DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 139 RC 021 080

AUTHOR Basile, Carole G.; Copley, Juanita V.
TITLE The Effect of an Outdoor Nature Investigation Program on Young Children's Ability To Transfer Knowledge.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; *Elementary School Students; *Generalization; Grade 3; Hands on Science; Learning Strategies; *Outdoor Education; Primary Education; Problem Solving; Program Effectiveness; Schemata (Cognition); *Science Education; Teaching Methods; *Transfer of Training
IDENTIFIERS *Nature Study

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of using an outdoor nature investigation program on the ability of third-grade students to transfer knowledge. Specifically, the study determined whether the program enhanced students' ability to transfer declarative (facts and concepts), procedural (process skills), and schematic (experience) knowledge to a set of transfer situations. Forty-five third-grade students from an urban elementary school were divided into 2 groups, both of which were taught science by the same teacher in consecutive 7-week units. The main theme of each unit was habitats. The treatment program, used only with the second student group, involved students becoming scientists by reading about a particular topic, posing questions, collecting data in their schoolyard, and analyzing the data by creating graphs and charts. Students were interviewed after watching video vignettes that presented situations requiring generalization from what they had learned during the unit. Results indicate that both groups effectively transferred knowledge to the more similar scenario, but only the group that received the treatment was able to transfer knowledge to the less similar scenario. In addition, the treatment group transferred declarative knowledge better than students in the control group on the more similar problem but not on the less similar problem. The treatment group appeared to transfer procedural knowledge better in both scenarios. Transfer of schematic knowledge appeared to favor the treatment group, but schematic knowledge was low in both groups. Contains 13 references. (LP)

"The Effect of an Outdoor Nature Investigation Program on Young Children's Ability to Transfer Knowledge"

Paper presented at the
1997 American Educational Research Association Meeting
Chicago, Illinois

Carole G. Basile, Ed.D.
Juanita V. Copley, Ph.D.
University of Houston
Houston, TX

"The Effect of an Outdoor Nature Investigation Program
on Young Children's Ability to Transfer Knowledge"

"Effective education depends on curricula with an eye for transfer" (Singley & Anderson, 1989, p.1). Trends for determining effective education need to go beyond achievement. Emphasis in education should be towards teaching for insight or a deeper understanding. Dewey (1916) wanted education to emphasize knowledge with rich ramifications in the lives of learners; knowledge worth understanding. The power of the human cognitive system is going beyond the information given.

Perkins (1991) proposed that "the artful teacher creates the expectation in students that there are connections to be made--connections with upcoming ideas in the same course, with ideas in other courses, and with out-of-school settings" (p. 7). Therefore, the goal of education needs to be to prepare students to use relevant knowledge to solve important problems (Gragg, 1940; Bransford, Franks, Vye, & Sherwood, 1989).

What knowledge transfers and how educators can best promote transfer remains questionable (Perkins & Salomon, 1987; Singley & Anderson, 1989). Studies have included samples of toddlers, adolescents, and adults (Judd, 1908; Gick & Holyoak, 1980; Brown & Kane, 1988; Brown, 1990). The culmination of such efforts still leads to questions such as: what types of knowledge transfer, how does knowledge transfer, what types of curriculum and instruction are needed to enhance transfer, and at what age can educators expect different kinds of transfer.

The purpose of this study was to examine one particular program to determine whether it enhanced third grade students' ability to transfer declarative (facts and concepts), procedural (process skills), and schematic (experience) knowledge to a set of near and far transfer situations. In other words, situations that become more distant from the first in terms of content and context.

The research question was: What is the effect of using an outdoor nature investigation program, on the knowledge transferred by third grade students? The hypotheses were:

1. There is a statistically significant difference between the knowledge transferred by third grade students who participate in the investigations and third grade students who do not participate in the investigations given a near transfer situation.
2. There is a statistically significant difference between the knowledge transferred by third grade students who participate in the investigations and third grade students who do not participate in the investigations given a far transfer situation.
3. There is a statistically significant relationship between third grade students' knowledge given a near transfer situation and those third grade students' knowledge given a far transfer situation.

Forty-five third grade students (two groups) in a urban elementary school were used for this study. Both groups were taught science by the same teacher in consecutive seven-week units. The main theme of each unit was "Habitats". The treatment program was used with the second group of students only.

