

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)

OANA-RAMONA ILOVAN

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Department of Regional Geography and Territorial Planning, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: ilovanoana@yahoo.com

MARIA ELIZA DULAMĂ

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Psychology and Sciences of Education, Department of Exact Sciences Didactics, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: dulama@upcmil.ro

KINGA XÉNIA HAVADI-NAGY

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Department of Regional Geography and Territorial Planning, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: xenia.havadi@ubbcluj.ro

CRISTIAN NICOLAE BOȚAN

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Department of Regional Geography and Territorial Planning, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: cristian.botan@ubbcluj.ro

VIOREL GLIGOR

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Department of Regional Geography and Territorial Planning, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: viorel.gligor@ubbcluj.ro

LILIANA CIASCAI

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Psychology and Sciences of Education, Department of Exact Sciences Didactics, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, e-mail: liliciascai@yahoo.com

EMANUEL-CRISTIAN ADOREAN*

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Centre for Research on Settlements and Urbanism, Cluj-Napoca, Romania; email: adorean.ec@gmail.com

**corresponding author*

(Received: December 2018; in revised form: February 2019)

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses information and university students's opinions, from the Faculty of Geography of Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, regarding the field trips organised during their studies. Information and opinions were collected by means of a questionnaire administered in 2017. There were analysed: the number of field trips students participated at, their duration, sources of funding, types of learning activities and their efficiency, the places where the activities were organised, strengths and opportunities, weaknesses and threats, as well as improvement measures. The compulsory field trips are included and credited in the curriculum and completed with grades at all Bachelor specialisations. In addition, the professors organise short, optional thematic field trips in and around Cluj-Napoca. The results of the research revealed the professors' expertise in organising field trips, such as duration, places studied, content proposed for learning, didactic and research methodology, devices and tools used. Results showed students' greater involvement into compulsory field trips, compared to their participation at optional and short field trips organised in the local horizon. These results also highlighted the students' desire to benefit of a better field trip activity offer and of a broad range of student-centered learning activities: discussions and debates, problem solving and exercises, individual and group investigations, and so on. Our research will be useful for professors who organise field trips with Geography students.

Keywords: *learning activity, tasks, skills, active learning, exercise, investigation, research*

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Field trips are valuable activities within Geography academic education and have been organised systematically over time. This topic has been researched recently in Romania (Dulamă & Ilovan, 2015, 2017). They provide optimal contexts for acquiring knowledge in Geography (Dulamă, 1996; Dulamă & Roşcovanu, 2007), for geographical and environmental research (Scott et al., 2006), additionally providing important complementary benefits to teaching and library research (Fuller, 2006). The territory outside the formal university space is considered the ideal place where geographers perceive directly the processes from reality, have the chance to grasp them correctly and gain good quality experience about the reality they are living in (Hope, 2009; Havadi-Nagy & Ilovan, 2013; Ilovan & Havadi-Nagy, 2016), learn how to build Geography understanding, and it is the place where they enhance their awareness by integrating the insight gained in the field (France & Haigh, 2018), in both Human Geography (Hope, 2009) and Physical Geography (Dunphy & Spellman, 2009).

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)

Involving students in learning activities organised in the field develops their knowledge, skills and values, contributing to environmental education and education for sustainable development (Ilovan et al., 2018b), as well as to their forestry education when research is carried out in forests (Dulamă et al., 2016a; Dulamă et al., 2017). Inquiry learning, projects and research activity based on problems (PBL) (e.g. that organised on a river) facilitates understanding the complexity of environmental issues and fosters the accumulation of an ecological experience (Raath & Golighrly, 2017).

This field research offers the opportunity to use a big variety of teaching and learning strategies centered on students' activity: learning by discovery (Dulamă, 2008a), cooperative learning and teamwork (Dulamă, 2008b) and the project method (Dulamă, 2010b). The field trips are efficient in training and developing skills specific to Physical Geography, as well as to Human Geography (Wang et al., 2006; Dulamă, 2010a, 2011, 2012).

