelings about visiting museums if they receive a school tour" (p. 85), suggesting that experiences on school field trips support the development of cultural capital that helps offset perceptions of "not belonging". In the same study, these researchers demonstrated that statistically significant increases in historical empathy, levels of tolerance, critical thinking, and appreciation of arts and culture after a single art museum visit were attained at higher rates for poor and minority students, compared to children from more affluent households. Their research suggests that students in families who can (and do) have museum experiences outside of school life do not benefit as much as their less affluent peers.

Positive educational experiences have long-term effects on students' future attitudes toward learning, as well as feelings of motivation and persistence that lead to pursuing higher levels of educational attainment. Activities that are freely chosen, self-directed, voluntary, intrinsically motivated, active, and social, offer children control over their processes and outcomes, and are perceived as pleasurable and fun (Griffin, 2008; Wing, 1995). However, this is not the typical arrangement of schools, where classroom activities are work-like and externally controlled by the teacher, and children come to understand school as an outcome-oriented place that does not lead to satisfying learning experiences. Unfortunately, if learning becomes viewed as an activity defined by the classroom experience, individuals who have had a negative experience of school carry forward this perception into adulthood, and learning becomes negatively associated with the larger institution of education, of which museums are a part (Prince, 1990). Several researchers have found that past negative experiences with formal

education are reasons cited by infrequent and non-visitors for staying away from museums (Hood 1983; Hood, 1993; Prince, 1990). Furthermore, because museum visiting is associated with educational attainment (Iyengar et al., 2013), communities with higher drop-out rates are also less likely to be among museum visitors. To illustrate this point, while participation in the arts[5] showed a decline for all groups between the years 2002-2012, adults who did not graduate from high school nearly vanished from museums and art galleries altogether, dropping from 9.2% to 4.3% of museum visitors in a 10-year period (p. 20).

Epistemological Differences Between Formal and Informal Contexts for Learning

While it is artificial to describe learning as formal or informal, there are some commonly understood differences that help refine understanding of the affordances and constraints of either form. The distinction between formal and informal generally refers to the context in which learning occurs, and the expectations and experience of the learner in each context. School is a formal context for learning in which participation is controlled to meet expected outcomes, such as grades, promotion, and, ultimately, a credential of some kind. This is achieved through successful attainment of skills and abilities, which originate from educational and social interests deemed to be important, and by emphasizing individual performance and cognitive mastery over symbolic activities that are detached from a real world context (Resnick, 1987). Formal learning is typically undertaken beginning in childhood and continued through at least the mid-teen years, in accordance with individual state laws for compulsory education. Yet the overall amount of time one spends in a formal learning setting is only 19% during the K-12 years (Bransford & Stevens, 2005). All other learning occurs within the informal context.

Informal learning is carried out throughout one's lifetime in a variety of private and public settings, for example, in homes, libraries, parks, museums, and after-school clubs. It offers valuable educational experiences outside of the formal structure of school through activities that are pursued according to personal interest and motivation. Unlike formal learning, informal learning is ungraded, non-sequential, self-paced, and voluntary (Falk & Dierking, 1992; Lord, 2007). Informal learning is also exploratory, open-ended, and mediated within social groups, such as family and friends (Birney, 1988; Ramey-Gassert et al., 1994; Wellington, 1990). Because informal learning emphasizes the learner's interests and experiences, theoretically it has been characterized as constructivist (Hein, 1998). This perspective in education views learning as

> (…) a process in which knowledge and understanding are produced through an individual's exposure to successive experiences, which are interpreted in light of prior knowledge and understanding. Thus, an individual's knowledge and understanding is in a continual state of change as new experiences are encountered and interpreted by the learner (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001, p. 272).

To a large degree, the tasks associated with formal learning are outside of the control of the learner, and the rewards and motivations for participating external to the learner's personal interests. In the informal context, the arrangement is reversed. Learning of this kind emphasizes choice over what is to be learned and how it is to be learned, the outcomes of which offer many possible satisfactions and benefits, such as developing knowledge and abilities, and enhancing social bonds.

Individuals are motivated to learn when they are operating in a personal domain of interest (Hatano & Inagaki, 1987). As a key ingredient of learning, motivation plays a significant role both in formal and informal contexts. For example, the extrinsic rewards for

school attendance (beyond legal requirements) are satisfactory grades and a degree, which are obtained by meeting quantitative measurements of achievement. Informal learning, on the other hand, is driven by personal interests. The rewards from intrinsically motivated experiences are a sense of satisfaction, competence, control, and personal enrichment (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 105), dimensions that are "measured" in terms of the quality of the experience. Further, while school emphasizes cognitive gains, informal learning is affective in character. Affective learning involves changes in dispositions—attitudes, beliefs, and interests—and is characteristic of museum learning (Roberts & Garden, 1992; Wolins et al., 1992; Lord, 2007). In turn, attitudes, beliefs, and interests strongly influence learning (Griffin, 2004) because they form the basis for motivation (Falk & Dierking, 1992). Such motivational and emotional aspects of individual learning are not typically appreciated in the school environment.

While the distinctions between formal and informal "have little predictive value in relation to learning" (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 99), these terms highlight qualitative differences in the *experience* of learning. The contrasting ideas of formal/informal learning also suggest epistemological differences in what is meant by "education": a behavioral and technical approach that emphasizes task fulfillment and measurable outcomes, or a constructivist process of fluid and ongoing, integrative experiences. These differences are reflected in perceptions of education and learning as we understand them in the context of schools and museums and connote different kinds of experiences. Education is often conflated with the idea of learning and equated with schooling (Boyd, 1993). Education in this sense emphasizes the cognitive acquisition of facts, ideas, and information, and is viewed as passive, imposed, and negatively associated with teachers, work, and structure (Kelly, 2007). In contrast, learning is undertaken as a pleasurable endeavor, guided by personal interest. Learning in this sense is the

"consolidation and slow, incremental growth of existing ideas and information", filtered through highly subjective views based on one's personal experiences (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 98). These perceptions of education are strongly influenced by the social contexts in which learning is experienced.

Museum Learning

For decades, research on the educational value of museum visiting was dominated by quantitative studies attempting to measure learning outcomes of exhibits that produced equivocal or contradictory results, in part, because they employed classroom-type assessments that are ill-suited to evaluating the museum learning experience (Falk, 2000; Griffin, 1994; Olson, 1999). For example, teacher and text are the primary mode of instruction in the classroom, but in the museum, exhibits "replac[e] the teacher and become the principal medium of instruction" (Boyd, 1993, p. 764). Interest in understanding the nature of learning in museums intensified in the mid-1980s following publication of a report by the American Association of Museums (Weller, 1985) calling for a better understanding of the educational impact of cultural institutions on visitors. Coming to a shared understanding of what constitutes learning in out-of-school settings brought together researchers from a range of disciplines—education, psychology, anthropology, linguistics, among others (Rennie & Johnston, 2004)—to clarify what is meant by the nature of learning as it takes place in museums.

> Failure to distinguish among learning, education, and schools causes confusion among the concepts of learning cognitive information (facts and concepts), learning affective information (attitudes, beliefs, and feelings), and learning psychomotor information (how to center clay on a potter's wheel or focus a microscope). Learning, as defined by many theorists, focuses only on learning cognitive information. This is unfortunate. Learning is strongly influenced by

> what we know and feel as well as by associated visual and tactile information. Learning is rarely so pure as not to represent an amalgamation of all three components (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 99).

Guided by views that conceptualize learning as an ongoing, dynamic process rather than the static consequence of experience (Henderson & Atencio, 2007), research into museum learning reveals several dimensions of the experience, including cognitive, affective, motivational, and collaborative aspects (Anderson et al., 2002, p. 214), and includes outcomes like "an expanded sense of aesthetic appreciation, the development of motivation and interest, the formation and refinement of critical standards, and the growth of personal identity" (Schauble et al., 1998, p. 24). Indeed, Dewey's concept of "an experience" most closely captures the ethos of museum learning that gets at the heart of the difference between informal and formal learning. Dewey (1934/1980) describes "an experience" as coherent, whole, and satisfying, guided by one's desire and answered by a sense of completion. Experience in the aesthetic sense is one that is unified by emotion, which for Dewey is both the cognitive and affective, feeling and intellect, intertwined and inseparable.

Research into museum learning is grounded in sociocultural theory, which "emphasizes the importance of accounting for both differences and commonalities among individuals' learning; the processes of learning, not simply their outcomes; and it foregrounds meaning-making" (Schauble et al., 1998, p. 4). Studies addressing the sociocultural perspectives of learning focus on how visitors interpret their experiences as they interact with the museum environment and other visitors, in light of prior knowledge and experiences (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004). The social context for learning in museums has been explored using cognitive perspectives to understand how learning takes place as visitors interact

with exhibit content and each other (Hein, 1998; Beiers & McRobbie, 1992; Rice & Feher, 1987). Studies that address visitor attitudes, motivation, and values highlight the importance of the affective domain in museum learning (Roberts & Garden, 1992; Wolins et al., 1992); within this area are studies of the motivational aspects of learning that describe how visitors direct their learning experience according to intrinsic and extrinsic processes (Paris, 1997; Csíkszentmihályi & Hermanson, 1995; Anderson & Lucas, 1997). Aesthetic theories of learning focus on the sensory, perceptual, affective, and emotional experiences and activities of learners expressed through personal feelings or physical responses to museum content (Kindler, 1998; Housen, 1992).

Learning in the museum has been characterized as constructivist because museums (and other informal learning settings) place a premium on the learners' experience (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Hein, 1998). Museum learning is voluntary and guided by the needs and interests of the learner (Hooper-Greenhill, 1995; Packer & Ballantyne, 2002). The museum visitor takes control of his or her learning through actively seeking information, constructing meaning, and adjusting to challenges as he or she chooses what to learn according to personal interests, goals, and knowledge, thus demonstrating intrinsic motivation (Paris, 1997). Learners are free to explore in the museum according to their own interests, which inspires a sense of discovery that motivates continued exploration. Although each museum offers an educational curriculum associated with its purpose, the experience of museum learning described above is common to them all, even among different settings such as an art museum or natural history site (Falk, 2000; Falk & Dierking, 1995; Hooper-Greenhill, 1999). This freedom of discovery characterizes the distinction between a teaching curriculum and a learning curriculum (Lave & Wenger, 1991), as it pertains to museum learning. The teaching curriculum is created by the museum for the

instruction of visitors; however, in the museum, the learning curriculum is dominant and the learner's level of involvement in it is his or her choice (Rennie & Johnston, 2004).

Falk and Dierking (1992) affirm that the visitor's personal context is perhaps the single greatest influence on their museum experience (ibid, p. 37). Their Contextual Model of Learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000) provides a conceptual framework for understanding the museum experience from the visitor's perspective. The model acknowledges the overall experience in museums as the continuous interplay of three, overlapping contexts—the personal, social, and physical—that determine the structure and content of learning. Using this model in research, Falk and Dierking identified choice, control, and social collaboration as consistent findings characteristic of the museum experience. The personal context refers to the visitor's knowledge, attitudes, and experience prior to a museum visit and is influenced by the expectation of the upcoming museum experience, which in turn, has been shaped by past experiences (positive and negative). An important aspect of the personal context is the visitor's learning style, which can be given free rein in the informal environment. Whereas classroom learning focuses on linguistic, logical-mathematical, and interpersonal learning styles (Gardner, 1983), the rich physical and sensory environment of the museum can accommodate a broad range of preferences for learning. These characteristics of the personal context form much of the basis for motivation in learning.

Once at the museum, the personal context is influenced by both the social context of the visit and the physical context of the museum. The social context for a visit, for example, with family or as part of a school group, affords different types of experiences to museum visitors and thus exerts influence on the personal context. The student-visitor, parent-visitor and teacher-visitor each will have an individual, self-interested personal agenda for the visit, as well as a

group social agenda that includes elements common to the interests of the visiting group reflective of what the museum has to offer by way of exhibit content. Young visitors to museums, who depend on family or school to take them there, will have different experiences by virtue of the social context for their visit. Visiting families typically allow children greater choice and control in what exhibits are seen, and how much time is spent in them. School group visitors typically follow the teacher's agenda for the visit, which is influenced by classroom expectations for instruction and conduct. The visitor's agenda for their museum experience will be influenced in some way by the nature of the interaction that goes on within the social context, and results in different experiences according to the social group context in which the visit takes place. The physical context of the museum encompasses the museum as a whole, from the architecture to the exhibits, and it includes factors that organize the experience in advance of the visit; orient and guide visitors once there; and reinforce the museum experience afterwards. The organization of the museum experience along these contexts provides a structure that has allowed researchers in informal learning to share their research more readily using common understandings.

Field Trips

As a foundational educational experience, field trips have bridged both formal and informal contexts for learning for almost a century (Hein, 1998). Museums offer children a special type of experience that is qualitatively different from school by providing young learners with direct experiences of artifacts, specimens, images, and objects from nature and culture, learning opportunities that are unique and unavailable in the school environment. However, the

value of the field trip has not been well understood as an educational experience in the context of school life, in part, because of epistemological differences concerning what constitutes learning (both inside and outside the classroom) and how learning can be assessed. The literature on field trips historically examined connections to school learning; for example, showing whether these experiences contribute to school-based learning and how, and identifying learning outcomes that are the result of field trips (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008). Most of this research focused on cognitive outcomes of field trips as a way of justifying their complementary nature to classroom learning (p. 181). In recent years, greater awareness of the affective aspects of field trips has emerged as the result of memory studies (Falk & Dierking, 1997; McManus, 1994; Knapp, 2000), in which students were shown to have sustained interest in what was learned on field trips, and to be able to recall information learned on field trips, from a period of months to years after the outing.

Unfortunately, field trips are in decline due to lack of time and money and the pressure that standardized testing exerts on these limited resources (Terrero, 2012; Nassauer, 2009; DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008). Public schools are funded mainly through state and local governments, and from federal sources. The 2008 Recession and the effects of the 2013 Sequestration impacted funding and further stressed school districts, compounding difficult choices about curricular activities and "forcing cuts in areas that directly impact student learning and achievement" (Ellerson & McCord, 2009, p. 9). District administrators report increased class sizes, reductions in both academic and non-academic programs, deferments of instructional improvement initiatives and textbook purchases, and the elimination of field trips by approximately 30% of school districts (30.1% in 2010-2011 and 29.5% in 2011-2012), as a result of budget constraints (ibid).

While there is no direct evidence that high-stakes testing and teacher accountability are contributing factors to a decline in field trips, efforts to place the arts into the mainstream of educational reform resulted in a number of reports on the status of arts education in America's elementary and secondary public schools that offer a glimpse into the changing regard for field trips (Carey & NCES, 1995; Carey & NCES, 2002; Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012). The first two surveys, conducted in 1994 and 1999, collected information about field trips to museums and art galleries that occurred during the school day. In the years 1990-1994, elementary school field trips decreased by 10%, and secondary school field trips decreased by 9% (Carey & NCES, 1995, p. 29). However, it is not possible to determine the significance of this decrease as the report did not establish the current (1994) levels of field trips. The 1999 survey reported field trip participation levels at 65% for elementary students, and 68% for secondary students (Carey & NCES, 2002). When the survey was updated in 2009, the question regarding field trip participation substantially changed. Field trips were now measured as an activity that occurred outside of the regular school day and were counted along with concerts and plays as part of arts education. In the 2009 survey, 61% of elementary schools and 78% of secondary schools reported field trip participation (Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012), although it is not possible to determine how much of the reported activity actually took place at museums. The questionnaire for 2009 also included a question about virtual field trips, "using technology for students to visit places (e.g., museums and art galleries) without leaving the school" (ibid, p. A-38). The shift from viewing field trips as part of the school day, to something outside of school and conflated with other activities, to the emerging notion of the virtual field trip in which students do not leave the school building at all, is perhaps more revealing of the status of field trips than the actual statistics reported in these surveys. Further, Greene et al. (2014) report that field trips are

increasingly becoming a reward for hard work to improve test scores, with destinations such as movies and amusement parks rather than culturally enriching locations (p. 80). These shifting conceptualizations of "field trips" reflect practices in schools as they are shaped by ideologies of what is considered important in education.

Issues of funding and the effects of reform contribute to fewer field trips, a practice that under better circumstances still face challenges in terms of the perceived educational value of these experiences. Even though museums provide the ingredients for free-choice, socially mediated, constructivist learning, unfortunately, this does not necessarily mean that such learning is being allowed to take place in the context of a school field trip (Griffin, 2004). Another major impediment to perceptions about the value of field trips is teaching strategies appropriate to a formal setting are frequently used in museums with unsatisfactory results in terms of learning, as measured by classroom standards (Griffin, 1994; Olson, 1999). Teachers tend to structure the educational experience in the museum for their students as they would for the classroom (Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Jensen, 1994; Michie, 1998), resulting in field trip experiences that do not always amount to "testable" results. In addition, students appear to be having fun on field trips, adding to the perception that these excursions are more like glorified recess than instruction. What is not appreciated is the psychological context for pleasurable learning makes it appear as though an engaging task is not cognitively demanding, even when it is (Czikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1995). Finally, coupled with the need to justify the field trip to school administrators, teachers face a significant number of administrative tasks associated with organizing it; for example, obtaining permissions and chaperones, arranging for a substitute teacher, and planning for managing students in a new setting (Michie, 1998). In order to support teacher use of museums and answer the challenges they face in justifying field trips, museum

education departments offer curricular materials for classroom use related to exhibit content. Aligning the field trip to what goes on in the classroom through the use of pre- and post-visit connections to the curriculum is viewed as an important piece of the field trip experience (Anderson & Zhang, 2003; Storksdieck, 2001). However, studies show little evidence of teachers making such integrations and suggest that the issue of curriculum fit "appears to be inextricably linked to the need to secure legitimacy and administrative authority and not with integration of field-trip experiences with the school-based curriculum" (Anderson & Zhang, 2003, p. 9).

