



CLASSROOM TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Mehmet Uygun¹ⁱ,

Mehmet Duman²

¹Asst. Prof. Dr.,

Division of Primary School Education,

Department of Primary Education,

Faculty of Education,

Pamukkale University,

Denizli, Turkey

orcid.org/0000-0001-9693-8690

²Classroom Teacher,

Atatürk Primary School,

Denizli, Turkey

orcid.org/0000-0003-2870-984X

Abstract:

The present study aims to investigate classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments. The study was designed around a survey model. The sample of the study was comprised of 359 classroom teachers determined with random sampling method, working in the central districts of Denizli province in the 2021-2022 academic year, and who completely responded to the questions in the data collection tool. The data collection tool used in the study consisted of two parts as "Personal Information" and "Out of School Learning Regulation Scale". Looking at the classroom teachers' responses to out of school learning regulation scale and its dimensions, the highest mean was found in the "application" dimension and indicated a high-level perception while the lowest mean was in the "planning" dimension and indicated a medium level. It was also seen that the classroom teachers' perceptions were at a medium level in the "information" dimension, high in the "evaluation" dimension and high in the overall scale, and it was understood that the teachers were generally at a good level in this area. The classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning regulation did not differ according to their teaching experience, education level and receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments; however, their perceptions differed according to their gender, age, marital status, the district where they work, and studying the out-of-school learning environments guidebook.

Keywords: learning, out of school, informal, field trip, planetarium

ⁱ Correspondence: email muyguntr@gmail.com, muyguntr@pau.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Learning takes place in every moment of a person's life from birth to death. It is evident that educational activities are performed in every period as required by the conditions of that period and within the limits of the possibilities. Education in the 21st century is carried out in totally different dimensions and with different tools and through the application of novel methods. In the current educational activities facing very rapid changes, activities that establish a connection between people's personal lives and objects and that offer the opportunity to experiment and practice, to make predictions and to obtain results should be expanded (Paykoç & Baykal, 2000). In today's world, where access to information is very easy, out-of-school activities and the learning environments brought along with these have become indispensable elements of the teaching-learning process in terms of creating opportunities for access to education.

In developed countries, some hold the idea that educational activities can be carried out outside the school in a way that supports learning. In fact, learning at school is supported by structured out-of-school learning environments. It has been revealed in various studies that out-of-school activities make positive contributions to school, lessons, students, teachers, and parents. It can be ensured that students become familiar with the branches of science they are interested in closely by including environmental opportunities that will support learning within the scope of outdoor education, creating scientific-social environments, and reinforcing these with real-life experiences. In addition, this allows students to evaluate their own interests and competences better and effectively, as well as helps them gain and improve many social skills like entrepreneurship, communication, etc. (Sözer, 2015).

2. Literature Review

An out-of-school learning environment is defined as *"the places where teaching materials and tasks are structured, and the desired teaching process is carried out"* (Taşçı and Soran 2008). Akın (2012) specified out-of-school learning as the learning that is performed outside of schools and includes additional work on learning while Şimşek and Kaymakçı (2015) referred to it as the learning experiences that include people, areas, institutions, and resources other than school buildings, as well as covering all the curriculums and a plan and program. Öztürk (2019), on the other hand, stated that such learning environments enable individuals to gain different perspectives through concrete experiences based on interactions and include components that provide high-level thinking and development such as taking responsibility, critical thinking, problem-solving, and making decisions, which are among the main purposes of the constructivist approach.

Regarding this type of learning and teaching activities, Ataman (2014) strongly criticized the statements like *"it takes place behind closed doors and real learning cannot occur"*. For this reason, it was underlined that it would be an extremely big mistake to confine the channels where education activities can take place only to the classrooms. In this direction, it is believed that taking learning activities outside the classroom would make

highly remarkable contributions for the sake of students. As a result of the activities being planned in this way, students will have the advantage of learning the subjects by getting out of rote learning habits and by using more than one sense, and also instructors will be able to teach subjects in a much more motivating way and have more job satisfaction. It is seen that there has been a great tendency towards out-of-school learning environments in recent years in order to yield more permanent learning. In addition to these, it is frequently specified by many circles that this way of teaching has a very strong effect in terms of helping the students become more attentive.

Considering that formal education is given in a limited time period, it has been revealed in the relevant studies that students learn much more in the larger period outside of this formal part (Erten & Taşçı, 2016), that structured out-of-school learning environments provide students with experience (Bozdoğan & Yalçın, 2006; Tatar & Bağrıyanık, 2012), that outdoor learning provides permanent knowledge through observation skills (Balkan & Atabek, 2010), and that out-of-school learning enables students to develop cognitively and emotionally (Güler, 2011; Tatar & Bağrıyanık, 2012; Berberoğlu & Uygun, 2013). In recent years, the rate of schools, students and teachers with opportunities to access places that can be used as "*out-of-school learning environments*" has gradually increased.

Akyüz (2019) defined schools, which are the institutions where educational activities are carried out, as sacred places where education is held, structures that carry the "*normative structure of the state*" and places where people are integrated into the social structure. Yayla (2001) stated that our country still carries out its educational activities through traditional schools, and underlined that students perform activities that are disconnected from real life under the roof of schools. In addition, he indicated that these institutions face threats that hinder the relations they can establish with environmental elements due to factors such as "*bureaucratic obstacles, economic difficulties, teachers' heavy course loads*". Illich noted that individuals learn most of the information outside the school (cited in Yayla, 2001). If the concept of school is handled under the auspices of lifelong learning, it can be easily stated that apart from being structures surrounded by walls, it also has organized educational structures that include different places and situations related to life. The reason for this is that teachers, who perform their duties within the schools, are in constant active communication with their students, whether at school or outside the school while performing their education activities. According to Çebi (2018), the contributions of out-of-school learning environments are as follows: students' goals related to lifelong learning become more comprehensive and clearer, students can reach more tangible and permanent learning thanks to different experiences and find solutions to the problems they face, and it becomes much easier for them to establish relationships between natural activities and natural events.