The treatment was a program entitled, Nature At Your Doorstep (Basile, Collins, & Malone, 1997). This is a skill-based curriculum rooted in the scientific method. In

each investigation, primary school students become scientists (that is, a botanist, entomologist, or wildlife biologist), by reading about the particular topic provided, posing questions, collecting data in their schoolyard, and analyzing the data by creating graphs and charts. It presents knowledge in a contextual format that connects curriculum to practical applications and personal insights.

Data was collected using the following methodology. Students saw a video vignette, in which three children are confronted with the problem of what to do with a baby bird that they found on the ground in their local park. After watching this segment of the tape, students were individually interviewed utilizing questions that would provide the researcher with evidence of declarative, procedural, and schematic knowledge.

In week seven, students saw a second video vignette. This video vignette was a continuation of the first. However, the children have now met an animal rescue worker who has a bald eagle to be released. The children in the video are now confronted with the problem of finding a good habitat for this bald eagle. This video problem represented the same content area as the first video, habitats, and was similar in context, birds. This would be considered a near transfer situation. Students watched this segment of the tape and were asked a series of questions similar to the first set of questions.

Two weeks passed without additional information regarding habitats or Nature at Your Doorstep. In week ten, students viewed a third video vignette and were asked to solve the following problem. On this tape an astronaut discusses the space station and the fact that at some point in time NASA may want to take children to space. The problem presented to the students was that NASA did not know how to create the proper habitat for third grade students. This video problem represented the same content area as the first video, habitats, but contained a different context, people. This would be considered a far transfer situation. Again students were interviewed individually and asked similar questions as previous sessions. Data collected were analyzed using a multivariate analysis of covariance and Pearson product moment correlation procedures.

Results for hypothesis one and two are summarized in the figure below:

	Posttest 1: Near Transfer	Posttest 2: Far Transfer
Overall results	Not Statistically Significant Not Educationally Significant	Statistically Significant* Educationally Significant**
Declarative Knowledge	Statistically Significant* Educationally Significant**	Not Statistically Significant Not Educationally Significant
Procedural Knowledge	Not Statistically Significant Educationally Significant**	Statistically Significant* Educationally Significant**
Schematic Knowledge	Not Statistically Significant Not Educationally Significant	Statistically Significant* Educationally Significant**

* $p < .05$; Treatment > Non-Treatment
** $p > .50$; Treatment > Non-Treatment

Overall results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups given a far transfer situation not a near transfer situation. Both groups, independent of the treatment, transferred knowledge to the near transfer situation, but only the group that received the treatment was able to transfer knowledge to the far transfer situation. Therefore, the treatment appears to be effective in aiding transfer of all three knowledges. In order to examine this conclusion further each knowledge component was considered separately.

When declarative knowledge was analyzed, the researcher found that the treatment group transferred declarative knowledge better than students in the control group on the near transfer problem but not the far transfer problem. Students in the control group learned about habitats through traditional instruction, such as whole group learning, focus on factual knowledge and comprehension, and low-level questioning strategies.

Research has shown that transfer depends on the type of instruction and the way the knowledge is organized (Singley & Anderson, 1989). Therefore, students in the treatment group used the outdoors as their classroom and learned declarative knowledge as a part of the process of systematically investigating habitats. Cognitive scientists continue to debate whether the two can be separated (Singley & Anderson, 1989) or whether there is a concrete interactional effect. Differences between the groups with regard to the second problem could be attributed to the fact that the first group was the teachers homeroom group, continually exposed to materials in the classroom pertaining to the content area.

The treatment group not only appeared to transfer procedural knowledge better in the near transfer situation but also the far transfer situation. These results are the most promising and possibly the most telling about what can occur with the type of instruction used in this study. Royer (1986) conveys that something is understood when it has been integrated in a meaningful way into the learner's existing knowledge structure. "When the learner does not have any relevant knowledge that can be used to construct an interpretation of a message, memorization may occur, but understanding will not" (p. 87). In addition, "the ability to transfer learned information is evidence that understanding is present" (p. 95).