Children's Museum Experiences

Children make up the single largest category of museum visitor (Falk & Dierking, 1992), consequently, many investigations examining children in museums have been undertaken to establish a foundation for understanding the sociocultural and affective factors specific to younger visitors. Most of the literature on children and museums tends to be specific to a museum or exhibition, and focus on children's learning, frequently in the context of evaluating how well the stated goals of a specific exhibition meet learning outcomes. Jensen (1994) identified three categories of visitor studies involving children's museum experiences aside from evaluative studies: 1) studies of children's memories of museum experiences (Fivush et al., 1984; Wolins et al., 1992); 2) studies of children's behavior in museums seen in the context of their overall development (Hein, 1991); and 3) studies of families in museums (Dierking, 1989; McManus, 1994). Research on the ways in which children become enculturated to museum experiences (Anderson et al., 2002; Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997) is interested in discovering how children are socialized into museum visiting through school and

family group visits, and how long-term connections to museums are formed by the personal and social aspects of learning in the museum. However, these studies are largely conducted within the museum setting with families and thus represent the experience of individuals who share the typical museum visitor profile. These studies also tend to focus on younger children in science museums with fewer studies exploring the experiences of adolescents in museums of any kind (O'Connell, 1979; Asia & Andrews, 1979; Lemerise, 1995).

For young children, initiation into museum visiting begins as a dramatic and novel experience in which they experience a large-scale environment containing exciting content, such as dinosaurs, full-scale machines, and immersive exhibits (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001). The physical attributes of the museum initially distinguish it as a unique place and lead to iconic memories that are salient many years later after the initial experience. Memory studies[6] show that adults are able to readily recall their childhood field trip experiences in vivid detail even after the passage of time, pointing to the enduring impact of early museum visits (Falk & Dierking, 1995; Wolins et al., 1992; Falk, 2000; McManus, 1994). These studies suggest that museum memories are salient and persistent, and are influenced by the social and physical contexts of the visit, duration of the visit, prior knowledge and experiences, and the presentation of exhibit content. Key findings point to the combination of prior knowledge and the experience of museum content as being able to produce indelible memories (Falk & Dierking, 1995). Wolins et al. (1992) found that the most powerful memories are not just about what the child saw or did but about the affective or emotional content of the experience, including the child's feelings about himself or herself in that particular setting. This affective content tends to be unique to each child and frequently has little to do with the intended educational goals for a visit (p. 26). These early positive experiences are important to establishing a long-term appreciation

for museums, one rooted in emotions and personal meaning (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997).

However, while novelty may command one's attention, it is not sufficient for maintaining interest. Pre-existing knowledge and understanding contribute to positive and memorable museum experiences for children because they are able to make connections from their everyday lives (at home and school) to what is seen in the museum (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001). Children are excited by exhibits that hold direct or indirect experiential relevance to them. The medium of story, play, and objects—elements that are found in exhibit spaces—can be readily identified by young children from their own experiences and can facilitate learning, enjoyment, and memory in the museum (Anderson et al., 2002, p. 222). In subsequent museum visits, prior knowledge gained at home and school serves as a foundation through which children increase their understanding from museum content and continually build upon their learning. In fact, encounters with unfamiliar content and ideas affect children's enjoyment of museums negatively (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001) because overly novel experiences do not join to previous experiences to form a meaningful connection. Repeat visits are encouraged by museums for this reason; additionally, studies examining children's behaviors in museums indicate that their ability to concentrate and their self-confidence increased with repeated visits (Hein, 1998).

Children respond strongly to kinesthetic experiences in the museum and familiar contexts for learning, but it is through encounters with exhibit content that children are able to identify what is special and favorite to them personally, and very often, uniquely, from others' interests (Anderson et al., 2002). The constructivist framework of museum learning acknowledges that visitors create personal and social meanings unique to their individual characteristics and cultural backgrounds, as they interact with exhibit content (Jensen, 1994, p. 301), resulting in a personal

connection to a museum based on individual experience. While all visitors may be exposed to the same museum-generated exhibit content and programming, each will take away a private curriculum (Vallance, 1995) in terms of what is learned, based on personal interest and mediated by prior knowledge and social interaction with co-learners. The highly individual nature of museum learning has led researchers to explore the role of museums in identity formation (Falk, 2006; Rounds, 2006; Kelly, 2007), demonstrating that personal identities are influenced by museum visits (Leinhardt & Gregg, 2002). The intensely personal learning experiences that occur in museums are memorable, in part, because the museum setting enables children to respond to and learn using multiple forms of intelligence (Gardner, 1983), such as spatial, kinesthetic, and interpersonal modes, while exploring exhibit content that attracts their interest. Investigations of museum experiences from the educational psychology perspective point to museums as places that foster intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement because they "promote construction of personal meaning, permit choices and control over learning, provide challenges, and lead to feelings of pride and self-efficacy" (Paris, 1997, p. 25). These characteristics of informal learning—choice, control, and intrinsic motivation—are understood to be powerful mediators of children's learning (Engel, 2010; Henderson & Atencio, 2007).

Lemerise (1995) suggests that the paucity of research on adolescents in museums is due to the fact that this group is at a transitional stage of life. This developmental period is relatively brief and marked by change, so few museums focus on this narrow segment of the visiting audience. Museums also perceive this age group as being difficult to "win over" (p. 393). Further, it is likely that by adolescence children have already attended museums at that all-important stage of life when socialization into future museum visiting has been secured. A study by Asia and Andrews (1979) exploring urban adolescents' attitudes about art museums found

that teens regard having opportunities to learn in which their views are respected and supported as being very important to having positive experiences in museums. Negative memories from previous visits illustrate how students perceive museums as being boring and "not for them", as a result of encounters with patronizing, and sometimes hostile, museum staff. Visits in which student were rushed through exhibits and offered few opportunities for self-discovery also contributed to negative views about museums (p. 229). However, in spite of these unpleasant experiences, the majority of participants in the study (68%) viewed the museum as a potential gathering place for socializing with peers, highlighting the influence of the social context for a visit on the overall enjoyment of the museum experience.

Social Contexts for Children's Museum Experiences

While children respond to museum experiences in unique ways, as a function of their prior knowledge, interests, and sociocultural backgrounds (Anderson et al., 2002), the social context in which they visit museums contributes to different types of experiences. Learning in museums is socially mediated, that is, individuals with more knowledge and experience facilitate learning in the presence of children through scaffolding, the process of supporting the learner, and modeling behaviors (Schauble et al., 1998). This area has been explored through "listening studies" of adults in museums that investigate meaning-making as it is revealed through their conversations (Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004). These studies reveal that museum conversations are centered on learning (Griffin, 2004). Further, research demonstrates that visitors of all ages spend considerable time thinking about what they see in exhibits both during the visit and afterwards, suggesting that museum visiting is not a "mere experience" but involves a

considerable amount of cognitive processing (Falk & Dierking, 1995, p. 13; McManus, 1994).

Jensen (1994) found the social context to be the defining feature of children's enjoyment of museums. Social contexts that children perceive as supportive rather than restrictive, and which provide opportunities for them to shape their own experience, are critical to children's enjoyment of museums (p. 320). Children interact differently (and are permitted to interact differently) within the social units of family and school (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Jensen, 1994). Family interactions in museums have been studied extensively, revealing that children visiting in family groups are typically allowed to experience museums in ways consistent with the tenets of informal learning. Families allow group members greater autonomy in identifying and pursuing personally interesting museum content, and permit intergroup social interactions more readily (Falk & Dierking, 1992; Griffin & Symington, 1997; Paris, 1997). As a social unit, family group visitors to museums provide a social context that can support children's interests, pacing, needs for social interaction, and guide children in support of learning about museum exhibits and appropriate museum behavior (Jensen, 1994, p. 321). These aspects of family group visits contribute to positive experiences in museums for children and also enhance what is memorable personally and collectively, because what is learned and remembered is shared through conversations at home and at the museum (Falk & Dierking, 1992).

When visiting as part of a school group, students enjoy museums when they have a sense of purpose, choice, and can take ownership of their learning (Griffin, 2008). Studies of children's and adolescents' learning preferences in museums point to choice, social interaction, personal interests, and motivation as key ingredients for positive experiences (Griffin, 2004; Griffin & Symington, 1997). However, school visits can diminish children's enjoyment of the museum because of the need to limit learning to the teacher's pre-determined agenda (Jensen,

1994). Activities that children determine to be work-like are those that are externally controlled by the teacher, who directs and evaluates the activity and its outcomes (Fein, 1985). As a result, children can perceive the role of the teacher as interfering with their desire to look and act freely when in the museum. The drawbacks for students visiting as part of a school group are that the goals of a museum visit can be in conflict with personal interests and expectations because the school group context for the field trip can introduce classroom management behaviors into the experience. Students articulate a strong preference for guiding their own learning and dislike activities such as worksheets provided by teachers to direct their attention. Research on students' perceptions of museum experiences demonstrates that this clash in expectations around field trips can undermine the benefits of informal learning. Children generally find a narrowly focused field trip planned by a teacher to be boring, while less structured visits appear to produce more positive attitudes towards museums (Falk & Dierking, 1992, p. 50).

Perceptions about the nature of learning may explain differences in expectations around the outcome of school field trips for both teachers and students. In a study by Griffin (2008), students expressed the view that they were not learning in the museum when independently interacting with or examining exhibit content; however, students reported they were learning when completing a teacher-directed task, for example, using worksheets to guide them through an exhibit. While self-guided study in the museum is more enjoyable, it is not perceived as learning by students who identify this type of engagement as almost exclusively associated with the types of activities undertaken at school. Griffin concluded that learning and enjoyment are closely allied in circumstances where learners are given a choice in what they were doing (p. 153). Clearly, children who are enjoying themselves may not perceive they are learning even as they engage in cognitively demanding tasks (Wing, 1995), thus, the impression teachers and

other decision-makers may hold is that learning does not take place.

The literature presented here intends to provide an overview of the educational landscape for situating field trips as an important educational opportunity during the years of formal schooling. While the educational aims of school can be thought of as a technical process by which the effect of a curriculum can be evaluated through testing and measurement, the educational purposes of museums are broad. These contrasting ideas of school/museum learning originate in an epistemological difference in what constitutes education: incremental, measurable improvement in skills or an ongoing, fluid, and highly subjective experience. What museums can provide uniquely is a learning experience that is tailored to the learner's interests. The museum visit emphasis on the combination of learning and enjoyment in which students experience choice, engagement, and involvement highlights the learner-centered approach of informal education. The structure of the reform-centered classroom threatens positive engagement with school by eliminating all of the pleasurable aspects of self-interested and self-motivated learning, with disastrous potential. These negative perceptions about learning gained through experiences in school jeopardize the relationship between museums and their communities because museums are associated with the larger institution of education. Further, students enrolled in schools that promote test achievement over genuine learning gain little by way of content depth and critical thinking, both inside and outside of the classroom. These effects of education reforms on the urban school-museum relationship promise to restrict opportunities to learn outside of the classroom. School-based assessments do not capture the impact of field trips in the context of one's overall education, and the meaning of the museum experience for the young learner is unappreciated and often, unknown. As a result, "[t]here is no important role for museums in the back-to-basics education movement" (Hein, 1998, p. 6).

This inquiry will contribute to contextual studies of children's perceptions of museums; in particular, it will fill a gap in an unexamined area of adolescents' museum experiences. In addition, problematizing field trips as an equity issue is unexplored in the literature. In mounting this study, I draw upon various bodies of research not typically presented together to provide educators in both formal and informal settings a common understanding of each other's realm. The importance of this latter contribution is the expectation that educators in both settings will become better advocates for field trips when the better understanding of their value, and greater awareness of their significance, is shared.

Chapter 3. Methodology

Introduction

This study seeks to understand the question, What meanings and significances do urban middle-school students derive from their field trip experiences, in the context of the learning opportunities available at school? This is explored through sub-questions aimed at uncovering memorable aspects of students' past and recent field trip experiences, their views on learning in the museum compared to school; their perceptions, beliefs, and feelings about museums and their visitors; and how students see themselves as learners, now and in the future. I also examine the role of teachers as advocates for field trips and inquire into their perceptions of the role of museums in the overall intellectual and social development of their students, the value of such resources, and whether their school culture supports or discourages such practices. This inquiry into students' field trip experiences will be approached using a phenomenological framework in order to render descriptions that characterize the nature of their learning in out-of-school settings. Phenomenological approaches are an appropriate methodology for research that seeks to illuminate questions rooted in personal meanings and values, as well as social meanings and significance (Moustakas, 1994, p. 103).

In the following, I present the methodology for this inquiry. In the first part of this chapter, I provide the theoretical framework for my work and offer a description of the phenomenological approach used for conducting the study. The remainder of the chapter details the methods undertaken to address the research questions, including a discussion of the site, sample, and recruitment; methods of data collection and analysis; limitations; and conclusion.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

The research presented here is a critical inquiry emerging from personal and professional concerns about how the structure of public education may be implicated in perpetuating class- and race-based differences in museum audiences. Critical research in education is informed by principles of social justice to bring about change in the social context for schooling (Lichtman, 2012, p. 114). In this study, I position field trips as a type of valuable curriculum knowledge and educational experience that is increasingly withheld as a result of reform policies that stretch limited resources at the school level. This arrangement especially impacts urban schools by foreclosing significant learning experiences for low-income children of color. In problematizing field trips as a curricular issue, this critical inquiry focuses on these outings as a knowledge form that is unequally distributed in school (Apple, 2004). A critical perspective of curriculum theory is interested in examining the form and content of what is taught through the questions: Who decides what is the most worthwhile knowledge to teach? How is knowledge controlled through structures that afford or constrain different types of educational experience, according to race and social class? How are unequal social relationships reproduced in various curriculum designs and models that privilege or exclude learners from particular experiences? (Apple, 2004; Pinar, 2012; Anyon, 1980). While the problems of curriculum traditionally focus on school settings, these questions are applicable to both formal and informal learning environments (Lindauer, 2006). Given a well-documented history of disparity in museum audiences, exploration of these questions as contributing factors to continued inequities is warranted.

The conceptual framework informing this study is Falk and Dierking's Contextual Model of Learning (2000), "a device for organizing the complexities of learning within free-choice [informal learning] settings" (Falk & Storksdieck, 2005, p. 745) among the personal, social, and

physical aspects of the museum experience. Falk and Storksdieck clarify that this model "does not purport to make predictions other than that learning is always a complex phenomenon situated within a series of contexts … [and is] more appropriately thought of as a framework" (ibid). Ravitch and Riggan (2011) describe a conceptual framework as a "dynamic meeting place of theory and method" (p. 141), in which ideas find organization and support but are not guided into pre-determined outcomes. This view accommodates an understanding of the frame as providing flexible boundaries while the process of research unfolds. Using the Contextual Model enables me to situate this study within a body of research on museum learning that has coalesced around the interrelated ideas expressed within this frame, while giving careful attention to the unique contributions of the participants.

Phenomenology and the Study of Educational Experiences

This inquiry uses phenomenological methods in order to understand and describe students' lived experience of field trips. Phenomenology is a term that refers to both a philosophical movement and a range of research approaches. As a philosophical approach, phenomenology attempts to understand experiences as having essential qualities; as a research methodology, phenomenology can be described as the study of the nature and meaning of a phenomenon from the perspective of one who has experienced it (Finlay, 2009). In the social sciences, a phenomenological approach seeks to determine general or universal meanings from a personal description of a lived experience, through a process in which the researcher reflects on the particulars of an individual's description of an experience to arrive at the abstract properties of it (Moustakas, 1994). The use of phenomenological frameworks in education emerged in the

1970s through the work of curriculum theorists Ted Tetsuo Aoki and Max van Manen, who

sought humanistic approaches to addressing curriculum problems through attention to the lived

experiences of individuals (Pinar et al., 1995). Curriculum theory and phenomenology share a

common interest in understanding educational experience from the perspective of those who

experience it.

> Curriculum theory is a form of autobiographically informed truth-telling that
> articulates the educational experience of teachers and students as-lived. As such,
> curriculum theory speaks from concretely existing individuals' subjective
> experience of history and society, the inextricable interrelationships among which
> structure educational experience (Grumet, in Pinar, 2012, p. 35).

Applied to educational issues, phenomenological approaches can reveal new directions for

research and "uncover new layers of clarity in perception, conceptions, actions, and practices"

(Stanage, 1987, p. 245).

The goal of phenomenological analysis is to describe rather than explain, and to present

understandings in order to increase awareness, prompt further discussion, foster personal

reflection, and provide insights for additional research (van Manen, 1990). In general, the

process may include perceiving, thinking, and imagining as part of the explication of the

phenomenon under study (Moustakas, 1994, p. 92). This begins by adopting a

phenomenological attitude, also referred to as epoche, or bracketing, the process of setting aside

prior knowledge and assumptions about the phenomenon under study to perceive it afresh and

with openness. The phenomenological researcher seeks to interpret "how phenomena—'the

things themselves'—present themselves in the lived experience of the individual" (Pinar, et al.,

1995, p. 405). Epistemologically, phenomenological approaches are based in a paradigm of

personal knowledge and subjectivity, and emphasize the importance of personal perspective and

interpretation (Lester, 1999, p. 1). Further, phenomenological approaches acknowledge researcher subjectivity. In undertaking a phenomenological inquiry, I become present in the research, as it emerges from my own lifeworld and biographical situation. The humanizing aspect of phenomenological inquiry is what makes it empowering as a methodology because "evidence" is derived from first person reports of experience. As an alternative to research methods that pursue the practical application of knowledge to solve the technical problems of schooling and curriculum, phenomenology aims to produce knowledge to disclose "what it means to be human" (p. 407).

Site Identification, Sample, and Recruitment

The sites for this research study are located in a large, Midwestern city with a population of more than 2.7 million people. The sites are the Florence School, a private K-8 school; the Lincoln School, a public K-8 charter school; a history museum located in a nearby suburb; and a city neighborhood in which a community-based education program is offered.[7] The participants in this inquiry were from a K-8 private school and a K-8 charter school located in a large, Midwestern city with a population of more than 2.7 million people. I observed a total of 58 students in the classroom and on field trips, and subsequently interviewed four students from the private school and five from the charter school. Three female and six male students participated in the interviews. Seven students were in the 8th grade at the time of the interview; two students were in the 7th grade. Two African-American, five Hispanic, and two bi-racial students participated. In addition, I interviewed the teacher from each school, a White male and a White-Hispanic female. The students were selected by the teachers for participation in interviews,

based on my request to identify students from a range of backgrounds in terms of what teachers knew about their past museum experiences, socioeconomic status, and academic achievement. My intention was to have a diverse group and to remove any personal bias in the selection of student participants. The age range of students was 13-15 years old.

