

MASTER THESIS

FINDING THE BALANCE BETWEEN LEARNING AND TRAVEL EXPERIENCE IN STUDENT FIELD TRIPS

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA SLOVENIA

July 31st 2015

YUE CUI

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ljubica Knezevic Cvelbar

EMTM Universities Faculty of Humanities, University of Southern Denmark Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona

AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT

The undersigned **Yue Cui**, a student at the university of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics, (hereafter: FELU), declare that I am the author of the master thesis entitled *Finding the balance between learning and travel experience in student field trips* written under supervision of **Prof. Dr. Ljubica Knezevic Cvelbar.**

In accordance with the Copyright and Related Rights Act (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, Nr.21/1995 with changes and amendments) I allow the text of my master's thesis to be published on the FELU website.

I further declare

- the text of my master thesis to be based on the results of my own research;
- the text of my master thesis to be language-edited and technically in adherence with the FELU's Technical Guidelines for Written Works which means that I
 - Cited and /or quoted works and opinions of other authors in my master thesis in accordance with the FELU's Technical Guidelines for Written Works and
 - Obtained (and referred to in my master thesis) all the necessary permits to use the works of other authors which are entirely (in written or graphical form) used in my text;
- to be aware of the fact that plagiarism (in written or graphical form) is a criminal offence and can be prosecuted in accordance with the Copyright and Related Rights Act (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, Nr.21/1995 with changes and amendments);
- to be aware of the consequences a proven plagiarism charge based on the submitted master thesis could have for my status at the FELU in accordance with the relevant FELU Rules on Master Thesis.

Date: July 31st 2015

Author's signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
1. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
1.1 Tourism and tourists	7
1.2 Education and Learning	8
1.3 Educational Tourism	11
1.4 Field Trip	16
1.4.1 Definition of Field Trip	16
1.4.2 Early Research on Field Trip	17
1.5 Learning Experience	26
1.5.1 The Definition of Learning Experience	26
1.5.2 The Dimension of Learning Experience	27
1.6 Travel experience	32
1.6.1 The Definition of Travel Experience	32
1.6.2 The Dimensions of Travel Experience	33
2. RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESIS	39
3. METHODOLOGY	41
3.1 Research Paradigm	41
3.2 Instrument Design	42
3.2.1 Interview	42
3.2.2 Questionnaire	44
3.2.3 Online Survey	45
3.2.4 Paper Survey	47
3.3 Sampling and Data Collection	47
4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	49
4.1 Socio-Demographic Profile	49
4.2 Empirical Analysis	54
4.2.1 Multiple Liner Regression Analysis (MLR. a)	54
4.2.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)	57
4.2.3 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Five New Factor (MLR. 1	b).63
4.2.4 Multi Linear Regression Analysis of Each Factor	67
4.3 Other Findings	78
4.3.1 Indicators not Mentioned in the List of New Model	78
4.3.2 Other Details Mentioned In the Interviews	80
5. CONTRIBUTION AND LIMITATION	82
5.1 Contribution to Theory and Practice	82
5.2 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	83
CONCLUSION	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
APPENDIXES	102

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Total number of mobility grants	10
Figure 2: Conceptualizing Educational Tourism	13
Figure 3: Parameters of educational tourism	14
Figure 4: Process of Virtual Field Trip Product Development	24
Figure 5: Illustration of the Selinda Model of Visitor Learning	
Figure 6: Experience model of student field trip	
Figure 7: Range of the field trip	
Figure 8: Purpose of the field trip	
Figure 9: Participant of field trip	
Figure 10: Major of the participants	50
Figure 11: Gender of the participants	
Figure 12: Age of respondents	
Figure 13: Education background of respondents	
Figure 14: Histogram of MLR. a	56
Figure 15: Histogram of MLR. b	66
Figure 16: Histogram of MLR. c	69
Figure 17: Histogram of MLR. d	72
Figure 18: Histogram of MLR. e	74
Figure 19: Histogram of MLR. f	76
Figure 20: New experience model of Student Field Trip	78

LIST OF TABLE

Table 1: Categories of Field Trip	17
Table 2: Construct Domain: the Service Experience	33
Table 3: Changing Concept of Safety and Security in the Tourism (1950–2010)	37
Table 4: Pool of Service Elements In Student Field Trips	43
Table 5: List of Constructs and Scale Items	45
Table 6: Summary of Socio-demographic profile	52
Table 7: Summary of descriptive statistics	53
Table 8: Model Summary of MLR. a	54
Table 9: ANOVA of MLR. a	55
Table 10: Coefficients of MLR. a	55
Table 11: Summary of Descriptive Statistics of EFA	57
Table 12: KMO and Bartlett's Test	58
Table 13: Summary of Total Variance	59
Table 14: Rotated Factor Matrix ^a	60
Table 15: Summary of Factor Loading	61
Table 16: Summary of the Cronbach's Aplha	63
Table 17: Variables Entered/Removed ^a	63
Table 18: Excluded Variables ^a	64
Table 19: Model Summary ^e of MLR. b	65
Table 20: ANOVA ^a of MLR. b	65
Table 21: Coefficients ^a of MLR. b	66
Table 22: Model Summary ^b of MLR. c	68
Table 23: ANOVA ^a of MLR. c	68
Table 24: Coefficients ^a of MLR. c	69
Table 25: Model Summary ^b of MLR. d	70
Table 26: ANOVA ^a of MLR. d	71
Table 27: Coefficients ^a of MLR. d	71
Table 28: Model Summary ^b of MLR. e	73
Table 29: ANOVA ^a of MLR. e	73
Table 30: Coefficients ^a of MLR. e	74
Table 31: Model Summary ^b of MLR. f	75
Table 32: ANOVA ^a of MLR. f	76
Table 33: Coefficients ^a of MLR. f	76

INTRODUCTION

Educational travel had existed in the classical age dating back to the pharaohs' time in Egypt (Gyr, 2010). The privileged Egyptians started the first journeys, visiting famous monuments and relics of ancient Egyptian culture. The Greeks had similar traditions of traveling to Delphi in order to seek answers from the Oracle, and participate in the Pythian Games or the early Olympic Games (Ludwig, 1990). In the middle ages, diverse groups came up with their own definition of travelling, according to their own needs. This gave rise to the traveling scholar movement in twentieth century, when journeys to famous educational institutions in France, England and Italy became both a custom and a component of education. The desire to explore the world emerged as a unique guiding principle (Opaschowski, 1996).

An early precursor of modern tourism came from the grand tour that was undertaken by young nobles between the 16th and 18th centuries with the intension to broaden one's education, mark the coming of age, and acquire social status. However, over the years, leisure and pleasure became increasingly important aspects of the grand tour (Opaschowski, 1996). Soon, the search for amusement and enjoyment implied an element of travelling as an end by itself. The "initial phase of modern tourism", between the first third of 19th century and around 1950, refers to all the developments, structures and innovations of modern tourism characterized by a prototypical upsurge in a middle-class culture of travel and its formation, popularization, and diversification, which prepared the way for a mass tourism recognizable to modern concepts of spending leisure time (Freyer, 1990).

In the recent development of tourism, there is a consensus that the enormous boom during the Post-World-War-Two period was connected to economic growth, technological progress, a high level of competition, and the creation of new destinations and travelling styles. From that point on, the mass tourism was gradually replaced by alternative tourism which focuses on specific products tailored to diverse demands. This segmentation fit into the central characteristic of modern tourism – diversification and specialization. Educational tourism is one of the fastest growing branch of modern tourism industry, designed to satisfy the need of education purposes during the trip (Freyer, 1990).

separate educational tourism into two Two major purposes categories: "Education-first" and "Tourism-first" (Ritchie, 2003). "Tourism-first" refers to excursions that prioritize tourism content such as "ecotourism and culture tourism", while "Education-first" values the educational aspect which always takes the form of school field trips. Field research or study has been used increasingly as an innovative method of higher education in recent years. Many university students have the chance to participate in travelling during their studies in higher education institutes through course-related field trips that form an important part of the learning experience. Excursions provide the students with the opportunity to observe and experience what they were taught in the classroom (Stainfield, 2000). This form of experiential learning is designed to stimulate the students' interests, and foster the links between theory and reality in order to help them engage in deeper learning processes. A wide variety of university disciplines, such as tourism management, geography, and anthropology, have a long history of offering excursions ranging from day-trips to couple weeks of international and domestic trips.

In educational tourism, participants will obtain a unique experience that combines learning and traveling together. As an explorer in the perspective of tourism and education, participants face the challenge of switching roles between tourists and students. Nowadays more and more participants would like to get rid of the name of "tourist" in favor of the term "explorer". However, due to a difference in the understanding of the pedagogical function in educational tourism, travel-providers often focus more on the leisure aspect. It is a challenge for travel-providers to design products with a good balance between education and leisure.

Therefore, there is an urgent need for field trip organizers and tour-providers to study this issue. With that in mind, the primary focus of this thesis is to answer the following research question:

How do field trip organizers and tour-operators balance learning and travel experience in student field trips?

This dissertation focuses on customer experience for different roles during the field trips in search of the paramount experiences to the satisfaction of overall experience and essential service elements of a successful field trip. To answer the question, this paper will utilize the first chapter to define the learning experience and the travel experience in the student field trips. The models for travel experience and learning experience are presented to provide a better understanding of the two experiences. An in-depth review of previous researches on field trips is also presented in this chapter. In the second chapter, the research model and hypotheses of this dissertation are introduced. The third chapter continues with details on the methodology undertaken in this research. The research paradigm is stated and data collection method is presented.

In the forth chapter, critical service elements in field trips are identified according to qualitative interviews, literature review, and panel expert opinions. A quantitative questionnaire and analysis examines the hypotheses in the research model. Furthermore, a discussion is also provided, together with some other findings from the results of interviews. The fifth chapter further describes the potential contributions of this dissertation to the theoretical and practical framework on education tourism, and continues with proposed suggestions for field trip operators on product design or marketing strategy in order to provide better customer experience. Finally, the limitation of this research and some recommendations are pointed out for future researchers.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Tourism and tourists

"Tourism is a social, cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes" (United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2014) The definitions of tourism vary due to the different perceptions of individuals and organizations as well as the motives of tourism. McIntosh et al. (1995:10) introduced the concept of sustainability in a system-based approach while defining tourism as "the sum of phenomena and relationships arising from the interaction of tourists, business suppliers, host governments and host communities in the process of attracting and hosting these tourists and other visitors", which includes the potential impact that tourists may have upon the host community and also includes "other" visitors such as students. Wever and Oppermann (2000) has modified the required 24-hour stay in the definition of tourist to be an overnight stay which considered a significant improvement. If a person's trip does not incorporate at least one overnight stay, the term excursionist will be applied (Weaver & Oppermann, 2000). According to UNWTO (2014), International tourist arrivals (overnight visitors) has reached 1 billion in 2012 and the number is expected to increase by 3.3% per year from 2010 to 2030 to reach 1.8 billion by 2030. International tourism receipts reached US\$ 1159 billion worldwide in 2013. Asia and the Pacific recorded the strongest growth with a 6% increase in arrivals, followed by Europe and Africa (both +5%). China has consolidated its position as the number one tourism source market in the world, spending US\$ 129 billion on international tourism.

However, the growth of tourism on a worldwide scale, coupled with the search for new destinations and experiences, have raised concern over the tourism impacts, and call for more sustainable or alternative type of tourism. The tourist marketplace became increasingly specialized and segmented, which resulting in the growth of niche markets such as ecotourism, adventure tourism, culture heritage tourism, creative tourism et cetera since 1980s. Moreover, the demand of educational and learning experiences within tourism seems to be increasing (CTC, 2001), and the rise in learning experience in tourism product has also stimulated the potential for educational tourism (Roppolo, 1996).

1.2 Education and Learning

Smith (1982:37) defined education as "the organized, systematic effort to foster learning, to establish the conditions and to provide the activities through which learning can occur". Kidd (1973) and Smith (1982) believe that there is no precise definition of learning because it can refer to a product (where the outcome is important), a process (which occurs during learning) and a function (the actual steps to achieve learning). Ritchie (2003) states educational tourism could be viewed in a similar way, as a product, process and function. As a product, the emphasis is on the outcome of the learning experience. While as a process or a function, it focuses on the means to the end which is to extend or apply previous study (Kalinowski & Weiler, 1992).

According to Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2001), economy and society tend to transition from industrial-based to knowledge-based with an increasing emphasis on extending learning beyond initial schooling. Through extending learning beyond schooling, individuals, communities and countries are able to better adjust themselves to current and future changes. Citizens are more likely to contribute to society through increased innovation,

business development and economic growth. The key features of developing education and lifelong learning is to achieve a more inclusive and fair society by making education more accessible, especially for less privileged members in society (DfES, 2008).

Governments have already put in tremendous efforts in developing the education industry. For instance in the UK, the British government initiated the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and a State Minister of Lifelong Learning and Higher Education in 2001. Meanwhile, the Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Department (ELLD) of Scottish Executive was established in order to be responsible for economic and industrial development, tourism, further and higher education, student support, and skills and lifelong learning in Scotland. ELLD promotes lifelong learning through policy development and funding for further adult education and higher education. The policies of Western governments towards lifelong learning have received a rise in the provision of post-secondary education together with a rise in economic development and prosperity.

The rate of expansion in higher education market is as fast as the rise in income levels in the developed countries. As a result, greater expenditure on education is provided by parents. Furthermore, Roppolo (1996) states that educational institutions will need to incorporate international experiences into their curriculum due to the growing interdependence among countries to provide benefits to both students and the tourism industry.

In 2012, at least 4 million students went abroad for education purpose, representing 1.8% of all tertiary enrolments globally. Countries like United States remain strong magnets for students who are seeking for high-quality education, while new destination countries and regional hubs are competing for a share of the revenue and transforming to intellectual capital of internationally mobile students. Australia and Japan, two traditional destinations in East Asia and the Pacific, are seeing their market chipped away by newcomers like China, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, Singapore and New Zealand, which hosted 6% of the global share of mobile students in 2012 (UNESCO, 2014).

These data include only students who pursue a higher education degree outside their country of residence (so-called "degree mobility") and exclude students who are under short-term, for-credit study and exchange programs that continues for less than a full school year (so-called "credit mobility").

Credit mobility can be defined as "a limited period of study or traineeship abroad (in the framework of on-going studies at a home institution) for the purpose of gaining credits" (European Commission, 2014). After the mobility phase, students return to their home institution where the credits are recognized and complete their studies.

In the recent 25 years, European Union has funded the Erasmus program which has enabled more than three million European students to spend part of their studies in another higher education institution elsewhere in Europe. In 2015, Erasmus+ allows mobility from other parts of the world to the "Program Countries" (the 28 EU Member States, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey), and for outgoing mobility for European students to go to "Partner Countries" (all other countries in the world). In the 2015 Call for Proposals, EUR 121 million is shared between the 33 program countries for mobility with 10 regions throughout the world. The numbers in Figure 1 demonstrate the total number of mobility grants for that region for international credit mobility projects selected in 2015 (based on a typical six month mobility period for a student).



Figure 1: Total number of mobility grants

Language learning, particularly English language learning has grown rapidly over the last few decades, especially in the case of developing countries. Graddol (1997) believes that the English language has become the global language, and it is therefore not surprising that the provision of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) courses established themselves into a global industry. English language learning can be

accurately described as a national obsession for the Chinese people. It is estimated that one-fifth the population studying English in most of their spare time with an expenditure of over \$60 billion per year on English language learning materials (Frank, 2006). Summer schools and English learning camps that take students to English speaking countries have become a new growing economic sector.

There appears to be a growth in tourism and an increase in "alternative" tourism experiences that include a growing number of educational and learning elements. The growing potential market for the travel and tourism industry amongst schools, universities and further educational institutions shall not be ignored and needs to be better understood by the tourism industry.

1.3 Educational Tourism

The early educational tourism could date back to the time of the Grand Tour, which was initially undertaken by scholars and aristocratic British youth as part of their education during the 17th and 18th centuries. The objective of the Grand tour was to teach and civilize participants through a series of studying tours lasting up to several years in some European destinations. Various courses could be taught, such as foreign languages, fencing, dancing, riding and foreign affairs (Ritchie, 2003). However, the participation moved over time from being solely an activity of the upper class and wealthy elite to the bourgeoisie, and later to the lower class and mass market (Gee et al, 1997). As a result, the tour was therefore shortened while activities and the number of destinations were condensed. This led to an increase in more general sightseeing and informal learning through travel (Steinecke, 1993). In the twentieth century, the original education value of travel facilitated the development of study abroad as a legitimate component of tertiary education in the western world (Kalinowski & Weiler, 1992). With formal and informal educational activities in tourism, education has more recently become an increasingly important and recognized component of travel activities and experience.

Edu-tourism is any type of program in which participants travel to a location either alone or in a group with the primary motive of engaging in or having a learning experience (Rodger, 1998). Educational tourists (edu-tourists) are "individuals or groups who travel to and stay in places outside their usual environments for more than 24 hours and not more than one year" for purposes including study, business, leisure and other activities (UNWTO, 2012) Ritchie (2003) defined educational tourism as "tourist activity undertaken by those who are undertaking an overnight vacation and those who are undertaking an excursion for whom education and learning is a primary or secondary part of their trip." He further stated the various categories of educational tourism which could include general tourism and adult study tours, international and domestic university and school students' travel, such as language school excursions and exchange programs. Educational tourism can be independently or formally organized and can be undertaken in a variety of natural or human-made settings.

Moreover, Ritchie (2003) provided a model to illustrate potential educational tourism market segments and relationship between education, tourism and the changing external environment.



Figure 2: Conceptualizing Educational Tourism

As shown in Figure 2, "Edu-tourism" and "adult educational" tourism is considered to be in the "tourism first" segment where education and learning is considered as an important part of the tourist experience but the itineraries are tourism oriented. On the other hand, the university and college student tourism, where travel experience may be secondary to the educational aspect or intentions, is considered as "Education first" segment which will be primarily discussed in this paper. Various segments could be distinguished by some parameters which defines the nature of educational tourism. Ritchie (2003) also contributed by identifying some parameters of educational tourism.

•	Parameters	
Minutes	Length of Time	Years
No Intentions	Intentions	Full Intentions
Multiple Purpose	Motivation	Sole Purpose
Limited Preparation	Preparation	Full Preparations
Informal	Formality Level	Formal
Natural	Setting	Human Made
•		

Figure 3: Parameters of educational tourism

Figure 3 shows that educational tourism experience can differ due to length of time, tourist intention, motivation, preparation, level of formality and the various settings where the educational tourist experience can be undertaken. Educational tourism could be a few hours tour to the museum or a semester study as an Erasmus student. Kalinowski and Weiler (1992) stated that educational tourism can serve a wide variety of purposes, varies from satisfying curiosity about other people to deepening the fascination for cultural heritage and historic places. It can comprise a diversity of activities and experiences in various settings and products. Kalinowski and Weiler (1992) explain that educational tourism goes "beyond a curiosity, interest or fascination for a particular topic. It involves a travel experience in which there is organized learning, whether that be formal or experimental".

