

This article was downloaded by: []

On: 19 January 2012, At: 01:47

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/raol20>

Influence of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of two inexperienced adventure educators

Mark H. Zmudy^a, Matthew D. Curtner-Smith^b & Jeff Steffen^c

^a The University of Minnesota—Duluth, Duluth, Minnesota, USA

^b Department of Kinesiology, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA

^c The University of Wisconsin—La Crosse, Wisconsin, USA

Available online: 15 Dec 2009

To cite this article: Mark H. Zmudy, Matthew D. Curtner-Smith & Jeff Steffen (2009): Influence of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of two inexperienced adventure educators, Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning, 9:2, 115-134

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14729670902817049>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Influence of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of two inexperienced adventure educators

Mark H. Zmudy^{a*}, Matthew D. Curtner-Smith^b,
and Jeff Steffen^c

^a*The University of Minnesota—Duluth, Duluth, Minnesota, USA;* ^b*Department of Kinesiology, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA;* ^c*The University of Wisconsin—La Crosse, Wisconsin, USA*

A relatively small number of researchers have found it interesting and useful to examine why and how persons choose to be and become adventure educators (AEs) and why they teach as they do. The implications of this knowledge are: (1) gaining insight into novice AEs' perceptions of what is required to provide in-depth and high quality instruction in adventure education; and hence, (2) the impact on the structure of AE training. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of occupational socialization on two AEs with less than five years' experience. Data were collected using a variety of qualitative techniques while the AEs worked at two, week-long summer camps for elementary and middle school-aged children. They were analysed using standard interpretive methods. Results indicated that both AEs' acculturation led to them entering formal training without having had any structured teaching of adventure content modelled for them, suggesting, as has been found in physical education under similar circumstances, a 'play only' perception of the professional field of adventure education with class management and safety, rather than instruction, being the top priorities. Their professional socialization, however, led to real and deep growth and development in their pedagogies. The AEs' organizational socialization, unfortunately served to partially wash out these gains. Key socializing agents at the various stages of the AEs' development are identified and discussed as are practical implications for AE education.

Review of the literature

In Western culture, the inclusion of activities in educational settings which could be described as 'outdoor and adventurous' dates back perhaps as far as 400 BC (Hunt, 1990). Moreover, adventure education has been included in one form or another in the school and local community/agency curricula of many countries for close to 100 years

*Corresponding author: University of Minnesota—Duluth, Dept. of HPER, SpHC 110, Duluth, MN 55812, USA. Email: mzmudy@d.umn.edu

(Neill, 2004; Outward Bound, 2006). For example, since its inclusion in the national physical education content standards (National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE], 1991), it has served as a platform for offering unique and non-traditional activities in American public school physical education curricula. Similarly, in Britain it has been included as one of the six areas of activity to be studied by pupils since the inception of the National Curriculum for Physical Education (Department of Education and Science & the Welsh Office, 1992; Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007). Perhaps in comparison to other sub-disciplines of physical education, then, adventure education has evolved into a well-established professional field in its own right (Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003; Association for Challenge Course Technology [ACCT], 2004).

Historical development of adventure education

A major influence on how adventure education is popularly known has been the teachings of Outward Bound founder, Kurt Hahn (Stetson, 2005). Hahn's visions of teaching peace and survival skills were developed and honed beginning in 1904 and initially put into practice at the Salem School in Germany in 1920, Gordonstoun School in Scotland in 1934, and the first Outward Bound School in 1941 at Aberdovey, Wales. During the 1950s and 1960s, Outward Bound schools were also opened in England, Kenya, Germany, Australia, Canada, Singapore, the USA and parts of Asia (Outward Bound, 2006). Project Adventure, perhaps the most well-known modern and American incarnation of adventure education, was first established in Massachusetts in 1970. Project Adventure has since expanded within the USA and internationally and has become a well-known provider of adventure educator (AE) training (Neill, 2006).