I employed purposive sampling to recruit teachers through museum-based teacher professional development programs, using a flyer that was distributed through email and in person by education staff at four museums in this urban center. The reason for recruiting through the museum professional development programs was to identify teachers who, by virtue of their participation in such a program, were likely to use museum resources in the classroom and arrange a field trip. Initially, I sought participants from public "neighborhood schools" located within 3-5 miles of the museums noted above, which are concentrated in a central area of the city. This "museum campus" is in relative proximity to residential areas of the city, including neighborhoods with high rates of poverty. A "neighborhood school" has an attendance boundary and can vary widely in the programs it offers; however, neighborhood schools can be described as typical of the district overall in terms of the composition of minority and low-income students and academic standing according to the public school district's school performance rating. However, circumstances made it clear that working in a neighborhood school would be impossible in the near future.[8] To broaden participation in my inquiry, I extended the eligibility requirements to include teachers from private and charter schools in the city and amended my DePaul University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Research Protocol. This amendment allowed me to work directly with the principal and teacher at the school level to arrange for my research because these settings would not require any district-level approvals.

The recruitment proceeded and resulted in two contacts over a period from September to

early December, 2012, Max from the Florence School and Crista, from the Lincoln School. I arranged to meet with each of them individually after school hours to explain my interest in the research problem and outline the plans for my study. We also discussed their backgrounds (education, length of time in the field, interest in museums) and logistics, such as the likelihood of gaining access to their school for research purposes. After getting confirmation that each teacher wanted to proceed with participating, I contacted the principals at their schools to notify them of my plans to do research and to obtain letters permitting me to conduct my study at their schools to file with the DePaul University Institutional Review Board (IRB). I also provided teachers with an explanatory letter for parents/guardians, consent procedures, and consent forms to be sent home with students. Working over a period of weeks in January and February 2013, a schedule for classroom visits was made in conjunction with the teachers. In the same period, teachers provided me with their field trip plans and prospective dates for the outings.

The Florence School is a private, Progressive PreK-8 school that promotes field trips and a social justice curriculum with an interest in experiential learning. Florence has 250 students, 77% of whom are from ethnic/racial minority populations. While some receive need-based grants that pay from 15-80% of tuition (which ranges between $17,000-$20,000), there are no children at the school who are eligible for free- or reduced-price meals. The Lincoln School is a CPS dual-language, K-8 charter school. Lincoln's school philosophy is one of holistic education centered on core values that emphasize the social and emotional well-being of students through physical health (activity and nutrition) and academic growth. To ensure that students are well nourished, the school provides breakfast and lunch. The school has a modified, year-round schedule, with four days extended days (7.5 hours) each week that allow for extended wellness and academic programming. The majority of students at Lincoln are Hispanic (83%) and from

low-income households (85%). Lincoln accepts students citywide through a random lottery. As of the 2012-2013 school year, there were 464 students enrolled at the school.

Along with the respective teachers, participants at the Florence School included one African-American male student, one African-American female student, and two bi-racial male students. Two students were in the 7th grade and two were in the 8th grade. The student participants at Lincoln were three Hispanic male students and two Hispanic female students. All students were in the 8th grade.

Methods of Data Collection

This study employed qualitative methods of participant observation and semi-structured interviews for collecting rich descriptions of the feelings, settings, and activities of field trips as experienced. Participant observation is a qualitative research method in which researchers observe a setting or join the activities of those they are studying and take notes on what they see (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). As a participant observer, my presence in the classroom and on the field trips allowed me to co-experience the learning activities and made me a more familiar figure to students, which I believe put them at ease when later they participated in the interviews. The guide for conducting interviews with students (Appendix A) consisted of open-ended questions about past and recent field trip and school-based learning experiences aimed at lifting detail for answering the research question and sub-questions. The interviews with the teachers explored their perceptions regarding making use of museum resources both in the classroom and as a field trip, obstacles or difficulties they face, as well as other themes that arose in conversation (Appendix B).

Data collection commenced in February and continued through June 2013. Prior to beginning the inquiry period, I collected the parent/guardian consent slips from the teachers. All guardians permitted their respective student to remain in the classroom and attend the field trip in my company. Only two students were not permitted to participate in semi-structured interviews. During classroom observations, I paid close attention to students' responses to the instruction and content as demonstrated by interactions with the teacher and each other. Additionally, I took detailed field notes describing the school and physical classroom environment. During the field trip observations, I was attentive to these same characteristics of instructional approach, interactions, and the physical environment. Following each participant observation and field trip, field notes were prepared, reviewed, and appended with memos generated through reflection on the data. In addition to data obtained directly from me, both teachers engaged students in broad discussions about their field trip experiences outside of my presence. These discussions generated anonymous, written comments by students that were voluntarily shared with me.

Before conducting the interviews following the observation period, I followed consent procedures outlined in my DePaul University IRB Research Protocol. The data sources generated from this effort were field notes from classroom and field trip observations, and transcripts from interviews with a total of nine students and two teachers. Each teacher was interviewed twice for about one hour, at the beginning and at the end of the inquiry period. Students were interviewed for 20-35 minutes each, one week to three months after their field trip experience. Interviews of both the teachers and students were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. Cross-validation was achieved by comparing field note observations with transcripts and summarized data. Because most of the students participating were in the 8th grade, they graduated and left their schools before it was possible to feasibly verify their responses by

providing a summary transcript. However, verification of student interview data was made in consultation with the teachers, who were able to confirm my impressions and lend accuracy to my analysis of their field trip descriptions. In addition, the student interview guides included questions about their direct experiences in addition to questions asking them to speculate about other's opinions about the same type of experience. In their responses to questions about other's opinions, students tended to project their personal views onto an anonymous group. This suggested an internal consistency between their personal views about their experience and their opinion about the same experience for others.

Methods of Data Analysis

The meaning, or significance of students' lived experiences on field trips, was interpreted through phenomenological reflection on the data gathered through classroom and field trip observations, and semi-structured interviews. Throughout, I employed basic coding methods to assure I would be systematic in the process of managing and exploring the data from my field notes and interviews. Basic coding refers to a number of possible approaches used in qualitative research for generating words or phrases that capture the essence of what is being communicated in a portion of data (Saldaña, 2013). I used attribute coding (ibid) as a data management practice to ensure that field notes and interviews were properly identified with descriptive information about the participants, dates, and sites visited. In attribute coding, the researcher logs information about the data source. For example, at the beginning of each interview transcript, I made a notation at the top of the page with the participant's name, age, gender, race and ethnicity, grade level, interview site, and date and time of interview. I also wrote a brief

descriptive statement intended to help me recall the student, such as taking note of the small talk we engaged in and the student's demeanor.

The process of phenomenological analysis is guided by four procedural activities: 1) the researcher chooses a phenomenon in which he or she can participate along with the research subject; 2) the phenomenon is investigated as it is lived, not as it is theorized; 3) the researcher reflects on the essential themes or structures characterizing the phenomenon that emerges from the data; and 4) the researcher describes the phenomenon through the art of writing (van Manen, 1984). Moustakas (1994) and Giorgi (2009) offer further procedural descriptions of the major processes in phenomenological methods. Moustakas (p. 97) identifies the processes as: 1) epoche, or bracketing; 2) phenomenological reduction through horizontaling; 3) imaginative variation and identification of themes; and 4) organization of the composite textural and composite structural descriptions. Giorgi (pp. 128-132) offers the following guidelines: 1) read for a sense of the whole, 2) identify units of meaning, and 3) reflect on the units of meaning through re-writing them to arrive at a descriptive analysis of the phenomenon.

Following Moustakas' (1994) main processes of phenomenological methods outlined above, I also incorporated steps outlined by Giorgi (2009) for identifying horizons of experience through the analysis of meaning units, identifying the structure of experience, and identifying the essence of experience. While somewhat prescriptive in their approaches, having specific procedural steps to guide me gave me confidence that I was being systematic in my analysis while allowing free reign of my imagination in the analytical process. The primary source of data for this inquiry was the student interview transcripts and field notes from my observations in the classroom and on the field trip, which were the main foci of my reduction and analysis process. The teacher interview transcripts unexpectedly yielded insights into the significance of

field trips for the adults in this inquiry; as a result, this data became a second focal point of my analysis. A secondary source of data was additional student comments obtained by teachers through questions they presented in class to spark student discussion about museums.

Phenomenological data analysis proceeds through the methodology of reduction, the analysis of specific statements and themes, and a search for all possible meanings (Creswell, 1998). Attaining a description of these qualities in order to derive meaning becomes the formidable task of developing both a textural description (what is experienced) and structural description (how it is experienced) of the phenomenon. This is achieved through an extended period of reflection on the data to identify horizons of experience. The concept of horizontaling encompasses the idea that as the data are reflected upon and described, new perspectives emerge and vanish, like landmarks in the distance on a vast stretch of road. Using the metaphor of the frame, the researcher studies what is in the picture for an extended period, watchful of new elements on the horizon, previously unnoticed. Those that persist, the "invariant constituents" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 122), become themes in the data which form the basis for a textural description. These are collected together, and through the process of writing, presented as a composite picture that generally describes the experience.

Working first with complete, verbatim transcripts of the nine student participants, I read each one several times to gain a holistic impression of the students' individual and collective experiences—to hear the student's voice in his or her words on the page, to remember each one in my mind's eye, and to recall our shared experiences together in the classroom and on the field trip. I consulted my field notes from the classroom and field trip observations as I read the transcripts to revive my memory of the students in each setting. This process engaged me in thinking deeply about each student's experience, and at times it brought me face-to-face with the

difficulties of maintaining a phenomenological attitude. For example, when a student expressed a seemingly contradictory statement in an interview transcript, I initially felt an adrenaline rush as I noted the inconsistency. The alteration of my mental state that I experienced at this point clearly marked for me the moments when my bracketing slipped. My awareness of the shift prompted me to read again and honor the words as truths from the student's perspective. Such falterings on my part were moments that rendered some of the more fruitful explorations of the data.

The outcome of reading was identifying horizons of experience (Moustakas, 1994, p. 97). In this process, all expressions made by the participants are given equal and unprejudiced consideration to lift the invariant constituents from the data; that is, to isolate statements with persistent qualities and to move towards a textural description of what is experienced on field trips. This step involved reducing the transcript into smaller segments in order to allow meaning to arise from the text. I did this by marking on the transcript where I noticed a shift in the given description, for example, whether students referred to an inner state compared to an outward observation, or when they speculated about something compared to describing it as directly experienced. Giorgi points out that there is arbitrariness to this process (p. 130), in that these determinations are based on the researcher's discretion. However, one of the valuable aspects of this process is that it helped me recognize that what I thought was a student's contradictory statement was actually two ideas that could be teased apart. As a result, I came to identify cases wherein more than one meaning was contained within a single statement. This process resulted in a list of horizons, individual statements that would constitute the textural description ("what is experienced"). Each of these statements was listed in tabular form in a spreadsheet.

In the next step, I rewrote the horizon statements in the third person as "transformations"

(Giorgi, 2009, p. 130). Reflecting upon each statement, I rewrote it in the column next to the original statement. As I continued to reflect and revise the statement, I strove to produce multiple versions (as many as four, in some cases), in which I restated the horizon. The process resulted in a table of these transformation statements that clarified the meanings (and possible meanings). In this interpretive stage, I allowed intuition and imagination to enter into reflections on the textural description to arrive at a structural description; that is, how the phenomenon is experienced. Through writing and re-writing, I synthesized both the textural and structural descriptions as the final step in the analytical process, revealing a better understanding of the essential structure of field trips to students. This process yielded three analytic categories (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012) that will be examined in the following chapter.

Limitations

The participants in this study are from a public charter school and a private school that are not typical of the district in terms of the curricula and resources (both financial at the school level and the social and cultural capital of students' families), which confer advantages to the students not offered in the regular, neighborhood schools. In addition, neither school was designated as being on probation or facing sanctions as a result of underperformance[9]; as a result, the schools' resources were not diverted from academic programming or enrichment activities to address achievement issues. Because the type of student most likely to miss out on field trip opportunities was not included in this study, the findings have limited generalizability to the wider population within this large, urban public school district. The small number of participants and urban setting, in which schools and museums are in close proximity, also decreases the

generalizability of the findings to populations in other regions. Guided by my request for students from a range of academic levels, life experiences, gender, and family arrangements, teachers identified students to participate in the semi-structured, individual interviews. Their selections may have also been influenced by other factors unknown to me. Fewer observations than planned took place at the school sites because of changes in classroom activities and schedules. Additionally, one of the field trips was not museum-based; however, it shared structural elements as an educational outing consistent with a museum experience and contributed to a richer understanding of the significance of these outings to students.

Although the intention underlying the process of epoche significantly reduces the influence of preconceived thoughts, judgments, and biases (Moustakas, 1994, p. 90), it is rarely achieved perfectly. Phenomenology also typically involves a small number of research participants (Creswell, 2003). While it is appropriate for use with a small sample, and robust in calling forth the experiences and perceptions of individuals, one must be tentative in generalizing the discoveries from phenomenological research to a wider population. However, as these small studies are undertaken, they collectively contribute to a larger understanding of the meaning of curriculum-as-lived. Finally, as a phenomenological study, the findings could be subject to other interpretations.

This exploratory, phenomenological inquiry into the meaning of field trips examines the field trip as a form of curriculum-as-lived by those who experienced it. My interest in this topic originates from personal and professional experiences and merges with my concerns about differences in museum audiences and the role of school in perpetuating these differences. As such, I undertake this work from a critical perspective, informed by curriculum theory discourse over how the form and content of curriculum are offered unequally, in order to render the

meaning of the curriculum-as-lived. I use phenomenological methods to describe what is essential about the field trip experience from the perspective of a small sample of nine middle-school students who attend school in a large, Midwestern city. While this inquiry has limitations, it seeks insights into the meaning of museum field trips that have not been highlighted elsewhere in the literature, and aims to generate analyses that can increase awareness, prompt discussion, and provide insights for additional research. Importantly, it will contribute to a better understanding of what is lost when field trips are not offered as a part of school life.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of this inquiry. I begin with a detailed description of the Lincoln School field trip to help the reader envision how it was enacted, and experienced by me, as a form of "autobiographically informed truth-telling" (Grumet, in Pinar, 2012, p. 35).[10] The next section provides an overview of responses to the primary interview questions I posed to students, intended to elicit background on their past field trip experiences; their perceptions, beliefs, and feelings about museums and their visitors; and how students see themselves as learners. I then elaborate on three key themes that emerged from phenomenological analysis of this data, which highlight the personal and social aspects of students' field trip experiences. I include the teachers' perspective on the field trip to present another view into the experience. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

The participants in this study were Max, a teacher at the Florence School and his students: Michael, a 14-year old in the 8th grade; Felix, a 14-year old in the 8th grade; Wilma, a 14-year old in 7th grade; and Houston, a 13-year old in the 7th grade. At the Lincoln School, participants were Crista, a teacher; James, a 14-year old in the 8th grade; Julian, a 14-year old in the 8th grade; Carlos, a 14-year old in the 8th grade; Selena, a 13-year old in the 8th grade; and Christina, a 15-year old in the 8th grade.[11] The section addressing the emerging themes draws heavily from interviews with students from the Lincoln School, who undertook a traditional museum-based field trip. While the responses from students across both sites were similar in terms of the personal and social experiences of field trips, the format of the outings resulted in

nuanced differences that were more fruitfully explored using data from the traditional, museum-based field trip format.

The Lincoln School

In February, I visit the Lincoln School to observe two, one-hour periods of 7th and 8th grade students in a social studies class. The neighborhood surrounding Lincoln has the feeling of suspended gentrification. There are pockets of recently constructed townhomes, but along most of the street are two- and three-flat apartments standing at the original street level. The exterior of the original school dating from the early 1900s remains, but the inside has been renovated and is bright, friendly and clean. There is a playground that appears to have been the parking lot at one time. The main entrance is of new construction and as welcoming as the greeter poised behind the front desk. Classroom entrances are decorated with banners emblazoned with the insignia of universities and messages addressing health and character.

When I arrive at Crista's classroom, the door is locked. I peer through the door window to catch Crista's attention, and knock sheepishly until a student admits me. There are about 14 students, mostly males, sitting at desks grouped together so that students face each other. All students wear a uniform of white shirts and blue pants. I take a seat at the rear of the room and notice there is a teaching intern and another observer present. The classroom is well-resourced with books and computers, and the walls are covered with handmade posters relating to history and social studies topics, and language arts skills, specifically analytical reading skills and creative writing skills. Books include immigrant identity, young adult literature, and Spanish/English dictionaries.

The curricular emphasis is reading and writing history through a lesson in which students analyze events leading up to World War II. Students write a short statement in response to the prompt: What is the impact of our decisions? The lesson then explores the butterfly effect—the idea that a small occurrence can have widespread impacts—using a timeline of events from the Treaty of Versailles leading up to World War II. Each event is written on a sheet of construction paper and hung on a clothesline to represent a historical timeline. The intern demonstrates the lesson by removing one event from the clothesline, and through discussion, hypothesizes the impact of this action on future historical events. Students are asked to do the same by removing one or several events and rewriting the outcome. They are invited to get out of their seats to look at the clothesline, and some even sit beneath it to do their work. They interact, but very quietly. I am struck by how studious and serious they appear, although I can see that Crista is quietly communicating with students to curtail what I suspect are interactions unrelated to the task. After approximately 15 minutes, students are asked to share their writing with each other in small groups. Students are offered conversation prompts to help facilitate discussion, and there is time enough in the class period for students to write reflections. The bell rings, and the students rise to leave as Crista readies herself for the next class.

The History Museum Field Trip

It is a bright June morning when I join Crista and her class for their field trip. It is a beautiful, clear, nearly summer day. The students gather under the shade of trees expectantly, until word comes that their bus went to the wrong location. While other schoolmates board buses bound for Great America (an amusement park), the students waiting to visit the Holocaust Museum are directed back to the playground. They wait there in the unremitting sunlight,

exchanging autographs in slim, red memory books created especially for the graduating class. This memento, separate from the school yearbook, is the work of a school volunteer. As befits the end of the school year, students seem relaxed and happy. We move inside so as not to allow the sound from the playground to disturb the students remaining at school. The school counselor regards me with friendly relief when I am introduced as one of the chaperones. "The kids don't know how to behave in museums," he says. The field trip group of 39 students will have five chaperones. Most of the students are in the 8th grade, but there are a few 7th graders, included because they are students of the Special Education teacher, who is also a chaperone.

Upon arriving at the museum, we pass through a security screening and then students divide into three groups, each with a docent and at least one adult chaperone. Our docent explains that the museum exhibits present the theme of "bystander/upstander" to illustrate the ethical behaviors of individuals and groups. She orients students to the physical space of the museum, which intends to tell the story of systematic change—how individuals and groups can gain acceptance over time through small steps—through the exhibits and architectural features. Students wear wireless headsets fitted with receivers so that the docent can speak quietly into a microphone and be heard by all without disturbing other visitors. The headsets can be tuned to channels for different docents so that each group can hear their own guide speaking.