As Nichols (1982) suggested, the characteristics of learning activities carried out within the scope of out-of-school learning environments are as follows:

- 1) It takes place outside the walls of schools.
- 2) Students' direct participation in activities is essential.
- 3) It includes real objects.

- 4) Lessons should be associated with authentic events or situations.
- 5) It is highly essential to appeal to more than one emotion.
- 6) It allows for permanent learning and voluntary participation through enjoyable and engaging activities.

Within the scope of out-of-school learning environments, activities conducted outside the course/class/school in the education process can be listed as follows: all kinds of structured field trip studies (museums, zoos, nature, historical museums, dams, science-technology museums, meteorology stations, planetariums, botanical gardens, water treatment plants, industrial facilities, etc.), nature education, virtual reality activities, environmental club activities, sports activities, homework and projects directly related to the environment, social events, cultural events, scientific events (exhibitions, panels, meetings, conferences, congresses and symposiums) and lifelong learning-based practice areas (Fidan, 2012). It is seen that out-of-school environments make it easier for students to establish connections with daily life (Ertaş, Şen, & Parmasızoğlu, 2011; Tortop & Özek, 2013), enable students to develop cognitively and affectively (Güler, 2011; Tatar & Bağrıyanık, 2012; Berberoğlu & Uygun, 2013), support formal education and create environmental awareness (Karataş, 2011; Yardımcı, 2009; Berberoğlu & Uygun, 2013).

Out-of-school learning environments can be studied under the following titles: field trips (to near and far away places) and field studies, observation, trips to social, cultural, industrial and scientific places, virtual reality, nature trainings, environmental club activities, theses, assignments and projects, designing activities (modelling-material-model development), sports activities in nature, spatial arrangements and applications based on lifelong learning (experiential education), and spontaneous learning environments (Karadoğan, 2016).

While it is seen that teachers who prefer out-of-school learning environments use research and inquiry-based teaching approaches more, it is also seen that students conduct research, are curious and interested, ask questions, experiment, search for information, solve problems, take responsibility, and try to construct their knowledge (Thomas, 2010). Dillon, Rickinson, Teamey, Morris, Choi, Sanders and Benefield (2006) found that out-of-school activities are less forgotten by students. Lakin (2006) stated that out-of-school activities have positive effects on students' attitudes, values, and beliefs. According to a study conducted by Avcı (2019), as a result of the out-of-class activities carried out for the social studies course, there was a significant increase in the success levels of the students, and the students' ability to keep the information they learned in their minds also showed positive progress. In line with all these aforementioned results, it is believed that the activities in question can make great contributions to the students in an educational sense, reveal their exploratory characteristics, provide them with the knowledge required by their age and help them gain effective achievements in line with these qualities. In the study carried out by Aslan (2020), it was concluded that regarding the Out-of-School Learning Regulation Scale (OOSLRS), the perceptions of the school administrators and teachers were quite sufficient in general in terms of meaningful teaching and social skills teaching, while their perceptions of OOSLRS were sufficient at medium level. It was also determined that the perceptions of the school administrators

and teachers about OOSLRS did not differ significantly according to their gender, marital status, and branch, while their perceptions differed according to their age, working position, education level, the district where they work, and receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments.

When we look at the literature, it is seen that studies and activities related to out-of-school learning environments are very few and limited in our country. Studies on out-of-school learning environments in Pamukkale and Merkezefendi are very limited as well. Students' access to out-of-school environments in the city centre and elsewhere is very limited, primarily due to economic difficulties.

In this study, the following research questions were asked in order to determine the perceptions of classroom teachers about out-of-school learning environments and whether or not these perceptions change according to different variables.

In this sense, the question "What are the perceptions of classroom teachers regarding the out-of-school learning regulation scale?" constitutes the problem of the research. Also, the sub-problems of the study are as follows:

- 1) What are the perceptions of classroom teachers regarding the dimensions of the out-of-school learning regulation scale?
- 2) Do classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning regulation scale dimensions differ significantly according to the variables of gender, age, teaching experience, marital status, education level, the district where teachers work, studying out-of-school learning environments guidebook and receiving education related to out-of-school learning environments?

3. Method

This study was designed around a descriptive survey model and quantitative methods. Survey models are research models that aim to describe a past or present situation (event, person, object) as it is in its own terms (Karasar, 2012, p.79).

3.1 Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of classroom teachers working in Merkezefendi and Pamukkale districts of Denizli province in the 2021-2022 academic year. 380 teachers were selected by the "random sampling" method to represent the population of the study, but the responses of 359 teachers that appropriately filled in the scale were used. The personal information and distribution of the participants who filled in the scale appropriately in accordance with the scientific study norms are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of Personal Information of the Teachers

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	201	56.0
	Male	158	44.0
Age	25-35	84	23.4
	36-45	113	31.5
	46-55	106	29.5
	56 and above	56	15.6
Experience	1-10 years	78	21.7
	11-20 years	118	32.9
	21-30 years	102	28.4
	31 and above	61	17.0
Marital Status	Married	313	87.2
	Single	46	12.8
Level of Education	Undergraduate	318	88.6
	Graduate	41	11.4
District Where They Work	Pamukkale	193	53.8
	Merkezefendi	166	46.2
Studying the out-of-school learning environments guidebook	Yes, I studied	47	13.1
	No, I did not study	312	89.9
Receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments	Yes, I received	33	9.2
	No, I did not receive	326	90.8

In Table 1, the highest rates regarding the distribution of personal characteristics of the participating classroom teachers are as follows: 56.0% of the participants were female, 31.5% of them were between 36-45 years old and 29.5% were 36-45 years old. In terms of experience, 32.9% of the participants had 11-20 years of experience and 28.4% of them had 21-30 years of experience. It is observed that 87.2% of the teachers were married and 88.6% of them were undergraduates. In terms of the district, it is seen that most of them were working in Pamukkale with a rate of 53.8%. Also, most of them did not study the guidebook a rate of 86.9%, and most of them did not receive any training related to out-of-school education with a rate of 90.8%.