Models and goals of adventure education

As explained by Brown (2006), 'adventure education is based on the experiential learning model which combines direct experience with guided reflection and analysis under the supervision of a group instructor/facilitator/teacher' (p. 685). Similarly, for Miles and Priest (1990), a major goal of adventure education is for each pupil to expand the self and realize his/her own potential by learning, growing, and progressing. Some (Rhonke & Butler, 1995; Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003) have suggested that adventure education includes those activities and pedagogies which enable children and youth to move through identified sequences of the adventure process (for in-depth discussion of sequences see Mortlock, 1994; Bisson 1997, 1998, 1999). Specifically, they have argued that AEs should seek to *teach through* outdoor and adventurous activities (e.g. rock climbing, kayaking, canoeing, backpacking, winter camping, snowshoeing, trail biking, scuba diving, ropes and challenge courses) so that pupils make acquaintances, warm-up and lose inhibitions, communicate with each other, solve problems, build trust in groups, take on group challenges on low-ropes course elements, take on individual challenges on high-ropes course elements,

and then later apply what they have learned in a team-oriented outdoor pursuits experience where they travel through a natural environment without using motorized transport (Ford & Blanchard, 1993).

Others (Neill, 2004) have argued that adventure programmes do not have to be so rigid and can be based on various and different models of experiential learning (for example, see Joplin, 1995; Dewey, 1997 [1938]; Priest & Gass, 1997). Arguably, one of the best known and most often utilized of these is the four-stage model designed by Kolb (1984, cited in Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). This model requires pupils to follow the cycle of experiencing an activity, observing/reflecting, forming concepts and generalizations, and applying new concepts in different situations. For example, in a lower level initiative students could stand side-by-side on a downed tree log and be asked to get in order by birth date without ever touching the ground. No other directions would be given; and students may find that this requires detailed communication. On reflection, students could then be guided to discuss aspects of their lives where clear communication is useful (for example, school, work, teams, etc.).

Research in adventure education

Research in adventure education has primarily focused on unearthing any general therapeutic benefits on participants (Gass, 1993; Kelley & Coursey, 1997; Autry, 2001; Neill, 2003; Reed, 2003) as well as its influence on participants' self-esteem, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social development (Barrett & Greenaway, 1995; Priest, 1996; Paxton, 1999; McKenzie, 2003). These studies have consistently suggested that adventure education has positive effects on participants.

A limited amount of research has also been conducted on the physiological impact of the adventure experience on participants (Watts & Drobish, 1998; Bunting, Tolson, Kunh, Suarez, & Williams, 2000). Results of this line of research suggest that participants' physiological responses to high adventure activities vary depending on the degree and type of stressors present.

More recently, researchers have examined the effects of school-based adventure education and co-operative education programmes on both pupils (Dyson, 1995, 2001, 2002; Dyson, Griffin, & Hastie, 2004; Grenier, Dyson, & Yeaton, 2005) and teachers (Dyson, 1996). Findings of these studies suggest that student learning and enjoyment in physical education increases due to less intimidation; students feel that trying hard and making a good effort are valued even when skills are not performed perfectly; and students of all ability levels and both genders improve social skills as well as motor skills.

Some researchers have investigated factors that influence why and how persons become AEs and various factors that influence their approach to teaching (for example, see Birmingham, 1989; Barnes 1999, 2003, 2006). These studies have indicated that outdoor educators generally prefer autonomy; AEs in the field are often heavily influenced in terms of socio-cultural behaviours by the environments in which they teach and work; and AEs are often more satisfied with their positions

when management is well organized, and a sense of community is promoted amongst workers. Other researchers have focused on women's experiences and life histories in adventure education (Warren, 1996; Allin & Humberstone, 2006). This line of research has indicated that socialization in the area of outdoor education with relation to significant others makes the transition into a career in outdoor education much smoother. Yet, at the same time, career decisions of women to be educators in what Allin and Humberstone refer to as a 'traditionally male field' (2006, p. 150), may be stereotypically described by some as women's manoeuvres to resist career paths typically associated with females.