Segmentation is to split a population down into sub-groups or segments based on similar characteristics, needs and buying behavior (Swarbrooke, 1995). Educational tourism consists of many different market segments and sub-segments, including international and domestic schools' tourism, international and domestic university students, and adult education or extension programs (Holdnak & Holland, 1996). Each of the potential educational tourism segment or sub-segment may have their preference towards education within their travel experience. It is very essential to consider these segments as to their characteristics, needs and preferences in order to best manage the overall experience of educational tourism. The three main types of segmentation are demographic and socio-economic, geographic and psychographic (Kotler, 2010).

Key factors of demographic and social-economic segmentation such as age, gender, employment and education are often important, dynamic, and interrelated determinants of demand. Age could play an important role in deciding the types of activities and experiences that appeal to someone on holiday (Devlin, 1993). Comparing to the older ones, younger travelers have higher tolerance for all types of new experiences and are thus likely to be more adventurous (Mill and Morrison, 1985).

Geographic segmentation uses the basis of geographic (climate, location) to develop market segmentation strategies. Research on tourist motivation has previously outlined that it is often associated with "escape" from one destination to another, whether this is to a different rural, urban, alpine or coastal environment.

Buying behavior and tourist demand are also influenced by sociological and psychological or mental forces. As Middleton and Clarke (2001) noted "some individuals are mentally predisposed to seek adventure, enjoy the risks and active vacation, whereas some seek environmental qualities often represented in eco tourism and others seek the self-development associated with cultural tourism."

Taking into consideration the three criteria for segmentation, in this research, we focus on the university student (between 18 to 30 years old) field trips that comes with an educational purpose to both international and domestic destinations.

The concept of educational tourism is imported from the western world to Asia, and has witnessed a strong potential of growth. In China, a strong increase in development is taking place in the market of educational tourism. According to statistics from an international educational tourism operator in China (Lianglimi, 2015), there were 350 thousand students who participated in educational tourism abroad in 2014. The expenditure reached 9 billion Chinese Yuan for 2014 and is predicted to achieve 12 billion Chinese Yuan by 2015 with a total of 500 thousand participants involved. The number is predicted to increase by 40% or more each year, which is going to cover different age groups. The aging population is going to rising star in the increasing market.

Of all the popular destinations of educational tourism in Chinese market, 50% of the market prefers the United States. Europe takes a share of 25%, while other Asian

countries and the Oceania shared 18% and 14% respectively. 70% of the people who choose US would like to take a short term study in the university while the rest 30% prefer to study American history, culture and society by sightseeing.

There are three main purposes for the educational tourism in Chinese market. 93% of the population intends to improve their language level. 63% of all the entire population would like to major in business while only 10% prefer studying architecture and art. With the growth of aging population, Asian countries like Japan, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan are predicted to become the popular destination for lower cost and high culture similarity.

1.4 Field Trip

1.4.1 Definition of Field Trip

A field trip refers to an organized journey by a group of people to a place away from their normal environment for the educational purpose of observation or non-experimental research. In some natural science disciplines, such as biology or geography, field trip is usually named field work, and was defined as "knowledge" learned in the classroom setting with improved observation and application in the field (Demirkaya & Atayeter, 2011). It provides students with the opportunity to see and experience what they have been taught in the classroom (Stainfield et al., 2000). Recognized as an effective means of pedagogy, field trip is applied to many areas of researches in higher education institutions. A wide variety of university disciplines, including nature science such as geography and biology, history, tourism management, media, music, have a long history of organizing student field trips that last between one day and a couple of weeks both internationally or domestically. The result can be a higher quality of learning and better graduates than would be the case without the presence of educational excursions in the curriculum (Wojtas, 1997).

The value of field trip was discussed dating back to 1950s. Margret and George (1955) stated the education aim field trip should satisfy:

- to enrich and extend the school curricula;
- to motivate and supplement class activities;
- to develop the abilities of students to plan and work together;
- to satisfy such urges as migratory instinct;

- to develop a better understanding of the community;
- to create better understanding between students and teacher;
- to practice good citizenship

Fuller et al. (2003) concludes in his study that students perceived field work to be beneficial not only to their learning which develops the subjects knowledge, and technical and transferable skills, but also some concomitant values like socially interaction with their lecturers and peers. The value of field trips lies particularly in providing students with a better sense of the real world and direct experience with concrete phenomena.

Previous researchers working in the field trip area come up with a lot of findings in various disciplines. The author has sorted them in different themes and presented the findings below.

1.4.2 Early Research on Field Trip

In the beginning of the field trip research, the benefit of field trip is recognized early. In Europe, travel has long been regarded as the great educator, and in the United Stated it was growing as one of the finessing means of supplementing and enriching the curriculum in the 1940s. The research in 1941 concluded several categories of field trip as shown in Table 1.

Categories of field trip	
The short walking trip	The day camp trip
The bus trip within the radius of the community	The week-end trip
The long bus trip to neighboring cities	The youth hostel trip
The exchange trip with other schools within	The long trip by train or bus
and without the city	
The orientation trip visit to prospective schools	The tour camp trip
	The permanent school camp

Table 1: Categories of Field Trip

It also emphasized the importance of the role of teachers, directors, communities and other stakeholders. The safety issue such as transportation safety is addressed. The care for the physically-challenged was also mentioned. It is also interesting to find that the article also states that the student contribution appear to dominate (Heaton, K. L., 1941).

First-hand Knowledge

In the field trip that James (1983) organized for the journalism students, the "on-site classes" and first-hand knowledge was emphasized. Students have opportunity to witness or even participate in the production, marketing, merchandising and researching of major films during the visit. Except for formal schedule, students could also select an organization or topic on their own interest to study in a flexible schedule. An assignment and evaluation was also required after the field trip. The students have received many practical experiences and a comprehensive acknowledgement of the media industry by encountering with the first-hand material.

Knowledge Sharing

In nature sciences, field trips are usually intended to illustrate and reinforce, at the site of occurrence, the concepts, facts and skills used in the area of nature science being taught (Keown, 1984). In terms of the planning of the field trip, Keown (1984) thought the events of the trip should have maximum carryover back in the classroom in relation to the course content. Keown (1984) further emphasized the importance of sharing the knowledge of "how-to" and "where-to" of successful field experience by teachers and the importance of assignment which presents the success of the class and outcome of individual's performance.

Discussion, which refers to "the theory and practice of group talk" (Brookfield &Preskill, 1999), provides a means for engaging in structured reflection. While structured reflection includes an interactive group dimension which begins with discussion. Arnold et al (1991) stated through discussion, experiences get "collectivized", allowing more voices to be heard and similarities and patterns among experiences to be identified. Brookfield & Preskill (1999) pointed the value of discussion as:

- To help participants reach a more critically informed understanding about the topic or topics under consideration
- To enhance participants' self-awareness and their capacity for self-critique.
- To foster an appreciation among participants for the diversity of opinion that invariably emerges when viewpoints are exchanged openly and honestly.
- To act as a catalyst to helping people take informed action in the world.

Safety

In terms of safety issue, Dunklee (1987) talked about the liability in the field trip for music school students. He stated that a music educator's legal obligation is to exercise reasonable care and supervision of students so that they would not get injured on field trips. He further noted that the school owes the same duty of care and supervision to take reasonable precautions to avoid foreseeable injuries to students who participate in mandatory field trips and excursions as would be owed to the students during the normal school days.

Indeed travel motivated by a quest for knowledge has long been recognized as carrying health consequences (Reid, 1995). Tourist health and safety risks are an integral feature of every part of the travel experience including: pre-travel planning; the trip from origin to the destination area (the travel stage); and personal safety and tourist health at destination (destination management) (Page, 2002). Field trip organizers need to consider the criminal and civil law of their own country and that of the country to be visited (Hunter-Jones, 2007). Travel risk in pre-travel stage or during travel should also be considered. Page (2002) provided a practical identification of key concerns that travelers worry during the pre-trip phase. This includes vehicle and handbag theft, currency exchange fraud, cash and credit card fraud and personal safety. Natural disasters, earthquakes and hurricanes have been no longer necessarily the primary deterrents as the tourists are increasingly likely to avoid destinations perceived to have problems with crime, terrorism and infectious disease (UNWTO, 2002).

During the travel stage, a number of travel-related conditions require forward planning. Motion sickness including land, sea and air-borne sickness as well as economy-class syndrome, can cause discomfort. The WHO (2004) guide offers particularly good guidance on preventative measures (Hunter-Jones, 2007). Hunter-Jones (2007) further listed the problem that could happen in travel stage, such as jet lag, which is common particularly in long-haul travel; disorientation, which is a common cause of accidents; and injuries, traffic accidents and the problem caused by consumption of alcohol. Reilly et al (1997) finds that the incidence of accidents within the first week of travel is high. The key factors influencing the nature of accidents and injuries on holiday include: location; the profile of tourist; the type of holiday; the type of activity pursued and level of competency (Hunter-Jones, 2007).

Hunter-Jones (2007) proposed the measures for managing risk by using guidelines from non-governmental organization like UNTWO and WHO, to identify potential

hazards and to provide measures from some specialist organizations including those dealing specialist travel needs to counteract problems.

The Goal of Field Trips

Kent, Gilbertson and Hunt (1997) has categorized the goal of field trip into: subject-specific, transferable/ enterprise skills and socialization and personal development. Lai (1999) analyzed the hidden agenda of the field trip includes objectives such as enhancement of staff-student relations, stimulation and enhancement of enthusiasm for study and development of respect for environment.

In the interviews that Demirkaya and Atayeter (2010) conduct, it is found that it is more efficient if the field trip is more organized and project-based. They also emphasized that student-student and student-teacher interaction has increased. Students began to observe the surroundings with the eye of profession not like an ordinary citizen after the field trip.

Preparation

Field trips generate participants' own interest and enthusiasm which makes the learning of inductive and deductive reasoning skills and problem-solving a pleasure (McKay & Parson, 1986). Douglas (2000), in his research about adult learning, states three critical aspects of a successful simulated field trip: preparation, implementation and post-field trip requirements. He believes that the key is that preparation must be viewed as a shared responsibility between participants and facilitator in not only the administrative preparations, but more importantly, in the setting of goals and objectives for the trip. In the preparation phase, reduction of student apprehension is also vital as learners must be physically and emotionally comfortable to maximize the learning opportunity. Orion (1993) points out the importance in the preparation stage of field trip is reducing the "novelty space" (psychological factors, geographical factors and cognitive factors) to the minimum, related to how familiar the student is with the place to be visited.

Klepper (1990) believes the preparation of field trip is the most important which determines success and failure. In the checklist he created, he listed the important issues organizer should pay attention such as secure administrative approval and be familiar with state laws on protected species. Klepper (1990) finally suggested providing sufficient well-planned activities to keep students busy.

In terms of topics preparation, Lewis (2010) gave some suggestion about the topic of

the project in a research about field trip of history class. He found that students appreciate the sense of mastery that can come from a topic that is broad enough to be significant but narrow enough to be reasonably explored.

Journals/Notes

Student worksheets are often used and occasionally criticized (Fry, 1987). Renner (1983) suggests that journals should be used in field trips to capture critical information such as what activities occurred, what was learned, the feelings and observations and questions that arose that were not answered. The writing not only helps with recall but also in clarifying feelings and attitudes so vital in active learning (Boud & Walker, 1991; Cranton, 1994; Renner, 1989).

Sullivan-Caitlin (2002) considered that while immersed in an experience, students' ongoing "journaling" provides a medium through which "they describe their activities and observations and reflect on their own reactions (intellectual and emotional) to these experiences". Journaling helps to recognize students' own personal resources; how much they can learn from each other; and how much they already know about a theme (Arnold Burke, James, Martin & Thomas, 1991). Jakubowski (2003) thinks that it is possible to move from individual meditation on an experience to something more structured, once individuals concretize their experiences.

Phases of Field Trip

Bitgood (1989)'s overview of field trip provided many practical perspectives about field trips. He summarized field trip into four phases which are: planning of the program, re-visit preparation, on-site activities and follow-up activities. And he pointed out that the planning session is the most important phase through the entire field trip. He (along with others, e.g., Eason & Linn, 1976; Screven, 1976) assumed that evaluation should be necessary part and should take place in all four phases on the field trip.

Bitgood (1989) points out that teacher's preparation has a vital influence on the outcome of the field trip experience and they may benefit as much as the students during the field trip. Steiner (1987) proposed a workable and useful scenario for field trip: planning sessions with guest speakers; discussion of assigned readings; presentation of research and potential project; intensive work during the trip and post-production consultation and exhibition.

It has been shown in several researches that students' prior knowledge of the environment is essential for successful accomplishment of the instructional objectives (Balling & Falk, 1982; Falk, et al., 1978; Martin, Falk, & Balling, 1981). Children in a novel environment may focus their efforts on learning about the environment rather than on learning the instructional material. In Falk's study (1989) conducted at the National Zoo, he found that students should be given a complete agenda so they know exactly what they will do and when in order to keep them attending to the instructional material. Melton et. al (1936) concluded in his research about museum tour that a pre-tour lecture could be more effective than exhibits. Moreover, the skills of the tour guide are also important.

Guided Tour

In many studies about guided tour(Melton etal. 1936; Stronck, 1983; Rennes, 1978) suggested that both structured(with guide) and unstructured(without guide) tours can be valuable for students. Structured tours could produce superior factual learning while unstructured tours appear to create more enthusiasm and interest in the subject matter. Bitgood (1989) assumed that it is wise to include both components in a field trip for maximum impact. He further talked about the size of the group which is obviously affecting the learning experience. Large groups in lectures and demonstrations may cause several potential problems like "distance from the instructional stimuli", "opportunity to interact with hands-on materials" and "space limitations".

Group Project

Brymer (1978) points out the importance of assigning tasks or topic based on the students' interest after finishing the obligated tasks, in his study on a field trip of hospitality students. He also agreed with smaller group size by dividing the big group into smaller ones if possible. He gave further suggestions on group management by selecting and training group leaders and having group meetings. To get the students involve in the field trip, he created some measures like attendance form which is counted in the grading system related to their certificate. He found out that a discussion after field trip provides a good opportunity for students sharing their experience and learn from each other. Steiner (1987) stated that field work requires students to work together to accommodate mutual needs and to cooperate in meeting significant professional as well as personal and interpersonal challenges.

Davis (2001) found that groups of four or five members work best, as they increase

each member's opportunity to express their opinions and participate actively. "This optimum size also increases the ability of all members to discuss and negotiate the rules and conventions of the learning community among the group and to ensure that one or two people do not monopolize control of the activities."

Skop (2009) further discovered that when organizing the field trip, including students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds, residential history or immigration status in the project could help with creating dynamic learning community. For scholars committed to issues of racism and inequality and whose objective is to broaden the participation of underrepresented minority groups in geography, field trip could be particularly foster a sense of appreciation of both diverse and multiple perspectives (Estaville, Brown and Caldwell, 2006).

Service Learning

The concept of service-learning was addressed through field trip by Jakubowski in 2003 for she regard field trip as one type of "service learning" in her paper of which the central theme is "learning through involvement". According to Jacoby (1996), "Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development." She also invited the concept of "community-based learning (CBL)" which refers to "any pedagogical tool in which the community becomes a partner in the learning process", to reflect the role of community. She further proposed two alternatives which are journals (Sullivan-Caitlin, 2002) and discussion for reflection which is the link that ties student experience in the community to academic learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Jakubowski (2003) further talked about the factors that influence the willingness of a students to experience action as follows: the student's degree of comfort with the dynamics of the teaching and learning process, the student's level of self-confidence, cultural experiences, how well the students understands the problem under consideration and previous experience working for social justice and change in community.

Virtual Field Trip (VFT)

According to Foley K. (2007), virtual field trip is defined as "a guided exploration through the "world wide web" that organizes a collection of pre-screened, thematically based web pages into a structured online learning experience". Sanchez,

A. el.al (2005) have discussed about the entire process of establishing a "virtual field trip", which includes market investigation in the preparation style, theoretical literature review and so on. The process of virtual field trip product development is presented as bellow:



Figure 4: Process of Virtual Field Trip Product Development

Learning Community

Skop (2009) proposes using field trip- based learning community as a way to foster informal interaction among students and faculty and to design environment and experiences that help students craft knowledge and solve problems for themselves (Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1998). Cross (1998) defines learning community as groups of students and faculty seeking to maximize human interaction and encouraging active and experiential learning outside the classroom. Skop (2009) discovered that field trip-based learning fits well with the learning community concept. It provides an environment that both students and teachers utilize their life experiences to develop meaningful intellectual interactions outside the classroom.

Maximizing the out-of-class academic experience is paramount for developing learning communities. Field study is an effective way to broaden, extend and deepen the intellectual content of undergraduate instruction by integrating theory and practice in a particular subject area outside the classroom (Davis, 2001). Field-based learning increases stimulate students to engage in academic work through the experience of applied knowledge. It also encourages students to develop their skills as

independent investigators. Informal discussions with faculty who incorporate field-based learning into their courses report that the practice has enhanced their teaching experience and improved the quality of their instruction (Skop, 2009).

Skop (2009) concluded that field trip created an environment where teachers, researchers and learners shares the consensual goal to support each other in learning; students are no longer simply "recipients of research" but become vital co-actors (Healey, 2005). While instructors become co-learners as new problems, unexpected issues and alternative perspectives emerge through their interactions with students in the field (Le Heron, Baker, and McEwen, 2006). Learning community members can likewise develop their own methods for testing proposed knowledge in ways they can share with the group and across situations and time. (Wilson and Ryder, 1996)

Tourism Impact

Kelner and Sanders (2009) conducted a field trip study of sociology tourism and pointed out some significance and impacts of tourism in the field trip. Transportation poses a major planning challenge for meetings primarily off-campus in different locations. Trip planning involves multiple site visits and conversations with potential guides. Learning about the mechanics of guiding is required in order to speak intelligently about sites when doing course planning. Seasonal weather conditions need to be taken into account when choosing which semester to offer the course and when to schedule the distribution of field trips across the semester. Demirkaya and Atayeter (2010) clarified that fieldwork should be carried out in parallel with the schedule and stressed the importance of choice of sightseeing, security measures, food & beverage and arrival.

Motivation

Alagona and Simon (2010) conclude three factors that contribute to an increase in student's interest and engagement in the environmental humanities which are field immersion experience; the small group dynamic and the curriculum design. Environmental educators have long recognized that venturing out of the classroom and into the field engaged learning in college-level courses in environmental science disciplines such as geology, ecology and meteorology (Elkins & Elkins, 2007; Fuller, 2006). Slattery (2001) and Stewart (2008) emphasize the importance of environmental history in outdoor education. A grading system is also recognized as a good stimulation to encourage consistently active engagement (Kelner and Sanders, 2009).