The docent leads a relatively interactive tour, in which she actively attempted to engage students in dialogue as they moved through the museum's main exhibits. We walk around the museum for about two hours, visiting a circular room evocative of a smokestack, on which the names of victims are painted in increasingly fainter letters at the highest reaches of the walls; a gallery highlighting contemporary artistic responses to genocide and other atrocities; and the permanent collection of more than 500 artifacts, documents, photographs, which includes a

German rail car used in Nazi deportations. Often students clump together and talk as the group ambles through the museum. Generally, they appear to be alternately attentive to the docent and inclined to look around the exhibit. The docent asks students questions intended to prompt them to look closely at the exhibit materials and quizzes them about the historical events leading up to the Holocaust. A few of the students consistently respond to her questions, often with such knowledgeable responses that the docent reacts with surprise, but most seem to lag at the rear of the group, periodically talking to each other. Frequently the docent stops to ask students not to lean on exhibits or sit on the floor. At times, she seems clearly frustrated. Throughout the tour, as the docent works to engage students in answering questions and disciplining them here and there, fewer students seemed to be actively paying attention to her.

The exhibit tour ends with a summary film that connects the lessons of the Holocaust with other genocides around the world. Students then gather in a small auditorium, where an elderly woman, a Holocaust survivor, sits at a table on the stage, joined by a member of the museum staff who makes an introduction to the audience. The woman reads from her handwritten notes about her early life. I marvel at the level of detail—and the ordinariness—she remembers of the time, as if living in extraordinary circumstances becomes normal at some point. Because she speaks so quietly, and with a German accent, I have to be especially attentive and patient to get her story. I sit behind the students and notice they are remarkably attentive given the length of the tour, although they must be struggling as I am to hear and understand. When she finishes her story, she invites questions. A couple of students raise their hands, and for a few minutes, there are some awkward attempts as the audience and speaker try to comprehend each other.

Before departing, students gather in a lunch room to eat sack lunches provided by the

school. There are a few vending machines in the lunch room offering drinks and snacks.

Students are not allowed to purchase from the machines, so the adults wait until all of the

students depart for the bus until they buy their own snacks. During this time, I speak briefly with

the docent, who expresses frustration over having to discipline the group. She offers that she has

many student groups visiting from urban schools, and that she researches the school before she

meets with the students; however, she does not pre-judge based on demographic descriptions.

She says she is constantly (positively) surprised by students from the public schools.

Key Themes

        In the following section, I present three key themes that were identified through

phenomenological data analysis of student interviews: 1) students held positive views about

museums and experienced empathy on their field trips; 2) students desired more autonomy in

how they went about learning, especially in the field trip context; and 3) students felt their social

interaction was limited in the museum. Analysis also revealed, within these themes, students'

expectations and desires for their learning experiences, in both the museum and school settings.

The reporting of these findings is informed by Falk and Dierking's (2000) Contextual Model of

Learning, which acknowledges that learning in museums (and informal learning, generally) is

influenced by the continuous interaction among the personal and social "agendas" for learning,

as well as the affordances of the physical setting in which learning takes place.

Appreciation and Empathy

I spoke individually with nine students, four from the Florence School and five from the Lincoln School, to find out about their past field trip experiences; what perceptions, beliefs, and feelings they hold about museums and their visitors; and how they see themselves as learners. All of the students had visited local museums previously, including the ones I had targeted for distributing the recruitment flyer. Additionally, several had attended museums outside of the area when on their eighth-grade class outings to Washington, D.C. (Lincoln) and Mexico (Florence). The students were equally divided among social contexts for visiting: three reported that they attend museums most often with family, three most often as part of a school group, and three students reported visiting equally with family and as part of a school group.

Students hold positive feelings about museums and their visitors. They perceive museum visitors as being "anyone" and describe a cross-section of people ranging in age from children to "old people", tourists, "rich people", and individuals with a special interest in what is on display at the museum. The common denominator among this diverse group is that people who visit museums place a high value on learning and find pleasure in it.

> Christina: People who want to be educated or experience something fun or new. Really anyone goes to the museum. They're nice places to sit and think if you don't want to visit any exhibits. The only people who don't go to museums are the ones who haven't had the chance or haven't got the time to go.

> Julian: Someone who, um, (…) who wants to learn, someone who's kind of like the, uh, the adventurous type, or, the kind of, intellectual type, you know? Like you want to learn about your past, or, like, do something, or [learn] how to do something, you know? You gotta find the information from somewhere.

Expectations based on past positive experiences and having a personal interest in the museum's contents were echoed among all students as a necessary condition for wanting to visit

a museum in the future. All students envision that they will visit museums as adults, when they will have more choice and control over which ones to visit and how they want to experience them, motivated by "interest in learning something" and "being with friends". Many noted that they no longer visit as often as when they were younger because of activities they are engaged in outside of school hours. Students are busy, as are their parents. Felix told me, "When I was younger, I enjoyed museums a lot more because I really didn't have so many things going on in my life".

When I asked students about their recent field trip experiences, their responses centered on strong feelings and impressions from encounters with objects, spaces, and individuals. Feelings of empathy were elicited chiefly through encounters with objects that are contextualized in the medium of story. Listening to a story is an active process that easily brings the "teller" and the "listener" into relationship, fostering understanding. Narrative allows for emotional engagement with academic content, connecting abstract events and knowledge gained in the classroom so that students, in Crista's words, can "see themselves in history instead of seeing someone else's world."

> Wilma: Um, just having the woman who was there tell us stories about what happened and how, uh, certain people live (…) I like people to tell stories and those stood out a lot to me. I guess I like to be able to picture things, and, not just that, just, know (student's emphasis) stories of other people, I guess, and learn about people.

> James: The personal narratives of some of the Jews, like the survivor, (…) just her story was, uh, it gives you a glimpse of what she had to go through when she was, uh, living during that time.

The use of narrative, implied and made explicit in museum environments, enabled students to visualize past events that contributed to a deeper understanding about the human condition.

Narrative has a structure that makes it easy to follow and recall. It allows for openness in terms of sense-making and interpretation. The act of interpretation, or meaning-making, is a way of constructing our world and finding ourselves in it. In the museum, stories are implied through the arrangement of objects and the physical space in which viewers discover their own meaning. Objects do not have to be unique or rare to be interesting to students; ordinary objects placed in the context of the museum can elicit feelings of connection. The "blanket of the baby" in the Holocaust Museum implies a story, that, given the setting in which it is placed, we can write ourselves. Hearing stories connected to objects also endows ordinary objects with the presence of people past. Julian told me the story of one of the objects, a uniform worn by concentration camp prisoners.

> Julian: Like, they had this little exhibit with, um, the um, the Jew's, like, uniforms, the striped pajamas and, um, how a man saved a 14-year old girl, telling her, or 13, [stuttering] telling her to pretend she's 15, and he saved her, so, they helped each other out at that time.

In advising the girl to lie, the prisoner was attempting to spare her from being executed, as children were seen as unfit for work in the Nazi labor camps. This information is not obvious to the viewer; it must be sought out through attention to the object. As students moved through the environment, they discovered these stories on their own as they paused to attend to items that attract their interest. However, in contrast with the types of museum objects often recalled by very young children, for example, encounters with large-scale objects and spaces, the types of artifacts students referenced in describing their recent field trip experience reflect a mature interest in the nature of the objects themselves and the meanings that can be associated with them. Interpreting objects is a form of visual dialogue in which the viewer can imagine a story. When objects display the "impact" of time through signs of age, or wear-and-tear, their powers

of evidence attract attention and sustain interest in looking and imagining. Students are

fascinated by evidence, as Carlos noted, "because then you get to see actual things, part of

history." Carlos went on to explain that objects hold the viewer's attention, "Just to see the

actual thing in person, and up close (…) most people are more intrigued when it's actually there

in front of them." Objects are primary sources that can tell the story of another time and place

and easily conjure those once connected to it, eliciting powerful empathic responses.

> Selena: We were actually in one of the train cars. I thought it was much bigger.
> I couldn't imagine being in there and waiting for the [long pause], I think visiting
> the train cars was [memorable] because it really had an impact on me, imagining
> myself in their shoes. I think that for me, it has to be, if I'm learning, like the
> example with the car again, if I'm learning about the car, and how they traveled in
> it, and then I see it, it helps me relate to how people felt.

Given that museum objects are contextualized in exhibit spaces, the importance of the physical

setting of the objects is as important as the objects themselves in evoking feelings of empathy.

The difference is that the museum exhibit space is a fabrication, a physical embodiment of

narrative, not authentic in the same sense of the object but equally as powerful for many

students. The exhibit space implicitly tells a story by providing visual cues and a pathway

through objects intended to emulate an experience of systematic change as Jewish persecution

became naturalized in Nazi Germany. The story that unfolds through the physical environment

is presented through illusions that have intrinsically interesting elements, as well. For some

students, "just going around" the physical space was noted as a salient feature of the field trip,

that could also arouse appreciation for the aesthetic qualities of the environment.

> Julian: I thought that was interesting how, like, the walls had went along with all
> the learning, the stone wall and, like the, the wooden wall, I guess, and they made
> walls that were like buildings, Kristallnacht, the broken glass, and even the, even
> the floors, were like, all glass. It was pretty interesting.

Moving through the physical environment is a type of enactment, or reenactment, of another's experience. Consistent with constructivist views of museum learning, as students encounter these narratives in the environment, they build upon prior knowledge and reformulate what they know, arriving at a deeper appreciation for the human experience as a result of the environment.

> Selena: Well, I would just say that I knew the Holocaust was really something devastating, and going to the museum just showed me more of that, more of the story behind it. Afterwards, how people struggled, not only in the Holocaust but after, trying to rebuild. When the people came back from the camps, their homes were taken, so they had to stay in a camp by themselves, and they were trying to work it out.

> James: I didn't know like, uh, like, just how Adolph Hitler viewed Jews, and like other people, I just found it, like, so evil, I mean, like how he killed, uh, like even disabled people and children because there's no need for them, 'cause, like, they won't do anything for him [pause]. I just found that very, like, just very [pause], like, not open-minded, yeah.

Presenting institutionalized forms of injustice and oppression using traditional textbook approaches does not result in the same impact on students. Crista organized the field trip "for reinforcement" of what was learned in the classroom, "but I think most importantly it's that voice piece. When there are people who can actually tell you their own experience in or with a particular period of history, that's so important." This experience could only be offered at the museum.

> Crista: [My] voice can only go so far. Videos and readings and pictures in the classroom can only go so far. When students sort of experience it in a different way, I feel like exhibits have a way of tying together all the pieces that I've taught them, and so that ability to take what they've learned in the classroom and think, "Oh, I remember this, oh, I saw this, and now I'm thinking this."

Crista described the museum as a "moving classroom" in terms of how students interact with the environment, but metaphorically, her statement captures the ethos of affective learning well.

The Desire for Autonomy

The experiential qualities of the field trip provided a real-world context for learning that students found memorable and pleasurable, in part, because they attended to elements of the learning environment that held personal interest, meaning, or could elicit connection. However, external controls or efforts to shape the experience interfered with the pleasurable aspects of intrinsically motivated learning. The students in this inquiry chafed at too much guidance on their field trips, even if it was familiar guidance from the school context. In the museum, students desired intellectual and physical freedom to explore according to their own interests.

As is typical of a docent-led tour, the classroom teacher is not involved in formal instruction once at the museum. The docent, who is an unfamiliar figure to students, is then responsible for managing the group and harnessing their attention. While making pre-visit arrangements, Crista spoke with one of the docents at the museum to lay out her expectations for the students' experience so the guide would "understand what we already know" when the class arrives, thereby providing a deeper context for learning rather than a reprise of what was already addressed in the classroom. Despite efforts to engage students and introduce them to new exhibit content, the docent at times struggled in her interactions with the students. While students could appreciate the docent as knowledgeable, they generally perceived her efforts as overly guiding their experience. The docent controls the pace of moving through the museum, and this interrupts students' attention from taking in things of interest. Even with headsets, the physical

environment of the field trip had acoustical challenges that placed an additional demand on students' attention as they strove to listen. The tour was long—for more than two hours the docent continually interacted with students—limiting their personal attention span and giving the impression of leading a one-sided conversation. Christina told me, "It's sometimes boring when they talk a lot."

> Michael: In a museum we go around and they kind of tell us like, this and this and this and this, and, uh, we usually read this stuff that usually a teacher would, or somebody, would be telling us (…). Some museums you have to listen for long periods of time.

> Wilma: Just kinda hear people talk to me [pause], I mean, I listen to them, but I don't [pause], it's not what I want.   I'd rather not do that.

"I noticed when the docent was just talking and there were pictures, the reaction [from students] was more 'Ehhh, okay, might as well be a classroom'," Crista observed. Listening is a form of guidance from school that communicates to students that they should be quiet and passive. An exception, however, is when the information is conveyed as a story rather than a recitation of facts, there is greater interest on the part of the students to listen because then listening requires active attention.

Another form of guidance in the museum is offered through the exhibit context, the setting for objects and images that provides visual and environmental cues to communicate information about the items on display. Exhibits include interpretive text in the form of wall panels and object labels as additional sources of information. Reading is familiar from classroom practice, and students seemed to naturally assume that reading the exhibit text was required. Expectations concerning reading interpretive texts varied widely, in terms of how much students felt they wanted to, or were expected to, be attentive to them, and whether reading

labels was regarded as a required activity or not. Several students expressed irritation, if not exasperation, when it comes to reading exhibit text, which they view as a requirement that interferes with attending to the learning environment.

> Felix: I would have to say the least favorite aspect of any museum would probably be [reading] all of the like writing of about the exhibit.
>
> Julian: I think, like, standing up and just having to read something, yeah, I mean, I don't mind reading but I mean, when you're there, for like, on a field trip, you're there for like, several hours.

When combined with other types of interactions in the museum environment, for example, "walking and reading", "standing and reading", and "walking and talking"—combinations of how one usually experiences instruction on field trips (especially when led by a docent)—they interfere with students' experience. Students who saw interpretive texts as an optional resource to consult if they had questions, or to use as a self-test (comparing their observations of museum content to the expert's description), generally saw this level of guidance to be helpful and not intrusive into their experience. The perception that exhibit label content must be read is a common view that highlights the influence of conventional classroom learning in such a completely different environment.

In the museum, there is a greater impulse for action and interaction, and this is expressed in terms of self-interested, autonomous involvement in the environment, both intellectual and physical. Students described preferences for interacting in the museum environment as engaging in "hands-on kind of stuff, like control something", and doing "anything that involves physical activity (…) I don't really like to look at things to learn about them, more, like, do stuff". Through interaction with the environment, students guided their own experience and attended to

the environment according to personal preferences for learning. The desire to pursue learning

according to one's interest is a strong impulse on field trips, and highlights how motivating

museum and out-of-school environments are for learning.

> Felix: I really like watching things, observe, and then learn by myself, more than [tiredly] reading, reading, reading, reading. I have to, like, sometimes [read] to understand what's going on, like, where this animal is from or things like that, but, like, if I already know, then I can just, like, look. I think that you can mostly learn just by looking. I mean, you can tell by the way it's, like, the exhibit is, like, put (…) around you, you can tell the climate it was in, the time period, things like that.
.

The autonomy that is possible (when allowed) in a field trip setting is one of the main aspects of

learning students enjoy, because of the level of personal engagement, interest, that is motivating

and can be acted upon. Julian described the benefits of museums this way, "You get to pick

whatever exhibit or whatever lesson you want to learn, and, you know, it's basically freedom,

like, to learn what you want". Self-interest and motivation, aspects of pleasurable learning, also

make the experience fun. When learning is fun, students are "more likely to actually remember

it," according to Carlos. Crista explained why students find museums fun: '[they] just have tons

of ways of kind of not making it obvious to students that they're learning."

Learning as a Social Activity

Even though students reported past and recent positive experiences at museums, nearly

all students (including those from Florence) expressed a preference for learning at school, where

they feel freer to interact with one another. At the Lincoln School, students sit in groups and

typically engage in small group activities. For example, during classroom observations of the

unit on the Holocaust that preceded the field trip, a teaching intern demonstrated the "butterfly

effect" as a way of analyzing the events leading up to World War II. As a part of this activity,

students left their desks and interacted, quietly, as they completed their classwork.

For the Lincoln students, the social milieu of the classroom was significantly disrupted on

the field trip. Students value school for its social aspects. School is a more comfortable and

familiar setting for learning with clearer expectations around social and learning behaviors. The

classroom also offers more opportunities for participation because students are allowed to work

in groups and can talk more frequently, and openly, with peers and their teacher.

> Wilma: It's more of a social place to be and um, [you] just kind of sit in one
> place and your teacher talks to you and you can talk to other people, but, um, at a
> museum it just seems kinda like you're walking around everywhere and looking
> at things and [pause] I'd just rather be at school.

> Julian: You're able to express yourself like and like learning about the subject
> you get to express yourself and your feelings (...) at the museum I think it's
> mostly like they tell you the information and they kind of expect you to know it.
> [in class] you know, say what you want to say.

While peer interaction is accepted classroom practice for the students participating in this

research, they felt inhibited interacting in the same way in the field trip context. Students wanted

to talk with each other but perceived this was discouraged, perhaps because of the need to listen

to a docent. However, the perception that they should remain quiet had the unintended result of

telegraphing to students that museums are "boring" places and this dampened their enthusiasm.

> Michael: Even when we are walking [around the museum] sometimes we're not
> allowed to talk, like, even if nobody's talking to us we're not supposed to talk,
> which is kind of weird to me because, even if we're not listening to anything we
> can't talk.

Students who admitted to talking to peers on the tour explained that they engaged in both general, social exchanges as well as conversation about the objects on view or being discussed by the guide. In some cases during the field trip for Lincoln, it was clearly disruptive to both the guide and the other students, who later complained about the behavior of their classmates as being "immature" and "annoying." Julian felt more adult chaperones were needed to reign in the behavior of classmates, while Selena offered another explanation for their behavior: "A lot of them find it embarrassing to be interested in some things. They don't want to seem that they are."