Problematic in the adventure education research conducted to date is the fact that much of it has involved employing positivistic pre-post designs which have focused on outcomes rather than teaching processes (Baldwin, Persing, & Magnuson, 2004; Brown, 2006). In short, researchers have conducted what Locke (1977) critically referred to as 'black box' experiments. Moreover, there has been what Ewert (1987) called an 'over-reliance on paper and pencil measurements of attitudes, most notably self-concept' (p. 23). As Brown (2006) argued, there is, then, a need for more process-oriented research of adventure education. In addition, we would suggest that there is a need for researchers to utilize methodologies from the interpretive and critical paradigms in order to provide more depth to the current body of work and to attempt to answer different types of questions, particularly ones that cannot be answered by statistically generalizing (e.g. the various teaching processes that yield the widely reported benefits of adventure education; adventure education practices incorporating the promotion of social justice).

Purpose and theoretical framework

In the areas of physical education teacher education (PETE) and coach education, researchers have found it particularly useful to study the processes by which persons become physical education teachers and coaches by employing occupational socialization theory (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Sage, 1989; Templin & Schempp, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stroot, 1993; Curtner-Smith, 1997, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008). Studies utilizing the occupational socialization framework have been instrumental as a way to establish distinguishing characteristics of physical educators dedicated to the use of in-depth pedagogical practices geared toward quality learning outcomes—in PETE known as a *teaching orientation* (Lawson 1983b; Curtner-Smith 1996, 1999, 2001); and those who spend their time in gymnasias providing equipment with no quality instruction, moderate attention to safety, doing what Williams (1996) referred to as 'rolling out the ball' (p. 46)—in PETE known as a *coaching orientation* (Lawson 1983b; Curtner-Smith, 1996, 1999, 2001). These studies have helped to steer curriculum development in PETE toward a streamlined approach aimed at yielding teachers with a teaching orientation.

A smaller body of research in adventure education has examined why and how persons choose to be and become AEs and why they teach as they do (Birmingham, 1989; Barret & Greenaway, 1995; Barnes, 1999, 2003; Rickinson et al., 2004). This

line of research has primarily focused on personal biography of AEs, aspects of teaching in adventure as a cultural phenomenon (Barnes, 2003), factors that motivate AEs in their teaching careers (Birmingham, 1989; Barnes, 1999), and women's experiences in adventure education (Allin & Humberstone, 2006). As part of a larger study of adventure education, the purpose of this study was to add to that body of research by examining the effects of occupational socialization on two purposefully selected AEs. Specifically, we attempted to determine the influence of *acculturation*, *professional socialization*, and *organizational socialization* on the AEs' perspectives and practices.

Occupational socialization

In the PETE literature, occupational socialization has been defined as 'all kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers' (Lawson, 1986, p. 107). Occupational socialization consists of three major components: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. In the present study, this same theoretical framework has been applied to AEs to determine how their acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization have led to various teaching orientations in adventure.

Acculturation refers to the years prior to entering formal training for work during which individuals' perceptions of their occupation are influenced by a variety of factors. For example, recruits into PETE have been found to be heavily influenced by their parents, their experiences in sport, their physical education teachers and coaches, and their general schooling or what has been termed their 'apprenticeship of observation' (Lortie, 1975). Owing to these influences, many American recruits enter PETE with what have been termed coaching orientations (i.e. their main motivation is to coach extra-curricular sport) and teaching physical education is merely a 'career contingency'. Conversely, relatively few recruits enter PETE with teaching orientations, in which coaching is a career contingency. For AEs, acculturation is the shaping of their perceptions of careers in adventure and what is involved in instructional delivery due to their exposure and experiences in adventure education and outdoor pursuits (e.g. with family or teachers, in non-formal settings such as camps, or in the formal school setting) prior to entering any formal training.