As the findings showing above, most of the research focus on the learning experience in the field trip but ignored the travel experience which is also an indispensable experience that has significant impact on the overall satisfaction of the experience. The majority of the university and college students are chronologically defined as belonging to the youth population (between 18 to 30 years old) and there are very few research in tourism area about this distinct population with different age level, various socio-cultural, education backgrounds and economic characteristics, to understand their travel needs, expectations and behaviors on vacation (Davies & Lea, 1995;Sirakaya & McLellan, 1997; Babin &Kim, 2001).

Josiam (1994) found that university students' holiday motivations encompass a desire of engaging in a combination of passive, social and hedonistic activities. The passive desire is related to relaxing, the hedonistic motivation is associated with a wish to "party and dance/drink", and the social activities include meeting /being with friends/relatives (Josiam et al., 1994). In contrast, students do not tend to be strongly motivated by educational, anthropological or employment-related issues (Chadee & Cutler, 1996). The behavior of students on holiday tends to reflect their motivations, in which passive, hedonistic and social activities predominate.

However, there is almost no research studying both learning and travel experience on student field trips. This paper is going to study the service elements in the perspectives of both learning and traveling, about their influence on the satisfaction of learning and travel experience. Furthermore, the impact of learning and travel experience to satisfaction of overall experience will be discussed as well. In this article, we focus on field trip that is organized by university or college for students between 18 to 30 years old in the purpose of learning and research to an international or domestic destination outside their institute including at least one overnight stay.

1.5 Learning Experience

1.5.1 The Definition of Learning Experience

Learning is an activity occurs when people want to make sense of an objective, which involves enhancing in knowledge, skills, understanding, values, feelings, attitudes and capacity of reflect (Dawson, 2006). Learning experience refers to any interaction, course, program, or other experience in which learning takes place, whether it occurs in traditional academic settings (schools, classrooms), nontraditional settings

(outside-of-school locations, outdoor environments), or whether it includes traditional educational interactions (students learning from teachers and professors) or nontraditional interactions (students learning through games and interactive software applications) (Education forum, 2013). Learning experience emphasizes the importance of interactions among learners and between learners and teachers, as integral to the development of an effective learning experience (Buraphadeja & Dawson, 2008).

Learning experience provides a way of thinking about what a learning intervention might be in the context of desired end goals and outcomes. It informs people on how to organize communication channels and modes, learning activities, and resources combining to best support the learning outcomes. In this context, the learning intervention could be perceived as a collection of pedagogical models and collections of resources that participate in shaping an individual's learning experience that are aligned with learning outcomes and positive actions that stem from the experience.

The learning experience in field trip will be defined as the interaction, course, program, or other experience take place during the field trip including all kinds of interventions aiming to organize communication channels and modes, learning activities, and resources to best support the learning outcomes.

1.5.2 The Dimension of Learning Experience

Many researches attempt to find out the dimensions or elements of learning experience in different fields. Norliza Katuk, Jieun Kim, Hokyoung Ryu (2013) applied a "Flow design framework" to measure the experience of e-learning. There are four dimensions discussed in their learning experiences: "control", "attention focus", "curiosity", and "intrinsic interest". Meanwhile, Anson C.Y. Tang, Nick Wong, Thomas K.s. Wong (2014) implemented a qualitative research on the learning experience of Chinese nursing students in an online clinical English course and identify 7 themes as essential factors: technical issues, adequacy of support, time requirement, motivation, clarity of course instruction course design, and relevancy of the course.



Figure 5: Illustration of the Selinda Model of Visitor Learning. Source: Perry. D (2012)

Perry (2012) developed the Selinda Model in the larger context of visitor learning from two years of dissertation research at the Children's Museum of Indianapolis in the late 1980s. According to Figure 5, the Model consists of three complementary perspectives on visitor learning: an outcomes perspective, an engagement perspective, and a motivations perspective. The Selinda Model of visitor learning provides a powerful, robust, and flexible construct for considering and facilitating learning that is useful for the ambitious and often nuanced aspirations of professionals working in not only museums, but also informal learning environments (Morrissey, 2012). Applying in the informal learning settings, it defined the learning experience as follows: learning as **outcomes** (a product); learning as **engagements** (a process); and learning as **motivations** (a desire).

1.5.2.1 Outcomes:

From an "outcomes" perspective, the focus is on what visitors take away from their

experience which could be, for instance, a new understanding, attitude, interest or desire to take action, a new skill, or a new way of thinking about oneself or the world. In addition to the traditional types of educational outcomes such as cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning, and in spite of increased attention to the wide range of affective outcomes (Roberts, 1991), there is a large assortment of less discussed and less studied outcomes, such as sparking interest, delayed learning, visceral learning, and wrap-around learning (Perry, 2002; Spock, 2000; Spock & Perry & Lewis 1997); adding to the experience bank (Ansbacher, 2002); behavioral change (Dotzour et al, 2002); and identity (Falk 2009; Rounds 2006; Silverman, 2010). Therefore, Perry (2012) concluded four broad categories of visitor outcomes: meaning, attitudes and actions, identity, and skills, which are presented hereinafter.

Outcomes-Meaning

By introducing two different kinds of meaning outcomes of museum visiting, which are developing islands of expertise and progressing along a knowledge hierarchy, Perry (2012) proposes a shift in the approach to how visitors understand museum exhibits and the messages they walk away with. It shifts the focus from the educational impact of the exhibit on the visitors to how effectively the exhibits contribute to visitor learning journey.

Outcomes-Attitudes and actions

Spock (2000) found that there has been increasing interest in the role that museums can play in helping visitors develop caring attitudes to the point that they take some action, whether that action takes the form of signing up for drawing class or even pursuing a particular career. It has been a mission for some museums that one of the outcomes of exhibit experiences will be the development of caring attitudes, and ultimately, the behavior among visitors (Dotzour et al, 2002; Gyllenhaal, 2001; Irvine, Saunders & Foster, 2000; Saunders, Birjulin & Myers, 1998).

Outcomes-Identity

Identity has been described as either an input or an outcome (Perry, 2012). "As an input, identity is a part of self that a visitor brings to the museum setting, for example, their prior knowledge, experiences, and who he or she is. As an outcome, identity represents what visitors became as a result of their museum visit, for example, how they see their place in the world and in relation to those around them differently." Identity as an outcome includes how visitors change in intimate and personal ways that are central to who they are and how they perceive the world.

Outcomes-Skills

Skills refer to the development of a new skill or learning of a different way of doing something. It also includes developing one's learning experience.

1.5.2.2 Engagement

Museum professionals came to be interested in the process of meaning-making, and understanding not just the outcomes (Simon, 2010), but the process and product of museum visits actually interfere with visitors.

Perry (2012) thinks all visitor experiences contain some emotional components. Intellectual engagements encompass all those cognitive and intellectual process that are taking place in the visitor's mind. Intellectual engagements include thought for instance. observing, hypothesizing, processes, comparing, analyzing, contemplating, recognizing and wondering. Csikszentmihalyi (1988) states the importance for the learner to get intellectually involved if any learning is to take place. It is an important component of learning experience that must be carefully and deliberately designed. Moreover, Perry (2012) stated that social interactions include all the many ways that visitors engage with one another socially, such as touching, arguing, gesturing, debating, making eye contact, laughing, standing in close proximity to one another and mirroring body postures.

1.5.2.3 Motivation

The third aspect of the "Selinda Model" is about motivations, the psychological needs and desires that affect visitors' ability to learn in informal settings. The model of motivations consists of 6 parts: communication, curiosity, confidence, challenge, control and play, which work together, resulting in intrinsically motivating visitor experiences.

"When folks go to a museum, they want and expect to be part of a successful dialogue between themselves and the museum (communication), to be surprised and intrigued (curiosity), to feel safe and smart (confidence), to be challenged and exposed to new ideas (challenge), to feel in charge of their experiences and to have free choice over what they do and where they go (control), and to be playful and have fun (play)." stated by Perry (2012). The results of the researches by professionals in the museum visiting area indicated that once these needs are met, visitors will engage with the exhibit in meaningful ways for extended periods and walked away with new understandings, new interests, and deeper appreciations for things they did not even know they were interested in (Perry, 1992). The following presents the findings of these researches.

Motivation-Communication: communication is an intrinsic motivation for informal learning environments. A primary reason for visiting museums is often a desire to be part of a communication process which includes communication between a) an exhibit and the visitors b) communication among the members of the group with whom one is visiting and c) communication as part of a guided tour.

Motivation-Curiosity: there are many methods to stimulate participants' perceptual and intellectual curiosity. For instance, the museum can stimulate interest by leaving some things unsaid – too little information can be frustrating, but if things are too obvious then curiosity can wane.

Motivation-Confidence: Perry (2012) thought that visitors will be motivated to learn in situations they feel "safe and smart". Success breeds a feeling of accomplishment and exhibits should guide the visitor through a "series of mini-successes".

Motivation-Challenge: confidence and competence should be balanced with an appropriate level of uncertainty and challenge. Ensure visitors are clear what is expected of them, but don't suggest that success will be automatic – participants will not feel challenged if they can just go through the motions and be successful anyway.

Motivation-Control: it is an important facet of the psychology of visitor experiences to have control over the environment. Visitors will feel in control when they have appropriate choices and the power to influence what is happening in the environment.

Motivation-Play: playing and the ability to engage the imagination are essential ingredients of free-choice learning. Visitors who have the most satisfying and enjoyable experiences are those who feel the most playful – playful with actions, ideas, thoughts, and all over".

The "Selinda model of visitor learning" is designed for informal learning or study such as museum visiting. Comparing to traditional teaching method in school, field trip is also an informal learning method which could be applied with "Selinda model of visitor learning" to understand the learning experience in field trips. The elements of learning experiences in the field trips would be developed through a literature searching, expert opinions seeking, and population sampling in field trip area to generate a large pool of scales items in order to measure the satisfaction of the field trip in terms of learning experiences. And these elements of learning experience will be sorted into the three experience dimensions above which are "Motivation", "Engagement" and "Outcomes".

1.6 Travel experience

1.6.1 The Definition of Travel Experience

The definition of travel experience has been discussed long time ago dating back to Boorstin (1964) who defines it as a popular act of consumption, and a contrived, prefabricated experience of mass tourism. In contrast, MacCannell (1973) believes it to be an active response to the difficulties of modern life, arguing that tourists are in search of "authentic" experiences in order to overcome the difficulties.

Cohen (1979) defines tourism experience as the relationship between a person and a variety of "center" by illuminating that the meaning of the experience is derived from a person's worldview, depending on whether the person adheres to a "center".

A general definition of travel experience may be drawn from the commonality of the studies by Hamilton-Smith (1987), Nash (1996), Page (1997), Pearce (1982), Ryan (1993, 1997), Smith (1989), Urry (1990), and Yiannakis and Gibson (1992). The original definition is from Ryan (1997) that "tourism experience is a multifunctional leisure activity, involving either entertainment or learning, or both, for an individual."

"Tourism is a collection of activities, services and industries which deliver a travel experience comprising transportation, accommodation, eating and drinking establishments, retail shops, entertainment businesses and other hospitality services provided for individuals or groups traveling away from home" defined by McIntosh and Goeldner (2002). McIntosh and Goeldner also perceived travel experience as the core component of tourism. Travel experience can be described as the subjective mental state felt by the participants. It is a composite of product, service or atmosphere that can meet the emotional needs of tourist (Tongxian Zhou, 2003).

In this article, we define the travel experience in the field trip as the mental state from the collection of tourism activities associated with transportation, accommodation, eating and drinking establishments, retail shops, entertainment businesses and other hospitality services provided for individuals or groups during the student field trips.

1.6.2 The Dimensions of Travel Experience

Otto & Ritchie (1995) implemented an exploratory research which comprised open-ended depth interviews with consumers of five different tourism services. A content analysis was performed on the results and an expert panel was used to sort the responses into 6 dimensions illustrated below:

Dimension	Examples
Hedonic	Excitement
	Enjoyment
	Memorability
Interactive	Meeting people
	Being part of the process
	Having choice
Novelty	Escape
	Doing something new
Comfort	Physical comfort
	relaxation
Safety	Personal safety
	Security of belongings
Stimulation	Educational and informative
	Challenging

Table 2: Construct Domain: the Service Experience

The "hedonic", "novelty" and "stimulation" dimensions are consistent with experiential benefits emerged from exploratory empirical research by Havlena & Holbrook (1986), Holbrrok & Hirschman.(1982) and Bello & Etzel (1985), among others. "Safety" constitutes the basis of the "Maslovian need hierarchy" and "comfort" has been documented as a fundamental benefit of the service encounter. Furthermore, the existence of interactive benefits in services consumption has been empirically corroborated and described by Hui & Bateson (1991) and Arnould & Price (1993).

Based on this domain model, after interviews with students who have taken field trip in the past and consulting with experts, this article will focus on student travel experience in field trip in perspectives of four domains which are "Hedonic", "Interactive", "Comfort" and "Safety". "Stimulation" focuses on educational and informative perspective which is overlapped with the learning experience. "Novelty" experience focuses more on participants' feeling about new environment which has no significant relation with services during the field trip. Therefore, in the research model of this article, we do not include theme of "Stimulation" and "Novelty".

1.6.2.1 Hedonic experience

Holbrrok & Hirschman (1982) defines hedonic consumption as those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of product usage experience. Multisensory refers to the receipt of experience in multiple sensory modalities including tastes, sounds, scents, tactile impressions and visual images. Berlyne (1971) thought that hedonic perspective posits efferent experiencing of multisensory impulses as an important form of consumer response which are not only to multisensory impressions from external stimuli by encoding these sensory inputs but also react by generating multisensory images within themselves.

There are two types of multisensory images which are historic imagery and fantasy imagery. It is unlikely that a consumer could generate a detailed multisensory imaginative sequence without having some access to relevant real experiences. Henceforth, multisensory imagery should be treated as a continuum from purely historic recollections to complete fantasy (Holbrrok & Hirschman, 1982). According to Izard & Beuchler (1980), emotions represent motivational phenomena with characteristic neurophysiological, expressive and experiential components which include feelings like joy, jealousy, fear, rage and rapture (Freud, 1995). The seeking of emotional arousal is posited to be a major motivation for the consumption of certain product classes such as novels, games and sporting events (Holbrook, 1980). Furthermore, Levy (1959) stated that emotional involvement is tied to the consumption of even simple products such as cigarettes, food and clothing.

The same can be applied to tourism products. Hedonic experience is one of the motivations of students participating in this study journey combined with tourism itineraries which is going to be presented by a series of service elements within the field trips and to be examined in this research.

1.6.2.2 Comfort

The concept of comfort is linked to the well-being of individual in a normal and desirable state which includes physical, physiological and psychological components (Slater, 1985). Physical and Physiological components are closely related to the surrounding environment which are objective elements and affect everyone similarly. The psychological one is more subjective, since individuals have different perceptions to the reality according to one's socio-demographic profile and personality traits.

María José Viñals, Maryland Morant and Lola Teruel (2014) identify three factors that condition psychological comfort which are Bio-climatic and safety factor, environmental factor including: a) space or setting where recreational activities take place, b) recreational activities, c) facilities and services, and visitors. Climate is a relevant factor when developing outdoors activities. The bio-climatic comfort can be defined as the state in which the body is willing to make the smallest effort to maintain the internal temperature. They also pointed out two assumptions that should be taken into account: basic facilities (welcome and information facilities, restrooms, signage, parking areas and trails) and facilities in perfect state of maintenance. Welcome and information facilities are the basic elements to provide trust and confidence to the visitors. Moreover, the complicate mental processes inherent to human beings are pointed out to have a big impact on visitors' psychological comfort (María José Viñals, Maryland Morant and Lola Teruel, 2014).

1.6.2.3 Interactive

The production and consumption of services generally involve a series of interactions between consumers and both the contact personnel and the settings that are provided by service organization (Eiglier and Langeard, 1977). From interpersonal (contact personnel and consumer) and human-environment (consumer and service setting) interactions, consumers attempt to get their needs and satisfaction. Therefore, perceived control is considered as a crucial determinant of the quality of the two types of interactions (interpersonal and human environment) that constitute the service encounter (Hui & Bateson, 1991). Proshansky, Ittelson & Rivlin (1974) further suggests that people tend to feel and behave more positively when they perceive having more control in the environment. Schutz (1966) suggests that a feeling of control is essential to having satisfactory interactions with other people.
During the field trips, interactions not only occur between the students and tour-provider but also within participants which will also have impact on travel experiences. The interactions concern the relationship a) among the individuals, b) between the individuals and the team, c) among the teams. Service elements reflecting the interaction experience such as pre-trip orientation, team building activities, group projects and social events will be studied in the part of empirical study in the later chapter.

1.6.2.4 Safety

In general, safety is the freedom from danger, risk, or doubt which involves physical security, financial security and confidentiality. Due to terrorist acts, local wars, natural disasters, epidemics and pandemics, the security of tourism has significantly decreased which made security much more important in the last two decades. The concept and scope of safety and security has been changing for the last few decades as in demonstrated in Table 3 complied by István Kôvári & Krisztina Zimányi (2011). Safety and security have always been an indispensable condition of providing qualified travel experience. More than any other economic activity, the success or failure of a tourism destination or operator depends on being able to provide a safe and secure environment for visitors.

Period	Main characteristic	Features, attributes
Mass tourism/	Safety and security	-Tourism security is a one or
1. 1950-1970	problem as one of the	two-dimension notion
	problem in tourism	-Only few elements of security issues are
	Simplified approach in	in focus (public safety, health safety, road
	perception of safety and	safety etc)
	security issues in tourism	-Within the elements of safety and
		security only a small number of factors
		were given importance (e.g. health and
		hygiene problems:1. drinkable water, 2.
		necessity of vaccination, 3.cleanness of
		toilets)
		-Security problems are localized in time
		and space
		-Security problems may effect the image
		of a city or country but not the image of a
		whole region
		-Travel related risks and problems are not
		raised on the international level of
		tourism industry (excluding international
		transport regulations
		-Solving problems of security depends
		mainly on the regulations of the national
		authorities
Mass tourism/	Period of enlargement of	-Additional risk factors appear in travel
1. 1970-1990	security concept in tourism	and tourism (airplane hijacking, terrorist
		actions as a tool of social struggle)
		-Threats on security reach regional level
		in some regions of the world (Middle
		East, Basque country etc.)
		-Beginning of a wider international
		cooperation related to security issues
		-Technical improvements in safety e.g.
		air transport)
		-WTO draws attention on safety, security
		of tourists (Hague Declaration on

		Tourism, 1989)
		-Compact but specific (that is to say not
		general) solutions are created (e.g. the
		case of El Al Israeli airlines)
Transition to	Period of complex	-Numerous new elements appear within
global tourism	perception of safety and	the tourism security issues due to the
1990-	security in tourism	omnipotent factors of globalization
		meaning that national/regional
		economies, societies and cultures become
		integrated through a worldwide network
		of communication (internet), mobility
		(tourism), trade of goods and services.
		(personal data security, environmental
		security, natural disasters, pandemics etc)
		– Security of travel has become a global
		problem that we cannot disregard
		– Number of destinations, situations and
		tourists affected by the lack of security is
		increasing
		- Lack of security causes regional
		stagnation or decrease in tourist flows
		and even on global level (9/11.)
		- Basic changes in security concept in
		travel and tourism, understanding the
		necessity of common actions

Table 3: Changing Concept of Safety and Security in the Tourism (1950–2010) The Safe experience is first and foremost the experience that must be satisfied in the student field trips. In addition to physical or financial security, health care and contingency plan also need to be addressed in the phase of preparation.