3.2 Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool used in the study consists of two parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, in order to find out general information about the teachers, there were eight about "Gender, Age, Experience, Marital Status, Education Level, District, Studying the Out-of-School Learning Environments Guidebooks, and Receiving Trainings about Out-of-School Learning Environments". In the second part, in order to determine the perceptions of the classroom teachers regarding the regulation of out-of-school learning environments, the "Out of School Learning Regulation Scale" (OOSLRS) consisting of 29 questions was used. "Out-of-school Learning Regulation Scale (OOSLRS)" was developed by Bolat and Köroğlu (2020). The scale consists of four dimensions. "Information" dimension was measured through the items numbered between 1-8, "Planning" dimension was measured through the items numbered between 9-16, "Application" dimension was measured through items the items numbered between 17-

22, and "Evaluation" dimension was measured through the items numbered between 23-29. The Cronbach Alpha values of the original scale and the dimensions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: OOSLRS Items and Alpha Coefficients

	Number of Items	Alpha Coefficient
Information	8	.86
Planning	8	.81
Application	6	.73
Evaluation	7	.77
Total	29	.87

Table 2 demonstrates that the Cronbach Alpha values of the "Out-of-School Learning Regulation Scale" with 29 items and four dimensions are between 0.73 and 0.87, and these values indicate that the scale is reliable concerning its dimensions and in general. Accordingly, it is seen that the reliability level of the scale is high.

3.3 Data Collection

Upon getting the necessary permissions to conduct the study, the researchers informed the school where the study would be carried out about the study, and those who volunteered to participate were asked to fill in the scale. The data collection tool used in the study consists of two parts. To elicit general information about the participating teachers, the first part of the questionnaire included eight questions about "Gender, Age, Experience, Marital Status, Education Level, District, Studying the Out-of-School Learning Environments Guidebook and Receiving Trainings related to Out-of-School Learning Environments". In the second part, in order to determine the perceptions of classroom teachers regarding the regulation of out-of-school learning environments, the "Out of School Learning Regulation Scale" (OOSLRS) consisting of 29 questions were used. "Out-of-school Learning Regulation Scale (OOSLRS)" was developed by Bolat and Koroğlu (2020). The scale consists of four dimensions. While the items numbered between 1-8 were related to the "Information" dimension, "Planning" dimension was measured through the items numbered between 9-16, "Application" through the items numbered between 17-22 and "Evaluation" dimension through the items between 23-29. The scale is a five-point Likert type scale, and the options are as follows: (5) Totally agree; (4) Highly agree; (3) Partly agree; (2) Slightly agree; (1) Totally disagree.

3.4 Data Analysis

The answers of the classroom teachers working in Denizli province in the 2021-2022 academic year were analysed through SPSS 24 statistical program.

For the normality analysis of the collected data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and kurtosis and skewness analysis were performed. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of Kolmogorov Smirnov Test and Kurtosis and Skewness Analysis of the Data from the Out-of-School Learning Regulation Scale and its Dimensions

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Kolmogorov Smirnov	Kurtosis Values	Skewness Values
Information	.118	.809	-.715
Planning	.113	.279	-.495
Application	.217	.745	-.869
Evaluation	.216	.662	-.857
Overall Scale	.115	.706	-.734

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov z value of the scale and its dimensions ($z > p$) shows a normal distribution. It is also observed that the values of "Kurtosis and Skewness" vary between -.869 and .809. It is accepted that values between -2 and 2 show a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010; Şencan, 2002). Therefore, it was accepted that the data showed a normal distribution and for this reason, parametric tests were used in the analyses. The $\alpha=.05$ value was determined for the significance.

The process followed in the analysis of the data in the study is as follows:

1) Descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) were used in the distribution of the personal characteristics of the classroom teachers.

2) The ranges of the Out-of-School Learning Regulation Scale were determined and interpreted by looking at the means as follows: 1.00 – 1.80 Very low; 1.81 – 2.60 Low; 2.61 – 3.40 Medium; 3.41 – 4.20 High; 4.21 – 5.00 Very high.

3) "Independent Sample t" test was used to compare binary categorical variables such as teachers' gender, marital status, and education level.

4) "One-way analysis of variance (One-way Anova)" was performed to make multiple comparisons between the variables such as age and experience of teachers, and Tukey HSD test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was used to determine between which groups there was a difference.

4. Results

In this section, the results obtained as a result of the data analysis are presented considering two sub-problems of the study. The sub-problems that were addressed in the study are as follows: (1) What are the perceptions of classroom teachers regarding the dimensions of the out-of-school learning regulation scale? and (2) Do classroom teachers' perceptions regarding the out-of-school learning regulation scale dimensions differ significantly according to the variables of gender, age, teaching experience, marital status, education level, the district where they teach, studying out-of-school learning environments guidebook and receiving education related to out-of-school learning environments?