Professional socialization refers to the influence of formal training on recruits into a given occupation. For example, PETE has been shown to have very little influence on many pre-service physical education teachers, particularly those who enter with coaching orientations. Beliefs and values with which recruits enter PETE are often left unchanged or are even reinforced as are ideas about practice and pedagogy. Some PETE programmes, however, can make a difference. These are staffed by specialists and highly professionally trained faculty who work together to challenge the faulty beliefs of coaching-oriented recruits, supervise early field experiences and student teaching very closely, emphasize what Lortie (1975) called a 'shared technical culture' (i.e. the knowledge and skills needed for physical education

teaching), and do everything in their power to support those pre-service teachers who enter PETE with teaching orientations. We suggest that the same holds true for AEs. For example, some AEs may enter their formal training with the belief that ropes courses are merely sophisticated playgrounds for providing exhilarating activities which heighten one's sense of self through experiencing an adrenaline rush (e.g. riding down a zip line). Others may recognize that ropes course instruction may have purposeful objectives, intentionally sequenced activities, and may be founded in philosophical principles which have been derived from a widely recognized professional field of study.

Organizational socialization refers to the influence of the culture of the workplace on individuals. For example, neophyte physical education teachers have been found to face particularly conservative forms of socialization in American schools. Primary socializing agents including administrators, senior teachers, pupils, parents, and, of course, coaches form what has been called the 'institutional press' (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1983) and often serve to 'wash out' (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981) any new pedagogies that were actually instilled during PETE or support those teachers who come to schools with their coaching orientations intact and intent on doing very little real teaching during curricular lessons. Moreover, those new teachers who do maintain their teaching perspectives in the face of this press are forced to adopt a number of coping strategies. According to Etheridge (1989) some teachers 'strategically adjust', in that they lower their standards temporarily in order to get along. In time, unfortunately, the 'adjustment' often becomes permanent. In addition, Lacey (1977) found that some teachers 'strategically comply' with poor practice so that they can survive but teach and act according to their real beliefs when they can do so without being detected. Conversely, Lacey (1977) found that other beginning teachers try to 'strategically redefine' their situations by challenging poor practice and thinking. We suggest that AEs have similar experiences depending on their choice of career location. For example, an AE may arrive at his/her new post with a variety of progressive and innovative strategies for teaching adventure education well, only to find that time constraints or attitudes of other staff members make it impossible to do so.

Method

Participants

For the purposes of this study, we defined an AE as one who is hired by an organization to deliver instructional content to audiences in ropes courses, and outdoor pursuits (e.g. rock climbing, hiking, canoeing) in either formal or non-formal settings, and who had received any amount of formal training under the guidance of a mentor who had: (a) documented class work on his/her college transcripts in both adventure ropes course and outdoor pursuits pedagogy; (b) documented experience as a participant in a formal outdoor training programme outside the university setting (e.g. National Outdoor Leadership School, Outward

Bound, Wilderness Education Association); (c) a mentoring strategy that incorporates teaching practices derived from theoretical foundations in adventure as well as current practices in the adventure education field; and (d) a minimum five years of full-time experience in a lead role as an AE. Participants in this study were two fairly inexperienced, middle class, Caucasian AEs. Both were also physical education teachers and had completed their master's degrees in PETE with an emphasis in adventure education at a university in the same mid-sized city, situated in the American Midwest, in which they currently lived and worked.

Nancy¹ had completed her undergraduate work in PETE at the same institution. This degree programme had also included a significant adventure education component. Conversely, Joel had undergone his undergraduate PETE training at another institution in which he was exposed to adventure education only minimally. These participants were chosen for three reasons: (1) they both had been formally trained during their professional socialization in PETE, at least at the graduate level, to deliver instruction in adventure education and outdoor pursuits in accordance with NASPE (1991) guidelines for inclusion of these activity categories in American physical education; (2) both participants had embarked on professional careers where adventure education and outdoor pursuit content was being utilized, making it possible to study all three components of occupational socialization with each of them; and (3) with each being novice AEs, we could set ourselves up to embark on a line of research at a later date geared toward identifying effective teaching behaviours and orientations in adventure, and hence propose recommendations toward becoming an expert AE. Both signed consent forms in congruence with the university's institutional review board policy on human subjects.