This research combined the results of exploratory research with a review of the literature in education, tourism, educational tourism and field trip. The exploratory research comprised open-ended depth interviews with students who have taken field trips before. A content analysis was performed and an expert panel was used to sort the responses into dimensions. The definition of the elements of travel experience of this research will follow this method to find out the domains and their respective elements reflected in the travel experience of field.

2. RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESIS

The main purpose of this study is to find out the impact of various experiences of field trips to the overall satisfaction. To identify the experiences related to field trips, this study applied three experience models, which are "conceptual model of educational tourism", "the Selina Model of Visitor learning" and the "Tourism service experience model", as mentioned in the literature reviews. This chapter presents the research model derived from the three models above (shown in Figure 6) and addressed the hypothesis of the research model in order to answer the research question.



Figure 6: Experience model of student field trip

According to the conceptual model of educational tourism, education and tourism are two major themes of the educational tourism. Therefore, learning experience and travel experience consist of the overall experience in field trips.

H1: learning experience positively influences the overall satisfaction of field trip.

H2: travel experience positively influences the overall satisfaction of field trip.

H3: learning experience has a stronger influence to overall satisfaction than travel experience.



Based on "the Selina Model of Visitor learning", learning experience was divided into three dimensions to measure which are "Motivation", "Engagement" and "Outcomes".

H4: Motivations in the field trip positively influences the learning experience.

H5: Engagements in the field trip positively influences the learning experience.

H6: Outcomes in the field trip positively influences the learning experience.

Based on the "Tourism service experience model", travel experience was divided into six dimension: "Hedonic" "Interactive" "Novelty" "Comfort" "Safety" and "Stimulations". However, according to interviews and expert suggestions, "Novelty" is not significant theme to field trip experience, and "Stimulations" was more or less overlap with "Motivation" experience in the learning experience. Henceforth, travel experience was discussed in four dimensions as "Hedonic", "Interactive", "Comfort" and "Safety" in this study.

H7: Hedonic experience positively influences the travel experience

H8: Interactive experience positively influences the travel experience

H9: Comfort experience positively influences the travel experience

H10: Safe experience positively influences the travel experience

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to answer the research question and examine the hypotheses and in the research model in order to identify the experiences that impact on the overall satisfaction of field trips.



3. METHODOLOGY

This research intends to find out which experience in the student field trip, learning experience or travel experience, has more impact on the satisfaction of overall experience, and which service element plays a more important role in the learning experience or travel experience. This is a descriptive study about experiences in students field trips organized by university or college because descriptive research contributes to the development of tourist profile, traveler typologies, travel experience description, tourism decision-making process, spatial distribution patterns of tourists movements/flows and tourism developments, tourism inventories and baseline database, upon which to measure future changes in tourism trend and impacts (Jennings, 2010). The author conducted both qualitative and quantitative studies. The qualitative study is performed to collect data about important service elements in the field trips through interviews. The quantitative study is applied in order to measure the impact of various service elements to respective different experiences. A survey is performed with participants who has taken field trip before to collect representative information about the relationships between service elements and experiences. The data gathered is then analyzed through the use of Statistical Package for the Social Science (abbreviated SPSS). The results are discussed in the analysis and discussion part presented in this article.

3.1 Research Paradigm

Paradigm is "a set of beliefs that guides action, whether of the everyday garden variety or action taken in connection with a disciplined inquiry (Guba, 1990)." Shawn, Dixon and Jones III(2010) defined paradigm as fundamental assumptions about what the world is like and how it should be researched according to a body of literature and also what the key objects of analysis should be.

This study is conducted under the stimulus of a post-positivism paradigm. In the ontological view, post-positivism acknowledges that truth can only be improbabilistically known (Jennings, 2010). Jennings (2010) further states that epistemological position should be objective although it is acknowledged that there might be researcher bias. In terms of methodology, post-positivism prefer quantitative, however, there has been a growth in mixed methods which combine quantitative and qualitative approaches. Willis (2007) comments that post-positivism can be viewed as

a more welcoming form of positivism for that the research uses methods such as survey and qualitative methods like interviews to collect detailed information and data. Many scholars view post-positivism as a modified scientific method for social science than positivism. In this study, qualitative interviews are performed to collect detailed information about service elements in field trips with student participants. A quantitative survey is later applied to measure the satisfaction of services and experiences during the past field trip experiences.

3.2 Instrument Design

3.2.1 Interview

Okaley (1981) defines interviews as pseudo-conversations that traditionally have set rules to follow. The semi-structured interview is open and allows new ideas to be brought up during the interview. It can be presented in the form of a list of open-ended questions, which adds some structure to the interview (Jenning, 2010), via face-to-face or computer assisted communication. The semi-structured interview determines multiple realities since it does not constrain the participant to following the researcher's prior reasoning. Detailed information regarding attitudes, opinions and values could be elicited to make up the disadvantage of scales that tend to reduce the participants' experience to numeric positions along a continuum (Jennings, 2010). Therefore, in this study, a semi-structured interview about past field trip experiences was applied to the European Master in Tourism Management (EMTM) 2013-2015 students.

EMTM students (2013-2015) have all participated in at least 3 field trips which included at least 1 overnight stay. They meet all the standards of sample in this study. For the reason of distance, the author conducted the interview via "facebook" chat and skype. There were in total 16 people participated in the interview. Two open-ended questions were asked as following:

- 1. Please write down **Service Elements** that you think are necessary or important in the **Learning experience** in the student Field Trip. For example: Orientation or introduction before departure, on-site lectures or certificate (5 or more)
- 2. Please write down **Service Elements** that you think are necessary or important in the **Travel experience** in the student Field Trip. For example: food & beverage, accommodation, transportation or free time (5 or more)

Many of the participants not only answer the question, but added explanations for their answer and suggestions for the future development of field trips. The information collected was organized and used in the "pool of service elements" (Table 4). The "pool" is developed based on the in depth exploration of the academic literatures as demonstrated in the literature review section and results of semi-structured interviews with participants of student field trips. It provided the possible index to be studied in this research.

Pool of service elemen	ts in student field trips
Learning Experience	
orientation: introduction about the subject	instructors and guides
learning materials (examples: relevant	workshop/ discussion among students,
articles, guidance book, video, brochures)	professors and entrepreneurs
relevant research topic	presentation of group project
group project	group activities including professors
compulsory field journal or notes	record of lectures, meetings and
requirement for students	presentations
competition or team challenge	assignment
on-site lectures from professors and	certificate or grading strategy
scholars	
meeting with representatives of local	evaluation/feed-back session
communities or business	
opportunity to interact with/interview	schedule and plan for the study
local people	
Travel experience	
orientation: itineraries, travel tips	insurance
free time	health care
team building activities	emergency solution
transportation	language assistance: translator
accommodation	visa assistance
food and beverage	currency assistance
organized guided tour	social events
selected sight-seeing or activities	platform for sharing pictures and contact
	information
organized games	place for night life

Table 4: Pool of Service Elements In Student Field Trips

3.2.2 Questionnaire

As a data collection tool, surveys have been used in the social science research for a long time (Cook, Heath & Thompson, 2000; Chang & Krosnick, 2001). Survey provides a way to collect descriptive, explanatory, predictive and evaluative data to take into account the overall objectives of the study (Babbie, 2004). Survey and questionnaires sometimes are used interchangeably, yet they are quite different in reality. Sarantakos (2005) points out that, in general, surveys are methods of data collection in which information is gathered through oral or written questioning. While oral questioning is known as interviewing and written questioning is accomplished through questionnaires.

In general, a questionnaire usually includes a set of questions with designated answers for respondents to choose. It helps to collect an organize information systematically which could be analyzed statically. The questionnaire in this survey is developed based on the "pool of service elements" (Table 4) and followed the suggestions from the expert panel.

The author invited two professors from EMTM program who has experiences of organizing student field trips and one guest lecturer from US who is expert of research methodology to participate in this research. They have generously provided many suggestions including the construction of the questionnaire. Based on the literature, interview and expert suggestion, the list of constructs and scale items was presented below in Table 5.

Construct	Scale items
Learning exp	erience
Motivation	
M1	Orientation: introduction of the subject; learning materials
M2	Up to date topic
M3	Provide and follow the schedule
M4	Opportunity to interact with local people
M5	Quality of professor lecture
M6	Competition between teams
M7	Visiting with local business
Engagement	

E1	Presentation of all group projects
E2	Workshop/ discussion among students and entrepreneurs
E3	Compulsory field journal or notes requirement for students
Outcomes	
01	Quality of assignment
O2	Quality of feed-back session
03	Certificate
O4	Record of lectures and presentations(ppt,video)
05	Gaining the relevant capabilities that will help me in future career
06	International learning environment
Travel experi	ence
Hedonic	
H1	Quality of organized guided tour
H2	Selected sight-seeing or activities
H3	Available free time
Interactive	
I1	Orientation: itineraries
I2	Team building activities
I3	Social events
Comfort	
C1	Transportation
C2	Accommodation
C3	Food & Beverage
Safety	
S1	Insurance
S2	Health care
S 3	Emergency solution

Table 5: List of Constructs and Scale Items

3.2.3 Online Survey

An online questionnaire was created in both English and Chinese, by using "Sojump", a professional wed-based survey software. Online survey could access to a diverse sample group with people of different ages, gender, nationalities. It is also cost-reduction and time-saving. There are many other advantages of online survey. First, online survey can be tailored logically and not all questions have to be displayed to all respondents (Selm & Jankowski, 2006). Second, Respondents could finish it anytime without any physical intervention. Once the survey is completed, the data is immediately collected and organized in usable format (Wright, 2005). The images, colors, logos and links can be easily added, modified or replaced with the online survey tool. "Sojump" provides various tables, charts and figures to present the results of each question, and users can download the data directly to different format of documents, such as Microsoft Word, Excel and SPSS. It is very efficient for users to collect and calculate data.

The online self-administered questionnaire has four parts. The first part was a filtering question to check if the respondents qualify as field trip (included at least one overnight stay in the past five years) participants. If the respondent has never taken a field trip before, then the survey will be finished. In the second part, the questionnaire led the respondents to recall one of the field trip he or she remember the best and collected data about characters of that field trip. In the third part, respondents rated on satisfaction of the experiences of field trip and service elements they have experienced with four-level scale. The forth section aims to collect demographic data such as gender, age, nationalities, major and education background.

The questions in section one, two and four were presented as simple close ended questions such as "In the last five years, have you participated in any field trip, which included at least one overnight stay, organized by university or college for the purpose of education or research?" with answer choices of "Yes" and "No". The questions in section three were demonstrated with four-level scale, which are "very unsatisfied", "unsatisfied", "satisfied", "very satisfied" and "I can't rate". The "neutral" opinion is also considered included in the "I can't rate" opinion. A copy of the complete final survey is presented in Appendix.

Veal (2006) & Jennings (2010) recommended researchers to use pilot test for better questionnaire design before survey. Therefore, a pilot test was conducted to test the wording of the questionnaire, sequence and layout. The pilot survey was sent to 10 students who have done questionnaire survey before to exam the comprehensiveness and refine the wording and layout. The questionnaire received some positive feedback also with suggestions on wording. Therefore, several changes have been made after the pilot test and the final version of online questionnaire is released on Facebook and Chinese biggest SNS application "Wechat".

3.2.4 Paper Survey

A paper survey was generated for the students who participated in the field trip named International Tourism and Hospitality Academy at Sea (ITHAS) from May 9th to May 16th 2015. ITHAS is an international study field trip organized by the University of Zagreb since 2006 with more than 100 participants from Germany, Croatia, Oman, Israel and students from EMTM of 23 nationalities. Different topic was chosen each year and the 2015 edition is "sustainable development in tourism destination". Considering the topic the route was planned and the program took place within a cruise along the south Adriatic Coast. Lecturers invited were famous scholars in the sustainable development area from around the world. ITHAS is a special intensive education program which consists of theoretical lectures, meetings with local tourism experts, as well as practical experience with the topic. Students would get a certificate in the end of this program.

In order to reach this sample, a paper questionnaire was particularly designed for them. Compared with the online questionnaire, the questionnaire did not include section one and two for the author has already understood the characters of ITHAS (The author was an alumni of ITHAS 2014). Only section three and four were displayed to the participants on ITHAS 2015. The component of section three and four stayed the same as the online questionnaire.

Moreover, a pilot test of the paper questionnaire was performed with 5 master students in Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana before the questionnaires being distributed. Feedback of the pilot test was positive and few wording and layout problem were modified.

3.3 Sampling and Data Collection

There are two classificatory systems for sampling: non-random (non-probability) sampling and random (probability) sampling. Random sampling is generally associated with quantitative research (Jennings, 2010). Saunders, Lewuis & Thornhill (2000) further state that random sampling is mostly used for online surveys. Hence, the author used random sampling for the online survey. However, for various reasons, such as research approach and limited resource, non-random sampling may be used for quantitative research (Jennings, 2010). For the reason of limited time, the author chose non-random sampling which targets students of ITHAS 2015 on paper survey.

This study focuses on students who have taken part in field trips organized by university or college which included at least one overnight stay in the last five years.

The online survey was sent out to the author's social network on Facebook and Facebook groups including "ITHAS 2014 international" which includes alumni from ITHAS 2014, "EMTM students and alumni" group including EMTM students and alumni most of whom had high possibility to have taken field trips, and groups of Erasmus students which are "Erasmus Girona 2014/2015", "Erasmus GIRONA 2013/2014" and "Ljubljana Erasmus 2014/2015". After collecting paper questionnaires on ITHAS 2015, the author also released the online survey on the Facebook group of "ITHAS 2015" where there might be some students have not done the questionnaire on the boat. The author also sent email to international student office in University of Ljubljana asking them to help sending links to international students in Ljubljana.

The online questionnaire in Chinese was released through the Chinese biggest SNS application Wechat which has more than 50 million active users globally. Wechat is an application mainly for mobile device. The online survey application Sojump also support mobile devices by providing mobile version questionnaire with layout fits in different mobile devices. As sister SNS application from same company, QQ was also chosen as a platform to send online questionnaires. It has more users than Wechat and has similar function as Facebook in terms of sharing links in groups. The author has many friends on QQ who are member or alumni of "Liberal learning project" in Sun Yat-Sen University in China. "Liberal learning project" is a three year study project focusing on liberal art learning established since 2008. The project organizes student field trips every semester to culture and nature heritages in Guangdong and other Provinces in China.

The online survey was conducted in the period from May 12th to June 5th 2015. Participation was completely voluntary and no form of incentive was provided. The survey took around five to ten minutes to complete. A thank you page will be displayed upon completion of the survey. The paper questionnaires were performed during ITHAS 2015 from May 9th to May 16th. The distribution of questionnaires was assisted by four EMTM 2014-2016 students who were also participants of ITHAS 2015. The questionnaires were distributed to five boats on the last day of ITHAS field trip.

In conclusion, a total of 238 respondents participated in the survey. However, only 195 respondents actually completed the survey. 43 questionnaires were invalid because of various reasons. Out of 50 paper questionnaires distributed, 20 questionnaires were missing and 3 of them were not completed. There were 20 online questionnaires were vetted because of clear lack of engagement with survey according to the time for filling the questionnaire shown by Sojump. Out of 195 qualified responses, 161 were identified as valid cases who have participated in student field trip organized by university or college including at least one overnight stay.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented together. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this study used SPSS as analysis tool. In the first part, the socio-demographic profile of respondents was demonstrated. Multi factor linear regression method and factor analysis were performed through SPSS and the results were presented in the second part.

4.1 Socio-Demographic Profile

The survey was distributed in three ways which were Facebook, Wechat/QQ, and paper questionnaires on ITHAS 2015. As mentioned above, there were in total 161 out of 194 valid responses were identified as students who have taken student field trip organized by university or college including at least one overnight stay. Therefore, in this study, these 161 respondents are considered as sample. Henceforth, the Multiple linear regression and factor analysis were based on the sample size of n=161.

For the screening question, 83% of the respondents answered "Yes" as they identify themselves as field trip participants. To gain a better understanding of the characters of the field trip respondents have participated, three questions were displayed asking about range, purpose and participants in the field trips.



Figure 7: Range of the field trip



Domestic

International

Figure 8: Purpose of the field trip



Figure 9: Participant of field trip

It is clearly evident from the data collection showed above in Figure 7, 8, 9, that the majority of the respondents have participated in international field trips for the purpose of learning, and the learning environment is also very international since the participants of field trips are students from international schools.



Figure 10: Major of the participants



Among all the respondents, 72% are female and 28% are male as shown in Figure 11. Female has consisted more than two thirds of the sample size. The major of the respondents might explain the difference. As Figure10 demonstrated below, most of the respondents major in Humanities and social science, which composes mainly female students.

Figure 11: Gender of the participants

The distribution of age of respondents is demonstrated in Figure 12. Most of the respondents were between the age 26 to 30 with a total of 64%. Respectively, the education backgrounds of most respondents were graduate or post graduate students as shown in Figure13 62.5% of the respondents hold graduate or undergraduate degrees, while 30% of them hold a bachelor's degree. Therefore, most of the respondents have received a good education.



Figure 12: Age of respondents



Figure 13: Education background of respondents

		SPSS value	Frequency	Percent
Field trip	yes	1	161	83%
participants	no	2	34	17%
Range	Domestic	1	131	81%
	international	2	30	19%
Purpose	Learning	1	144	89%
	Research	2	17	11%
Participants	students only from	1	37	23%
	your school			
	students also from	2	2	1%
	other domestic			
	schools			
	students also from	3	122	76%
	other international			
	schools			
Gender	Female	1	116	72%
	Male	2	45	28%
Age	Less than 18	1	0	0
	18-30	2	155	96.3%
	31-40	3	3	1.6%
	41-50	4	2	1.4%
	50+	5	1	0.7%
Major	Nature science	1	2	1.2%
	Humanities and Social	2	155	96.3%
	science			
	Medical and health	3	1	0.6%
	science			
	Engineering and	4	3	1.9%
	technology			
	Agriculture science	5	0	0
Education	High school/	1	12	7.5%
	secondary education			
	Diploma/ Associate's	2	0	0
	Degree (2 years)			
	Bachelor's degree	3	48	30%
	Graduate/Post	4	101	62.5%
	graduate Degree			
	Other	5	0	0

Table 6: Summary of Socio-demographic profile

Table 6 summarized all the demographic profile information discussed above. Moreover, the author used descriptive statistics to reveal that there was no anomaly in the socio demographic profile of the respondents. According to Table 7, some of the Kurtosis values is very strong because of the fact that majority of the respondents are similar in age and major.