Realising field trips requires the use of various tools and new information technologies (e.g. in the context of a comparative experimental study, using paper maps and mobile mapping tools in the field were analysed by Wang et al., 2017). The analysis of videos and oral interviews, notebooks and reflective diary (Marvell & Simm, 2018) represents, both for students and professors, a way of reflecting on and evaluating students' perceptions and emotions during field trip activities (Boyel et al., 2007), but also their knowledge and skills. Students' completing a reflective diary about their fieldwork is an excellent way to stimulate deep learning, facilitating assesment, metacognitive reflection and self-regulated learning (Dummer et al., 2008; Ilovan & Havadi-Nagy, 2016; Marvell & Simm, 2018).

For Geography students, research conducted directly in the field is necessary and useful to collect data valuable for the development of projects, Bachelor's or dissertation final theses. The methods and tools used by the students in these field investigations have been described in studies on territorial dysfunctions (Popa et al., 2017), the territorial identity of historical urban centres (Ilovan et al., 2018a), the study of river basins/ proposals of spatial planning measures for hydrographical basins (Dulamă et al., 2016b), and in studies of geographic landscapes (Toderaş, 2017).

For example, the students from the Faculty of Geography of the University of Belgrade are aware of a large number of pedagogical benefits of field work: immediate contact with the subject of knowledge, interdisciplinary study of a problem, variety of teaching methods, increasing motivation for learning, improving social relationships and developing the skills needed for field work (Andelkovic et al., 2018). In other studies, the students' attitude towards field trips was analysed (Dunphy & Spellman, 2009), as well as the effectiveness of learning activities (Fuller et al., 2006), the role of feedback and feedforward in geographic academic education (Dulamă & Ilovan, 2016), the use of Internet by Geography students in different contexts and for different purposes (Dulamă et al., 2015).

Although field trips are important nowadays for Geography students' professional training, as the above-mentioned research proves, some studies indicate that few academic programmes include fieldwork requirements and fieldwork is poorly integrated into certain programmes (Wilson et al., 2017). In other studies, results showed low awareness in universities of the field trips in Human Geography, and thus, adequate solutions are sought for the right choice of location and content, for widening the range of methods and techniques or for applying the field research results to the theoretical courses (Li & Li, 2018).

In a previous research paper (Dulamă et al., 2018), the authors of the present study investigated the students' motivation and roles in field trips organised by the Faculty of Geography of Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania, the efficiency and utility of these activities, the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, as well as the improvements proposed by their students. In this paper, with a view to finalising that research on field trips, we will present other results not published in the 2018 article due to limited space considerations: the number of field trips that the students participated in, duration, sources of funding, types of activities, students' learning process and its efficiency, the places where the activities were organised, portraying at the same time the SWOT analysis. We strongly believe that the information obtained through our research will be useful for professors who organise field trips with and for Geography students.

METHODOLOGY

5.1. Research methods. Research data collection was realised through a questionnaire by using the Google Forms application from Google Drive. Through the first three items, we collected information about the respondents (field of study, gender, the environment in which they have a stable residence), while through the medium of the other 14 items (11 items with Likert scale – with values from 1 to 5, one with dual choice and two with multiple answers) was obtained information on the field trips organised at the Faculty of Geography (the number of field trips students participated at, costs, duration, motivation, roles fulfilled, the usefulness of those activities then and in the future, strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and dangers/risks/problems and measures to increase field trips efficiency).

The questionnaire administered in 2017 was sent to the students by e-mail, to be filled in voluntarily and anonymously. The collected data was processed in Excel and presented in data tables. The respondents' answers and choices were analysed and we interpreted them, using researchers' experience in organising field trips and course and seminar activities within the faculty. Some statements are also supported by data obtained through participant observation. Professors' conceptions (i.e. ideas, beliefs) about

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)

field trips were highlighted by the community diagnosis method (i.e. through our participant observation in school communities in Romania and having discussions with Geography teachers.

5.2. Participants. The questionnaire was filled in by 50 students from the third year of studies at the Faculty of Geography of Babeş-Bolyai University, who had the chance to participate in several field trips. These students represent approximately 30% of the total number of third year students, from all courses of studies (Geography - 10%, Geography of Tourism - 42%, Cartography - 24%, Territorial Planning - 20%, Hydrology-Meteorology - 4%). Regarding the number of students from one course of study, students' weight from Cartography and Territorial Planning is more considerable. The respondents' distribution by gender (female - 78%) is similar to the one at university level, with this gender having a higher percentage in all courses of study. Concerning respondents' distribution according to their living environment (56% urban and the other in the rural area), we do not consider there is any relevance related to the following aspects: interest in professional training through field trips, easy access to the online environment and to electronic devices, and level of digital competences. However, the respondents living in the rural area have more frequent and intensive contact with the land/territory than those living in the urban environment, by the nature of their daily activities, so their skills in understanding different phenomena that are taking place in the surroundings may be well developed.