Nancy was 24 years old, completing her first year as an elementary physical education teacher, and as an AE had only intermittently delivered adventure education and outdoor pursuits instruction over four years. For example, she had completed a clinical experience teaching indoor rock climbing, acted as a volunteer instructor for other weekend classes and trips including ropes course, rock climbing, rappelling, winter camping, canoeing, caving, hiking and several week-long summer adventure camps, and she helped to host a week-long alternative adventure PE programme for a high school student. Joel was 23 years of age, concluding his first year as a high school physical education teacher, and had one year of experience as an AE during which he had acted as a college level teaching assistant for an adventure class, and had worked frequently with the climbing wall and ropes course programmes at his graduate institution.

Both Nancy and Joel had received all their formal AE training from within their undergraduate and graduate PETE programmes. At the graduate level, they had taken courses in a variety of outdoor activities including ropes and challenge courses, climbing walls, and outdoor rock climbing. They had also studied the principles and pedagogies of adventure education during three, 3-hour campus-based courses and two, 8- to 10-hour field experiences. The main emphasis during these courses was on experiential models of learning in general and teaching the sequenced stages of adventure (Rhonke, 1989; Mortlock, 1994; Bisson 1997, 1998, 1999; Wurdinger &

Steffen, 2003) in particular. The faculty responsible for delivering their training was primarily one male who met all of our criteria for an AE mentor, and who had over 20 years full-time in adventure education. He could be described as possessing an innovative orientation, meaning that he worked to incorporate progressive and current teaching practices derived from the field of adventure education, and as evidenced by his students' focus on and incorporation of adventure theory and sequentially logical teaching.

At the undergraduate level, Nancy had taken one course in adventure education with the same faculty member, and one course in outdoor pursuit pedagogy with an additional experienced faculty member who had the same theoretical emphasis. Joel, however, had taken one class that included outdoor pursuit content and also served as a 'leader' for the same class during a later semester.

Setting

The study was conducted while Nancy and Joel worked at two consecutive, week-long summer adventure camps in which they taught through a variety of outdoor and adventurous activities including high- and low-ropes course, hiking, caving, canoeing, indoor rock climbing, and compass skills. Each week campers also engaged in an overnight camping trip to a location where a swimming beach, hiking trails, and large playing fields were available. Supplemental activities included crafts and group games. The official or planned curriculum required Joel and Nancy to move through the sequenced stages of adventure (Rhonke, 1989; Mortlock, 1994; Bisson, 1997, 1998, 1999; Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003) while teaching on the ropes courses (i.e. incorporate activities and tasks designed to help the children make acquaintances, warm-up and lose inhibitions, communicate with each other, solve problems, build trust, tackle group challenges on low-ropes course elements, and tackle individual challenges on high-ropes course elements). In addition, a more general adventure education approach was taken by AEs while teaching through other outdoor and adventurous activities. Specifically, the AEs sought to allow students to learn and grow personally through the process of experiencing a variety of innovative and challenging outdoor activities, as well as to foster group development.

The camps were organized by the adventure co-ordinator supervised by the main faculty member responsible for training Nancy and Joel. For this reason, much of the activity took place on the university campus. Facilities here included a classroom for meeting, playing fields, two climbing walls, an indoor high-ropes course and outdoor high- and low-ropes courses. During the first camp, two parents acted as chaperones to the group which had come from a church. During the second camp, one guest AE participated in the overnight camping trip only.