	Field trip participation	Range	Purpose	Participants	Gender	Age	Major	Education
Ν	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161
Mean	1.00	1.81	1.11	2.53	1.28	2.06	2.03	3.48
Median	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Std. Deviation	0.00	0.39	0.31	0.85	0.45	0.35	0.31	0.84
Std. Error of Skewness	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
Skewness		-1.63	2.59	-1.26	0.99	6.36	4.84	-1.89
Kurtosis		0.65	4.77	-0.41	-1.03	43.4	33.30	3.10

Table 7: Summary of descriptive statistics

4.2 Empirical Analysis

4.2.1 Multiple Liner Regression Analysis (MLR. a)

In statistics, linear regression is an approach for modeling the relationship between a scalar dependent variable Y and explanatory or independent variable X (David, 2009). Multiple linear regression analysis is a generalization of linear regression analysis, which attempts to model the relationship between two or more explanatory variables and a response variable by fitting a linear equation to observed data. Linear regression was the first type of regression analysis to be studied rigorously and to be used extensively in practical applications (Yan Xin, 2009). It is because that models that depend linearly on their unknown parameters are easier to fit than models that are non-linearly related to their parameters. Moreover, the statistical properties of the resulting estimators are also easier to determine (Jennings, 2010).

Linear regression has many practical uses in many social science researches for prediction or forecasting or reduction on the one hand, and on the other hand, quantifying the strength of the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable (Cohen, J., Cohen P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S, 2003).

In the section two of the questionnaire, respondents rated their satisfaction of three experiences from one field trip they have chosen which are--- overall experience, learning experience and travel experience. To understand the impact of satisfaction of learning and travel experience to the overall experience, a multi liner regression analysis was conducted between the dependent variable - the overall experience, and the independent variables - learning and travel experience. The results were presented below.

			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.729 ^a	.531	.525	.567	1.698

Table 8: Model Summary of MLR. a

a. Predictors: (Constant), travel experience, learning experience

b. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

In Table 8, the adjusted R square is 0.525>0.4 which is one of the indicators of the fitness of the model. Durbin-Watson, 1.698, is close to 2 that means residuals are independent.

		Sum of				
Model		Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57.470	2	28.735	89.433	.000 ^b
	Residual	50.766	158	.321		
	Total	108.236	160			

Table 9: ANOVA of MLR. a

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), travel experience, learning experience

According to Table 9, regression 57.47 and residual 50.776 makes total of 108.236. F is 89.433 and the significant <0.01 which met the model appropriateness.

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	1.292	.248		5.203	.000		
learning experience	.344	.042	.461	8.227	.000	.945	1.058
travel experience	.416	.050	.466	8.317	.000	.945	1.058

Table 10: Coefficients of MLR. a

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

Multi-collinearity affects the regression coefficients and the extra sum of squares of the predictor variables. In a model with multi-collinearity, the estimate of the regression coefficient of a predictor variable depends on what other predictor variables are included in the model. In such models, an estimated regression coefficient may not be found to be significant individually. Multi-collinearity can be detected using the variance inflation factor (abbreviated VIF).

In Table 10, VIF in Collinearity statistics for both learning experience and travel experience are 1.058< 5, which indicate that the multi-collinearity does not exist. Moreover, according to Figure 14, in general the variables have a standard normal distribution. The significant of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001. The model fits well.





Therefore, the relationship between dependent variable Y which means the satisfaction of overall experience and independent variable Learning experience X1 and Travel experience X2 could be shown in the regression equation as follows: Y=1.292+0.344X1+0.416X2

According to the formula, both coefficients of travel experience and learning experience are positive. The coefficient of travel experience is higher than coefficient of learning experience. It could be concluded that, first, satisfaction of travel experience and learning experience positively impact the satisfaction of overall experience; therefore H1 and H2 are accepted. Second, travel experience has a stronger impact on overall satisfaction than learning experience. Henceforth, it can be concluded that participants who are satisfied with travel experience have a better chance to be more satisfied of the overall satisfaction, H3 is denied.

However, learning and travel experience are two main components of the overall field trip experience. To isolate the specific experiences that have the greatest impact on the overall experience and measure how significant that they impact the overall satisfaction, more independent variables need to be identified. As discussed in the research model, we divided these two experiences, learning and traveling, into seven factors in the secondary category, each of which includes at least 3 service elements as indicators which is shown in Table 5. To exam this model, a factor analysis is performed.

4.2.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Factor analysis is a statistical method used to describe variability among the observed, correlated variables in terms of a potentially lower number of unobserved variables called factors. Factor analysis searches for such joint variations in response to unobserved latent variables. The information gained through the interdependencies between observed variables can be used later to reduce the set of variables in a dataset (Harry, 1976). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is used to identify complex interrelationships among items and group items that are parts of a unified concept. The researcher makes no "a priori" assumptions about relationships among factors (Polit, 2012).

To prove that the data obtained was reliable, advanced multivariate analysis were conducted. First, all the indicators were analyzed for errors and anomalies by Kurtosis and Skewness test. According to the descriptive statistic test on the factor constructs, nothing significant was found in the data set, as demonstrated in Table 11.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was performed to examine whether the correlation between variables was large enough to proceed to a factor analysis. The result was displayed in Table 12 as following.

Tuble 11. Here and Bartlett's Test					
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	835				
Adequacy.		.055			
Bartlett's Test of	Approx. Chi-Square	2636.206			
Sphericity	df	378			
	Sig.	.000			

Table 11: KMO and Bartlett's Test

The value of KMO is 0.835 which is much higher than the minimum threshold of 0.5. The factor extraction was performed with the maximum likelihood criteria, and factors were extracted based on the eigenvalues of 1.0. Meanwhile, varimax rotation at Kappa 4 was also applied and all coefficients with absolute values below 0.4 were excluded. The summary of total variance and factor loading are resented as below in Table 13 and Table 14.

	N valid	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewnes	Kurtosis
Motivation							
M1	161	3.67	4.00	4	1.17	-0.66	-0.85
M2	161	3.95	4.00	4	1.11	-1.01	-0.06
M3	161	3.96	4.00	4	1.13	-0.89	-0.49
M4	161	3.04	2.00	2	1.40	0.11	-1.51
M5	161	4.24	4.00	5	0.94	-1.37	1.31
M6	161	3.76	4.00	4	1.09	-0.58	-0.49
M7	161	3.93	4.00	4	1.13	00.94	-0.25
Engagement							
E1	161	3.95	4.00	4	1.08	-1.07	0.18
E2	161	3.60	4.00	4	1.27	-0.49	-1.17
E3	161	3.67	4.00	4	1.16	-0.47	-0.81
Outcome							
01	161	3.68	4.00	4	1.02	-0.74	-0.27
O2	161	3.13	3.00	4	1.32	-0.15	-1.29
03	161	3.64	4.00	4	1.27	-0.79	-0.37
O4	161	3.08	3.00	2	1.18	0.14	-1.04
O5	161	3.52	4.00	4	1.28	-0.53	-1.06
06	161	4.32	5.00	5	1.06	-1.64	1.77
Hedonic							
H1	161	3.73	4.00	4	1.27	-0.97	-0.19
H2	161	4.07	4.00	5	1.15	-1.22	0.40
H3	161	3.39	4.00	4	1.44	-0.42	-1.31
Interactive							
I1	161	3.89	4.00	4	1.18	-0.99	-0.01
I2	161	3.93	4.00	5	1.26	-1.04	-0.12
I3	161	3.86	4.00	5	1.30	-0.85	-0.67
Comfort							
C1	161	4.34	5.00	5	0.94	-1.79	3.048
C2	161	4.19	4.00	5	1.10	-1.57	1.683
C3	161	4.16	5.00	5	1.17	-1.42	0.91
Safety							
S1	161	3.65	4.00	3	1.05	-0.43	-0.00
S2	161	3.58	3.00	3	0.95	-0.14	-0.91
S 3	161	3.48	3.00	3	0.97	-0.72	-0.11

Table 12: Summary of Descriptive Statistics of EFA

Factor	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared			Rotation
					Loadings		
							Squared
							Loading
	Total	% of	Cumulative	Total	% of	Cumulative	Total
		variance	%		variance	%	
1	9.235	32.982	32.982	2.488	8.884	8.884	3.868
2	2.787	9.955	42.937	6.274	22.407	31.291	2.832
3	1.983	7.081	50.018	3.240	11.570	42.682	2.662
4	1.783	6.368	56.386	1.957	6.990	49.852	2.637
5	1.286	4.592	60.978	1.234	4.409	54.261	2.522
6	1.158	4.137	65.115	0.880	3.143	57.403	1.264
7	1.034	3.692	68.807	0.720	2.570	59.973	1.008
Note. Ex	traction 1	method: Ma	aximum likelil	hood			

Table 13: Summary of Total Variance

				Factor			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O5	.717	.196	.173	.052	.104	.187	.185
O2	.677	.115	.081	.002	.287	127	.494
M1	.628	.181	.154	.181	.212	.137	.040
O4	.616	.059	.083	.164	.099	061	.193
O3	.571	001	.313	.035	.280	.099	011
M2	.538	.247	.018	.074	.257	.095	046
H1	.432	.397	.353	.208	.028	.208	092
E3	.425	.247	.011	.209	.378	041	195
M5	.347	021	047	.235	.343	017	.155
H2	.166	.798	.084	.156	190	.136	.242
H3	080	.769	.169	.016	.089	048	254
I1	.319	.589	.326	.117	.258	.064	065
M7	.231	.500	.088	.146	.223	.030	.139
M4	.343	.485	.216	.093	.139	147	.056
I3	.207	.346	.315	.138	.335	.146	.252
C3	023	.096	.721	.273	006	.024	034
C2	.196	.182	.712	.195	.208	.013	025
C1	.128	.242	.640	.231	.063	.304	.085
M3	.305	.242	.469	.094	.272	.026	012
S2	.173	.144	.244	.898	.108	.121	054
S 1	.151	.243	.187	.859	.124	001	.013
S3	.156	.035	.312	.738	.005	082	.198
I2	.131	.209	.380	142	.610	.140	.053
E1	.306	009	.080	.162	.608	.056	.085
M6	.164	.060	.151	.010	.574	.108	.125
01	.459	.176	053	.145	.492	002	.139
O6	.130	.024	.192	001	.212	.946	.070
E2	.272	003	060	.114	.332	.119	.629

Table 14: Rotated Factor Matrix^a

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.^a

a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

The result has selected 7 factors. However, there are only 5 factors that can be used for further analysis because each of which must include at least three indicators. Therefore, the first five factors were chosen as new 5 variables, which can impact the overall experiences. The factor loading of the five variables are shown in Table15 as follows.

		Factor
		loading
Factor1	Learning	
O2	Quality of feed-back session	0.677
03	Certificate	0.571
O4	Record of lectures and presentations(ppt,video)	0.616
O5	Gaining the relevant capabilities that will help me in future career	0.717
M1	Orientation: introduction of the subject; learning materials	0.628
M2	Up to date topic	0.538
Factor2	Hedonic	
H2	Selected sight-seeing or activities	0.798
H3	Available free time	0.769
I1	Orientation: itineraries	0.589
Factor3	Comfort	
C1	Transportation	0.640
C2	Accommodation	0.712
C3	Food & Beverage	0.721
Factor4	Safety	
S 1	Insurance	0.898
S2	Health care	0.859
S 3	Emergency solution	0.738
Factor5	Interactive	
I2	Team building activities	0.610
E1	Presentation of all group projects	0.608
M6	Competition between teams	0.574

 Table 15: Summary of Factor Loading

A new category is created by these five factors so that the component and characters of each can be understood.

Factor 1 includes indicators existed in the learning experience as displayed above in Table 5. The indicators are mainly from Factor "Outcomes" and "Motivation". Factor 2 consists of indicators from travel experience. "Selected sight-seeing or activities" and "Available free time" are indicators from Factor "Hedonic"; however, "Orientation: itineraries" also reflected the willing of being engaged in arrangement of the travel itineraries, such as what activities or sightseeing is included in the trip. For "Orientation: itineraries" also presented the attention participants have put on the hedonic need and satisfied the demand of feeling of control by participants, it could also be positioned in the Hedonic factor. Factor 3 and Factor 4 apparently stay in the same category as before belonging to Factor "Comfort" and Factor "Safety" respectively.

The indicators in Factor 5 "Team building activities", "Presentation of all group projects" and "Competition between teams " were from different Factors of the old category to which they belong are "Interactive", "Engagement" and "Motivation" . However, these three indicators have some characters in common. First, they all focus on team work. Each of them requires actions through a team. Second, all of them involve interaction between team members and each of them delivers an interactive".

As a result of the aforementioned reasons, five new factors have been generated to replace the old ones. Four of them belong to travel experiences which are "Hedonic", "Comfort", "Safety" and "Interactive". The first Factor is a mix between two factors from learning experience which are "Outcomes" and "Motivation". However, since the rest of the new factors are all travel experience related, the first factor is named after "Learning". The new list of constructs and scale items is displayed in Table 15.

Furthermore, reliability of a construct is measured by examining the indicator reliability and composite reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012). A Cronbach's method is applied to test the constructs internal consistency. Cronbach's Alpha helped determine whether the questions from the survey were really useful and helped avoid misleading data. The value of alpha could be considered appropriate is above 0.6 (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004). A summary of the Cronbach's Alpha of each construct is presented in Table16

Variable Name	Number of Items	Cronback's Alpha
Learning	6	0.849
Hedonic	3	0.758
Comfort	3	0.816
Safety	3	0.917
Intercative	3	0.702

Table 16: Summary of the Cronbach's Aplha

4.2.3 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Five New Factor (MLR.b)

To examine the relationship between the new five factors with the overall experience, another multiple linear regression analysis was conducted.

	Variables	Variables	
Model	Entered	Removed	Method
1	Easter 2		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter
	ractor 5		<= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Easter 1		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter
	Factor 1		<= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Easter 2		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter
			<= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Easter 5		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter
	racioi 3		<= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

Table 17: Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

According to Table 17 and Table 18, model with factor 4 is excluded for the significant is always >0.01 in each model.

_						Collinearity
					Partial	Statistics
Mode	2	Beta In	t	Sig.	Correlation	Tolerance
1	Factor 1	.425 ^b	7.127	.000	.493	.999
	Factor 2	.280 ^b	4.300	.000	.324	.997
	Factor 4	.040 ^b	.588	.557	.047	.998
	Factor 5	.286 ^b	4.412	.000	.331	.997
2	Factor 2	.259 ^c	4.603	.000	.345	.994
	Factor 4	.032 ^c	.535	.594	.043	.997
	Factor 5	.237 ^c	4.137	.000	.314	.982
3	Factor 4	.030 ^d	.535	.593	.043	.997
	Factor 5	.244 ^d	4.567	.000	.343	.982
4	Factor 4	.032 ^e	.602	.548	.048	.997

Table 18: Excluded Variables^a

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Factor 3

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2

e. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 5

In Model 4, Durbin-Watson value is 1.68 which means residuals are independent. Adjusted R square 0.552>0.4. According to Table 20, regression 60.918 and residual 47.318 make a total of 108.236. F is 50.210 and the significant <0.01 which meet the model appropriateness. Moreover, the significant of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001. According to Figure 15, in general the variables have a standard normal distribution and the model fits well. Therefore, Model 4 is chosen to explain the relationship between dependent variables and independent variables.

			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.507 ^a	.257	.252	.711	
2	.661 ^b	.438	.430	.621	
3	.710 ^c	.504	.495	.585	
4	.750 ^d	.563	.552	.551	1.680

Table 19: Model Summary^e of MLR. b

a. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3

b. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1

c. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2

d. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 5

e. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

		Sum of				
Model		Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.781	1	27.781	54.903	.000 ^b
	Residual	80.455	159	.506		
	Total	108.236	160			
2	Regression	47.354	2	23.677	61.447	.000 ^c
	Residual	60.882	158	.385		
	Total	108.236	160			
3	Regression	54.592	3	18.197	53.259	.000 ^d
	Residual	53.644	157	.342		
	Total	108.236	160			
4	Regression	60.918	4	15.230	50.210	.000 ^e
	Residual	47.318	156	.303		
	Total	108.236	160			

Table 20: ANOVA^a of MLR. b

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3

c. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1

d. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2

e. Predictors: (Constant), Factor 3, Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 5

		Unstand	lardized	Standardized		
		Coeffi	cients	Coefficients	l '	
Mode	el	В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	4.491	.056		80.103	.000
	Factor 3	.467	.063	.507	7.410	.000
2	(Constant)	4.491	.049		91.793	.000
	Factor 3	.457	.055	.496	8.306	.000
	Factor 1	.389	.055	.425	7.127	.000
3	(Constant)	4.491	.046		97.480	.000
	Factor 3	.444	.052	.481	8.541	.000
	Factor 1	.378	.052	.413	7.335	.000
	Factor 2	.230	.050	.259	4.603	.000
4	(Constant)	4.491	.043		103.461	.000
	Factor 3	.432	.049	.468	8.818	.000
	Factor 1	.350	.049	.383	7.160	.000
	Factor 2	.235	.047	.265	4.999	.000
	Factor 5	.231	.051	.244	4.567	.000

Table 21: Coefficients^a of MLR. b

a. Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction



Figure 15: Histogram of MLR. b

In brief, the relationship between overall satisfaction – dependent variable Y and independent variables F1, F2, F3, F5 are demonstrated in the regression formulation as follows:

Y=4.491+0.432F3+0.350F1+0.235 F2+0.231F5

- Y: satisfaction of overall experience
- F1: Learning experience
- F2: Hedonic experience
- F3: Comfort experience
- F5: Interactive experience

Comfort experience has the biggest coefficient which indicates that the satisfaction of comfort experience has the greatest impact on the overall experience. Followed by Hedonic and Interactive experience, learning experience has the second biggest impact on the overall experience. There are three travel related factors in the equation and the learning experience comes to the second place on the coefficient value. There are strong evidences that the travel experience has much stronger impact on the overall experience than travel experience.

Meanwhile, student participants pay most attention on the service of transportation, accommodation and food & beverage. The Hedonic experience and Interactive experience almost have the same level of impact to the overall experience.

For the "Safety" factor, most respondents chose "I can't rate", which means that they either have a "Neutral" attitude or they did not perceive the service related to this kind of experience. Therefore, there is no significant evaluation made for this factor. According to the results of interviews, almost no respondents mentioned safety issue. "Safety" is a topic constantly neglected by participants in the student field trips. For the services related to "Safety" such as "insurance", "health care" and "emergency solution", these are elements attract more attention of trip organizer and tour operator and of students when emergency happened.