The means and standard deviation results regarding the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: The Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of the Out-of-School Learning Regulation

Dimensions	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>s</i>	Level
Information	359	3.34	.77	Medium
Planning	359	3.28	.87	Medium
Application	359	3.59	.86	High
Evaluation	359	3.56	.91	High
Overall Scale	359	3.43	.81	High

As is seen in Table 4, regarding the teachers' perceptions of the out-of-school learning regulation scale and its dimensions, the highest mean ($\bar{X}=3.59$) was in the "application" dimension and indicated a high level, while the lowest mean was in the "planning" dimension ($\bar{X}=3.28$) and indicated a medium level. According to the table, in the information dimension, the mean was ($\bar{X}=3.34$) and it indicated a medium level, while in the evaluation dimension, the mean was ($\bar{X}=3.56$) and indicated a high level. Finally, the mean of the overall scale was ($\bar{X}=3.43$) and this indicated a high level. These results show that the participating teachers are conscious about out-of-school learning, and it can be said that while the levels are medium in the information and planning dimensions and high in the other dimensions.

The second sub-problem of the study was as follows: Do classroom teachers' perceptions regarding the out-of-school learning regulation scale dimensions differ significantly according to the variables of gender, age, teaching experience, marital status, education level, the district where they teach, studying the out-of-school learning environments guidebook and receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments?

The results of the t-test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by gender are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Analysis of the Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments by Gender

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Gender	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>s</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Information	Female	201	3.27	.75	357	-1.78	.07
	Male	158	3.42	.78			
Planning	Female	201	3.21	.90	357	-1.68	.09
	Male	158	3.37	.83			
Application	Female	201	3.50	.88	357	-2.33	.02*
	Male	158	3.71	.82			
Evaluation	Female	201	3.46	.92	357	-2.30	.02*
	Male	158	3.68	.88			
Overall Scale	Female	201	3.35	.81	357	-2.11	.03*
	Male	158	3.53	.79			

* $p < 0.05$

Table 5 demonstrates that according to the results of the analysis of teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by gender, there was no difference in the

information dimension ($t= -1.78$; $p>0.05$) and in the planning dimension ($t= -1.68$; $p> 0.05$), but there was a difference in the application dimension ($t= -2.33$; $p<0.05$), the evaluation dimension ($t= -2.30$; $p<0.05$) and in the overall scale ($t= -2, 11$; $p<0.05$) according to gender. When the means were examined, it was seen that the male teachers had higher means than the female teachers in the application dimension, evaluation dimension and in overall scale, and that the male teachers had higher competence to regulate out-of-school learning environments. Kılıç (2014) stated that Cohen's effect size (d) value can be defined as small if it is lower than 0.2, medium if it is 0.5, and large if it is higher than 0.8. In order to determine the effect size, Cohen d was calculated, and (d) values were found as $d=0.246$ in the application dimension, $d=0.244$ in the evaluation dimension, and $d=0.244$ in the overall scale, and the effect size was determined to be large.

The results of the ANOVA test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by age are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Analysis of The Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments by Age

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Age	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>s</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Difference
Information	25-35	84	3.19	.76	3.30	.02*	1-2; 1-3; 2-4; 3-4
	36-45	113	3.44	.61			
	46-55	106	3.44	.81			
	56 and above	56	3.16	.92			
Planning	25-35	84	3.23	.85	2.59	.05	No difference
	36-45	113	3.30	.79			
	46-55	106	3.43	.91			
	56 and above	56	3.04	.96			
Application	25-35	84	3.54	.84	2.74	.04*	3-4
	36-45	113	3.59	.75			
	46-55	106	3.76	.88			
	56 and above	56	3.37	.92			
Evaluation	25-35	84	3.40	.93	3.21	.02*	1-3; 3-4
	36-45	113	3.61	.73			
	46-55	106	3.73	.98			
	56 and above	56	3.34	.96			
Overall Scale	25-35	84	3.33	.79	3.06	.02*	1-3; 3-4
	36-45	113	3.47	.68			
	46-55	106	3.58	.84			
	56 and above	56	3.21	.93			

* $p<0.05$ 1.25-35; 2.36-45; 3.46-55; 4.56 and above

Table 6 presents the results of the analysis of classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by age. The results are as follows: In terms of the age variable, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ in the planning dimension ($F= 2.59$; $p>0.05$), but there was a difference in the information dimension ($F=3.30$, $p<0.05$), the application dimension ($F=2.74$; $p<0.05$), the evaluation dimension ($F=3.21$; $p<0.05$) and in the overall scale ($F=3.06$; $p<0.05$). In order to identify the groups that differed Post Hoc Tukey analysis was performed and the

following results were obtained: In the information dimension, there was a difference between the teachers aged 25-35 ($\bar{X}_{25-35 \text{ years}}=3.19$) and the teachers aged 36-45 ($\bar{X}_{36-45 \text{ years}}=3.44$), between the teachers aged 25-35 ($\bar{X}_{25-35 \text{ years}}=3.19$) and the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.44$), between the teachers aged 36-45 ($\bar{X}_{36-45 \text{ years}}=3.44$) and the teachers aged 56 and above ($\bar{X}_{56 \text{ and above}}=3.16$), between the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.44$) and the teachers aged 56 and above ($\bar{X}_{56 \text{ and above}}=3.16$), and the difference was in favor of the middle-aged ones. In the application dimension, there was a difference between the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.76$) and the teachers aged 56 and above ($\bar{X}_{56 \text{ and above}}=3.37$), and the difference was in favor of those aged 46-55. In the evaluation dimension, the difference was between the teachers aged 25-35 ($\bar{X}_{25-35 \text{ years}}=3.40$) and the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.73$) and between the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.73$) and the teachers aged 56 and above ($\bar{X}_{56 \text{ and above}}=3.34$), and the difference was in favor of those aged 46-55. In the overall scale, the difference was between the teachers aged 25-35 ($\bar{X}_{25-35 \text{ years}}=3.33$) and the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.58$) and between the teachers aged 46-55 ($\bar{X}_{46-55 \text{ years}}=3.58$) and the teachers aged 56 and above ($\bar{X}_{56 \text{ and above}}=3.21$), and the difference was in favor of those aged 46-55.