5.3. Research material. The research material consists of the respondents' answers and options offered for each item of the questionnaire.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the Faculty of Geography, during 2014 and 2017, two compulsory field trips (in the first two years of study) were organised annually for each course of study, completed with transferable grades and credits, as well as optional or mandatory field trips for some subjects in the curriculum (Dulamă et al., 2018). In the third year of study, the students individually carry out field trips for the preparation of their Bachelor's theses.

Regarding the compulsory field trips, results showed that all respondents participated during the first two years of study, and fewer (almost 50%), optionally, in those of the third year of study (Table 1). There is emphasized the students' preference for compulsory field trips during spring. The absence from a compulsory field trip must be compensated by another similar activity, with the approval of the organising

professor, or the student will participate in an extra field trip within the next year of studies. Concerning the complementary, voluntary, occasional field trips or those associated with courses, all the surveyed students claimed to have participated in, at least, one such activity, while no student participated in more than five activities. We also noticed the high frequency of participation in 1-2 day activities. Most participations were in the first year (48 participations) and in the second year (45 participations), and the lowest in the third year (39). The average of 2.64 participations/student indicates respondents' poor participation at optional field trips.

Table 1. Number of the field trips

Academic years	Spring field trips (compulsory)	Summer field trips (compulsory)	Complementary, occasional or associated with courses field trips								I don't know
			0	1	2	3	4	5	>5	Total	
2014-2015	46	4	0	20	16	8	2	2	0	48	2
2015-2016	32	18	1	13	16	9	4	2	0	45	2
2016-2017	21	1	10	10	11	7	1	0	0	39	4
Total	97	23	11	43	43	24	7	4	0	132	8

The sources of funding for the field trips attended by our respondents were diverse (Table 2). 76% of them claimed to have participated at field trips whose costs were borne both by the Faculty of Geography and by themselves, and 38% of them participated at field trips totally funded by the faculty. We should underline that the financial contribution allocated by the faculty to each student for binding field trips is too low and does not cover the full cost of these curricular activities. To improve this situation, either the amount allocated by the faculty should be increased, or the full cost of these applications should be reduced.

24% of the respondents affirmed that they have benefited from European funding, through POSDRU programmes (Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane [Sectorial Operational Programme for Human Resource Development]); a student (2%) to have been financially supported by a sponsor or received a scholarship for such a thematic activity. We do not have information about the category of field trips – compulsory or voluntary – which these financial resources (sponsorship and scholarship) were targeted to.

34% of the respondents wrote that they participated at field trips for free and 64% had their own financial resources. Based on direct observation, we emphasize that most of these field trips are voluntary, short-run, low-cost, organised in Cluj-Napoca or in the surrounding area and address certain elements and phenomena investigated, generally from the perspective of an educational discipline. Some of the field trips are optional, longer lasting, targeting an international route, so the high costs are fully paid by the participating students.

Table 2. Field trips funding

Funding sources	Students	
	Number	%
Faculty of Geography and own financial resources	38	76
Own financial resources	32	64
Faculty of Geography	19	38
Free/No costs	17	34
POSDRU projects	12	24
Sponsors/scholarships	1	2

The field trips attended by students were grouped by duration and degree of complexity in three main categories (Dulamă et al., 2018) (Table 3). Most respondents (84%) claimed to have participated at 25-hour, occasional field trips. We highlight that the compulsory field trips are part of this category, they are complex (the highest degree), and they aim at accomplishing multilayered objectives and many different tasks, have long itineraries or are stationary. The second place in the hierarchy is the 3-4 hour field trips (44%), followed by the 5-8 hour ones (24%), 9-16 hour (24%), and 17-24 hour field trips (22%).

In terms of the responding students' reasons to participate in field trips, the first places in the hierarchy are intrinsic reasons, such as: learning new things, achieving field research skills, visiting touristic objectives and places, clarifying some problems, etc. (Dulamă et al., 2018). However, the second place in the hierarchy is an extrinsic reason: obtaining the grade related to the field trip (Dulamă et al., 2018).