While the museum offers many possibilities for self-interested learning, in describing their experiences most students concurred that school provides a better social environment, and as a result, they preferred the classroom setting for learning. Very few students expressed a preference for learning in the museum exclusively over the classroom. For those who strongly preferred the museum, their responses accented the pleasure of learning when it is allowed to be self-guided. Concrete evidence of past events was experienced as a powerful aid in learning that also satisfied personal interests. What museums offer that school does not are these types of encounters with authentic objects, as well as opportunities for intrinsically motivated discovery and effort. Julian described the benefits of museums this way, "You get to pick whatever exhibit or whatever lesson you want to learn, and, you know, it's basically freedom".

I attended a docent-led tour of a history museum with students from the Lincoln School. I then interviewed a total of nine students discussing the primary research question and sub-questions to learn more about their past experiences (including their recent field trip) and perceptions about museums; and I asked them to compare learning at school with out-of-school experiences. Students had positive past experiences in museums, as well as positive views of museums and their visitors. In discussing their recent field trips, for both groups of students, the

out-of-school context for learning enlarged their understanding and deepened feelings of empathy. Students experienced empathy through the medium of story, which characterized various elements of their field trips, including expressive objects, spaces, and first-person accounts. Stories come alive through encounters in the learning environment. However, generally students preferred learning in the classroom to the museum environment. When asked to compare the two experiences, students expressed more freedom for social interaction in the classroom. Additionally, aspects of learning in the museum environment that attempt to guide their attention, typically in ways familiar from classroom instruction, generally perturbed students as they tried to find the balance between independence and guidance in the field trip experience. These findings highlight how individual and collective expectations for learning can clash in the out-of-school environment, yet the personal experience of learning outshines the classroom in terms of its emotional impact on students.

Chapter 5: Discussion

There is a divine beauty in learning. To learn is to accept the postulate that life did not begin at my birth. Others have been before me and I walk in their footsteps.

— Elie Wiesel

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory, phenomenological inquiry is to describe what students find meaningful and significant about their field trip experiences in order to shed light on what is lost when they are not offered as part of school life. This question originates in concerns over educational equity. Reports that field trips are in decline promise to impact poor and minority students more profoundly than students in better-resourced schools and families, perpetuating long-standing differences in museum audiences. The reason is twofold. First, poor and minority children receive less high-status curriculum knowledge, arts and humanities instruction, and enrichment experiences than their more affluent peers, and more instruction emphasizing basic literacies to ensure that they will achieve required levels on high-stakes, standardized tests (Lipman, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2004). Second, because of education reform measures that link student performance to teacher accountability, if students in Title I schools are not meeting mandated test scores, resources at the school level must be used to improve student achievement. In reports highlighting reductions and eliminations in field trips, funding is most often cited as the reason (Ellerson & McCord, 2009; Terrero, 2012; Nassauer, 2009), but other reform-oriented priorities also interfere with choices to embark on field trips, too, such as preparing for standardized tests (Kohn, 2000). In an effort to bring attention to this issue, I present this research with the aim of increasing the reader's understanding of the importance of field trips to

the overall social, educational, and emotional development of children. In this chapter, I analyze and synthesize the three key themes that emerged from the data, which describe students' field trip experiences and highlight their importance in terms of curriculum decisions and educational equity. The interpretation and analysis is informed by the Contextual Model of Learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000), which provides a conceptual framework for understanding the museum experience from the visitor's perspective. The model acknowledges the museum experience as the continuous interplay of the personal, social, and physical contexts for a visit.

Appreciation and Empathy

All of the students who participated in this inquiry have a history of museum-visiting with their families and classmates on field trips. They report positive feelings about their past experiences in museums and appreciate them as special places where unique and special things of interest can be seen and learned. Students recall these experiences readily and offer vivid detail about what they remember, consistent with studies of children's memories of museum experiences (Anderson et al., 2002; Falk & Dierking, 1997; Kindler & Darras, 1997). Students invoke a wide range of unique objects and exhibits from museums as holding personal interest, often in combination with strong emotions, such as excitement ("Sue the Dinosaur"), or disgust ("BodyWorks"). While the types of objects are quite varied, the feelings aroused by them are remarkably similar. The age, scale, and sense-oriented properties of various types of collections elicit awareness about nature and culture bordering on a sense of awe. From fossils, "giant artwork", rockets, "dead bugs and live spiders", to Kermit the Frog, students recall memorable objects from past experiences in museums that gave them feelings of connection to human and natural history on a broad time and distance scale.

Falk and Dierking (1992) affirm that the personal context—the visitor's knowledge, attitudes, and prior experience—of the visit holds the greatest influence on the museum experience; however, the social context (who one is visiting with) is also significant. In this study, students spoke much less about what they learned on these early visits or the social context of the visits, whether it was with family or as a part of a school group, unless prompted. The social context seems not to leave as much of an impression as the personal details of what was seen or done previously at the museum. Consistent with Wolins et al. (1992), the emotional content of these earlier experiences appears to have a lasting effect resulting in indelible memories that contribute to positive feelings about museums. Further, students intend to visit museums again in the future as adults, supporting findings by other researchers regarding the impact of childhood socialization on attitudes towards museums and future museum-visiting behaviors (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997).

Lemerise (1995) suggests that a reason why studies of adolescent visitors in museums are so few is partly because, by this age, the museum connection has been formed and thus this group requires no special attention. However, some students visit museums less often now as a result of their lives becoming "busier". A reason why museums overlook adolescents may also have to do with not offering the types of activities that compete with, or satisfy, the needs of this age group. Although their needs as older children are consistent with research by Falk and Dierking (1992) that highlights choice, control, and social interaction as fundamental qualities of museum learning, adolescents favor and benefit from certain elements of the out-of-school learning environment in ways different from younger children and young adults, as will be discussed in the sections that follow.

Students' early memories of museums are colored by an emotional response to seeing

familiar and large-scale objects in the museum setting. As older children now visiting a history museum, the experience is no less emotional. Their personal experiences of learning on the field trips culminate in feelings of empathy "the act of perceiving, understanding, experiencing, and responding to the emotional state and ideas of another person" (Barker, 2003, p. 141). This response to exhibit content highlights what many researchers describe as a hallmark of museum learning; that is, its affective quality (Roberts & Garden, 1992; Wolins et al., 1992; Lord, 2007). Describing the nature of affective learning, Lord (2007) writes, "The essential museum learning experience is the change in our feelings, interests, attitudes, or appreciation of the subject matter due to the museum display" (p. 16). Affective learning occurs readily in the museum because the focus of instructional activity shifts from the written word to the interpretation of the environment (Hein, 1998). In presenting visual and material culture as the primary mode of instruction, museums permit a wide range of interpretations to be made. The process of meaning-making from objects and images differs from the interpretation of text in that the act of reading does not elicit sensory or embodied reactions (Hooper-Greenhill, 1999). Objects evoke feelings because they speak metaphorically of another time and place. As referents of "others, objects have a "life" of their own and invite viewers into a dialogical encounter (Pinar, 2012). Describing the attraction of objects, Max explained that he will borrow items from museum teaching collections to use in instruction when he needs "a hook, something to deepen the kids' engagement". According to Max, hanging documents and reproductions on the wall does not coalesce attention the same way as authentic objects in the classroom.

> If you put up an exhibit case, or certain objects, they certainly draw students' attention (…) they can change the way a room feels. You can change classroom culture very subtly by introducing new objects or materials, things that are visually stimulating that otherwise are foreign. It's kind of like bringing part of the community into the classroom or opening up the walls.

Although students learned about the Holocaust at school through analytical and dialogical methods that engaged them in exploring ideas, the immersive environment of the museum commanded a deeper understanding. Students were attentive to the physical properties and aesthetic details of exhibit content, and could describe the everyday objects or clothing that were handled or worn by others as memorable items from their visit. The physical context of the museum allows students to experience, through a type of re-enactment, what it might have been like to live in fear and oppression. For example, many students gathered in the train car used in Nazi deportations of Jews to death camps. This experience of active participation in and interpretation of the environment are powerful mechanisms for affective learning in the museum setting (Hein, 1998; Lord, 2007).

Another mechanism by which students experience empathy is through the medium of story. It is through stories that we communicate and come to understand each other. As a way of structuring experience and conveying information, narrative has been found to be a powerful mediator for children's learning in museums (Anderson et al., 2002). The impact of narrative in museum exhibits on visitors is not widely acknowledged in the literature, even though cognitive research demonstrates individuals can mentally organize information effectively if it is recounted to them in a story (Schauble et al., 1998; Schank, 1990). Students can recount the stories associated with the objects on view, for example, in Julian's description of the striped pajamas. Storytelling as a form of pedagogy allows learners to subjectively engage in the material to be learned, cultivating self-reflection and social understanding (Egan, 1986). Through interpreting environments and listening to first-hand accounts on this field trip, students learn about the Holocaust in ways not possible at school. Comparing their field trip to classroom learning on this subject, students describe the classroom as "separated from reality." Specifically, in learning

about social issues, their field trip experiences "showed me how it really is"; "this was the only way to learn about this (…) I understood the environment, felt the place." The field trip encourages self-reflection and an appreciation for the social circumstances of others that cannot be experienced in the classroom.

> Wilma: I think that, us having the opportunity to go to this school, especially, and having the opportunities we have, a lot of kids don't have the same opportunities we have, and this school costs a lot, and I think that a lot of kids, especially here, don't think about things like that because of what they have. Our school tries to tell [us] that you might not always have this because of certain reasons, or, you may have this, but they don't, so we don't always think about ourselves.

When students engage in meaning-making, or interpretation, in the out-of-school environment, it invokes feeling and imagination. Because affective learning involves personal change, it is a transformative experience, enhancing both an understanding of the self and others. Affective learning also acknowledges the engagement of emotions in cognition. As a key ingredient of learning, emotion supplies the unity and coherence that makes the experience of learning aesthetic (Dewey, 1934/1980). The structure of an aesthetic experience is characterized "by feelings of personal wholeness, a sense of discovery, and a sense of human connectedness" through attention to a visual stimulus (Csíkszentmihályi & Robinson, 1990, p. 178). Empathy, as an outcome of these encounters, is rooted in students' subjective responses experienced in this learning environment. The significance of empathy as an outcome of museum visiting is documented by Greene et al. (2014), who undertook the first large-scale random-assignment experiment of the effects of school tours of an art museum. These researchers found that even after a brief museum visit, students demonstrate significant improvements in historical empathy, "the ability to understand and appreciate what life was like for people who lived in a different time and place" (p. 83). Additionally, Greene et al. found measurable changes in students'

critical thinking skills through analyses of writing samples that show improved skills of observation and attention to detail when writing descriptions of works of art. The impact of improvements to critical thinking, tolerance, and interest in art museums was found to be greater for students on the field trips who came from high poverty schools. In fact, the impact of these improved effects for more advantaged students was typically much smaller or null, suggesting that students who likely visit museums more frequently through family socialization do not benefit as much as children who rely on school to provide these experiences (p. 86).

Out-of-school learning opportunities offer a glimpse into the real-world, opening a dialogue that leads to social empathy as students come to recognize concepts such as privilege and disparity in their own lives. Such lessons can be discovered in personal pathways through life, as we encounter difference and are perceived as different ourselves. This consciousness-raising activity of school is not emphasized in typical classrooms, where individual performance is stressed (Resnick, 1987). The high-stakes testing climate works against the development of empathy by elevating the test above students, turning them into competitors and labeling them as achievers or failures. School thus establishes a social hierarchy that identifies some students as better than others (Rosenbaum, 1976), cultivating a mindset of oppression. In disrupting this pattern of school life, field trip outings allow for personal knowledge construction in students' educational experience, legitimizing the feelings and understanding they bring to it. Such outings also have the potential to give students a clearer view into social power divisions and oppression through the experience of "re-enacting" the life worlds of others in out-of-school settings. The benefits to self and society are greater in a scenario when opportunities to learn lead to understanding the needs of others, tolerance, and differences, and the possibility for social action; however, this is not in the ideological interests of schooling (Freire, 1990).

The Desire for Autonomy

For middle-school students in this inquiry, the desire for autonomy in their field trip experience is palpable. In the role of "student", as opposed to public learner, children must submit to more powerful adults who control their learning experience, but in the informal learning context, control is understood to be in the hands of the learner (Packer & Ballantyne, 2002). Students are especially sensitive to situations in which they detect control over the outcome of their experience. "Really by going with school isn't as fun, but with family I can feel free to do, feel, and think whatever I want about it. With school, it's all much guided," Michael explained. Felix added, "It's much looser" going to the museum with family. Students often communicate their desire for autonomy by describing situations in which they felt controlled. Control is the flipside of independence, the uninvited limitation that interferes with the optimal experience of learning.

> Michael: I wish it was kind of like, that when we went on the field trip, like, they trusted us to walk by ourselves and not do something wrong, 'cause, really, that field trip I think could have been a lot more powerful if we walked, like, in groups of, like, maybe four [students].

The desire for more autonomy in guiding one's museum experience originates, in part, through early experiences in family visits in which children are typically allowed greater choice and control in determining their movements. These early experiences raise the expectation of what museum visits are like, ideally, just as school routines shape expectations for learning in the classroom environment. Jensen (1994) found "[t]he museum as a place of negotiated semi-independence" is important to children by ages 9 to 10 (p. 311), suggesting that by the late elementary years, children are already desirous of more autonomy in their field trip experiences.

Museums invite opportunities for physical movement through acting or re-enacting in the environment, partaking in hands-on activities, and other forms of interaction. Interaction in the field trip context relates to students' intellectual, physical, and social engagement in the environment, and being permitted a good measure of independence across all three realms is important to students' positive experiences. For example, having the docent set the pace for moving through the museum was viewed as too much physical guidance that interfered with students' ability to attend deeply to the learning environment. Asia and Andrews (1979) reported a similar feeling by adolescents' in their study of teen museum experiences. What may not be appreciated by school- and museum-based educators is that adolescents do not require as much guidance as they are being offered, and the result is that students feel "rushed through exhibits". In contrast, allowing students to self-direct their engagement, particularly, allowing them freedom to interact with exhibit content, manipulate and control things, and explore, are activities that appeal strongly to students' desires for independence and mastery. Felix and Wilma described scenarios in which students would have a more unstructured experience "instead of having a teacher guide it the whole time" as ideal situations for learning on field trips.

> Felix: I would just have them, like, walking around, just looking at it because when you have, like, a lot of activities, like, a lot of writing and everything, I think it ruins the experience for everybody (…) I don't like it when our teachers give us, like, these handouts and then you have to go around looking for these things and writing these things down.

> Wilma: Hands on activities, really, not just walking around, not like people talking to you and stuff, activities and things, activities that are fun for teenagers, because a lot of time we don't want to do a lot stuff that people have planned for us.

Students' descriptions of more ideal field trip circumstances reveal how they understand certain activities to be associated with learning. Reading exhibit text is a frequent target of

disdain and confusion, as students feel conflicted over the perceived requirement for reading

interpretive information. Griffin (2008) found that students have a "strong feeling that learning

was related to school activities and in particular, involved reading and writing" (p. 146).

Students undertake undesirable activities, such as completing worksheets in museums, because

of the tacit belief that they "would not learn" if they did not have them (ibid). The influence of

school-based learning activities on students' perceptions of learning highlight the many ways

students are not learning in the classroom environment. For example, learning visually employs

capacities different from reading text, including attentiveness to the sense-oriented properties of

objects, and cultivation of the mental flexibility and imagination for dealing with a level of

ambiguity in what is being communicated. These skills are not typically cultivated in classroom

settings and are viewed skeptically as sufficient for legitimate learning. As Carlos told me, "you

don't really learn if you don't understand the backstory" provided by exhibit text. While exhibit

text is one of the ways in which museums guide visitors through a public curriculum, reading it

is a voluntary act and learners are able to engage in a "randomly accessed structure of

knowledge" (Vallance, 1995, pp. 4-6), favoring a highly independent and personal experience of

learning. This expectation of museum learning is not clear to students, who bring routines from

the formal learning environment to the field trip experience.

As adolescents, students are now awakening into adulthood, desirous of more

independence, which requires them to confront authority more directly. The "conflict" is

potentially productive, in that the socializing aspects of field trips involve learning how to

negotiate personal and social needs and wants, to learn how to act freely and with self-interest,

but in a social unit that requires one to adjust personal expectations in light of the group. This is

good practice for adult life and is one of the valuable aspects of school field trips in terms of

socializing students into the larger world. Permitting more independence and less guidance would have created an optimal field trip experience for students in this inquiry, affirming findings that classroom expectations imposed on the museum experience interfere with enjoyment (Griffin & Symington, 1997). However, students do not seem to object as much to restrictions on independent learning or overly guided instruction in the classroom setting, suggesting that their perceptions of what constitutes learning in either environment are distinct.

The form and content of schooling shape expectations for how learning is to be undertaken, and these expectations, in turn, inform what it means to learn in and out-of-school settings. The activities of school as being work-like and productive begin in the kindergarten years (Apple, 2004) and cultivate expectations for how one expects to undertake learning in formal settings. By middle-school, students have deeply internalized these expectations. As students make sense of their field trip experiences, they encounter instructional forms that are familiar from school that now take on dissonant qualities. Passive activities that are descriptive of classroom learning, for example, "a lot of sitting, standing, reading and listening", or teacher-driven effort, interfere with students' field trip experiences. Yet the perception that learning is defined by classroom-type activities persists in students' reports of their field trip experiences in spite of the many differences afforded by each learning environment, supporting research by Jensen (1994) and Griffin (2004) that children understand learning to entail practical outcomes and skill development rather than self-directed engagement.

A school culture that situates students as passive learners seated and waiting to receive instructions from the teacher runs counter to active physical and intellectual engagement in the out-of-school learning environment. Students are less critical of these forms when they are offered in the classroom, though not entirely. In part, this is what they have come to expect at

school, but outside of it, possibilities open up, and students become aware of the difference. The self-directed aspects of learning invited by the out-of-school environment is an aspect of informal learning that makes museums fun places in which to learn. The school field trip interrupts the perception of learning as a passive, performance-driven task. Students experience learning as "fun" because they are deeply engaged—that is, they are experiencing a high degree of interest and attention.

> Selena: I know I don't really learn as well if I'm not having a little bit of fun because you're not taking it in, you're just zoning out. Also, I want it to be important, though, to have an impact on [my] feelings and thoughts.