The results of the ANOVA test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by teaching experience are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Analysis of The Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments by Teaching Experience

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Teaching Experience	n	\bar{X}	s	F	p	Difference
Information	1-10 years	78	3.17	.71	1.73	.15	No difference
	11-20 years	118	3.42	.66			
	21-30 years	102	3.37	.86			
	31 years and more	61	3.35	.84			
Planning	1-10 years	78	3.12	.88	1.21	.30	No difference
	11-20 years	118	3.34	.77			
	21-30 years	102	3.35	.96			
	31 years and more	61	3.27	.90			
Application	1-10 years	78	3.48	.84	.63	.59	No difference
	11-20 years	118	3.60	.77			
	21-30 years	102	3.66	.98			
	31 years and more	61	3.61	.87			
Evaluation	1-10 years	78	3.36	.91	1.64	.17	No difference
	11-20 years	118	3.60	.77			
	21-30 years	102	3.64	.94			
	31 years and more	61	3.57	.91			
Overall Scale	1-10 years	78	3.27	.78	1.38	.24	No difference
	11-20 years	118	3.48	.71			
	21-30 years	102	3.49	.91			
	31 years and more	61	3.43	.82			

*p<0,05 1. 1-10 years; 2. 11-20 years; 3. 21-30 years; 4. 31 and more

Table 7 presents the result of the analysis of the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by teaching experience. The results are as follows:

In terms of the teaching experience variable, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ in the information dimension ($F=1.73$; $p>0.05$), in the planning dimension ($F=1.21$; $p>0.05$), in the application dimension ($F=.63$; $p>0.05$), in the evaluation dimension ($F=1.64$; $p>0.05$) and in the overall scale mean ($F=1.38$; $p>0.05$). Accordingly, it was determined that the teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning regulation did not differ according to their teaching experience, rather their perceptions were found to be similar.

The results of the t-test performed to compare the perceptions of the classroom teachers' out-of-school learning environments by their marital status are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Analysis of the Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments by Marital Status

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Marital Status	<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>s</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Information	Married	313	3.38	.74	357	2.46	.01*
	Single	46	3.08	.88			
Planning	Married	313	3.32	.86	357	1.87	.05
	Single	46	3.04	.93			
Application	Married	313	3.65	.83	357	3.49	.00*
	Single	46	3.18	.97			
Evaluation	Married	313	3.62	.89	357	3.64	.00*
	Single	46	3.10	.95			
Overall Scale	Married	313	3.48	.78	357	3.00	.00*
	Single	46	3.10	.90			

* $p<0.05$

As is seen in Table 8, as a result of the analysis of teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by their marital status, there was no difference in the planning dimension ($t=1.87$; $p>0.05$), but the teachers' perceptions differed in the information dimension ($t=2.46$; $p<0.05$), in the application dimension ($t=3.49$; $p<0.05$), in the evaluation dimension ($t=3.64$; $p<0.05$) and in the overall scale ($t=3.00$; $p<0.05$). When the means were examined, it was seen that the married teachers had higher means compared to the single ones in the information, application and evaluation dimensions and in the overall scale, and that the teachers believed married people had higher skills than single people in regulating out-of-school learning environments. In order to determine the effect size, Cohen *d* was calculated, and (*d*) values were found as $d=0.368$ in the information dimension, as $d=0.520$ in the application dimension, as $d=0.564$ in the evaluation and as $d=0.451$ in the overall scale, and the effect size was determined to be large.

The results of the t-test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments by their education levels are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Analysis of the Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments by Educational Level

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Education Level	n	\bar{X}	s	sd	t	p
Information	Undergraduate	318	3.33	.74	357	-.81	.41
	Graduate	41	3.43	.96			
Planning	Undergraduate	318	3.26	.84	357	-1.41	.15
	Graduate	41	3.46	.80			
Application	Undergraduate	318	3.58	.84	357	-.82	.41
	Graduate	41	3.70	.99			
Evaluation	Undergraduate	318	3.54	.89	357	-.83	.40
	Graduate	41	3.67	.43			
Overall Scale	Undergraduate	318	3.41	.78	357	-1.04	.29
	Graduate	41	3.55	.96			

* $p < 0.05$

As is seen in Table 9, in terms of the education level variable, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ in the information dimension ($t = -.81$; $p > 0.05$), in the planning dimension ($t = -1.41$; $p > 0.05$), in the application dimension ($t = -.82$; $p > 0.05$), in the evaluation dimension ($t = -.83$; $p > 0.05$) and in the overall scale ($t = -1.04$; $p > 0.05$). In this sense, it can be said that the teachers did not differ in terms of their perceptions of out-of-school learning environments whether they have undergraduate or graduate degrees.

The results of the t-test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments according to the district they work in are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Analysis of The Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments according to the District They Work

The Scale and Its Dimensions	District	n	\bar{X}	s	sd	t	p
Information	Pamukkale	193	3.45	.75	357	2.87	.00*
	Merkezefendi	166	3.21	.76			
Planning	Pamukkale	193	3.42	.85	357	3.23	.00*
	Merkezefendi	166	3.12	.88			
Application	Pamukkale	193	3.71	.83	357	2.78	.00*
	Merkezefendi	166	3.46	.88			
Evaluation	Pamukkale	193	3.67	.90	357	2.52	.01*
	Merkezefendi	166	3.43	.91			
Overall Scale	Pamukkale	193	3.55	.78	357	3.03	.00*
	Merkezefendi	166	3.29	.82			

* $p < 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 10, in terms of the district where the teachers work, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments differed in the information dimension ($t = 2.87$; $p < 0.05$), in the planning dimension ($t = 3.23$; $p < 0.05$), in the application dimension ($t = 2.78$; $p < 0.05$), in the evaluation dimension ($t = 2.52$; $p < 0.05$) and in the overall

scale ($t=3.03$; $p<0.05$). When the means were examined, it was seen that the teachers working in Pamukkale district had higher means than the teachers working in Merkezefendi district. In this regard, it can be said that the teachers working in Pamukkale district had higher competence to regulate out-of-school learning environments. In order to determine effect size, Cohen d was calculated, and (d) values were found as $d=0.317$ in the information dimension, as $d=0.346$ in the planning dimension, as $d=0.292$ in the application dimension, as $d=0.265$ in the evaluation dimension and as $d=0.324$ in the overall scale, and the effect size was determined to be large.