Table 3. Duration of the occasional field trips (complementary or associated with courses)

Academic years	Low duration		Medium duration		High duration		I don't know
	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	5-8 hours	9-16 hours	17-24 hours	More than 25 hours	
2014-2015	2	10	3	5	4	16	7
2015-2016	2	8	4	3	3	21	6
2016-2017	3	4	5	4	4	5	8
Total	7	22	12	12	11	42	21

We investigated, as well, the relationship between the roles that students have during field trips and their perception about learning efficiency in those contexts (Table 4).

Table 4. Learning efficiency according to students' roles during field trips

Roles	Weighted average
Listener of professors' or students' presentations	3.62
Member in teams in which we noticed/studied/researched a specific territory aspect	3.55
Excursionist	3.54
Presenter of information about observed/visited/studied places	3.17
Researcher (individual work) of a specific aspect from the field	3.06
Organiser	2.25

Most respondents consider that field trips have the highest efficiency (weighted average of 3.62) when they have, in fact, a passive role, by listening to the professors' or other students' presentations. This perception is probably due to the fact that they consider that if they easily understand the logical, systematic and accessible explanations, the learning process takes place, but the respective perception is not supported by studies in the Didactics of Geography (Dulamă, 2010b, 2012). Therefore, actively following an argument or an explanation (part of active learning) is not enough for learning to be fully ensured, students' personal effort being necessary (debating, argumenting, doing the demonstrated practice, exercising, etc.) (Dulamă & Ilovan, 2009). The second place in the efficiency hierarchy, more realistically perceived, is the member role in teams in which they researched a certain aspect of the territory (weighted average of 3.55). On the third place is the excursionist role (weighted average of 3.54), observing important touristic objectives and it is justified by the fact that many students attend the training programme at the Geography of Tourism. Smaller scores acquired the role of presenter of information about the observed or studied places, the individual researcher of a territory specific aspect, or organiser, probably because they had fewer contexts in which they performed such roles.

The respondents' answers referring to field activities that were very useful in their professional development (Table 5) are different from those about the learning efficiency according to the role performed. In Table 5, we can notice that, on the first places (with weighted average between 4.38 and 4.02), there were the discussions in the observation points and research in the field, the debates in these places, the solving of tasks/exercises/problems and the discussions with experts (Fig. 1). Although other activities (professors' actions, use of work sheets, questioning, team or individual research, individual task solving, discussions with Geography graduates) are in the second part of the hierarchy, the higher scores (weighted average between 3.97 and 3.33) indicate that they are also perceived as effective ways for professional development. Listening to the professors and/or other students (weighted average of 4.0) ranked 5th, indicating that they, nevertheless, find it helpful.

Table 5. Usefulness of field trip activities for students' professional development

Activities	Weighted average
Discussions in observation/research/study points	4.38
Debates in observation/research/study points	4.13
Solving tasks/exercises/territory problems in teams	4.04
Discussions with experts on the topic approached	4.02
Listening to professors' and/or students' presentations	4.00
Professors' personal actions (as an example)	3.97
Observation/research/study of territory issues based on a protocol (observation)	3.89
Questioning in observation/research/study points	3.84
Observation/research/teamwork of specific territory aspects	3.82
Individual observation/research/study of specific territory aspects	3.64
Solving individual tasks/exercises/issues in the field	3.62
Field discussions with Geography graduates	3.33

The place of the field trips activities is important for the development of Geography-specific skills (Dulamă, 2012) but also for the professional skills training (Dulamă, 2010a, 2010b; Dulamă, 2011). Choosing the right contexts for learning and skills training can also be influenced by the specialisation of the participants during field trips. In Table 6, it is noted that all the places proposed for assessment by the students were considered relevant for their professional development. Positioning on the first places the direct study of landscapes, landforms, of the environment in general and the urban and rural areas (Fig. 2), particularly, can be explained by the fact that they have an important role in geographic knowledge, but also because most of the respondents belong to the Geography of Tourism specialisation.

According to the respondents, places less relevant to their study were related to the presence of water, the association with a major relief unit (mountain/hill/plateaus/plains), weather, and pollution. The respondents' lower interest for their investigation can be explained by the specificity of their course of study, by the unpleasant aspect of the degraded or polluted places or by the need of specialised equipment for measurement and research.