4.2.4 Multi Linear Regression Analysis of Each Factor

To further discuss how the service elements impact the experience factor which they related to, a multi linear regression analysis was conducted between the service elements indicators with the experience factors we got above.

4.2.4.1 Learning experience (MLR. c)

For factor1-learning experience, the independent variables are O2, O3, O4, O5, M1, M2 (as shown in Table 15). The results are demonstrated in the following charts.

			Adjusted R Std. Error of		Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.927 ^a	.859	.853	.34397571	1.323

Table 22: Model Summary^b of MLR. c

a. Predictors: (Constant), O5, O3, M2, O4, M1, O2

b. Dependent Variable: Factor 1

In Table 22, the adjusted R square is 0.853>0.4 which is one of the indicators of the fitness of the model. Durbin-Watson, 1.323, is close to 2 that means residuals are independent.

		Sum of				
Mode	el	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	110.993	6	18.499	156.347	.000 ^b
	Residual	18.221	154	.118		
	Total	129.214	160			

Table 23: ANOVA^a of MLR. c

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 1

b. Predictors: (Constant), O5, O3, M2, O4, M1, O2

According to Table 23, regression 110.993.47 and residual 18.221 makes total of 129.214. F is 156.347 and the significant <0.01, which meet the model appropriateness. Moreover, the significant of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001. According to Figure 16, in general the variables have a standard normal distribution and the model fits well.



Figure 16: Histogram of MLR. c

-		Unstandardized		Standardized		
		Coeffi	icients	Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-3.060	.115		-26.524	.000
	M1	.120	.032	.157	3.802	.000
	M2	.125	.029	.155	4.319	.000
	O2	.155	.029	.228	5.331	.000
	O3	.108	.027	.153	4.003	.000
	O4	.145	.030	.189	4.852	.000
	O5	.228	.031	.323	7.443	.000

Table 24: Coefficients^a of MLR. c

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 1

In conclusion, the correlation between Factor "Learning" -- dependent variable Y and independent variables O2, O3, O4, O5, M1, M2 are demonstrated in the regression formulation as following

$Y{=}{-}3.060{+}0.120M1{+}0.125M2{+}0.155O2{+}0.108O3{+}0.145O4{+}0.228O5$

Y: Learning experience

M1: Orientation: introduction of the subject; learning materials

- M2: Up to date topic
- O2: Quality of feed-back session
- O3: Certificate
- O4: Record of lectures and presentations (slides, video)
- O5: Gaining the relevant capabilities that will help me in future career

First, all the independent indicators have positive impact on the dependent variable. The biggest coefficient goes to "Gaining the relevant capabilities that will help me in future career". Participants' satisfaction of learning experience was most related to the skills they got from the field trip for their future career. The post-field trip session which includes "Quality of feed-back session" and "Record of lectures and presentations (slides, video)" came to the second. The motivation related experience such as "Up to date topic" and "Orientation: introduction of the subject; learning materials" did not have as strong impact as the outcomes. The last service participants paid attention to is "Certificate".

According to the result of interviews, however, "Orientation" is mentioned by 90% of the respondents. A lot of information is required to be provided during the orientation. Not only learning materials, but also backgrounds about history, politics, economy, culture of the destination to be visited. Some students suggest to include "pre-trip lecture" with academic content to obtain a better understanding of the topic and relevance of the field trip to the overall course. The "Up to date topic" is expected to focus on the destinations. Many students considered "feedback" a very important part of the field trip. Some even thought group feedback is better than writing a report.

4.2.4.2 Hedonic Experience (MLR. d)

For Factor2-Hedonic experience, the independent variables are H2, H3, I1 (as shown in Table 15).the results are demonstrated in the following charts.

			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.966 ^a	.933	.932	.24298259	1.317

Table 25: Model Summary^b of MLR. d

a. Predictors: (Constant), I1, H3, H2

b. Dependent Variable: Factor 2

In Table 25, the adjusted R square is 0.932>0.4 which is one of the indicators of the fitness of the model. Durbin-Watson, 1.317, is close to 2 that means residuals are independent.

		Sum of	10		-	~ .
Mod	lel	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	128.846	3	42.949	727.445	.000 ^b
	Residual	9.269	157	.059		
	Total	138.116	160			

Table 26: ANOVA^a of MLR. d

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 2

b. Predictors: (Constant), I1, H3, H2

c.

According to Table26, regression 128.846and residual 9.269 makes total of 138.116. F is 727.445 and the significant <0.01, which met the model appropriateness.

Moreover, the significant of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001.

According to Figure 17, in general, the variables have a standard normal distribution and the model fits well.

Table 27: Coefficients^a of MLR. d

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Mode	el	В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-3.177	.078		-40.762	.000
	H2	.439	.021	.542	20.747	.000
	H3	.308	.017	.478	18.497	.000
	I1	.089	.020	.114	4.487	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 2


Figure 17: Histogram of MLR. d

In conclusion, the relationship between Factor "Hedonic"--dependent variable Y and independent variables H2, H3, I1 are demonstrated in the regression formulation as following

Y=-3.177+0.439H2+0.308H3+0.089I1

- Y: Hedonic experience
- H2: Selected sight-seeing or activities
- H3: Available free time
- I1: Orientation: itineraries

According to the previous category, the Hedonic related service "Selected sight-seeing or activities" and "Available free time" has significant stronger impact than "Orientation: itineraries" for which has very little coefficient. The results fit the model mentioned in the hypothesis. Although "Selected sight-seeing or activities" has the strongest impact on the "Hedonic experience", "Available free time" has also shared a big ratio. According to the interviews, 80% of the participants have mentioned the importance of "available free time" and find it necessary to be given free time for participants. First, on the learning perspective, they require time to collect data or interact with local people and explore the destination by themselves. Second, within the intense schedule, participants need time to relax or network with other participants and professors, which is another expected function of field trip. Third, available free time guarantee students could manage their time with learning and traveling.

Although "orientation" graded very low in this factor, according to the interviews, a "Well-thought and feasible agenda" is also concerned by many respondents. Some students suggest that the orientation should be a workshop that filed trip organizer and the student participants discuss and work together. It is an interactive activity between organizer and participants. Field trip organizers including university representatives and tour-operators should take care of the need from the demand side and the participants has rights to take part in the trip planning in this co-creating activity. In terms of orientation in the travel part, practical tips about food, transportation, and culture custom of the destination are also expected to be provided. Pre-trip practical information kit including document requirements; recommendations of what to take; short info about destination; emergency contacts of group leaders and local "911" was suggested by students.

4.2.4.3 Comfort experience (MLR. e)

Factor3, comfort experience, the independent variables are C1, C2 and C3 (as shown in Table 15). The results are demonstrated in the following charts.

_			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.909 ^a	.826	.822	.37583892	1.219

Table 28: Model Summary^b of MLR. E

a. Predictors: (Constant), C3, C1, C2

b. Dependent Variable: Factor 3

In Table 28, the adjusted R square is 0.822>0.4 which is one of the indicators of the fitness of the model. Durbin-Watson, 1.219, is close to 2 that means residuals are independent.

Table 29: ANOVA^a of MLR. E

		Sum of				
Mode	el	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	105.012	3	35.004	247.807	.000 ^b
	Residual	22.177	157	.141		
	Total	127.189	160			

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 3

b. Predictors: (Constant), C3, C1, C2

According to Table 29, regression 105.012 and residual22.177makes total of 127.189. F is 247.807 and the significant <0.01 which met the model appropriateness. Moreover, the significant of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001.. According to Figure 18, in general the variables have a standard normal distribution and the model fits well.

		Unstandardized		Standardized		
		Coefficients		Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-3.652	.147		-24.874	.000
	C1	.232	.042	.243	5.522	.000
	C2	.304	.038	.376	8.027	.000
	C3	.330	.034	.434	9.660	.000

Table 30: Coefficients^a of MLR. E

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 3



Figure 18: Histogram of MLR. e

In conclusion, the relationship between Factor "Comfort"--dependent variable Y and independent variables C1, C2 and C3 are demonstrated in the regression formulation as following

Y=-3.652+0.232C1+0.304C2 +0.330C3

- Y: Comfort experience
- C1: Transportation
- C2: Accommodation
- C3: Food and Beverage

Among services in the most related experience, food and beverage has the most impact to the comfort experience to participants. According to the interviews, food and beverage was also mentioned much more than "transportation" and accommodation by the participants. That is because, first, food and beverage is always not included in the itineraries in the field trips. At least, lunch is not included in the most cases. Students expected to be provided more options for food such as the opportunity to cook by themselves instead of going out in order to meet the budget if the food is not included in the itineraries. Second, most of the respondents took part in the international field trips in foreign countries where the culinary style may be different. There is a challenge for participants of getting used to the different food culture. Last but not least, there is alcohol control in many field trips. For many adult participants, night life is a necessary part of the field trip which is closely related to alcohol. The supply of alcohol during the field trip is also a big concern for some participants. Except for comfortable experience, according to the interviews, students mentioned interactive function of accommodation. Some prefer accommodation that allows interaction between students such as table soccer, group kitchen.

4.2.4.4 Interactive experience (MLR. f)

For Factor 5-Interactive experience, the independent variables are I2, E1 and M6 (as shown in Table 15).the results are demonstrated in the following charts.

			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Durbin-Wats
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	on
1	.869 ^a	.755	.750	.43515508	1.601

Table 31: Model Summary^b of MLR. f

a. Predictors: (Constant), M6, E1, I2

b. Dependent Variable: Factor 5

In Table 31, the adjusted R square is 0.750>0.4 which means which is one of the indicators of the fitness of the model. Durbin-Watson, 1.601, is close to 2 that means residuals are independent.

		Sum of				
Mode	l	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	91.394	3	30.465	160.882	.000 ^b
	Residual	29.730	157	.189		
	Total	121.123	160			

Table 32: ANOVA^a of MLR. f

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 5

b. Predictors: (Constant), M6, E1, I2

According to Table32, regression 91.394and residual 29.730 makes total of 121.123. F is160.882 and the significant <0.01 which meet the model appropriateness. Moreover, the significance of constant, and independent variables are all <0.001. According to Figure19, in general the variables have a standard normal distribution and the model fits well.



Figure 19: Histogram of MLR. f

		Unstandardized		Standardized		
		Coefficients		Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-3.259	.154		-21.202	.000
	I2	.257	.033	.372	7.844	.000
	E1	.336	.036	.418	9.268	.000
	M6	.245	.038	.306	6.529	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Factor 5

In conclusion, the relationship between Factor "Interaction"--dependent variable Y and independent variables I2, E1 and M6 are demonstrated in the regression formulation as following

Y=-3.259+0.257I2+0.336E1+0.245M6

Y: Interaction experience

- I2: Team building activities
- E1: Presentation of all group projects
- M6: Competition between teams

"Team building activities" and "competition between teams" has similar coefficient to the "interactive experience". Both focused on the interaction among teams. Team work is required and plays an important role in these services. The "presentation of all group projects" ranked the first in the interactive experience. It is an activity which not only requires interaction with other groups but also within the group. This interactive activity also brings out the most outcomes than the other two.

According to the interviews, some student thought that bonding exercises along the fieldtrip helps to enhance group dynamic while out of classroom. Competition between teams is an efficient way to keep students engaged and motivated. It is a good practice for students from different culture backgrounds to work together in order to get better connection and understanding of each other. After getting familiar, students tend to be more communicative on lectures which made the study more productive.

In conclusion, the new "experience model of student field trip" with correlations of each indicator are demonstrated as following in Figure 20.



Figure 20: New experience model of Student Field Trip

4.3 Other Findings

The research uses quantitative method as the main solution to exam the hypothesis. A small amount of interviews was also conducted to collect essential service elements in student field trips. Except for the factors and indicators discussed in the empirical analysis, other elements included in the list of scale items from the interviews will be discussed in this part. Many good comments that are not covered by the above indicators during the interview will also be presented in this part, in order to provide some good suggestions for field trip product development and management.

4.3.1 Indicators not Mentioned in the List of New Model

Time management is an important dimension of the quality of field trip management. A practical and precise schedule is always required before departure. Field trip organizers and student participants must reach an agreement on the schedule and the tour operator should try to follow the itinerary as possible.

One of the efficient ways of collecting data on site is interacting with local people. It is better to organize some activities engaging both students and local people to build some connections which would give students a better understanding of the destination and collect the data they need for the projects and assignments.

The lecture by professors during the field trip is another important part of the field trip. Students thought that lectures should be given by professionals/experts or individuals with good knowledge of the topic. In terms of lecturers, it would be more interesting with professors from various backgrounds.

The visiting of local business attracts a great deal of concern from the students. They think this part could be improved by giving more practical demonstrations instead of simply giving a theoretical lecture about the corporate. It would be more valuable and engaging to demonstrate and introducing the facilities and business problems while being on site. Question & Answer (abbreviated Q & A) part is considered as the most important part by some respondents. Q & A focuses on issues more related to the topic of the field trip and the content is also more practical.

The workshop between students and professor or sometimes engages with the local business is a knowledge co-creation process which could produce creative and efficient solutions to practical business cases. It could also motivate students to deliver tangible achievement in form of projects.

Note-taking is widely used in field trips especially in the area of natural science. It is an efficient way to keep students engaged and to capture important information during the field trip. Note is also a good reflection of important moments and ideas created on site which could assist the accomplishment of the report.

Assignment has both motivation and engagement functions. With the mission of completing the assignment, students behave more actively to collect the data needed and this would keep them engaged in the whole process. An assignment also serves as a conclusion and reflection on the students' observation; the results of thinking and teamwork can help students to think more deeply about the subject to gain more outcomes from the field trip.

Most of the field trips that the respondents participated were international field trips which provide international learning environments. It would be a substantial advantage to students to gain a culture exchange experience and build network around the world. Social event is mentioned by more than half of the respondents in the interviews. Various social events provide opportunities to build network with students and professors. It is a good practice to eliminate the distance between students and professors and to gain more understanding of each other. The respondents brainstormed various kinds of social events that could be attractive and beneficial, for instance, a culture dinner at the first night could help to gain knowledge about culture backgrounds of various nationalities. Ice breaking and team building activities may facilitate mutual understanding among the students. Availability of entertainment and recreation service after the daily tasks are also expected by some respondents.

4.3.2 Other Details Mentioned In the Interviews

In the international field trips, lecturers are from different countries, where English is not the official language. Therefore, language barrier becomes a new concern for students. They prefer if lecturers or local representatives have a good knowledge of English to deliver the presentation.

A knowledgeable and well prepared tour guide is required in the selected local tours. Moreover, they are preferred to being from the local community who are more likely to have a better understanding of the destination.

It is necessary to maintain balance between learning and travel in the itinerary. The product design should think about leaving enough free time for students, and to make good arrangement for the learning and travelling content in the field trip.

Inspect of "Up to date topics", leading questions provided in the pre-trip period will help students discover more about their trip in advance and stimulate the curiosity to keep them motivated to explore.

The team management of big groups requires code of conduct for the trip. To organize a group of normally more than 100 students from all around the world to a foreign country, it is critical to obtain a good knowledge of local legislation and interpret it into the code of conduct for the group.

Field trip is an innovative way to teach in comparison with traditional classes. Alternative tools and games such as problem solving through co-creation, workshop with entrepreneurs dealing with real business case would motivate students to brainstorm and deliver tangible outcomes in the end. Creative teaching space would generate a more relaxing learning atmosphere. Students would be the centre of the class to co-create new ideas and thoughts with professors.

Discussion is considered as one of the most productive part in the post-trip process. It provided a platform for students to share knowledge and experiences with each other and opportunity to raise questions they brought back from the field trip. However, some students said that discussion should be organized through the whole trip so that students could discuss their observation with others immediately, instead of recalling everything upon their return back to school, when part of the experience can be forgotten.

Group work was widely discussed during the interviews. Most of the students give positive comments on group work which bring a fun way to learn and travel with fellows. 90% of these respondents have mentioned the size of the group. A small group size is required by all the students, because it is more efficient to interact with group members in a small great to get more chances to communicate with each other and bring more outcomes.

Another concern that was not mentioned by many respondents was that the activities should correspond capabilities of the group. Some field trip might include some active sports activities in the itinerary. Field trip organizer should concern about students who are not able to participate in some particular activities and provide alternative options for them.

In addition to the software aspect of the field trip, hardware conditions are also expected. For instance, necessary travel equipment depends on the nature of the field trip, or supportive informative brochures and flyers describing the area to be visited are expected to be prepared before departure.

To sum up this chapter, factors which influenced the satisfaction of overall experience were detected by factor analysis. The multiple linear regression analysis examined the correlation of various indicators to the related factors. Except for H3, all the null hypotheses were rejected and credible evidence was found to support the outcomes. The results from the interviews have replenished the findings. Even though the author tried to guarantee the findings and the thesis is extensive, there are always some limitations and room for improvement. The next chapter discusses practical implication of this research, limitations and suggestions for further research.

5. CONTRIBUTION AND LIMITATION

5.1 Contribution to Theory and Practice

This research made several contributions to the theoretical framework of educational tourism. First, this is the first quantitative research about university and college field trip focusing on participant's experience in the tourism research area. The majority of the previous researches about field trips are qualitative researches. Most of them are published in education academic journals and are mainly describing the process of organizing student field trips and sharing their observation of managing student field trips in various disciplines, such as geography, natural science, biography, music, journalism, history, hospitality and tourism. There is no previous research studying the experiences of students in field trips. This research discusses the experiences in the learning and travel dimensions of field trip and finds that travel experience has stronger influence on the overall satisfaction than learning experience.

Second, in this research, the experience of educational tourism consists of learning experience and travel experience according to the "conceptual model of educational tourism". Furthermore, this study defined the learning and travel experience in field trip. The author combines the "Selinda model of visitor learning" for informal study and "construct model of tourism service experience" to create a new model of field trip experience. The "Selinda model of visitor learning" divides the learning experience in different themes, while "construct model of tourism service experience" model of tourism service experience.

Third, according to the literature review, semi-structured interviews and expert panel, a "pool of essential service elements" was generated. It provided a set of criteria for researcher and tourism practitioners when doing research or making strategy for marketing and quality management. It was concluded from various field trips in different fields of study from a substantial amount of literature review.

Finally, this study proves that travel experience has stronger impact on the overall

satisfaction than the learning experience. Majority of the previous research about field trip focused on the learning aspect while traveling was not discussed often. This study proves that the travel experience also positively impacts the overall experience and has greater influence than learning experience does. Field trip planners should pay attention on students' travel experiences and keep the balance between learning and traveling.

The research contributes to the theoretical framework; furthermore, the findings also have practical use for field trip organizers and tour-operators. For field trip planner from university side, travel experience should be taken into consideration when making field trip itinerary. A good communication between students and school will help convey the expectation from the demand side in the pre-trip stage which would contribute to delivering a more satisfying experience.