Table 11 presents the results of the t-test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments according to whether they studied the out-of-school learning environments guidebook or not.

Table 11: Analysis of the Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments according to Studying the Out-of-School Learning Environments Guidebook

The Scale and Its Dimensions	Studying the Guidebook	n	\bar{X}	s	sd	t	p
Information	Yes	47	3.65	.81	357	2.98	.00*
	No	312	3.29	.75			
Planning	Yes	47	3.61	.82	357	2.74	.00*
	No	312	3.23	.87			
Application	Yes	47	3.81	.88	357	1.84	.06
	No	312	3.56	.85			
Evaluation	Yes	47	3.71	.95	357	1.26	.20
	No	312	3.53	.90			
Overall Scale	Yes	47	3.69	.83	357	2.35	.01*
	No	312	3.39	.80			

* $p<0.05$

As can be seen in Table 11, in terms of the variable of studying *the Out-of-School Learning Environments Guidebook*, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ in the application dimension ($t=1.84$; $p>0.05$) and evaluation dimension ($t=1.26$; $p>0.05$); however, there was a difference in the information dimension ($t=2.98$; $p<0.05$), in the planning dimension ($t=2.74$; $p<0.05$) and in the overall scale ($t=2.35$; $p<0.05$). When the perception means in the information dimension, in the planning dimension and in the overall scale were examined, it was determined that those who studied/examined the out-of-school learning environment guidebook had higher means and higher out-of-school regulation competence. In order to determine the effect size, Cohen d was calculated; and (d) values were found as $d=0.461$ in the information dimension, as $d=0.449$ in the planning dimension and as $d=0.368$ in the overall scale, and the effect size was determined to be large.

The results of the t-test performed to compare the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments according to receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Analysis of the Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Out-of-School Learning Environments according to Receiving Education Related to Out-of-School Learning Environments

Scale and Dimensions	Receiving Training	n	\bar{X}	s	sd	T	p																																												
Information	Yes	33	3.42	.90	357	.59	.55																																												
	No	326	3.33	.75				Planning	Yes	33	3.36	.98	357	.52	.59	No	326	3.27	.86	Application	Yes	33	3.53	.95	357	-.47	.63	No	326	3.60	.85	Evaluation	Yes	33	3.51	.97	357	-.27	.78	No	326	3.56	.90	Overall Scale	Yes	33	3.45	.89	357	.13	.89
Planning	Yes	33	3.36	.98	357	.52	.59																																												
	No	326	3.27	.86				Application	Yes	33	3.53	.95	357	-.47	.63	No	326	3.60	.85	Evaluation	Yes	33	3.51	.97	357	-.27	.78	No	326	3.56	.90	Overall Scale	Yes	33	3.45	.89	357	.13	.89	No	326	3.43	.80								
Application	Yes	33	3.53	.95	357	-.47	.63																																												
	No	326	3.60	.85				Evaluation	Yes	33	3.51	.97	357	-.27	.78	No	326	3.56	.90	Overall Scale	Yes	33	3.45	.89	357	.13	.89	No	326	3.43	.80																				
Evaluation	Yes	33	3.51	.97	357	-.27	.78																																												
	No	326	3.56	.90				Overall Scale	Yes	33	3.45	.89	357	.13	.89	No	326	3.43	.80																																
Overall Scale	Yes	33	3.45	.89	357	.13	.89																																												
	No	326	3.43	.80																																															

* $p < 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 12, in terms of the variable of receiving education related to out-of-school learning environments, the classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ in the information dimension ($t=.59$; $p > 0.05$), in the planning dimension ($t=.52$; $p > 0.05$), in the application dimension ($t=-.47$; $p > 0.05$), in the evaluation dimension ($t=-.27$; $p > 0.05$) and in the overall scale ($t=.13$; $p > 0.05$). It can be said that the out-of-school learning regulation skills of the teachers who have received training related to out-of-school learning environments are similar to those who have not received any.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments were determined and also examined according to various personal variables. The results of the study are as follows:

Looking at the classroom teachers' responses to the out-of-school learning regulation scale and its dimensions, the highest mean was found in the "application" dimension and indicated a high-level perception. This showed that the teachers' competencies related to the application were at the highest level. The lowest mean, on the other hand, was in the "planning" dimension and indicated a medium level. It was also found that the mean of the planning dimension was low and indicated a medium level. The fact that the level in the planning dimension is medium but high in the application dimension reveals that teachers should be trained in terms of planning. It was also seen that the classroom teachers' perceptions were at a medium level in the "information" dimension, high in the "evaluation" dimension and high in the overall scale. It was understood that the teachers were generally at a good level in this area. Likewise, Sözer and Oral (2016) determined in their study that there are teachers who use out-of-school learning environments frequently and are successful in using these environments. In another study conducted by Kaya (2021), it was found that teachers

actively carried out out-of-school learning activities in almost all courses, that only a minority of them could not perform out-of-school learning activities effectively, and that most of them perform the activities even if few in number. In their study that focuses on teacher candidates' experiences with field trips, Doğan, Çiçek, and Saraç (2018) concluded that field trips within the scope of out-of-school learning environments developed their collaboration and cooperation skills, and observation and examination skills and contributed to their success in environmental science courses. Aslan (2020) emphasised in his study that education administrators and teachers are generally moderately competent in regulating out-of-school learning environments. In this context, results similar to the results of this study were obtained. Bozdoğan (2012) noted in his study that conducting theoretical and practical trainings within the scope of out-of-school environment activities makes significant contributions to preservice and in-service teachers. On the other hand, in the study of Karadoğan (2016), it was also revealed that teachers experienced problems on field trips and that they needed to receive training to overcome this, which is a different result.