Fig. 1. Field observations on processes associated to urban development (Florești, Cluj County) and solving tasks through teamwork.

Photo by Viorel Gligor, 2016



Fig. 2. Studying the urban landscape during a guided tour in Sibiu.

Photo by Michael Schneeberger, 2014

Table 6. Places for field trips and their influence on students' professional development

Activities and places	Weighted average
Direct study of landscapes	4.18
Direct study of landforms	4.10
Direct study of the environment	3.97
Activities in the urban anthropogenic environment	3.82
Activities in the rural anthropogenic environment	3.80
Direct study of water bodies	3.67
Activities in mountains/hills/plateaus/plain regions	3.67
Activities in the degraded/polluted anthropogenic environment	3.67
Direct study of the weather	3.39

In order to identify methods to improve future activities during field trips, we asked students to express their option for activities they would like to participate at, depending on their usefulness. Table 7 shows that all the proposed activities achieved good scores and that the hierarchy is similar to the previous one (Table 5).

Table 7. Activities proposed by students for future field trips

Activities	Weighted average
Professors' discussions with students in observation/research/study points	4.39
Discussions with experts on the chosen topics	4.34
Professors' debates with students in observation/research/study points	4.12
Solving tasks/exercises/field problems in teams	4.02
Observation/research/study of field issues in teams	3.93
Questioning in observation/research/study points	3.89
Listening to professors' and/or students' presentations	3.82
Observation/research/study of field issues based on a protocol (observation)	3.82
Observation/research/study of aspects of the territory, individually	3.82
Solving tasks/exercises/problems in the territory, individually	3.67
Field discussions with Geography graduates	3.13

In Table 8, it is articulated that, depending on the score, all aspects proposed for students' analysis were considered strengths. The first places in the hierarchy are: "realising connections between theory and practice, elements, structures and geographical processes, comparisons in the field and training and development of practical skills" (Dulamă et al., 2018).

Each field trip offers a significant number of opportunities for training and developing professional skills (Table 9): meeting with qualified staff from diverse activity fields (tourism, environment, industry, hydrology,

meteorology, etc.) (Dulamă et al., 2018) (Fig. 3), establishing links with students and professors of partner universities in the consortium, with other universities from Romania and from abroad (Figures 4 and 5) or having the possibility of obtaining funding from external sources. Respondents appreciated that field trips are a good opportunity to develop practical skills and to use research and data collection technology (Dulamă et al., 2018).

Table 8. Strengths of field trips

Strengths	Weighted average
Making connections between theory and practice	4.26
Comparing elements, structures and geographical processes in the field	4.25
Formation/development of practical skills	4.14
Direct observation of territorial components, geographical structures and processes	4.12
Developing skills/the competence to work in teams	3.85
Use of research/data collection technology (specialized instruments and equipment: drones, GPS, sonometers, mobile phones, cameras, recorders, etc.)	3.81
Developing scientific research skills	3.81
Using methods and techniques for investigating the territorial assemblies	3.55

Table 9. Opportunities that can be achieved during field trips

Opportunities	Weighted average
Formation/development of practical skills	4.38
Databases created by field research	4.24
Qualified staff from diverse activity fields	4.22
Research/data collection technology (drones, GPS, sonometers, mobile phones, cameras, voice recorders, etc.)	4.16
Possibility to obtain funding from external sources	4.00
Collaboration with partner universities in the consortium (Bucharest, Iași, Timișoara)	3.54
Collaboration with universities from abroad	3.47
Collaboration with other universities from Romania	3.32

We grouped the weaknesses of the field trips (Table 10), depending on their cause, into two main categories: those caused by the faculty (funding and organisation of field trips) and the ones caused by students (inappropriate behaviour, fatigue, non-compliance with regulations and legislation, and communication in foreign languages). The first places are the allocation of limited resources for field research activities, lack of full financing and inappropriate equipment (Dulamă et al., 2018). Although some aspects (large time resources allocated to the transfer between objectives, large number of participants, long routes, large number of objectives visited) are considered as weaknesses that least affect students, we believe that they all influence negatively the quality of their professional development during field trips.