Griffin (2004) found that students do not readily associate learning with fun or pleasure. When learning is equated with classroom routines, activities outside of those routines take on elements of leisure. School generally does not cultivate learning experiences for pleasure; on the other hand, students readily describe field trips as fun. Felix told me, "In the museum you are learning but you're having fun", a view consistent with findings by Griffin (2008) examining children's' perceptions of learning in museums. Similarly, Jensen (1994) found students used the word "work" to describe situations characterized by effort and obligation (p. 321), the absence of which is fun, with learning in the museum being "less like work." These perceptions highlight the ways in which students engage differently in the out-of-school environment when activities are more like play. Activities that are freely chosen, self-directed, voluntary, active, and social offer children control over their processes and outcomes and are perceived as enjoyable, fun and play-like (Wing, 1995). In play activity, "children transcend the immediacy of the present and physical reality to explore new learning cultivated by the power of the imagination" (Henderson

& Atencio, 2007, p. 246). Interest and attention describe the level of engagement present during field trips, and it is the engagement that, in part, makes the experience pleasurable and fun.

The role of interest in learning is significant because students are more apt to engage in a deeper level and subsequently acquire more in-depth knowledge about a particular subject area than when no interest exists (Henderson & Atencio, 2007). When learners are engaged in what they are doing according to their own interests, the pleasurable aspects of learning become their own reward, and this form of intrinsic motivation is uncharacteristic of the school environment. In the classroom, test performance stands in as the prime motivator for learning (McCaslin, 2006), in spite of evidence that external rewards are not effective in motivating students for success at school (Schroeder, 1994; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation also provides a positive psychological context for learning that helps individuals persist through demanding tasks. Studies of people engaged in challenging activities identify the features of the "flow" experience, one characterized by feelings of deep involvement and effortless progression, as key motivating factors in tasks where there is no external reward (Csíkszentmihályi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981). The school environment is a passive place for learning, in which the driver of the experience is the teacher, but in the museum, it is the learner who guides the experience and establishes the outcomes for it.

> Felix: [In the classroom] I feel that your teacher's mostly giving you lectures. You have to do your like absolute best but in a way that they approve of it. Not like your best like at a museum. You can look at it, you can remember it, and you know what you're receiving in your mind and then you can take notes on it. In the classroom it's more like "you have to do this". Then at the museum it's more like I can do this, I want to do this, I will do it (student's emphases).

The satisfaction that comes from intrinsically motivated experiences are a sense of competence and control, discovery, and personal enrichment (Falk, 1992, p. 105), which are descriptive of

students' experiences on field trips. A reason why students enjoy field trips is that they very likely put forth more effort as they take in the museum environment, compared to learning at school. According to research on museum visitors, learning is both pleasurable and cognitively demanding when one is engaged in a task that balances challenge with the potential to succeed (Czikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981). Activities that promote the perception of choice and contexts that afford learners the opportunity to pursue personal interests create highly, intrinsically motivating settings for learning (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When students are intrinsically motivated, they connect to feelings of mastery.

The richness of the out-of-school learning environment is both motivating and stimulating. Felix described the passive attention characteristic of the classroom as "you sit at your desk with your teachers telling you these things" to learn, but in the museum, "[I can] explore and do something on my own". Students explained that it is easy to "space out" in the classroom but feel "mentally connected to what's going on" on field trips. For students, the field trip "adds energy" to learning because it is "easier to engage" in the subject matter. Crista explained that her expectations for students' experiences have come to focus on the qualities that are unique to the out-of-school learning environment.

> Crista: I've learned though, in the past, to not make it as intense, kind of intentionally lower my expectations a little bit, because it's a different environment—you have so many things going on at one time. So lowering my expectations in terms of (…) what I'm asking them to do, that (…) is more important. It's quality versus quantity.

Although Crista's classroom and her pedagogical style are learner-centered, she acknowledged that the emphasis on efficiency and productivity inherent in school culture can creep into expectations for out-of-school experiences. Both Crista and her students encountered the

limitations that school culture has deeply imprinted on their expectations for learning

experiences. Yet, it important to remember at this juncture that the students who participated in

this inquiry are in school environments in better circumstances than most of their peers. In

schools with greater emphasis on the technical aspects of education, we deny students such

pleasurable experiences of learning. Play-like, pleasurable learning is self-driven, as such, it is

intrinsically motivated. The connection between interest, motivation, and behavior are important

to persistence and continued motivation (Paris, 1997). Importantly, autonomy-supportive

learning environments "catalyze in students greater intrinsic motivation, curiosity, and the desire

for challenge" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 59). Without positive, pleasurable experiences,

perceptions of learning become associated with classroom routines, and school becomes

unpleasant, learning drudgery, and the possibilities that education offers in terms of life

outcomes seem remote and unpromising. Furthermore, in terms of lifelong learning, the

museum's strong association with education is a negative feature that can interfere with the idea

that going to a museum for a learning activity is not viewed as an enjoyable experience,

particularly for those who have had negative experiences with formal education (Griffin, 2008;

Prince, 1990; Hood 1983).

Learning as a Social Activity

All learning is socially mediated; that is, "learning, both outside and inside school,

advances through collaborative social interaction and the social construction of knowledge",

(Brown et al., 1989, p. 40). How much social mediation is allowed as part of the learning

experience varies in the school setting. For example, classrooms arranged in rows are organized

to inhibit social interaction and focus student attention on the teacher. Classrooms with desks placed in groups facilitate exchange between students. Along with curricular differences, there is greater control over social interaction among students in urban schools. It is common to see the first type of arrangement in schools with large classrooms, such as in urban areas. However, this was not exactly the case for students in this study. Students felt they enjoyed more freedom to interact with peers at school than on the field trips. It was clear from interviews that students' expectations for social interaction at school are so prominent, that even though all students reported pleasurable, fun, and meaningful experiences on field trips, nearly all prefer the classroom environment for learning.

Informal learning is constructivist and socially mediated, that is, knowledge creation is the act of meaning-making by individual learners, who then learn from each other (Schauble et al., 1998; Falk & Dierking, 1992). Museum learning invites individuals to interpret elements of their environment, and make sense of these for themselves and through interaction with others. For the students participating in this research, the idea that learning is a shared activity outside of the school setting appears to be overwritten by other messages aimed at controlling their interaction on the field trips. While students engaged readily in the personal aspects of their field trip experiences, that is, deep engagement in attending to objects and environmental details according to their own interests, they felt the social aspects of the experience were stifled. At their respective schools, students are embedded in a social milieu that affords them opportunities for dialogue with others. Placed within a different social context, however, students felt constrained to interact with one another.

> Wilma: Like here at school, you're supposed to listen to your teacher, but after
> we learn about, a certain topic, our teacher will give us a chance to just talk to
> each other about what we learned, but it seems like at a museum we can't do that

as much.

Students did not directly identify how they came by the perceptions that they should not interact; the requirement for silence appeared to be a taken-for-granted notion, although, if the expectation for instruction and learning is modeled on school experience, then passive quietude seems "normal". Yet, being quiet conflicts with the natural attitude of learning in the out-of-school context. Placed within an extraordinary setting, with expressive objects calling out in a stimulating environment, talking is perceived as "acting up" and invokes the need to contain student behavior. Michael reasoned why, "I don't know if it's just 'cause they just don't want to, like, have to get control once somebody does start talking." A few students commented that museum personnel communicated the expectations for quiet, in addition, both Max and Crista discussed expectations for field trip behaviors with the students beforehand, and this may have reinforced the tacit understanding that their behavior would be monitored. The docent-led tour resulted in students' experiencing an implied constraint on social interaction, both through the need to listen and by the docent's direct requests to gain their attention.[12]

For the Lincoln students, the disruption to their social milieu was significant. Their typical interactions with each other and Crista drastically changed in the context of the field trip. At school, students sit in small groups and have controlled, but frequent, opportunities to interact as part of formal instructional activities.[13] Of course, the level of interpersonal interaction that goes on unnoticed in the classroom cannot be known. It is intentionally concealed by students, but we can assume, given the importance of peer relationships in the middle-school years, that it is significant. As a result, the social milieu of school for the Lincoln students offers levels of openness and control they have learned to mediate in order to satisfy the socially desirable

aspects of school.

It is revealing of the durability of their collective identity as learners that students experienced such a strong reaction to the change in learning environment. Learning is a product of joint socialization among students, as well as between students and the teacher, regardless of setting (Henderson & Atencio, 2007). Yet on their field trip, students were separated from a socially comfortable and familiar environment, then individually separated into smaller groups, and, for all but one group, separated from their teacher, as well. This disruption appears to be a significant factor in students' feelings about the field trip. All students who participated in this inquiry were relatively frequent museum visitors, having been to a museum two times within the past twelve months; as such, they could be expected to be relatively familiar with the museum environment and expectations around museum behaviors. However, the safety and security they felt together in the school environment was suddenly withdrawn, and in a different setting, the established social unit felt less comfortable in their typical interactions. Students' desire to interact with each other highlight how social interaction among learners (and teacher) functions as a support system. In considering how students balance the desire for autonomy with social interaction, it appears the wish to be able to talk with each other is akin to reaching out for those supports (in the form of peers) to make sense out of what is learned. Research by Leinhardt and Knutson (2004) and Griffin (2004) on visitor conversations in museums highlight that most of these are related to exhibit material, as individuals engage in individual and collective meaning-making. In a sense, through the socially mediated aspects of learning, all participants act as both teachers and learners. Students' preference for learning at school reflects the importance of the socially mediated aspects of learning, which they see as supportive.

Another possible explanation for students' perceptions is the implied authority of the

museum itself. As civic and educational spaces that evoke a reverence apropos to cathedrals, knowing how to behave appropriately in such settings is part of the unspoken museum code (Walsh, 1991; Vallance, 1995). Students did not reveal sensitivity to the museum's embodied authority. For example, even when asked directly about how it felt to undergo security screening upon entering the museum, none of the students I spoke with felt uneasy with this requirement. It may be that students are familiar with "policing" from other environments, as awareness of surveillance and security has increased in recent decades. Further, students readily spoke of future museum visiting and even the possibility of working in museums one day, without revealing that they felt they would not be welcome in these future roles. Yet the elements of control and discipline, formal presentation of academic knowledge, and the symbolic power of objects imbue the museum with a keenly felt sense of institutional authority sufficient to invoke the self-awareness about behaviors, particularly around talking. Crista provided another view into students' field trip experiences. She opined, "I think a lot of students feel their skin color when taken to a museum." This is "partly why museums are important," she said.

> Crista: Seeing students who I hope to motivate to do something greater with their lives, greater than just middle school, and wanting to give them opportunities to see different people, whether it's in the museum or when we're walking down the street in the city itself, those are good lessons for life, to learn how to interact with someone who may not be very warm to you and it shows. What do you do in those situations?

Although Crista professed a personal love of museums originating in childhood, she added that she has had negative experiences when she brings students on field trips and has been unhappy with the lack of warmth and welcomeness directed at her group. In exposing students to field trip experiences, Crista suggested a greater urgency to helping students recognize that outside of the school environment, they will encounter situations in which they will have to negotiate

difference.

In the preceding pages, I presented three key themes that emerged from the findings and discussed them in light of phenomenological analysis that describes students' lived experiences of field trips. These characteristics of students' experiences described here are appreciation and empathy, the desire for autonomy, and learning as a social activity. These individual characteristics are interdependent, making them difficult to separate into distinct features. However, what unifies all three is emotion in both students' responses to their learning experiences and their desire for connection, with each other and to a larger world through discovery that begins with the self. This pleasurable, aesthetic experience of learning reported by students points to a sense of personal satisfaction gained through self-interested exploration of their environment. The medium of story, expressed in objects, spaces, and individuals in out-of-school settings, allows students to enter a "shared space" with another and come to understand their life world and experience. The experience of learning converges with empathy to shape understanding of and tolerance towards human experiences. The museum as a stimulating environment offers many ways for students to pursue this type of self-interested learning. Not only is self-interested learning motivated, it is also fun when the expectations for learning in the out-of-school environment are met. These qualities make for pleasurable learning experiences that include a sense of deep emotional satisfaction through interaction with objects and spaces that evoke feelings of connection to another place and time and awaken us to what we take for granted in terms of the human condition.

By contrast, the performance-driven emphasis of school learning establishes motivations for learning that leave little satisfaction for students. Learning at school is work-like, consisting of both effort and obligation (Jensen, 1994). The mechanical aspects of school learning result in

experiences that are interrupted and constrained by the structure of the school day and its

emphasis on institutional goals and control. Dewey (1934/1980) describes learning that "submits

to convention in practice and intellectual procedure" (p. 40) as lacking the unity necessary for the

pleasurable, aesthetic experience of learning. The structure and content of reform-centered,

urban schools do not emphasize symbolic engagement with ideas and creativity or learner-

centered activity. As such, museum field trips are not seen as supporting the goals of school that

serve poor and minority children, which are primarily raising test scores. Students miss out on

subject matter knowledge that will appear on achievement tests and have limited opportunities to

engage in academically and socially enriching learning experiences in school. To this point,

Henderson and Atencio (2007) write,

> Failure to learn is the direct result of being excluded from participating. Children
> need to be afforded access and opportunity in order for them to contribute and in
> order for them to gain knowledge and interest from such participation (p. 245).

Moreover, if students are not expected to be museum visitors by virtue of education and social

class, then it is all too easy to withhold field trips with the simple justification that such

experiences are not for them. In this way, school maintains existing social arrangements that

perpetuate differences in socializing children into museum visiting by erecting technical and

structural barriers that limit particular learning opportunities.

The significance of this analysis points to a clearer understanding of *What is lost?* When

field trips are not offered, students lose opportunities for pleasurable, aesthetic experiences of

learning that add to their capacity for empathy as well as enlarge understanding. The

possibilities for self-discovery and understanding others, how to be in the world, and a sense of

connection to human history, are unrealized. The excitement of encountering evidence and

sense-making through visual and sensory engagement in the environment goes unknown, and experiences that nourish our sense of humanity are denied. When these positive experiences of learning and the satisfaction that come from them are not offered to all students, those who remain "absent" miss out on an experience of enduring value that can shape attitudes toward lifelong learning. Such experiences in childhood are important to future behavior and attitudes toward learning generally, and museums in particular, where educational inequities are mirrored in the visitor population.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

> *Our obligation—schools' and museums'—to [provide both the*
> *listening skills and good stories to listen to] is a serious one, for*
> *developing well-educated listeners and a well-educated citizenry,*
> *able to analyze arguments, see connections, make responsible*
> *interpretations and decisions about the world, is our shared goal*
> (Vallance, 1995, p. 13).

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory, phenomenological inquiry was to describe students' field trip experiences and present their perspectives in order to shed light on the importance of these opportunities in the context of school life. This exploration resulted in three analytic categories (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012), from which key themes emerged that describe the nature of students' experiences on field trips. These themes illustrate what students gain from field trips in terms of their personal, social, and intellectual development, and provide a rationale for why field trips are significant experiences in the context of one's formal education. The following discussion elaborates on the themes to highlight their importance in the larger context of museums and education reform.

The first theme that emerged from this study describes students' feelings of appreciation for museums, and empathy for humankind, as a result of their field trip experiences. The middle-school students who participated in this study hold positive views about museums and their visitors. Their early, personal histories with museums have provided an enduring sense of relationship to these institutions, affirming research on the impact of childhood socialization on future museum visiting attitudes and behaviors (Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997). Consistent with the tenets of constructivist and affective learning (Falk & Dierking,

1992; Hein, 1998; Schauble et al., 1998), the sense of lasting connection to museums is rooted in the personal meanings and emotions learners attach to their experiences in these settings. The out-of-school environment encourages students to explore educational content in personally satisfying ways that involve imagination and feeling. These qualities engage students in the emotional dimensions of learning and promote higher levels of interest, motivation, and satisfaction (Paris, 1997); and also help forge the identity of a future museum visitor and lifelong learner. Learning in the museum can influence identity (Falk, 2006; Rounds, 2006; Kelly, 2007) because affective learning transforms personal beliefs, interests, and attitudes by cultivating insight into the self and others. In the real-world context of field trips, students gain insight into the broader human condition in ways not possible in school, and importantly for adolescents, during a period in human development when the capacity for empathy rises (American Psychological Association, 2002).

The differences between learning in the classroom and in out-of-school settings are striking. When we move away from the written word to interpret visual and material culture, we actively engage the imagination through sense-making and reflection on the multiple meanings that are expressed by non-textual forms. An object, image, or expressive space, and the historical, cultural, and aesthetic qualities each present, is capable of drawing the viewer's attention to qualities that command sustained observation and analysis. This type of learning experience stands in contrast to the structural and technical arrangements of school and its emphases on cognitive gains and quantifiable outcomes; on the other hand, out-of-school learning "awakens" us from routines and encourages conscious engagement with the world (Greene, 1977). Dewey (1934/1980) describes learning that "submi[ts] to convention in practice and intellectual procedure" (p. 40) as lacking the unity necessary for the pleasurable, aesthetic

experience of learning; however, the affective aspects of learning in the out-of-school environment provide the unity to the experience that makes it truly educative. The importance of this is directly connected to learning motivation, a process that involves the combination of choices in what to learn, how to learn, persistence at learning, and continued motivation (Paris, 1997). When learning is pleasurable it becomes intrinsically motivating. Out-of-school learning offers opportunities for engaging emotionally with educational content that satisfies one's personal interests, while at the same time broadening appreciation for the experience of others through a sense of human connection.

While future museum visiting is a well-documented outcome of early museum experiences, as noted above, field trips also contribute to the social and emotional development of students with long-term effects that we cannot know today. For example, empathy raises consciousness and tolerance, which, in turn, can guide behavior towards positive social engagement (Höge, 2003; Jermyn, 2001; Sandell, 1998). In experiencing empathy on field trips, students gain insight into the conditions of others, which can lead to awareness of structural inequalities and disparities, as well as to actions that effect social change (Segal, 2011, p. 267). Likewise, the cultivation of students as lifelong learners and as citizens who participate in civic life through cultural participation confers personal benefits that extend far into the future, as the students of today become parents and introduce their own children to the larger world. These outcomes contribute positively to individuals and society in ways that complement and strengthen the goals of formal education, as well as support a vision of public education that promotes healthy citizenship and equality.