The classroom teachers' perceptions of out-of-school learning environments did not differ according to their teaching experience, education level and whether they have received training related to out-of-school learning environments, but differed according to gender, age, marital status, the district where they work, and whether they have studied out-of-school learning environments guidebook. According to the results obtained in the study by Sözer and Oral (2016) the variables of education level and education, areas created differences, a result different from the one obtained in this study. However, it showed similarities with the results obtained in the study by Yıldırım (2020) indicating that knowing out-of-school learning environments and applying relevant activities makes a difference. Aslan (2020) revealed that the perceptions of education administrators and teachers about OOSLRS did not differ significantly according to gender, marital status, and branch, but differed according to age, working position, education level, the district where teachers work, and receiving training related to out-of-school learning environments.

In the study, it was determined that considering the dimensions of the out-of-school learning regulation scale, the male teachers' perception means were found to be higher than the female teachers in the application dimension, in the evaluation dimension and in general, and that the skills of the male teachers to regulate out-of-school learning environments were higher than women. In the studies conducted by Aslan (2020) and Ustabulut (2021), on the other hand, no significant difference was found according to gender. According to the marital status variable, the married teachers had higher perception means than the single teachers in the information dimension, in the application dimension, in the evaluation dimension, and in the overall scale. and that the teachers believed married people had higher competence than single people in regulating out-of-school learning environments. However, Aslan (2020) determined in his study that there was no significant difference according to marital status. Considering the districts where the participating classroom teachers work, it was seen that the teachers working in Pamukkale district had higher means in all the dimensions and in general than the

teachers working in Merkezefendi district. In this regard, it can be said that the teachers working in Pamukkale district had higher competence to regulate out-of-school learning environments. According to a variable of studying the out-of-school learning environments guidebook, it was determined that those who studied the out-of-school learning environment guidebook had higher means and higher out-of-school regulation competence. It should be taken into consideration that these results obtained based on the participants' views may differ according to personal characteristics, place, time and conditions. Again, similar results were obtained in the studies carried out by Kılıç (2002), Tan and Temiz (2003) and Aslan (2020) indicating that out-of-school learning perceptions can differ according to the personal characteristics of teachers.

6. Suggestions

- It can be beneficial to carry out further studies, trainings, educational applications etc. aimed at increasing teachers' competences in regulating out-of-school learning environments.
- Considering out-of-school learning environment regulation, in order to back up teachers, especially in planning and information dimensions, teachers should be provided with in-service trainings, publications and so on.
- In addition to in-service trainings, in order to raise awareness towards the publications about out-of-school learning environments, schools can be provided with guidebooks and bulletins on this issue.
- Provincial and district directorates of national education and school administration should encourage teachers to use their skills in regulating out-of-school learning environments more actively and effectively.

Acknowledgements

This study was produced from a non-thesis graduate project. It was carried out with classroom teachers in primary schools in the 2021-2022 academic year fall semester.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Uygun received his bachelor's degree from Primary School Education Department at Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey in 2003. He started to work as a research assistant at Primary School Education Department, Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2005. He received his master's degree from Primary School Education Department at Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2008 and completed his doctorate education in Primary School Education Department at Hacettepe University in 2012. He started to work as an assistant professor doctor at Primary School Education Department of Dumlupınar University in 2013. He has been working at Primary School Education Department of Pamukkale University since 2020. He has many national and international

publications in the field of teaching literacy in primary education and Turkish language teaching. E-mail: muyguntr@gmail.com

Mehmet Duman received his bachelor's degree from Primary School Education Department, Faculty of Education, Pamukkale University in 1999. He started his profession at Bitlis Aşağıkaraboy Primary School in 1999. He worked at Bitlis Kurtuluş Özgür Kaya Taşdelen Primary School in 2000, Denizli Çameli Çiğdemli Primary School in 2004, Denizli Honaz Mimar Sinan Primary School in 2006, Mimar Sinan İmamhatip Secondary School in 2012, and Denizli Honaz Atatürk Primary School in 2014. He has been teaching at Denizli Pamukkale Atatürk Primary School since 2019. He completed his master's degree at Primary School Education Department, Pamukkale University in 2022. E-mail: mehmetduman77@hotmail.com

References

- Akın, F. (2012). *The effects of learnings in the school and out of the school to the student achievement*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Social Sciences, Burdur.
- Akyüz, E. (2019). *School as a tool of power in Ivan Illich's deschooling society*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu.
- Aslan, Ö. (2020). *Perceptions of education administrators and teachers towards organizing out-of-school learning environments*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis Project. Pamukkale University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Denizli.
- Ataman, S. (2014). *Teaching methods and techniques* (1st Edition). Yediiklim, Ankara.
- Avcı, G. (2019). *The effect of outdoor education on attitude, achievement and level of knowledge retention in primary social studies course*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Izmir.
- Balkan Kıyıcı, F., & Atabek Yiğit, E. (2010). Science education beyond the classroom: A field trip to wind power plant. *International Online Journal of Science Education*, 28(12), 1373-1388.
- Bozdoğan, A. E., & Yalçın, N. (2006). The effects of science centers on the change of "science interest" levels of primary education students and on their academic success: *Energy Park*. *Ege Journal of Education*, 2(7), 95-114.
- Berberoğlu, O. E., & Uygun S. (2013). Examining the development of out-of-class education in the world and in Turkey. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 9(2), 32-42.
- Bolat, Y. & Köroğlu, M. (2020). Out-of-school learning and scale of regulating out-of-school learning: Validity and reliability study. *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 5(13), 1630-1663.
- Bozdoğan, A. E. (2012). The practice of prospective science teachers regarding the planning of education-based trips: Evaluation of six different field trips. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(2), 1050-1072.