Five boys and 10 girls attended the first camp. They ranged in age from 9 to 14 years. Nine boys and seven girls participated in the second camp. Age ranges for these campers were from 10 to 14 years. The vast majority of children came from middle income backgrounds. Twenty-nine campers were Caucasian and two

were Asian/Pacific Islanders. As a group, the campers were enthusiastic, as evidenced by their high amount of excitement toward the activities and their interactions with the AEs. At times, the campers' enthusiasm and energy was focused more toward horseplay with each other and detracted from the AEs' instructional delivery. A typical day involved the children arriving at 08:00, engaging in activity from 08:30 to noon before eating lunch from 12:00 to 12:30. The children then participated in a second activity from 12:30 to 16:00 before eating a snack and being picked up by their parents at 17:00. Each week the AEs and campers worked as an intact group throughout all activities.

Data collection

A variety of qualitative techniques were employed to collect data aimed at explaining the influence of their acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization on the AEs' perspectives and practices. Formal 60-minute semi-structured (Patton, 1990) interviews of each AE were completed twice each week. These interviews consisted of questions aimed at unravelling the specifics of the AE's acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization, as well as how these experiences influenced, from their perspectives, their teaching practices in adventure education. These interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. Informal interviews were also conducted whenever there was an opportunity to speak with Joel and Nancy during the adventure camps. Informal interviews focused on what principle investigators observed during the AEs' instructional delivery, items included in the AEs' daily journals, and any other incident which seemed relevant to gathering information about the AEs' teaching practices (e.g. the decision to use a certain activity over another one; the particular debriefing/reflection questions asked). Detailed notes were recorded from each informal interview at the earliest convenience.

Non-participant observation was employed for the duration of every day of each adventure camp. This involved observing Nancy and Joel and extensive note-taking while they were instructing; organizing; interacting with colleagues and parents; and interacting with children during transitions, lunch, and snack time. On several occasions, and when appropriate, participant observation was also utilized. This involved joining in with activities or helping with instruction for short periods of time. Again, notes describing these observations were recorded as soon after they had occurred as possible.

Document analysis was also employed and involved examining Joel and Nancy's written plans and daily activity schedules, and making notes on the contents of these materials. Additionally, two, 30-minute activity session segments were videotaped during each week. These tapes were used to conduct stimulated recall interviews with each of the AEs. During these interviews, the videotapes were replayed to Nancy and Joel and paused periodically so that they could explain their thought processes related to specific courses of action during instruction. All four stimulated recall interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Think aloud planning was utilized and involved each AE talking into a tape-recorder during self-selected intervals throughout each day and evening. These tape recordings were transcribed verbatim.

AEs also supplied two critical incident reports per day. Following O'Sullivan and Tsangaridou (1992), the first of these involved the AEs describing anything they found significant about their working day in general while the second required them to record anything they found significant about their instruction, management, and the campers' social behaviour in particular. Finally, at the conclusion of each day, AEs supplied an electronic reflective journal entry about anything concerning the camps that seemed to be pertinent.

Data analysis

Standard interpretive methods were used to analyse data. This involved identifying and coding data indicating how the AEs practiced and thought about adventure education and how their occupational socialization had influenced these practices and perspectives. Both these data types were then divided into categories, subcategories, and themes by utilizing analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Trustworthiness and credibility were established by searching for discrepant cases, by cross-checking the accuracy of results from the different data collection techniques (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) (i.e. triangulating the perspectives of the principle investigators, the AEs, and of the children at the camps), and by inviting the AEs to review and provide feedback on the analysis at regular intervals as the results were yielded by the principle investigators.