Transfer of schematic knowledge appears to favor the treatment group. However, low mean scores from both groups showed that schematic knowledge seemed to be lacking. The conclusion is that seven weeks is not be enough time for these activities to become as meaningful as possible.

Finally, logic seemed to imply that there would be a relationship between students who could transfer to the near transfer situation and students who could transfer to the far transfer situation. The lack of statistically significant results for this third hypothesis implies that many factors were at work, that transfer is not simple or predictable.

The implications of this study guide not only the program in question, but also curriculum and instruction in general. This particular program has the potential to improve transfer abilities, especially in the area of procedural knowledge. However, as

the program develops, there is also need for the inclusion of opportunities for providing more practice transferring skills learned to new situations. Students need to be provided with opportunities to use the knowledges they have learned to solve authentic problems.

Generally, continued emphasis needs to be placed on instruction that integrates declarative and procedural knowledge as this may lead to greater transfer in problem solving tasks. Novices must be helped to notice the important features of various situations. Educators can influence the way students think and solve problems especially when both instructional and organizational factors focus on the goal of transfer. Therefore their primary role is to understand the goals of instruction. They need to know what knowledge they wish to impart and what kind of transfer they want their students to acquire (Royer, 1986).

Changes need to be made in school structures, in-service programs, preservice education, instruction and assessment. Students need to have success in both achieving knowledge and skills and transferring them. Stephens (1963) states, "just as students learn to learn, so may they have some success in learning to transfer" (p. 118).

References

Basile, C.G., Collins, F., & Malone, J. (In Press). Nature at your doorstep. Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.

Bransford, J., Franks, J., Vye, N., & Sherwood, R.D. (1989). New approaches to instruction because wisdom can t be told. In S. Vosniadou, & A. Ortony (Eds.), Similarity and analogical reasoning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, A.L. (1990). Domain-Specific principles affect learning and transfer in children. Cognitive Science, 14, 107-135.

Brown, A.L., & Kane, M.J., (1988). Preschool children can learn to transfer: Learning to learn and learning from example. Cognitive Psychology, 20, 493-523.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gick, M.L., & Holyoak, K.J. (1980). Analogical problem solving. Cognitive Psychology, 12, 306-355.

Gragg, C.L. (1940, October). Wisdom can't be told. Harvard Alumni Bulletin.

Judd, C.H. (1908). The relation of special training and general intelligence. Educational Review, 36, 42-48.

Perkins, D.N. (1991). Educating for insight. Educational Leadership, 49 (2), 4-8.

Perkins, D.N. & Salomon, G. (1987). Transfer and teaching thinking. In D. Perkins, J. Lockhead, & J. Bishop (Eds.), Thinking: The second international conference (pp. 285-303). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Royer, J.M. (1986). Designing instruction to produce understanding: an approach based on cognitive theory. In G.D. Phye & T. Andre (Eds.), Cognitive classroom learning. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Singley, M. & Anderson, J.R. (1989). The transfer of cognitive skill. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stephens, J.M. (1963). Transfer of learning. In R. F. Grose, & R. C. Birney (Ed.), Transfer of learning (pp. 103-121). New York: D. Van Nostrand.

AREA 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Effect of an Outdoor Nature Investigation Program on Young Children's Ability to Transfer Knowledge.	
Author(s): Basile, Carole G. Copley, Juanita V.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

[✓] ← Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document → [ ]

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Carole G. Basile	Position: VISITING ASST PROFESSOR
Printed Name: CAROLE G. BASILE	Organization: UH
Address: 1715 FAIR OAKS DR. EL LAGO, TX 77586	Telephone Number: (713) 743-4961
	Date: 4-1-97

OVER

RC 021080

CUA

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education, O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064
202 319-5120

February 21, 1997

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA[1]. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a printed copy of your presentation.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality. You can track our processing of your paper at http://ericae2.educ.cua.edu.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can drop off the copies of your paper and Reproduction Release Form at the **ERIC booth (523)** or mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to:

AERA 1997/ERIC Acquisitions
The Catholic University of America
O'Boyle Hall, Room 210
Washington, DC 20064

This year ERIC/AE is making a **Searchable Conference Program** available on the AERA web page (http://aera.net). Check it out!

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

---

[1]If you are an AERA chair or discussant, please save this form for future use.