- Çebi, H. (2018). *Effect of different extracurricular learning environment on students' attitudes and interest in science course*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Yıldız Teknik University, Institute of Science, Istanbul.
- Çebi, H., & Arslan, M. (2019). Effect of different extracurricular learning environment on students' attitudes and interest in science course. *Yıldız Journal of Educational Research*, 4(2), 1-35. doi: 10.51280/yjer.2019.007.
- Dillon, J., Rickinson, M., Teamey, K., Morris, M., Choi, M. Y., Sanders, D., & Benefield, P. (2006). The value of outdoor learning: evidence from research in the UK and elsewhere. *School Science Review*, 87(320), 107-111.
- Doğan, Y., Çiçek, Ö., & Saraç, E. (2018). The field trip experiences of pre-service science teachers in the environmental science course. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 20(1), 104-120. doi: 10.17556/erziefd.346487.
- Ertaş, H., Şen, A. I., & Parmaksızoğlu, A. (2011). The effects of out-of-school scientific activities on 9th grade students' relating the unit of energy to daily life. Necatibey Faculty of Education, *Electronic Journal of Science and Mathematics Education [EFMED]*, 5(2), 178-198.
- Erten, Z., & Taşçı, G. (2016). Developing activities of out of the school learning environments for science classes and analysing their effects on students' scientific process skills. *Journal of Education Faculty*, 18(2), 638-657.
- Fidan, N. (2012). *School learning and teaching book*. Nobel Publications, Ankara.
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: a simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (10th edition). Pearson, Boston.
- Güler, A. (2011). Impact of a planned museum tour on the primary school students' attitudes. *Elementary Education Online*, 10(1), 169-179.
- Karadoğan, S. (2016). Out-of-classroom-school learning practices and problems in education. R. Aksu, (Ed.). In *Academic evaluations on education problems in Turkey-I*, (pp.47-84). Maya Academy Publishing, Ankara.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific Research Methods*. Nobel Publishing, Ankara.
- Karataş, A. (2011). Role of natural history museums in increasing environmental awareness. *Academic Look Journal*, 27, 1-15.
- Kaya, Z. (2021). *Classroom teachers views on the use of out of school learning activities in elementary school*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Graduate School of Education, Rize.
- Kılıç, A. (2002). Affective field features and bringing individuals to them. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 8, 153-164.
- Kılıç, S. (2014). Effect size. *Journal of Mood Disorders*, 4(1), 44, 46.
- Lakin, L. (2006). Science beyond the classroom. *Journal of Biological Education*, 40(2), 88-90.
- Nichols, D. R. (1982). Outdoor educators: The need to become credible. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 14(1), 1-3.
- Öztürk, A. (2019). *Social studies teacher's views on outdoor education*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, Institute of Education Sciences, Niğde.

- Paykoç, F., & Baykal, S. (2000). Museum pedagogy: a study of the effectiveness of museums as culture, communication and active learning environments. Z.A. Kızılyaprak, (Pub. Ed.). In *New approaches in museology globalization and localization* (pp.102-113). Turkish Economic and Social History Foundation Publications, Istanbul.
- Sözer, Y. (2015). *Supplementary active outdoor learning for classroom learning: A meta-synthesis study*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Dicle University, Institute of Education Sciences. Diyarbakır.
- Sözer, Y., & Oral, B. (2016). Supplementary active outdoor learning process for classroom learning: A meta-synthesis study. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 7(22), 278-310.
- Şencan, H. (2002), *Scientific Writing*, Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business no:283
- Şimşek, A., & Kaymakçı, S. (2015). The purpose and scope of out-of-school social studies teaching. A. Şimşek and S. Kaymakçı, (Ed.). In *Out-of-school social studies teaching* (pp.1-11). Pegem Academy, Ankara.
- Tan, M., & Temiz, B. K. (2003). The importance and role of the science process skills in Science Teaching. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 13(1), 89-101.
- Taşçı, G., & Soran, H. (2008). The Effects of multimedia applications in cell division subject on the comprehension and application levels of learning achievement, *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34: 233 – 243.
- Tatar, N., & Bağrıyanık, K. E. (2012). Opinions of Science and Technology Teachers about Outdoor Education. *Elementary Education Online*, 11(4), 883-896.
- Thomas, G. (2010) Facilitator, teacher, or leader? Managing conflicting roles in outdoor education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 32(3), 239–254.
- Tortop, H. S., & Özek, N. (2013). The meaningful field trip in project based learning; The solar energy and its usage areas topic. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 44, 300-307.
- Ustabulut, M. Y. (2021). Opinions of Turkish teacher candidates about learning out of school. *Blue Atlas*, 9(1), 232-249.
- Yardımcı, E. (2009). *The effect of activity-based nature education at a summer science camp on 4th and 5th graders' conceptions of the nature*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu.
- Yayla, O. (2011). *Study of Ivan Illich's proposal of 'Deschooling Society' regarding functionalist and conflict theory approaches*, Unpublished Masters' Thesis. Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.
- Yıldırım, H. I. (2020). The effect of using out-of-school learning environments in science teaching on motivation for learning science. *Participatory Educational Research*, 7(1), 143-161.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).