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)



Fig. 3. Discussions with experts from diverse activity fields: (left) visit to Sibiu City Hall, 2015 and (right) debate with representatives of ADEPT Foundation in Saschiz, 2014. Photos by Michael Schneeberger



Fig. 4. (left) Direct observation in the field of geographical structures and processes: Gömörzölös Swamps, Hungary, 2015; (right) Activities in the rural area: visit to Viscri Fortified Church, Romania, 2016. Photos by Michael Schneeberger



Fig. 5. Field trip in cooperation with a partner university, guided tour and participant observation of touristic phenomena, Berlin, Germany, 2017. Photo by Xénia Havadi; Research of ecological phenomena during a boat ride on the Tisza Lake, Hungary, 2015. Photo by Michael Schneeberger

Table 10. Weaknesses of field trips

Weaknesses	Weighted average
Limited time resources allocated to field research	3.81
Lack of full funding	3.50
Inappropriate equipments	3.47
Inappropriate behaviour of some students	3.36
Heterogeneity of students' physical condition/preparation	3.29
Absence of medical personnel in case of emergency/accidents	3.28
Failure to comply with regulations, instructions and legislation by the students	3.24
Tiredness	3.22
High volume of information received in a relatively short time	3.20
High costs	3.14
Predominance of lecture activities compared to investigation/research ones	2.97
Students' low level skills for communicating in foreign languages of international circulation	2.89
Large time resources allocated to the movement between objectives /observation/research/study points	2.68
Large number of participants	2.41
Long routes	2.30
Large number of visited/studied objectives/places/processes	2.18

Any *in situ* activity is exposed to risks (Table 11) that may affect the programme and/or participants' integrity (Fig. 6). In order to prevent problems, students and professors must comply with the provisions of the *Regulations on field trips* (FG, 2016), an internal document developed by the Faculty of Geography and those on field work developed at the university level (Department for Prevention and Protection) (2018). Other risks can be diminished through good documentation of the route, allocation of time resources for unexpected situations, compliance to the programme and good coordination of the group.

In terms of measures for improving field trips, the most significant for students are those related to the content and organisation of the learning activities carried out in these field trips: differentiation of paths according to course of study and year of study; longer time resources at points for discussion, research activities, debates, asking questions, problem solving exercises, organising several team or individual research activities and their greater involvement in research activities (Dulamă et al., 2018). Some measures address organisational issues: accommodation at partner universities/student hostels, full funding from the university, student discussion about results and problems (Dulamă et al., 2018). Students want more field trips per year and fewer objectives and observation points a day. Some of them consider that the field trip routes should either be extended or shortened, with a duration either longer or shorter (Dulamă et al., 2018).

Table 11. Dangers/risks/problems that may affect field trips

Dangers/risks/problems	Weighted average
Unfavourable meteorological and hydrological conditions (storms, fog, blizzards, rainfalls, floods, etc.)	3.92
Transport (transport failures, interrupted traffic, traffic congestion)	3.71
Participants' illness and injuries	3.69
Services (unannounced renovation of the targeted objectives, prolonged parking at border points, etc.)	3.42



Fig. 6. Field trip (hilly area) affected by sudden weather change (snow storm on the 6th of April, 2016). Photo by Viorel Gligor

CONCLUSIONS

Field trips are important activities in all undergraduate courses of study from the Faculty of Geography, in Babeş-Bolyai University, being included and credited in the curriculum and finalised with grades. Recognising the role of these field trips in students' training and development of their professional skills, professors also organise various short thematic applications in and around Cluj-Napoca municipality. Research results reveal professors' expertise in organising field trips, such as duration, places

studied, content proposed for learning, didactic methodology and research, used apparatuses and tools. Students' higher involvement in compulsory field trips is observed, as compared to their participation in the optional and short-term ones organised in the local horizon. We noticed students' choice to benefit from a richer offer of field trips and from a broader range of student-centred learning activities: discussions and debates, problem solving and exercises, individual and group investigations, and so on. Yet, there is a perceived need of improvement in terms of financial support of these activities and also of organisational aspects (i.e. in terms of workload or logistics) for more efficient and successful field trips.