The second key theme emerging from this study is that students desire autonomy as learners. Analysis of student interviews revealed the desire to learn independently in the out-of-

school setting, a realization by students that surfaces when the environment offers personally interesting opportunities that can satisfy their individual interests. Echoing research by Griffin (2004) and Jensen (1994), students in this inquiry did not appreciate being overly guided on field trips. While they generally do not object to passive activities such as reading, listening, or having the teacher guide their experience when they are in school, these classroom activities clash with the affordances of the out-of-school learning environment, and when the setting is changed, the contrast becomes quite apparent to them. Museums present multiple objects placed side-by-side that may be viewed in any order; pathways through exhibits that may be explored in random patterns; and multi-sensory environmental features that may be attended to according to the learner's preferences. These possibilities for self-initiated exploration and discovery make field trips enjoyable experiences for students, and highlight the motivating aspects of learning in the out-of-school environment (Paris, 1997; Griffin, 2008). Unfortunately, it is a fairly common that students feel constrained by classroom management and instructional approaches on field trips (Griffin & Symington, 1997; Griffin, 2004). While students can "check out" from reading, listening, and accepting guidance as they move between active and passive involvement in any learning environment, in the out-of-school context there is a higher level of engagement that is attenuated when these instructional elements from the classroom impinge on the experience. In desiring autonomy as learners, students are also discovering for themselves that classroom instructional routines interfere with their ability to learn and act independently and according to their own interests.

At the same time, even though students desire greater independence from guided learning and feel the interference of classroom structures more acutely when in the out-of-school environment, their perceptions reveal an abiding view that learning is equated with classroom

routines (Griffin, 1994; Griffin, 2008). Students express a sense of conflict as they enact their classroom roles in the museum environment, illustrating how school influences their perceptions of, and expectations for, learning. Reading, for example, is viewed as an onerous, but legitimate, learning activity in the museum environment; likewise, observation or simply "just looking" often does not fit the expectation of a learning activity. Students recognize legitimized forms of learning from school, and participate to some extent, even as they experience classroom expectations as interfering with their enjoyment of the out-of-school environment. However, while students negotiate the constraints placed upon them as formal learners in the informal environment, ultimately the experience is perceived favorably because there is a high level of engagement, interest, and emotional involvement to render a positive outcome. Perceptions about learning as enjoyable or not have been shown to persist throughout one's lifetime (Griffin, 2008; Prince, 1990; Hood 1983) and can contribute to persistence that leads to continued educational attainment. The fun and enjoyable aspects of field trips may foster greater awareness of the pleasurable features of learning, and consequently support positive attitudes towards education by reversing negative or unpleasant perceptions based on experiences at school. Students come to view themselves as learners through their experiences at school, and self-evaluate their relative ranking or success in that environment (Brown, 1988). When students in "failing schools" end up with less enrichment and more testing, how can we expect public education in the current era of reform to positively shape students' attitudes toward learning or academic persistence?

The third theme to emerge from this study addresses learning as a social activity. Despite positive experiences learning in out-of-school settings, most of the students in this inquiry feel that the social aspects of school make it a preferable environment for learning because they are

allowed to interact more freely with their peers and teachers. Although socially mediated learning is a hallmark of the museum experience (Schauble et al., 1998; Falk & Dierking, 1992), students are not afforded the same type of freedom to interact as other types of museum visitors (Hein, 1998). Expectations for their behavior outside of school are communicated by teachers and museum personnel, which influence students' feelings of being able to freely interact and converse with each other while on field trips. The expectation of unspoken, conforming behaviors in museums has been documented by researchers as a reason why some individuals feel inhibited by visiting museums and thus chose not to attend (Walsh, 1991; Schwarzer, 2006). Of course, concerns about behavior will never be overcome without exposure to the museum environment. However, inhibitions regarding museum behaviors and appropriate types of interaction within them may be less revealing of students' preference for learning at school than demonstrative of the powerful influence that the social context of the classroom holds on students' expectations for learning. The routine of the school day includes a predictable social arrangement in which the patterns of interactions and expectations are clear, but in a different environment, the delicate ecology of the classroom is easily disrupted. In the classroom, students feel freer to say what they want and the balance of conversation between teacher and student is more dialogical, making it a more socially comfortable learning environment than the museum.

The classroom environment confers both social and academic learning experiences (Ryan & Patrick, 2001), which are qualitatively different from learning in out-of-school settings in important ways. The classroom as a social unit operates in a particular way and reveals how students and teachers interact as a part of learning experiences. When the classroom context is removed and the social unit is introduced into a new environment for learning, possibilities open

up, and at the same time, new challenges are presented, as interpersonal and social learning relationships are recast in a setting unlike the predictable environment of school. Expectations from the classroom and the dynamics of social interaction within it are important elements in how students experience learning. School as a mechanical process socializes us into routines, rather than adaptations to use the mind flexibly in solving the problems of the world or to find new forms of expression and discovery. The open-endedness of the museum experience allows for personal interest and knowledge to flourish, while bringing individuals into dialogue with each other, as we come to make sense of our shared visual and material cultural heritage. It is through this attention to human experience that the potential of education "to move people to critical awareness, to a sense of moral agency, and to a conscious engagement with the world" (Greene, 177, p. 120) offers the greatest promise of being realized.

Recommendations for Policy and Educators

The factors that inhibit museum visiting by minorities demonstrate the powerful impact that the intersections of race and class have on lifelong participation in the arts, as a result of less exposure to curricular knowledge, lower rates of early socialization into museum visiting as children in both family and school contexts, and lower levels of educational attainment as adults (Iyengar et al., 2009; Falk, 1993; DiMaggio & Ostrower, 1990). While this inquiry did not produce findings supporting differences in educational opportunities for field trips at the participating school sites, the problem of unequal access to arts instruction and enriching experiences, such as field trips, is well-known (Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012; Keiper et al., 2009). The meaning of field trip experiences to the students who participated in this inquiry illuminate

why these opportunities are important: Students experience empathy through encounters with objects, spaces, and individuals; they are able to exercise a greater degree of intellectual and physical freedom to learn according to their own interests; and they come to appreciate learning as a social activity in which their peers and teacher play an important role. All of these outcomes contribute personally, socially, academically, and emotionally to the development of young people who will influence and shape the future of our global society. School districts in urban areas need to reassess the role of the museum in the basic education of youth, many of whom are in danger of social exclusion and face more barriers to participation in cultural activities. These children influence our destiny, too, and their success (or failure) to safeguard humanity and our planet will stand as a record that demonstrates how well we, as a society, removed barriers to educational opportunities that foster equal standing as citizens. Administrators should consider the value of informal learning experiences in meeting the democratic aims of public education when making decisions about how to make use of funds. The value is incalculable. What other short-term educational experience is known to have such impact? A half-day field trip can result in powerful, enduring, outcomes and impressions. To what extent can we say this is true for educational experiences at school?

Museums also allow for individual learning that lead to unexpected outcomes for students. Both museum- and school-based educators should offer approaches that cater to the developmental needs of adolescents (Griffin, 2004; Griffin & Symington, 1997). To capitalize on the unique characteristics that learning in out-of-school settings afford, possible structures and itineraries could be offered in advance of the outing that could serve as a starting point to be amended by students according to their interests and desires. Because interest and motivation combine to influence behaviors (Paris, 1997), allowing students to pursue what is of most

interest to them personally is intrinsically motivating and can result in a deeper engagement in learning. This approach is similar to how family groups interact in museum settings, in which children are allowed greater choice and control over how they proceed through the informal learning environment (Falk & Dierking, 1992; Paris, 1997). School-based educators should allow students to define their experience of the museum and back away from performance expectations to support their sense of mastery in the learning environment. The open-endedness of the museum experience fosters essential skills of engagement, attentiveness, and persistence, which are analogous to the independent learning skills students need throughout middle school, high school, and beyond. Such skills can be nurtured through field trip experiences that allow students control of their learning and are not typically cultivated in the classroom.

An important consideration in allowing students more autonomy in guiding their experience is ensuring that they feel comfortable in the museum. The school-group context carries with it patterns of social interaction from the classroom that do not always encourage self-initiated effort. The relationships between peers and between students and teachers are disrupted in the out-of-school setting, and can contribute to feelings of social inhibition. Given that all learning is socially mediated (Brown et al., 1989), peer interactions on field trips should be encouraged, with school- and museum-based educators coming to an understanding that the school context for learning highly influences how students will want to interact in the museum. While there may be higher levels of social interaction among students at school, such interactions are context specific and are guided by routines and a milieu that are quite different from the out-of-school setting. Museum staff must make an effort to acquaint themselves with prospective student visitors in advance of their arrival in order to gain an appreciation for how they may feel socially in the museum and identify ways to ameliorate feelings of discomfort and

encourage peer-to-peer dialogue.

Because there is evidence that museums treat school groups differently (Hein, 1998), suggesting more control is exerted on them, museums must reconsider what kinds of learning experiences are best for visiting adolescents. Docent-led tours may be a poor choice for middle-school aged visitors because this communicates the expectation for quiet and is perceived as passive and in conflict with adolescent interests and the stimulating environment. A possible amendment would be to limit docent interaction to a brief introduction to the museum environment. The docent could then "float" among the school group as a resource for students when they desire guidance. Given the desire for peer socialization, docents close in age to the students (for example, high school student-docents) are likely to be more effective in engaging student attention and facilitating discussion. At the very least, as noted above, museums need to communicate to school-aged visitors that talking is expected, normal, and to be encouraged in the museum environment.

Adolescence is a time when offering students opportunities to exercise self-regulation coincides with their increased desire for independence. In addition, older children develop greater interest in expanding their intellectual range. Unfortunately, it is also a period when older children begin to lose connection with museums (Lemerise, 1995). Their lives become busier, and the perception of families that museums are settings for young children results in fewer visits as children age. Although they are maturing, most children in this age group are still too young to visit museums on their own with friends, even if the location is close by. While museums offer many out-of-school time and field trip programs aimed at young children, there are only a handful of quality programs directed for teens, particularly during out-of-school time. For the most part, older children are overlooked. This is an area of collaboration where

museums and schools can come together to create more opportunities for students to spend time in museums in learning and leadership roles.

Further Research

The importance of childhood socialization is well-documented in the literature examining museum visitors (Falk, 1993; Piscitelli & Anderson, 2001; Kindler & Darras, 1997; Wilkening & Chung, 2009); however, the experiences of older children are not addressed in any depth (O'Connell, 1979; Asia & Andrews, 1979; Lemerise, 1995), leaving a gap in understanding of the importance of museum experiences for this group. More research is needed as regards adolescents in museums, with an emphasis on the social and emotional aspects of museum learning for this age group. In particular, research that presents students' perspectives is needed to explore what they desire from their learning experiences and what they gain from field trips. How teachers themselves were socialized into museum visiting can shed light on the values they place on museum visiting for their own students as they act as advocates for these types of educational experiences. A new area for visitor studies research could focus on in-service teachers' museum socialization experiences. Finally, there is very little consolidated data on field trips. Reports of their decline (Terrero, 2012; Nassauer, 2009; DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008) do not accurately represent the impact of the loss in ways that robust, numeric data can. Quantitative data can be grasped quickly to convey changes in the landscape and thus mobilize advocacy. A publicly available clearinghouse of data on schools and museums would be a useful resource, with rigorous standards for data collection and classification that make clear that institutions are reporting comparable data, would be a valuable resource to researchers.

My initial interest in why differences persist in museum audiences has led me into new terrain, as I have come to understand the significance of field trips at a deeper level. Through this effort I have a clearer understanding of what students gain from these experiences, a better sense of the finely tuned needs and preferences of individual learners, and a greater appreciation for complexity of the learning process itself. My thinking has moved far afield from the view that everyone should visit museums out of a naïve sense of their intrinsic value, to recognizing museums as places where authentic learning can take place of a sort many children never get to experience in the classroom environment; and, perhaps, more importantly, where students can be moved toward empathy. Along the way, examining choices in curricular knowledge has become a new passion, as I have come to see better the hopes, dreams, and fears of adolescent learners as they negotiate a world hostile to students, youth, and public education.

Returning to the idea of *What is lost?*, posed at the beginning of this work, I offer some personal reflections. When field trips are not offered, students lose opportunities for pleasurable, aesthetic experiences of learning that add to their capacity for empathy as well as enlarge understanding. The possibilities for self-discovery and understanding others, how to be in the world, and a sense of connection to human history, are unrealized. The excitement of encountering evidence and sense-making through visual and sensory engagement goes unknown, and experiences that nourish our sense of humanity are denied. When these positive experiences of learning and the satisfaction that come from them are not offered to all students, those who remain "absent" miss out on an experience of enduring value that can shape attitudes toward lifelong learning, cultivate tolerance, combat feelings of social exclusion, and facilitate sharing in civic and cultural life. In the current context of school reform, can we truly justify that the

cost of buses, time away from standardized curricula, and the value placed on outcome-driven education is greater than all of *this*?

These realizations lead me to consider the larger question of how to move forward on field trip advocacy. If standardized test scores are upheld as the guarantee of adequate preparation for post-secondary study and the world of work, we are setting up countless children for a colossal injustice. Considering the skills and abilities needed to attain educational and economic success, and the continual change we see in workplace opportunities, emphasizing basic literacy and numeracy over rich and challenging educational experiences sets students on an early path to nowhere. Many of the skills and abilities with the most currency, assets that open up possibilities and provide personal enrichment and pleasure, originate from a humanistic education that involves the exploration of ideas and the skills of communication, analysis, and sense-making. Instruction in the arts and humanities is well-served in museum environments, and are essential in providing the type of preparation for academic pursuits, careers, and civic life that distinguishes individuals as educated citizens. Such experiences are provided to children in better-resourced family and schools through field trips, arts instruction, even travel, leaving behind children who do not have the same opportunities by virtue of their socioeconomic and familial circumstances. Students with advantages gain the cultural capital to leverage their broader exposure to curricular knowledge for securing college seats and jobs that are remote opportunities for less advantaged students. It is simply not enough to require a standardized test score of a certain measure as equal education by proxy without also offering learning opportunities that truly prepare individuals for a participatory life outside of school walls. Given that disparities in museum audiences fall along lines of social class and race and echo long-standing inequalities in our society, advocating for school field trips as an important educational

opportunity is a matter of social justice. The problem of field trips is a clear illustration of educational inequity that museums are poised to reform.

Appendix A: Student Interview Guide

1. Before you visited the [museum name] on [date], had you been to a museum?

2. Tell me about your past experiences with museums.

   - What museum(s) did you visit?
   - What parts of your past experiences with museums stand out for you?
   - Who did you visit the museum with?
   - What did you see there?
   - What was your favorite thing to see or do at the museum?
   - What about least favorite?

3. Before the field trip, what did you know about the [museum name]?

   - How did you find out about the museum?

4. Tell me about your experience using [museum name] resources. What activities did you do in class to learn about [subject area]?

   - What did you like best/least about using these materials? Why?
   - What are some things you learned about [subject area] from using these materials? How did you learn this?
   - Did you learn anything about the museum from using them? Can you give me an example?

5. What are your favorite things to do and learn about in school?

6. Tell me about your field trip. What things about the experience stand out for you?

   - What did you do?
   - What did you see?
   - What are some new things you learned about [subject area]? How did you learn this?
   - What was your most/least favorite part of the field trip? Why?

7. What things about the museum stand out for you?

   - What objects/exhibits/spaces/people/activities made an impression on you? Why?

- Did you learn anything about the museum that you didn't know before? How did you learn that?

8. When you think of learning about [subject area] in the museum and in the classroom, how do the two experiences compare?

- Did you prefer one type of experience over the other? Why?
- How did the experience of the museum affect you?
- Has this experience changed your views about museums at all? Tell me about it.

9. What do you think is the reason for learning about [subject area]?

10. Is there anything you would like to learn about that you don't get to study in school?

11. What type of person goes to museums?

12. What are some reasons why someone might like going to museums? What about dislike?

13. Do you think you will visit museums in the future?

14. Could you see yourself working in a museum one day?

15. Is there anything else about your experience of learning about [subject area] in the museum or in the classroom that stands out to you that you would like to share?

Appendix B: Teacher Interview Guide

1. Not all teachers use museum resources in class with their students or take them on field trips. Why do you?

2. What do you see is the value of using museum resources with your students? (By museum resources I mean both materials that can be brought into the classroom physically or virtually, as well as in-person visits to the museum.)

3. What influences your decision to use such resources?

4. How do your students respond to these resources?

5. What kinds of things do you do to prepare students before their field trip and as follow-up?

6. Has your preparation in museum education sponsored trainings exposed you to the tenets of informal learning (for example, allowing students choice, control, and autonomy)? If so, are you able to incorporate any of these into your practice either in school or at the museum?

7. Tell me about your experience on the field trip.

8. What kind of feedback did you get from students after the field trip?

9. What do you see as the main obstacles to making use of museum resources as a part of the curriculum?

10. Please tell me a little about your own history as a museum visitor.

References

American Association of Museums. (1992). *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

American Psychological Association. (2002). *Developing Adolescents: A Reference for Professionals*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Anderson, D., & Lucas, K. B. (1997). The effectiveness of orientating students to the physical features of a science museum prior to visitation. *Research in Science Education*, 27(4), 485-495.

Anderson, D., Piscitelli, B., Weier, K., Everett, M., & Tayler, C. (2002). Children's museum experiences: Identifying powerful mediators of learning. *Curator*, 4(5), 213-231.

Anderson, D., & Zhang, Z. (2003). Teacher perceptions of field-trip planning and implementation. *Visitor Studies Today*, 6(3), 6-11.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67-92.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 12-41.

Anyon, J. (2006). Social class, school knowledge, and the hidden curriculum: Retheorizing reproduction. In L. Weis, C. McCarthy, & G. Dimitriadis (Eds.), *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education* (37-45). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Barker, R. L. (2003). *The Social Work Dictionary*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Beiers, R. J., & McRobbie, C. J. (1992). Learning in interactive science centres. *Research in Science Education*, 22, 28–44.

Birney, B. A. (1988). Criteria for successful museum and zoo visits: Children offer guidance. *Curator*, 31(4), 292-316.

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation: A Roadmap From Beginning to End* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (2008). The forms of capital. In N. W. Biggart (Ed.), *Readings in Economic Sociology* (280-291). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. doi: 10.1002/9780470755679.ch15

Boyd, W. L. (1993). Museums as centers of learning. *Teachers College Record*, 94(4), 761-770. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org

Bradshaw, T., National Endowment for the Arts, & Jack Faucett Associates. (1998). *1997 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts: Summary Report*. Washington, DC: National

Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/Survey.pdf

Bradshaw, T., Nichols, B., & National Endowment for the Arts. (2004). *2002 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/NEASurvey2004.pdf

Bransford, J., & Stevens, A. (2005). The LIFE Center's lifelong and lifewide diagram. Seattle: LIFE Center. Retrieved from http://life-slc.org/about/citationdetails.html

Brown, A. L. (1988). Motivation to learn and understand: On taking charge of one's own learning. *Cognition and Instruction*, *5*(4), 311-321. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3233575

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.