Furthermore, for tour-operators that are working in the area of educational tourism, the findings can help identify what kind of service should be focused on and which part of the field trip has room for improvement. However, learning experience is still an essential part of field trip, and this study can help tourism operators and planners with keeping the balance between learning and travel experience.

5.2 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Field trip was not discussed much from the tourism perspective. Studies on customer experience was never conducted in the research of student field trip. This thesis tries to explore the experience of students in the field trip and attempted to find out which experience has stronger influence on the overall experience in order to maintain the balance between learning and traveling. However, author would like to acknowledge several limitations and provide some suggestion for the future study in the field trip area.

This research conducted qualitative interviews and a quantitative online-survey to identify the critical services in the field trip and experiences that have influence on overall satisfaction. One major limitation of this approach is the number of interviews performed. There should be a larger number of interviews and it is preferred that the respondents come from a diverse group of majors so that the results would be more applicable to other disciplines. The more majors respondents come from, the more perspectives can be collected. However, limited by the time and financial situation of this study, the author settles with the a sample that 96.3% of the respondents major in "Humanities and Social science", especially in tourism. Approximate half of the respondents are ITHAS participants which can not represent students from other disciplines. Future study should involve much more students from a diverse range of majors to collect data from more perspectives.

Another limitation from the part of survey is the limited opinions gathered through the use of questionnaires. Respondents may have a stronger impression on a certain aspect of service that is not listed in the questionnaire. It might influence the degree of accuracy of the results. Moreover, the scale of the questionnaire is not precise enough to account for the true feeling from the respondents. It is also difficult to distinguish the original opinion from respondents with the option - "Neutral /I can't rate"; despite that quite a large amount of studies have combined these together. A continuous line or track bar could be an alternative in the future study.

Moreover, the number of valid questionnaires is pretty limited. Only 161 questionnaires are considered valid for further study. For future reference, small gifts or raffles for respondents who participant in the survey can be provided to motivate more potential respondents. As for the paper questionnaires, it lacks of a good communication between the questionnaire distributor and field trip organizer on the ITHAS 2015. The distribution of the questionnaires was stopped by the organizer for certain reasons. As a result, the number of returned questionnaires is less than expected. For the distribution of paper questionnaire, researcher should be well prepared for the locale that he or she is handing out surveys, search the regulation of the site beforehand, and have good communication with the local administrator. Finally, it is important to be prepared for unpredictable situations and have a backup plan for the emergency.

The research model is created by the author according to literature reviews, interviews and expert panel. As an exploratory research, the model is not verified before so that many factors in the hypothesis model were thrown out in the factor analysis and cannot be used in the further analysis. Some of the indicators or factors that are important from the result of the interviews or literature may get weed out, which could have a huge influence on the entire research. More simulation and calculation will be needed for future studies in order to improve the research model.

The final recommendation to future scholars researching field trip is attract the

involvement of more stakeholders. A satisfying field trip or good product should take into consider of as many stakeholders in the service chain as possible. There might be some valuable opinions from the perspectives of university and field trip providers. It would be a good attempt to perform research on the supply side.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis is to discover the method for balancing learning and travel experience in order to improve the satisfaction of overall experience in student field trips. As for the theoretical background, the model of student field trip experience was generated based on the "Selinda model of visitor learning" for informal study and the "service experience model in tourism".

A "pool of essential service elements in field trip" was created through interviews, literature reviews, and expert panel. A research questionnaire was created and the data collected were used to examine the hypotheses in the research model and the correlations between experience factors and overall experience. The correlations between key service elements and the experience factors were also measured through multiple linear regressions. Though the aforementioned methods, credible evidence was found regarding the experience model and service elements.

First, the positive impact of learning experience and travel experience on the satisfaction of overall experience was proven. Moreover, it was verified that it was travel experience, not learning experience, that has a stronger influence on the overall experience. Travel experience should not be ignored by researchers and school trip organizers. Second, through the verification of factor analysis, the new experience model was generated with five factors: "Learning experience", "Hedonic experience", "Comfort experience", "Interactive experience" and "Safe experience". The new model, which is based on data analysis, is an improvement compared with the research model. The "Comfort experience" has the most impact on the overall experience with the highest correlation. Therefore, the related service such as "accommodation", "transportation" and "food & beverage" should be considered as key elements to the overall experience. "Learning experience" still composes a significant portion of the overall satisfaction. However, it was found that "Motivation" and "Outcomes" themes should be given more attention.

Despite "Safe experience" was highly valued in the literature review, the data do not demonstrate the same result. The importance of "Safe experience" did not pose a noticeable concern for the students during the trip. People tend to perceive the importance of safety only when danger approaches. However, for tour-provider and organizer, safety should always be the fundamental and preferential experience to be delivered.

The results of the interviews with field trip participants offered many suggestions for improving learning experience which are presented in the other findings.

This dissertation creates a student field trip experience model and detects a series of essential service elements. Furthermore, the correlations between factors and service indicators with the respective experience are determined through quantitative empirical analysis. This research is the first to explore the customer experience in the student field trip and use quantitative research method to define the relationship among critical experience factors and essential service elements. This thesis shall serve as a reminder for the field trip organizers to focus beyond the learning component of field trip, and understand that the travel experience is even more vital to the satisfaction of overall experience.

However, some limitations of this dissertation should be acknowledged for future research. First, the sample of the research should be bigger and it is preferred that the respondents come from different education and cultural backgrounds. Second, more service indicators are encouraged to be added in the questionnaire to improve the accuracy of the model generated. Third, the design of the questionnaire should be more precise by using continuous line or track bar as scale tool etc. Finally, opinions from the supply side and other stakeholders should be engaged and studied in the future research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abubakar A. M., Shneikat B. H. T. & Oday, A. (2014). Motivational factors for educational tourism: A case study in Northern Cyprus. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *11*, 58-62.

Alagona P. S. & Simon, G. L. (2010). The role of field study in humanistic and interdisciplinary environmental education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *32*(3), 191-206.

Ansbacher, T. (2002). Misunderstandings of meaning making. *Exhibitionist 21 (1)*, 53-55

Antonsen,I. M. N. (2010). The stakeholders" involvement in the process of building and maintaining a destination brand. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://bibliotecadigital.fgv.br/dspace/handle/10438/6636

Arnold, R., B. Burke, C. James, D. Martin, & B. Thomas. (1991). *Educating for a change, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Between the lines and Doris Marshall institute for education and action.*

Arnold, E J and Price, L L (1993). River magic: extraordinary experience and the extended service encounter. *Consumer research* 20, 132-140

Babin, B. J., & Kim, K. (2001). International students' travel behavior: a model of the travel-related consumer/dissatisfaction process. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *10*(1), 93-106.

Babbie, E. (2004). Survey research. The practice of social research, 10, 242-280.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (2012). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*,40(1), 8-34.

Bello, D. C., & Etzel, M. J. (1985). The role of novelty in the pleasure travel experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(1), 20-26.

Berlyne, D. F. (1971). Aesthetics and Psychobiology. New York: Meredith

Bitgood, S. (1989). School field trips: An overview. Visitor behavior, 4(2), 3-6.

Boorstin, D. J. (1964). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boud, D., & Walker, D. (1991). *Experience and Learning: Reflection at Work*. *EAE600 Adults Learning in the Workplace: Part A*. Adult and Workplace Education, Faculty of Education, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria, Australia 3217.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998), Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities.Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for theAdvancement of Teaching. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/pres/boyer.nsf/673918d46fbf653e852565ec0056ff-3e/d95 5b61ffddd590a852565ec005717ae/\$FILE/boyer.pdf

Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (1999). *Discussion as a way of teaching*(Vol. 85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brymer, R. A. (1978). Increasing the Educational Value of Hospitality Field Trips and" Reaction Papers". *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*,2(2), 25-38.

Buraphadeja, V., & Dawson, K. (2008). Content analysis in computer-mediated communication: Analyzing models for assessing critical thinking through the lens of social constructivism. *The Amer. Jrnl. of Distance Education*, 22(3), 130-145.

Canadian Travel Commission (2001). Learning travel. Canadian Travel Commission: Montreal, Canada. Retrieved July 30, 2015 from http://www.taskbc.bc.ca/documents/LearningTravelEdventuresCTC_000.pdf

Chadee, D. D., & Cutler, J. (1996). Insights into international travel by students. *Journal of Travel Research*, *35*(2), 75-80.

Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001, May). The accuracy of selfreports: comparisons of an RDD telephone survey with Internet Surveys by Harris Interactive and

Knowledge Networks. In American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting.

Cohen, E. (1979). A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences. *The Journal of the British Sociological Association 13*(2), 179-201.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple correlation/regression analysis for the behavioral sciences*.

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web-or internet-based surveys. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *60*(6), 821-836.

Cranton, P. (1994). Understanding and Promoting Transformative Learning: A Guide for Educators of Adults. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Jossey-Bass, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104-1310.

Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 64(3), 391-418.

Cronholm, L. C., & Lansing, E. A. (1955). What Are the Educational Values in Planned Field Trips?. *NASSP Bulletin*, *39*(210), 88-91.

Cross, P. K. (1998). Why learning communities? Why now? *About Campus 3 (3)*, 4–11.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988). Human behavior and the science center, Science learning in the informal setting. *Chicago academy of science*, 80-87.

Davis, B. G. (2001). Tools for Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Davies, E., & Lea, S. E. (1995). Student attitudes to student debt. *Journal of economic psychology*, *16*(4), 663-679.

Dawson, S., Burnett, B., & O'Donohue, M. (2006). Learning communities: an untapped sustainable competitive advantage for higher education. *International*

Journal of Educational Management, 20(2), 127-139.

Devlin, P. J. (1993). Outdoor recreation and environment: Towards an understanding of the use of the outdoors in New Zealand. *Leisure, recreation and tourism*, 84-98.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2008). Widening Participation in Higher Education: A Commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/HEcomm.pdf

Demirkaya, H., & Atayeter, Y. (2011), A study on the experiences of university lecturers and students in the geography field trip, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *19*, 453-461.

Dobbins, G. H., Lane, I. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1988). Research Note. Journal of Organizational Behavior (1986-1998), 9(3), 281.

Dotzour, A, Manubay, G., Smith, J. C., Houston, C., Schulz, K. & De Young, R. (2002, August). Evaluating exhibits that promote conservation behavior: Developing a theoretical framework. *31st Annual North American Association for Environmental Education Conference, Boston, MA*.

Douglas, B. (2000). Simulated field trips: Facilitating adult learning in and out of the classroom. *Adult Learning*, *11*(4), 7.

Dunklee, D. R. (1987). Performance and Prudence: Avoiding Liability for Negligence on Field Trips. *Music Educators Journal*, *73*(9), 26-30.

Eason L. P., & Linn, M. C. (1976). Evaluation of the effectiveness of participatory exhibits. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, *19*(1), 45-62.

Education Forum (2013). Learning experience. Retrieve July 19, 2015 from http://edglossary.org/learning-experience/

Eiglier, Pierre and Eric Langeard (1977). "Services as Systems: Marketing Implications," in Marketing Consumer Services: New Insights. *Marketing Science*, 83-103.

Elkins, J. T., & Elkins, N. M. (2007). Teaching geology in the field: Significant geoscience concept gains in entirely field-based introductory geology courses. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *55*(2), 126.

Estaville, L. E., B. J. Brown, and S. Caldwell. (2006). Geography undergraduate program essentials: Placement. *Journal of Geography* 105 (3), 3–12.

Eyler, J.,& Giles, D.E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Falk, J. H., & Balling, J. D. (1982). The field trip milieu: Learning and behavior as a function of contextual events. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *76*(1), 22-28.

Falk, J. H., Martin, W. W., & Balling, J. D. (1978). The novel field - trip phenomenon: Adjustment to novel settings interferes with task learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 15(2), 127-134.

Flak, J. H. (2009). *Identity and the museum visitor experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press

Falk, J. H., Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Benckendorff, P. (2012). Travel and learning: A neglected tourism research area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(2), 908-927.

Foley, K. (2007). *The Big Pocket Guide to Using & Creating Virtual Field Trips* (3rd ed.). Tramline. [1]. ISBN 0-9716154-0-3

Frank Tang (2006). "Project-based learning in teaching foreign languages." *Presentation at the Annual Conference of NYS Foreign Language Conference, New York*

Freud, S. (1955). "Beyond the pleasure principle," in the standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. 18. J. Strackey, ed., London: Hogarth Press.

Freyer (1990). Tourismus. p. 19.

Fry, P. (1987). The Darwin memorial at Down House, Downe, Kent. *Journal of Biological Education*, 21(1), 7-10.

Fuller, I., Gaskin, S., & Scott, I. (2003). Student perceptions of geography and environmental science fieldwork in the light of restricted access to the field, caused by foot and mouth disease in the UK in 2001. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(1), 79-102.

G., McLean, K., Rounds, J., and Spock, M. (2000). Meaning making: The conversation continues. *Exhibitionist, 19 (2), 38-47* Gee, C. Y., & Fayos-Sola, E. (1997). *International tourism: a global perspective*. World Tourism Organization (WTO)

Goeldner, C. R., Ritchie, J. B., & McIntosh, R. W. (2002). Turismo: princípios. práticas e filosofias. *Trad. Roberto Cataldo Costa*, 8.

Graddol David (1996). The future of English-a guide to forecasting the popularity of English language in the 21 century. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from https://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/business-postgraduate/files/2014/09/CIGBE-Th e-Future-of-English.pdf

Guba, E. G. (Ed.). (1990). The paradigm dialog. Sage Publications.

Gyllenhaal, E. D., & Garibay, C. (2001). Lessons learned from the evaluation of MuseumLink-Illinois. *Unpublished manuscript, Illinois State Museum, Springfield, IL.*

Gyr Ueli (2010). The history of tourism: structures on the path to modernity. Retrieved on 29th July, 2015 from http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/europe-on-the-road/the-history-of-tourism/ueli-gyr-the-his tory-of-tourism#InsertNoteID_6_marker7

Hamilton-Smith, E. (1987). Four Kinds of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research 14*, 332-334.

Harman, Harry H. (1976). Modern Factor Analysis. University of Chicago Press. pp. 175, 176. ISBN 0-226-31652-1

Havlena, W and Holbrook, M (1986). The varieties of consumption experience: comparing two typologies of emotion in consumer behavior. *Consumer research*, *13*, 394-404

Heaton, K. L. (1941). A Co-operative Approach to Improvement of Teachers in Service. *NASSP Bulletin*, 25(95), 5-9.

Healey, M. (2005). Linking research and teaching to benefit student learning. *Journal* of Geography in Higher Education 29 (2), 183–201.

Hecht, B., Starosielski, N., & Dara-Abrams, D. (2007). Generating Educational Tourism Narratives from Wikipedia. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence Fall Symposium on Intelligent Narrative Technologies (AAAI-INT'07)*, 37-44

Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *The Journal of Marketing*, 92-101.

Holbrook, M B & Hirschman, E (1982). The experience aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings and fun. *Consumer Research*, *9*, 132-140

Holdnak, A., & Holland, S. M. (1996). Edu-tourism: Vacationing to learn. *Parks and Recreation*, *31*(9), 72-75.

Hui, M K and Bateson, J E (1991). Perceived control and the effects of crowding and consumer choice on the service experience. *Consumer Research*, *18*, 174-184

Hunter-Jones, J., & Hunter-Jones, P. (2007). Managing health and safety on international school trips. *Management in Education*, 21(1), 8-14.

Irvine, K. N., Saunders, C D. & Foster, J. S. (2002). Using evaluation to guide the development of behavior change programs, Visitor studies: Theory, research and practice. *Selected papers from the 1995 Visitor Studies Conference 8* (2).'

Izard, C. E. and S. Buechler (1980). "Aspects of Consciousness and Personality in Terms of Differential Emotions Theory," in Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience. New York: Academic Press.

Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94104.

Jakubowski, L. M. (2003). Beyond book learning: Cultivating the pedagogy of experience through field trips. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *26*(1), 24-33.

Jennings, G. (2010). *Tourism research second edition*. John Wiley and sons Australia, Ltd.

Jose Vinals, M., Morant, M., & Teruel, L. (2014). Psychological comfort and tourism experience. The Valencian natural protected areas (Spain) case study. *Boletin De La Asociacion De Geografos Espanoles*, (65), 293-316.

Josiam, B. M., Clements, C. J., & Hobson, J. S. P. (1994). Youth travel in the USA: Understanding the spring break market. *Tourism: The state of the art*, 322-331.

Kalinowski, K. M., Weiler, B., & Hall, C. M. (1992). Educational travel. *Special interest tourism*, 15-26.

Katuk, N., Kim, J., & Ryu, H. (2013). Experience beyond knowledge: Pragmatic e-learning systems design with learning experience. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 747-758.

Kelner, S., & Sanders, G. (2009). Beyond the Field Trip Teaching Tourism Through Tours. *Teaching Sociology*, *37*(2), 136-150.

Keown, D. (1984). Let's justify the field trip. The American Biology Teacher, 43-48.

Kent M, Gilberstion DD & Hunt Co. (1997). Field work in geography teaching: A critical review of the literature and approaches. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21 (3), 313-332.

Kidd, J. R. (1973). How adults learn. Chicago. Follett

Klepper, N. H. (1990). Lifetime Legacy: The Successful Field Trip. *The American Biology Teacher*, 245-248.

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2010). Principles of marketing. Pearson Education.

Kovari, I., & Zimányi, K. (2011). Safety and Security in the Age of Global Tourism (The changing role and conception of Safety and Security in Tourism). *APSTRACT: Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, *5*.

Lai KC. (1990). Freedom to learn: A study of the experience of secondary school teachers and students in a geography field trip. *International Research in Geographial and Environmental Education*, 8(3), 239-255.

Le Heron, R., R. Baker, and L. McEwen. (2006). Colearning: Re-linking research and teaching in geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education 30* (1): 77–87.

Levy, Sidney J. (1959). Symbols for Sale. Harvard Business Review, 37, 117-119.

Lewis Michael (2010). In and out of field. Journal of Urban History 36 (1), 68-80

Lianglimi (2015). Market development in educational tourism in China. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://free.chinabaogao.com/wenti/201506/0E2106112015.html

Ludwig Der neue (1990). Tourismus, p. 30

MacCannell, D.(1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Journal of Sociology* 79(3), 589-603.

Manubay, G., Smith, J. C., Houston, C., Schulz, K., Dotzour, A., & De Young, R. (2002). Evaluating exhibits that promote conservation behavior: Developing a theoretical framework. In *31st Annual North American Association for Environmental Education Conference, Boston, MA*.

Martin, W. W., Falk, J. H., & Balling, J. D. (1981). Environmental effects on learning: The outdoor field trip. *Science Education*, 65(3), 301-309.

McIntosh, G. Ritchie (1995). Tourism Principles, Practices, Philosophies.

McKay, I. A., & Parson, H. E. (1986). *The Successful Field Trip*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Melton, F. A. (1936). An empirical classification of flood-plain streams. *Geographical Review*, 593-609.