References

- Andelkovic, S., Dedjanski, V. & Pejic, B. (2018). Pedagogical Benefits of Fieldwork of the Students at the Faculty of Geography in the Light of the Bologna Process. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 42(1), 110-125.
- Babeş-Bolyai University, Serviciul Intern de Prevenire și Protecție [Department for Prevention and Protection] (2018). *IP-SSM-98 privind instruirea de securitatea muncii și S.U. efectuată studenților din ciclurile de studii universitare de licență/master/doctorat, pe timpul efectuării stagiilor de practica in teren* [Document on the instruction about work safety and emergency situations realised by Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral Students during field work] from the the 1st of August 2018. Internal document.
- Boyel, A., Maguire, S., Martin, A., Milsom, C., Nash, R., Rawlinson, S., Turner, A., Wurthmann, S. & Conchie, S. (2007). Fieldwork Is Good: The Student Perception and the Affective Domain. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 31(2), 299-317.
- Dulamă, M. E. & Ilovan, O.-R. (2009). Study on Students' Representations Starting from Texts about Geomorphological Processes. *Studia Universitas Babeş-Bolyai, Psychologia-Paedagogia*, LIV(1), 133-142.
- Dulamă, M. E. & Ilovan, O.-R. (2015). Development of the Geography School Curriculum in Romania, from the 18th Century to 1989. *Transylvanian Review*, 24(Supplement 1), 255-284. WOS:000364727800020
- Dulamă, M. E. & Ilovan, O.-R. (2016). How Powerful is Feedforward in University Education? A Case Study in Romanian Geographical Education on Increasing Learning Efficiency. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice (ESTP), Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri (KUYEB)*, 16(3), 827-848. DOI: 10.12738/estp.2016.3.0392
- Dulamă, M. E. & Ilovan, O.-R. (2017). The Development of Geographical Education in Romania, Under the Influence of the Soviet Education Model (1948-1962). *Transylvanian Review*, 26(1), 3-17. WOS:000401400500001
- Dulamă, M. E. & Roșcovanu, S. (2007). *Didactica geografiei* [Didactics of Geography]. Chișinău: Bons Offices.

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)

- Dulamă, M. E. (1996). *Didactică geografică* [Didactics of Geography]. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2008a). *Metodologie didactică. Teorie și aplicații* [Didactical Methodology. Theory and Applications]. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2008b). *Metodologii didactice activizante. Teorie și practică* [Activating Didactical Methodologies. Theory and Praxis]. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2010a). *Formarea competențelor elevilor prin studierea localității de domiciliu. Teorie și aplicații* [Forming Students' Competences through Studying the Home Settlement. Theory and Applications]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2010b). *Fundamente despre competențe* [Fundamentals about Competences]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2011). *Despre competențe* [On Competences]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Dulamă, M. E. (2012). *Didactică axată pe competențe* [Competences-Based Didactics]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Dulamă, M. E., Ilovan O.-R., Boțan, C. N., Havadi-Nagy, K. X., Gligor, V. & Ciascai, L. (2018). Geographical Field Trips during University Studies. Where to? In Chiș, V. & Albușescu, I. (eds.), *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences. 5th International Conference "Education, Reflection, Development"* (pp. 494-502). Future Academy, 41. WOS:000449456600057
- Dulamă, M. E., Ilovan, O.-R. & Magdaș, I. (2017). The Forests of Romania in Scientific Literature and in Geography. Teachers' Perceptions and Actions. *Environmental Engineering and Management Journal*, 16(1), 169-186. WOS:000399094900019
- Dulamă, M. E., Ilovan, O.-R., Magdaș, I. & Răcășan, B. (2016a). Is There Any Forestry Education in Romania? Geography Teachers' Perceptions, Attitudes, and Recommendations. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Psychologia-Paedagogia*, LXI(1), 27-52.
- Dulamă, M. E., Ilovan, O.-R. & Nițoaia, A. (2016b). Forming and Assessing the Competence to Elaborate Proposals of Spatial Planning Measures for Hydrographical Basins. *PedActa*, 6(1), 16-27.
- Dulamă, M. E., Magdaș, I. & Osaci-Costache, G. (2015). Study on Geography Students' Internet Use. *Romanian Review of Geographical Education*, 1, 45-61, DOI:10.23741/RRGE120154
- Dummer, T. J. B., Cook, I. G., Parker, S. L., Barrett, G. A. & Hull, A. P. (2008). Promoting and Assessing 'Deep Learning' in Geography Fieldwork: An Evaluation of Reflective Field Diaries. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(3), 459-479.
- Dunphy, A. & Spellman, G. (2009). Geography Fieldwork, Fieldwork Value and Learning Styles. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 18(1), 19-28.
- Facultatea de Geografie (FG) (2016). *Regulamentul aplicațiilor în teren* [Regulations on Field Trips] Internal document. Cluj-Napoca: Universitate Babeș-Bolyai.