Carey, N. L., & National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs95/95082.pdf

Carey, N. L., & National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1999-2000*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002131.pdf

Conn, S. (1998). *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Covington, M. V. (1992). *Making the Grade: A Self-Worth Perspective on Motivation and School Reform*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Csíkszentmihályi, M., & Hermanson, K. (1995). Intrinsic motivation in museums: What makes visitors want to learn? *Museum News*, 74(3), 34-7, 59-61.

Csíkszentmihályi, M., & Robinson, R. E. (1990). *The Art of Seeing*. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Csíkszentmihályi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols and the Self*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College*

Record, 106(6), 1047-1085.

Dewey, J. (1934/1980). *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigree.

DeWitt, J., & 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. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10645570802355562

Dierking, L. D. (1989). The family museum experience: Implications from research. *The Journal of Museum Education*, 9-11.

DiMaggio, P., & Ostrower, F. (1990). Participation in the arts by Black and White Americans. *Social Forces*, 68(3), 753-778. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2579352

DiMaggio, P., & Useem, M. (1978). Social class and arts consumption: The origins and consequences of class differences in exposure to the arts in America. *Theory and Society*, 5, 141-161.

Egan, K. (1986). *Teaching as Storytelling*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ellerson, N. M., & McCord, R. S. (2009). *One Year Later: How the Economic Downturn Continues to Impact School Districts.* Alexandria, VA: American Association of School Administrators. Retrieved from https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Resources/files/OneYearLater%20FINAL.pdf

Engel, S. (2010, April 26). Putting the child back into the school. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org.

Falk, J. H. (1993). *Leisure Decisions Influencing African-American Use of Museums*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Falk, J. H. (1998). Visitors: Who does, who doesn't, and why. *Museum News*, 77(2), 38-43.

Falk, J. H. (2000). Assessing the impact of museums: A note from the guest editor. *Curator*, 43(1), 5-7.

Falk, J. H. (2006). An identity-centered approach to understanding museum learning. *Curator*, 49(2), 151-166.

Falk, J. H. (2009). *Identity and the Museum Visitor Experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (1992). *The Museum Experience*. Washington, DC: Whalesback Books.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (1995). Recalling the museum experience. *Journal of Museum Education*, 20(2), 10-13.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (1997). School field trips: assessing their long-term impact. *Curator*, 40(3), 211-218.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2000). *Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Falk, J., & Storksdieck, M. (2005). Using the contextual model of learning to understand visitor learning from a science center exhibition. *Science Education*, 89(5), 744-778.

Farrell, B., & Medvedeva, M. (2010). *Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums*. Washington, DC: AAM Press. Retrieved http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/publications/Demographic-Transformation.pdf

Fein, G. G. (1985). Learning in play: Surfaces of thinking and feeling. In J. L. Frost & S. Sunderlin (Eds.), *When Children Play: Proceedings of the International Conference on Play and Play Environments*. Wheaton, MD: Association for Childhood Education International, 45-53.

Finlay, L. (2009). Debating phenomenological research methods. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 3(1), 6-25. Retrieved from http://www.phandpr.org/index.php/pandp/article/view/40

Fivush, R., Hudson, J., & Nelson, K. (1984). Children's long-term memory for a novel event: An exploratory study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* 303-316.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: BasicBooks.

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Husserlian Approach.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Greene, J. P., Kisida, B., & Bowen, D. H. (2014). The educational value of field trips. *Education Next*, 14(1), 78-86. Retrieved from http://educationnext.org/the-educational-value-of-field-trips/

Greene, M. (1977). Toward wide-awakeness: An argument for the arts and humanities in education. *Teachers College Record*, 79(1), 119-125. Retrieved from http://www.maxinegreene.org/pdf/articles/toward_wide_wakeness.pdf

Griffin, J. (1994). Learning to learn in informal settings. *Research in Science Education*, 24, 121-128.

Griffin, J. (2004). Research on students and museums: Looking more closely at the students in school groups. *Science Education*, 88(11) S59-S70.

Griffin, J. (2008). Learning about learning and teaching: "You don't learn in there, you play," In Aubusson, P., & Schuck, S. (Eds.), *Teacher Learning and Development*, 145-162.

Griffin, J., & Symington, D. (1997). Moving from task-oriented to learning-oriented strategies on school excursions to museums. *Science Education*, 81(6), 763-779.

Hatano, G., & Inagaki, K. (1987). A theory of motivation for comprehension and its application to mathematics instruction. In T.A. Romberg & D. M. Steward (Eds.), *The Monitoring of*

School Mathematics: Background Papers. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Hein, G. E. (1998). *Learning in the Museum*. London: Routledge.

Hein, G. E. (1991). How children behave in museums, *ICOM Education*, 12, 52-57.

Henderson, T. Z., & Atencio, D. J. (2007). Integration of play, learning, and experience: What museums afford young visitors. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(3), 245-251.

Hochschild, J. L. (2003). Social class in public schools. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(4), 821-840.

Höge, H. (2003). A museum experience: empathy and cognitive restoration. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 21(2), 155-164.

Holzer, D., Scott, D., & Bixler, R. (1997). The long-lasting effects of early zoo visits. *Curator*, 40(4), 55-257.

Hood, M. G. (1983). Staying away: Why people choose not to visit museums. *Museum News*, 61(4), 50-57.

Hood, M. G. (1993). The African-American museum visitor: Who comes, who does not come, and why? The art museum visitor and non-visitor. *Visitor Behavior*, 8(2), 5-10.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1995). A museum educator's perspective. In A. Chadwick & A. Stannett (Eds.), *Museums and the Education of Adults*. Leicester, UK: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, 49-64.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1999). Education, communication and interpretation: Towards a critical pedagogy in museums. In E. Hooper-Greenhill (Ed.), *The Educational Role of the Museum* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, 3-27.

Housen, A. (1992). Validating a measure of aesthetic development for museums and schools. *ILVS Review*, 2(2), 213-237,

Illinois State Board of Education. (2014). Illinois interactive report card. Retrieved from http://iirc.niu.edu/Classic/District.aspx?source=Profile&districtID=15016299025&level=D

Iyengar, S., Bradshaw, T., Nichols, B., & National Endowment for the Arts. (2009). *2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://permanent.access.gpo.gov/gpo35469/2008-SPPA.pdf

Iyengar, S., Shewfelt, S., Ivanchenko, R., Menzer, M., & Shingler, T. (2013). *How a Nation Engages with Art: Highlights from the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/highlights-from-2012-SPPA-rev.pdf

Jensen, N. (1994). Children's perceptions of their museum experiences: A contextual

perspective. *Children's Environments*, 11(4), 300-324.

Jermyn, H. (2001). *The Arts and Social Exclusion*. London: Arts Council of England. Retrieved from http://culturability.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files_mf/1271756791theartsandsocialexclusion.pdf

Keiper, S., Sandene, B. A., Persky, H. R., & Kuang, M. (2009). *The Nation's Report Card: Arts 2008*. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED505664.pdf

Kelly, L. (2007). Visitors and learning: Adult museum visitors' learning identities. In S. J. Knell, S. MacLeod, & S. Watson (Eds.), *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and are Changed* (276-290). London: Routledge.

Kindler, A. M., & Darras, B. (1997). Young children and museums: The role of cultural context in early development of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. *Visual Arts Research*, 23(1), 125-141.

Kindler, A. (1998). Aesthetic development and learning in art museums: A challenge to enjoy. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22(2&3), 12-16

Knapp, D. (2000). Memorable experiences of a science field trip. *School Science and Mathematics*, 100(2), 65-72.

Kohn, A. (2000). Standardized testing and its victims. *Education Week*, 60, 46-47.

Kridel, C. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lamont, M., & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural capital: Allusions, gaps, and glissandos, *Sociological Theory*, 6(2), 153-168.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leinhardt, G., & Gregg, M. (2002). Burning buses, burning crosses: Student teachers see civil rights. In G. Leinhardt, K. Crowley, & K. Knutson (Eds.), *Learning Conversations in Museums* (139-166). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Leinhardt, G., & Knutson, K. (2004). *Listening in on Museum Conversations*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Lemerise, T. (1995). The role and place of adolescents in museums: Yesterday and today. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 14(4), 393-408.

Lester, S. (1999). *An Introduction to Phenomenological Research*. Retrieved from www.sld.demon.co.uk/resmethy.pdf

Lewin, T. (2010, April 21). Museums take their lesson to the schools. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/

Lichtman, M. (2012). *Qualitative Research in Education: A User's Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lindauer, M. A. (2006). Looking at museum education through the lens of curriculum theory. *Journal of Museum Education*, 31(2), 79-80.

Lipman, P. (2004). *High Stakes Education: Inequality, Globalization, and School Reform*. New York: Routledge/Farmer.

Lord, B. (2007). What is museum-based learning? In B. Lord (Ed.), *The Manual of Museum Learning* (13-19). Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

McCaslin, M. (2006). Student motivational dynamics in the era of school reform. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(5), 479-490.

McManus, P. (1994). Memories as indicators of the impact of museum visits. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 12, 367-380.

Mehta, A. (2009, June). Arts education opportunities, achievement gap remain. The Dana Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.dana.org/

Michie, M. (1998). Factors influencing secondary science teachers to organise and conduct field trips. *Australian Science Teachers Journal*, 44(4), 43-50. Retrieved from http://members.ozemail.com.au/~mmichie/fieldtrip.html

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nassauer, S. (2009, October 28). Bad trip: School outings get downgraded. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/home-page

New York City Coalition for Educational Justice. (26 March 2010). *Beyond School Closings: Effective Alternatives for Low-Performing Schools*. Retrieved from http://www.nyccej.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/CEJ-Turnaround-PaperFinal.pdf

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115 - Stat. 1425 (2002).

Noguera, P. A. (2004). Standards for what? Accountability for whom? Rethinking standards-based reform in public education. In K. A. Sirotnik (Ed.), *Holding Accountability Accountable: What Ought to Matter in Public Education School* (66-81). New York: Teachers College Press.

O'Connell, P. (1979). *Adolescents and Museums: A Final Report Prepared for the National Endowment for the Humanities*. Sturbridge, MA: Old Sturbridge Village Museum Education Department.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (2008). Keeping track: Structuring equality and inequality in the era of accountability.

Teachers College Record, 110(3), 700-712.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1992). Detracking schools: Early lessons from the field. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(6), 448-454.

Olson, J. K. (1999). *A Qualitative Analysis of the Field Trip Experience: A Formal Trip in an Informal Setting*. Paper presented at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching Annual Meeting, Boston.

Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2002). Motivational factors and the visitor experience: A comparison of three sites. *Curator*, 45(3), 183-198.

Paffenroth, K., & Kennedy, R. P. (2003). *A Reader's Companion to Augustine's Confessions*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 178.

Paris, S. G. (1997). Situated motivation and informal learning. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22(2/3), 22-27.

Parsad, B., & Spiegelman, M. (2012). *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1999-2000 and 2009-10*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012014rev.pdf

Philipp, S. F. (1999). Are we welcome? African American racial acceptance in leisure activities and the importance given to children's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(4), 385-403.

Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is Curriculum Theory?* (2nd). New York: Routledge

Pinar, W. F., & Reynolds, W. M. (Eds.). (1992). *Understanding Curriculum as Phenomenological and Deconstructed Text*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Piscitelli, B., & Anderson, D. (2001). Young children's perspectives of museum settings and experiences. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 19(3), 269-282.

Prentice, R., Davies, A., & Beeho, A. (1997). Seeking generic motivations for visiting and not visiting museums and like cultural attractions. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 16(1), 45-70.

Prince, D. R. (1990). Factors influencing museum visits: An empirical evaluation of audience selection. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 9(2), 149-168.

Rabkin, N., & Hedberg, E. C. (2011). *Arts Education in America: What the Declines Mean for Arts Participation*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED516878.pdf

Ramey-Gassert, L., Walberg, H. J., III, & Walberg, H. J. (1994). Reexamining connections: Museums as science learning environments. *Science Education*, 78(4), 345-363.

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2011). *Reason & Rigor: How Conceptual Frameworks Guide Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Rennie, L. J., & Johnston, D. J. (2004). The nature of learning and its implications for research on learning from museums. *Science Education*, 88(Supplement 1), S4–S16.

Resnick, L. B. (1987). The 1987 presidential address: Learning in school and out. *Educational Researcher*, 16(9), 13-20, 54. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0013-189X%28198712%2916%3A9%3C13%3AT1PALI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-X

Rice, K., & Feher, E. (1987) Pinholes and images: Children's conceptions of light and vision. *Science Education*, 71(4), 629-639.

Roberts, L., & Garden, C. B. (1992). Affective learning, affective experience: What does it have to do with museum education? *Visitor Studies: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4, 162-168.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1976). *Making Inequality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rounds, J. (2006). Doing identity work in museums. *Curator*, 49(2), 133-150.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 437-460.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sandell, R. (1998). Museums as agents of social inclusion. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 17(4), 401-418.

Sauerwein. K., & Bosch, R. (2003, March 15). Tight school budgets spell fewer field trips. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/

Schank, R. C. (1990). *Tell Me A Story: Narrative and Intelligence*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Schauble, L., Leinhardt, G., & Martin, L. (1998). A framework for organizing a cumulative research agenda in informal learning contexts. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22(2 & 3), 3-8.

Schiro, M. S. (2012). *Curriculum Theory: Conflicting Visions and Enduring Concerns*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Schroeder, K. (1994). As they like it. *Educational Digest*, 59, 63.

Schwarzer, M. (2006). *Riches, Rivals and Radicals: 100 Years of Museums in America*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Segal, E. A. (2011). Social empathy: A model built on empathy, contextual understanding, and social responsibility that promotes social justice. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 37(3), 266-277.

Shedd Aquarium. (2011). Shedd Aquarium 2011 Annual Report. Retrieved from http://www.sheddaquarium.org/pdf/Annual_Report.pdf

Shedd Aquarium. (2013). Annual Impact Summary. Retrieved from http://www.sheddaquarium.org/pdf/publicrelations/EAC1401_2014_Impact_Summary_FINAL.pdf

Stanage, S. M. (1987). *Adult Education and Phenomenological Research: New Directions for Theory, Practice, and Research*. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.

Storksdieck, M. (2001). Differences in teachers' and students' museum field-trip experiences. *Visitor Studies Today*, 4(1), 8-12.

Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural capital and educational attainment. *Sociology*, 35(4), 893-912. Retrieved from http://soc.sagepub.com/content/35/4/893

Swan, D. W. (23 August 2013). Kindergarteners' visitation to libraries and museums. [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://blog.imls.gov/?p=4060

Terrero, N. (2012, January 12). School budget cuts lead to less field trips. Retrieved from https://static.nbclearn.com/files/nbcarchives/site/pdf/56674.pdf

Vallance, E. (1995). The public curriculum of orderly images. *Educational Researcher*, 24, 4, 4-13. Retrieved from http://edr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/24/2/4

van Manen, M. (1984). Practicing phenomenological writing. *Phenomenology + Pedagogy*, (2)1, 36-69.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Walsh, A. (Ed.). (1991). *Insights: Museums, Visitors, Attitudes, Expectations: A Focus Group Experiment*. Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and The J. Paul Getty Museum.

Weil, S. (2007). The museum and the public. In S. Watson (Ed.), *Museums and Their Communities* (32-46). London: Routledge.

Weller, A. S. (1985). *Museums for a New Century*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Wellington, J. (1990). Formal and informal learning in science: The role of the interactive

science centers. *Physics Education*, 25, 247-252.

Wilkening, S., & Chung, J. (2009). *Life Stages of the Museum Visitor: Building Engagement Over a Lifetime*. Washington, DC: AAM Press.

Williams, K., & Keen, D. (2009). 2008 *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved from http://arts.gov/sites/default/files/2008-SPPA.pdf

Wing, L. (1995). Play is not the work of the child: Young children's perceptions of work and play. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 10, 223-247.

Wolins, I, S., Jensen, N., & Ulzheimer, R. (1992). Children's memories of museum field trips: A qualitative study. *Journal of Museum Education*, 17(2), 17-27.

Working Group for School Transformation. (2012). *The Way Forward: From Sanctions to Support.* Retrieved from http://annenberginstitute.org/pdf/SchoolTransformationReport.pdf

End Notes

[1] The National Endowment for the Arts' Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) is the nation's largest population survey of arts participation trends. The SPPA only asks about art museum and gallery attendance, not attendance at other types of museums. The Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) collects visitor data on visits to science-related museums, zoos, aquaria, art, history, and other types of museums.

[2] In 2013, the Mayor of Chicago initiated an arts education plan requiring that all 400,000 students in the public schools receive two-hours per week of arts instruction. It remains to be seen whether this plan will result in greater utilization of the free admission policy at Chicago museums.

[3] Schools designated as Title I have a population with at least 40% of students coming from low-income families.

[4] "Accountability means using the results of student assessments to improve teaching, evaluation, compensation, and retention by encouraging and rewarding effectiveness and discouraging and punishing ineffectiveness. Innovation means using standards, assessment, and accountability to improve schools through such innovations as implementing merit pay, supporting charter schools, and promoting collaborations between business leaders and educators" (Schiro, 2013, p. 202).

[5] The National Endowment for the Humanities Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) Surveys defines arts participation as having visited a museum or art gallery in the previous 12 months.

[6] Various types of memories studies have been undertaken with children and adults, and adults recalling childhood experiences. These studies include short-term memory studies, frequently aimed at determining what was learned on a museum visit, as well as recollection studies that focus on long-past experiences in museums.

[7] The names of schools, teachers, and students have been pseudonymized in this paper.

[8] The recruitment period coincided with major upheavals in the school district, precipitated by a change in administrative leadership that intensified simmering tensions with the teacher's union.

[9] Probation is one of three accountability designations that prompt remedial actions, for example, increased oversight to address performance deficiencies. Accountability designations are made according to current and trend performance on standardized tests and attendance statistics.

[10] The classroom and field trip observations are reported in the present tense to give the reader a vivid sense of "being there".

[11] As a reminder, the names of schools, teachers, and students have been pseudonymized in this paper.

[12] Interestingly, the requirement for silence is a limitation noticeably absent in students' descriptions about visiting as part of a family group. Interaction among family members is not perceived by students as discouraged in the museum, suggesting that museum personnel may interact differently with school groups (see Hein, 1998).

[13] As an outside observer, my impression at the Lincoln School was that students were fairly controlled. Although students were arranged in small groups, they also wore uniforms and sat in locked classrooms.