Morrissey. (2012). What makes learning fun?: principles for the design of intrinsically motivating museum exhibits, Endorsement. *Rowman Altamira*.

Nash, D.(1996). Anthropology of Tourism. Oxford: Pergamon.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. *Doing feminist research*, 30(6), 1.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2001). Cities and Regions in the New Learning Economy. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://learningcities2020.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/OECD-Cities_in_Learning_Econ. pdf

Opaschowski (1996). The subjective experience of travel is a distinguishing feature of the beginnings of the modern age: by travelling, one's self experienced its liberation" [translated by C.G.]. *Tourismus*, p. 65

Otto, J. E., & Ritchie, J. B. (1995). *Exploring the quality of the service experience: a theoretical and empirical analysis's in Bowen, Advances in services marketing and management: research and practice, (5).* JAI Press, CT.

Otto, J. E., & Ritchie, J. B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17 (3), 165-174

Page, S (1997). Urban Tourism, Analysing and Evaluating the Tourist Experience. In *The Tourist Experience: A New Introduction*. London: Cassell.

Page, S. (2002). Tourist health and safety. Mintel International Group Limited.

Pearce, P. (1982). The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour. New York: Pergamon.

Perry, D. (2012). What Makes Learning Fun? Principles for the Design of Intrinsically Motivating Museum Exhibits. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Perry. Miller el.al (2002). *Perspectives on object-centered learning in museums*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, Paris, S. G., and Mercer, M. J.

Pitman, T., Broomhall, S., McEwan, J., & Majocha, E. (2010). Adult Learning in Educational Tourism. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *50*(2), 219-238.

Polit DF Beck CT (2012). *Nursing Research: Generating and Assessing Evidence for Nursing Practice, 9th ed.* Philadelphia, USA: Wolters Klower Health, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Proshansky, Harold M., William H. Ittelson, and Leanne G. Rivlin (1974). "Freedom of Choice and Behavior in a Physical Setting," in Environmental Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 170-181.

Quezada, R. L. (2004). Beyond Educational Tourism: Lessons Learned while Student Teaching Abroad. *International Education Journal*, *5*(4), 458-465.

Renner, P. F. (1983). *The instructor's survival kit: a handbook for teachers of adults*. Training Assoc Limited.

Reid, D. (1995). Epidemiology of travel-related diseases, in G.C. Cook (ed.). *Travel Associated Disease. London*. Royal College of Physicians of London, pp. 1–8.

Reilly, T., Atkinson, G. and Waterhouse, J. (1997). Travel fatigue and jet lag. *Journal* of Sports Sciences, 15(3), 369–79.

Ritchie, B. W. (2003). *Managing educational tourism* (Vol. 10). Channel View Publications.

Robert A. Mill, Alastair M. Morrison (1985). *The Tourism System: An Introductory Text*. Prentice-Hall.

Roberts L.C (1991). The elusive qualities of "affect". ILVS Review, 2 (1), 133-36.

Rodger, D. (1998). Leisure, learning, and travel. *Journal of Physical Education*, *Recreation & Dance*, 69 (4), 28–31.

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

Roppolo, C. (1996). *International education: What does this mean for universities and tourism*. Tourism and Cultural Change, Sunderland: Centre for Travel and Tourism and Business Editorial Press

Ryan, C. (1993). *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective*. London Routledge.

Ryan, C. (1997). *The chase of a dream, the end of a play. in the tourist experience: a new introduction.* London: Cassell.

Sanchez, A. D., Cuevas, H. M., Fiore, S. M., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2005). Virtual field trips: Synthetic experiences and learning. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* 49(6), 732-736.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). Social Research. 3rd. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saunders, C., Birjulin, A. A. & Myers, O. E. (1998). Developing caring attitudes at a new "children's zoo": Guiding principles and front-end studies. *Current trends in audience research and evaluation*, 11-89.

Saunders, M. L., & Lewis, P. (2000). P. and Thornhill, A.(2009). Research Methods for Business Students. *Financial Times Prentice Hall Inc., London*.

Scarinci, J., & Pearce, P. (2012). The perceived influence of travel experiences on learning generic skills. *Tourism Management*, *33*(2), 380-386.

Screven, C. G. (1976). Exhibit Evaluation—A Goal - Referenced Approach.*Curator: The Museum Journal*, *19*(4), 271-290.

Schutz, William C. (1966). *The Interpersonal Underworld*. Palo Alto, CA: Science & Behavior

Shah, S., Prakash, V., Dekkers, L. M. A., Fiddler, H., Sittiwong, T., Manyum & Yusuf, M. (2015). Factors influencing academic performance of Indian undergraduate physiotherapy students. *Physiotherapy*, *101*, 1371-1372.

Silverman, L. H. (2010). *The social work of museums*. New York: Routledege. Simon, N.

Simon, N. (2010). The participatory museum. Museum 2.0.

SIRAKAYA, E., & MCLELLAN, R. W. (1997). Factors affecting vacation destination choices of college students. *Anatolia*, 8(3), 31-44.

Skop, E. (2009). Creating field trip-based learning communities. *Journal of Geography*, *107*(6), 230-235.

Slater, K. (1985). Human comfort (Vol. 1). Springfield, Ill., USA: CC Thomas.

Slattery, D. (2001). What can environmental history offer outdoor education practitioners?. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 5(2), 28.

Smith, R. (1982). Learning how to learn. Chicago, IL: Follett.

Smith, V. L. (1989). Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism. Philadelphia. *University of Pennsylvania Press*.

Spode, Historische(1993). Tourismusforschung, p. 4-6

Stainfield, J., Fisher, P., Ford, B., & Solem, M. (2000). International virtual field trips: a new direction?. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *24*(2), 255-262.

Steinecke, A., Pompl, W., & Lavery, P. (1993). The historical development of tourism in Europe. *Tourism in Europe: structures and developments.*, 3-12.

Stewart, A. (2008). Whose place, whose history? Outdoor environmental education

pedagogy as 'reading'the landscape. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning*, 8(2), 79-98.

Stronck, D. R. (1983). The comparative effects of different museum tours on children's attitudes and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*,20(4), 283-290.

Sullivan-Caltlin, H. (2002). Food, hunger, and poverty: A thematic approach to integrating service-learning. *Teaching Sociology*, *30*(1), 39-52.

Swarbrooke, J, (1995). The development and management of visitor attractions. *Butterworth-Herinemann Oxford*

Swartz, J. E. (1983). Interterm Program Expands, Improves Traditional Field Trip. *Journalism Educator*, *38*(3), 41-42.

Tang, A. C., Wong, N., & Wong, T. K. (2015). Learning experience of Chinese nursing students in an online clinical English course: Qualitative study. *Nurse education today*, *35*(2), 61-66.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (2014). Understanding Tourism: Basic Glossary, Retrieved July 14,2015 from http://media.unwto.org/en/content/understanding-tourism-basic-glossary

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) (2002). Safety and Security in Tourism: Partnerships and Practical Guidelines for Destinations. Madrid:World Tourism Organization

United Nations World Tourism Organization (2015). UNWTO tourism highlights 2014 edition, Retrieved July 14,2015 from http://publications.unwto.org/

United Nations World Tourism Organization (2012). Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://themis.unwto.org/

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Culture Organization (UNESCO) (2014). Global flow of tertiary-level students. Retrieved July 14,2015 from http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society*. London:Sage.

Van Selm, M., & Jankowski, N. W. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality and Quantity*, 40(3), 435-456.

Veal, A. J. (2006). *Research methods for leisure and tourism: A practical guide*. Pearson Education.

Wever and Oppermann (2000). Tourism Management. John Wiley and Sons

Willis, J. W., Jost, M., & Nilakanta, R. (2007). Foundations of qualitative research: *Interpretive and critical approaches*. Sage.

Wilson, B., and M. Ryder. (1996). *Dynamic learning communities: An alternative to designed instructional systems*. Proceedings of selected research and development presentations at the 1996 National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Indianapolis, Indiana. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~mryder/ dlc.html

World Health Organization (WHO) (2004). International Travel and Health, Geneva :World Health Organization. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2007/9789241580397_eng.pdf

Wojtas, O. (1997). VR field trips come step closer. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 13(6), 97.

Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching Internet - based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer - Mediated Communication*, *10*(3), 00-00.

Yan, X. (2009). Linear regression analysis: theory and computing. World Scientific.

Yiannakis, A., and H. Gibson (1992), Roles Tourists Play. *Annals of Tourism Research 19*(2), 287-303.

APPENDIXES

Appendix I

Survey of ITHAS experience

Hello,

You are invited to participant in this survey which aims to better understand the experiences in the student field trip. We welcome your honest feedback. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Your survey response will be strictly confidential and anonymous. All data collected from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. If you have any questions at any time about the survey or the results, you may contact the author at traveler.cy@hotmail.com. Thank you for your valued time and support!

Declaration: I Yue Cui declare that I did not receive any financial support for this research from any parties or companies named in this survey. This survey is for academic use only and will be used as a part of my master thesis.

Sincerely, Yue Cui EMTM 2013-2015

Supervisor Dr. Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar

Part one

For the purpose of the research, please try to think about your experiences on ITHAS and answer the following questions.

Please rate your satisfaction of overall experience on **ITHAS** (If "Neutral", please select "I can't rate")

	,				
	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	I can't rate
	unsatisfied			satisfied	
Overall	0	0	0	0	0
satisfaction					
Learning	0	0	0	0	0
experience					
Travel	0	0	0	0	0
experience					

Please rate your satisfaction of the following elements on **ITHAS** (If "Neutral", please select "I can't rate")

	Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	I can't
	0	0	0	0	rate
Orientation: introduction to	0	0	0	0	0
subject, learning materials	0	0	0	0	0
Up to date topic	0	0	0	0	0
schedule	0	0	0	0	0
Opportunity to interact	0	0	0	0	0
with local people					
Quality of professor	0	0	0	0	0
Competition between teams	0	0	0	0	0
Visiting local business	0	0	0	0	0
Presentation of all group	0	0	0	0	0
projects					
Workshop/ discussion	0	0	0	0	0
among students and					
entrepreneurs					
Compulsory field journal or	0	0	0	0	0
notes requirement for					
students					
Quality of assignment	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of evaluation	0	0	0	0	0
Certificate	0	0	0	0	0
Record of lectures and	0	0	0	0	0
presentations(ppt,video)					
Gaining the relevant	0	0	0	0	0
capabilities that will help					
me in future career					
International learning	0	0	0	0	0
environment					

1) Service elements related to your LEARNING experience

2) Service elements related to your TRAVEL experience

	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	I can't
	unsatisfied			satisfied	rate
Quality of organized	0	0	0	0	0
guided tour					
Selected sight-seeing or	0	0	0	0	0
activities					
Available free time	0	Ο	0	0	0
Orientation:itineraries	0	Ο	0	0	0
Team building activity	0	0	0	0	0
Social events	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	Ο	0	0	0
Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0
Health care	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency solution	0	0	0	0	0

Part two

You are almost there! Please tell us a little about yourself

- 1. Your gender?
- **O** Female
- O Male

2. Year of birth

3. Where are you from?

- 4. Your major?
- **O** Nature science
- O Humanities and Social science
- O Medical and health science
- O Engineering and technology
- O Agriculture science
- 5. The highest level of formal education
- **O** High school/ secondary education
- O Diploma/ Associate's Degree (2 years)

O Bachelor's degree

O Graduate/Post graduate Degree

O Other, please specify

Thank you for participating in the survey! Please feel free to contact us at traveler.cy@hotmail.com. Thank you again and have a wonderful day!

Appendix II

Experience in student field trips

Hello,

You are invited to participant in this survey which aims to better understand the experiences in the student field trip. We welcome your honest feedback. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Your survey response will be strictly confidential and anonymous. All data collected from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. If you have any questions at any time about the survey or the results, you may contact the author at <u>traveler.cy@hotmail.com</u>. Thank you for your valued time and support!

Declaration: I Yue Cui declare that I did not receive any financial support for this research from any parties or companies named in this survey. This survey is for academic use only and will be used as a part of my master thesis.

Sincerely,

Yue Cui Supervisor Dr. Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar

Part one: Screening question (respondents do not see this information in italics)

1. In the last five years, have you participated in any field trip, which included at least on overnight stay, organized by university or college for the purpose of education or research?

O Yes

O No – Thanks for helping! You are finished.

Part two: For those that responded with "Yes" to question 1 (respondents do not see this information in italics)

For the purpose of the research, please try to think about ONE field trip you remember the most (it is necessary that field trip includes overnight stay) and answer the following questions for that particular field trip.

1. Was the trip domestic (within your country) or international?

O Domestic

O International

2. Was the purpose of the trip for learning or research?

O learning

O research
- **3.** The field trip was organized for?
- O students only from your school
- O students of other domestic schools
- O students of other international schools

Base on **THAT** particular field trip, please rate your satisfaction of the following experiences. (If "Neutral", please select "I can't rate")

	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	I can't rate
	unsatisfied			satisfied	
Overall	0	0	0	0	0
satisfaction					
Learning	0	0	0	0	0
experience					
Travel	0	0	0	0	0
experience					

Please rate your satisfaction of the following elements in THAT field trip (If "Neutral", please select "I can't rate")

1) Service elements related to your learning experience

2)

	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	I
	unsatisfied			satisfied	can't
					rate
Orientation:introduction to	Ο	0	0	0	0
subject, learning materials					
Up to date topic	0	Ο	0	0	0
Provide and follow the	0	0	0	0	0
schedule					
Opportunity to interact	Ο	Ο	0	0	0
with local people					
Quality of professor	0	0	0	0	0
Competition between teams	0	Ο	0	0	0
Visiting with local business	0	0	0	0	0
Presentation of all group	0	Ο	0	0	0
projects					
Workshop/ discussion	0	Ο	0	0	0
among students and					
entrepreneurs					
	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	Ι
	unsatisfied			satisfied	can't
					rate

Compulsory field journal or notes requirement for students	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of assignment	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of feed-back session	0	0	0	0	Ο
Certificate	0	0	0	0	0
Record of lectures and	0	0	0	0	0
presentations(ppt,video)					
Gaining the relevant	0	0	0	0	0
capabilities that will help					
me in future career					
International learning	0	0	0	0	0
environment					

2) Service elements related to your TRAVEL experience

	Very	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very	I can't
	unsatisfied			satisfied	rate
Quality of organized	0	0	0	0	0
guided tour					
Selected sight-seeing or	0	0	0	0	0
activities					
Available free time	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation:itineraries	0	0	0	0	0
Team building activities	0	0	0	0	0
Social events	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0
Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0
Health care	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency solution	0	0	0	0	0

Part three: this page is a continuation from part two or a logical leap from part one when respondent select No to the screening question (Respondents do not see this information in italics)

You are almost there! Please tell us a little about yourself

Your gender?
 O Female
 O Male

2. Year of birth

3, Where are you from

4. Your major?

O Nature science

O Humanities and Social science

O Medical and health science

O Engineering and technology

O Agriculture science

5. The highest level of formal education

O High school/ secondary education

O Diploma/ Associate's Degree (2 years)

O Bachelor's degree

O Graduate/Post graduate Degree

O Other, please specify

Thank you for participating in the survey! Please feel free to contact us at traveler.cy@hotmail.com. Thank you again and have a wonderful day!

Appendix III Chinese version of Questionnaire

关于大学生"社会研习(实践)、田野调查"的学习与旅行体验调查

为了更好地了解大学生社会研习(又作社会实践,田野调查等,以下统称社会研 习)的学习体验与旅行体验,本次调查将请你针对您所参加过的一次社会研习 的整体体验满意度以及相应的学习与旅行服务要素进行评价。本次调查仅供学术 研究使用,您的信息将得到严格保密。所收集的全部数据将以统计数据的形式呈 现。如果您对本次调研或其结果有任何意见或建议,<u>欢迎发邮件到</u> traveler.cy@hotmail.com 联系我们。感谢你的参与与支持!

崔月

European Master in Tourism Management 2013-2015 指导老师: Dr. Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar

1,在最近的五年, 您是否参加过学校组织的以学习或研究为目的的社会研习活动(包括至少一晚住宿)?

- 0是
- **O**否

请回忆你印象最深刻的一次社会研习活动(包括至少一晚住宿),并根据您的这次经历回答以下问题

2, 这次社会研习范围是境内还是境外?

- **0**境内
- **0**境外

3, 这次社会研习的主要目的学习还是学术研究?

0 学习

0 学术研究

4, 这次社会研习的主要参加者是?

O 仅限本校学生

O包括本校以及国内其他学校学生

O包括本校以及国内学生

5, 请对这次社会研习体验的满意度进行打分(中立请选不能评价)

	非常不满意	比较不满意	比较满意	非常满意	不能评价
整体体验	0	0	0	0	0
学习体验	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο
旅行体验	Ο	0	0	0	Ο

	非常不满	比较不满	比较满	非常满	不 能 评
	意	意	意	意	价
行前准备:提供课程介绍,学习	0	0	0	0	0
资料					
提供前沿研究或学习课题	0	0	0	0	0
遵守流程和时间表	0	0	0	0	0
与当地人交流互动的机会	0	0	0	0	0
指导老师的水平	0	0	0	0	0
团队竞赛	0	0	0	0	0
团队竞赛	0	0	0	0	0
小组展示	0	0	0	0	0
与当地企业进行研讨交流	0	0	0	0	0
调研笔记(强制性)	0	0	0	0	0
调研报告的质量	0	0	0	0	0
反馈机制	0	0	0	0	0
证书	0	0	0	0	0
调研过程的演讲或展示记录	0	0	0	0	0
(ppt 或视频录像)					
得到有利于未来发展的相关技	0	0	0	0	0
能					
国际化的学习氛围	0	0	0	0	0

6, 请对以下有关学习体验的服务要素的满意度进行打分(中立请选不能评价)

7, 请对以下有关旅行体验的服务要素的满意度进行打分(中立请选不能评价)

	非常不满意	比较不满意	比较满意	非常满意	不能评价
有导览与讲解的参观	0	0	0	0	0
有选择的观光与旅行活动	Ο	0	0	0	0
自由支配的活动时间	0	0	0	0	0
行前准备:行程介绍	0	0	0	0	0
团队建设活动	0	0	0	0	0
社交活动	0	0	0	0	0
交通	0	0	0	0	0
住宿	0	0	0	0	0
餐饮	0	0	0	0	0
保险	0	0	0	0	0
医疗设施	0	0	0	0	0
突发事件解决方案	0	0	0	0	0

问卷即将完成,请简单介绍一下你!

8, 你的性别

0女

0 男

9, 年龄

10, 国籍

11. 专业
0 自然科学
0 人文与社会科学
0 医药科学
0 工程与技术科学
0 农业科学
12. 你获得的最高学历
0 高中

O 专科 **O** 本科

O研究生(硕士、博士)

O 其他

非常感谢您的宝贵时间与热心参与!