- France, D. & Haigh, M. (2018). Fieldwork@40: Fieldwork in Geography Higher Education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 42(4), 498-514.
- Fuller, I. C. (2006). What is the Value of Fieldwork? Answers from New Zealand Using two Contrasting Undergraduate Physical Geography Field Trips. *New Zealand Geographer*, 62(3), 215-220.
- Fuller, I., Edmondson, S., France, D., Higgitt, D. & Ratinen, I. (2006). International Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Geography Fieldwork for Learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 89-101.
- Havadi-Nagy, K. X. & Ilovan, O.-R. (2013). International Summer Schools in a Knowledge-Based Society and University. *Acta et Commentationes. Științe ale Educației. Revistă științifică*, 2(3), 126-133.
- Hope, M. (2009). The Importance of Direct Experience: A Philosophical Defence of Fieldwork in Human Geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(2), 169-182.
- Ilovan, O.-R. & Havadi-Nagy, K. X. (2016). Geography University Students' Awareness of Their Own Learning Process during the 2013 Neubrandenburg International Summer School. *Romanian Review of Geographical Education*, 4(1), 5-30. DOI: 10.23741/RRGE120161
- Ilovan, O.-R., Dulamă, M. E., Boțan, C. N., Ciascai, L., Fonogea, S.-F. & Rus, G. M. (2018a). Meaningful Learning: Case Studies on the Territorial Identity of Historical Urban Centres. Chiș, V. & Albulescu, I. (eds.), *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences. 5th International Conference "Education, Reflection, Development"*. Future Academy, XLI (pp. 413-421). WOS:000449456600048
- Ilovan, O.-R., Dulamă, M. E., Boțan, C. N., Havadi-Nagy, K. X., Horvath, C., Nițoia, N., Nicula, S. & Rus, G. M. (2018b). Environmental Education and Education for Sustainable Development in Romania. Teachers' Perceptions and Recommendations. *Journal of Environmental Protection and Ecology*, 19(1), 350-356, WOS:000430319500037
- Li, W. & Li, Z. (2018). On the Teaching Reform of Fieldwork in Human Geography. *Proceedings of the 2018 International Seminar on Education Research and Social Science (ISERSS 2018) Book Series Advances in Social Science Education and Humanities Research*, 195, 189-192.
- Marvell, A. & Simm, D. (2018). Emotional Geographies Experienced during International Fieldwork: An Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Strategies for Reflective Assessment. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 42(4), 515-530.
- Popa, A. R., Ilovan, O.-R. & Dulamă, M. E. (2017). Capitolul 9. Analizarea disfuncționalităților teritoriale din comuna Galda de Jos, județul Alba [Analysis of the Territorial Dysfunctions in Galda de Jos Commune, Alba County]. In Dulamă, M. E. (ed.), *Cercetări în didactica geografiei* (pp. 78-91). Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Raath, S., & Golightly, A. (2017). Geography Education Students' Experiences with a Problem-Based Learning Fieldwork Activity. *Journal of Geography*, 116(5), 217-225.

GEOGRAPHICAL FIELD TRIPS DURING UNIVERSITY STUDIES. WHERE TO? (II)

- Toderaş, A. (2017). Analiza peisajului geografic. Studiu de caz: Comuna Şuncuiuş. In Dulamă, M. E. & Ilovan, O.-R. (eds.), *Tendenţe actuale în predarea şi învăţarea geografiei. Contemporary Trends in Teaching and Learning Geography*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Wang, I., Fuller, I. & Gaskin, S. (2006). Life without Fieldwork: Some Lecturers' Perceptions of Geography and Environmental Science Fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 161-171.
- Wang, X., van Elzakker, C. P. J. M. & Kraak, M.-J. (2017). Conceptual Design of a Mobile Application for Geography Fieldwork Learning. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-information*, 6(11), 355. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi6110355>
- Wilson, H., Leydon, J. & Wincentak, J. (2017). Fieldwork in Geography Education: Defining or Declining? The State of Fieldwork in Canadian Undergraduate Geography Programs. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 41(1), 94-105.