Results and discussion

AEs' practices and perspectives

Based on parallels drawn from the occupational socialization literature in PETE, prior to the study it seemed likely that the AEs' orientations would fall along a continuum ranging in similarity from *coaching orientations* to *teaching orientations*, as has been noted with physical education teachers (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Sage, 1989; Templin & Schempp, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stroot, 1993; Curtner-Smith, 1997, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008). Specifically, we thought it possible that some AEs might have a *leisure orientation* and essentially do little more during activity sessions than provide a supervised and safe environment in which pupils could 'play'. These AEs would have the same non-teaching perspective as physical education teachers with strong coaching orientations. At the other extreme, it seemed likely that some AEs would have an *adventure orientation* in that they would make every effort to incorporate and draw on elements from the various experiential learning models on which adventure education is based. A key feature of the instruction provided by these AEs would be *teaching through* the various outdoor pursuits (e.g. rock climbing, hiking, canoeing) in which their pupils

engaged. These AEs would be comparable to physical education teachers with strong teaching orientations. Finally, we hypothesized that in the middle ground between these two extremes would be AEs with an *outdoor pursuits orientation*. These AEs would focus on the *teaching of* the various activities in which their pupils engaged. Helping pupils to master physical skills would be the ultimate goal of their instruction rather than a means to realizing objectives linked with the theoretical underpinnings of adventure education.

The bulk of the data collected during the study suggested that both Nancy and Joel fitted somewhere between the leisure and outdoor pursuits orientations described in the preceding paragraphs. Both were 'very enthusiastic' and 'energetic' but, as the following extracts illustrate, their primary goals were to provide campers with 'enjoyment', expose them to a variety of activities, and teach them some 'skills':

I want the students to have fun. I want to give them as many opportunities to do different activities [as I can] . . . The third thing would be to give them more information on the different skills and, you know, give them more of the technical aspects (Nancy).

I think the first one [i.e. objective] is fun. Second, might be friends, just trying to talk with friends and hang out with friends, and just be with those people (Joel).

Additionally, when describing the degree to which they thought they had been 'effective' during their instruction at the end of the second camp, both AEs alluded to their priorities:

I think that I'm somewhat effective and I feel like the kids have fun and they are exposed to the activities. I don't know how proficient I am at them, but I would say somewhat effective (Nancy).

I would say I'm fairly effective . . . I feel like I can teach some things. My knowledge base is limited . . . I've been experiencing things for a while, but not actually teaching, and a lot of the skills are new to me (Joel).

The AEs' pedagogies also mostly betrayed their priorities for 'fun' and 'skill learning'. For example, during the teaching of some activities, the AEs created a welcoming, warm but 'business-like' atmosphere, fashioned a well-sequenced and developmental set of tasks, provided numerous 'demonstrations' with technical instruction, and gave plenty performance feedback while monitoring the campers very closely. Moreover, they differentiated tasks for campers of different abilities and often used 'indirect styles' of teaching. During the teaching of other activities, however, the environment was more 'relaxed and easy-going', there was no sequence of tasks, demonstrations were few and far between, feedback was sparing and predominantly motivational, and the teaching styles employed were more 'direct'.

While the main body of data indicated that Joel and Nancy possessed hybrid leisure-outdoor pursuits orientations, there was, at least, some suggestion that they were contemplating using or actually experimenting with pedagogical elements associated with an adventure orientation. In their written plans, for example, they listed tasks which they could use to move campers through 'the stages of adventure' including 'group juggle' ('acquaintance activities'), 'monster walk' ('problem

solving'), and 'zipper run' ('trust'). Both AEs were also observed 'processing' and 'debriefing' campers during some ropes course activities albeit at a 'superficial level'. For instance, on one occasion Samantha, a camper in Nancy's group, noted that she and her peers had 'worked pretty well together and done a good job of encouraging each other'. On another, following a low-ropes course session, Joel explained that 'what I try to get those students to think about during the debrief is what made them successful . . . or if they were unsuccessful, why . . . and how could they change that for . . . a different activity in the future'. Other indications that the AEs were thinking about the adventure process came in their own reflections. For example, following one particularly successful caving session, Nancy explained that she 'really thought the kids were all talking and working well with each other today'. Similarly, Joel enthused at his campers' 'persistence' and ability to 'work together' after a low-ropes session. When questioned directly about their incorporation of 'adventure theory' into their teaching at the end of the second camp, however, Nancy spoke for both herself and Joel when she stated that 'it's hard to do, but you try to touch on [the stages of adventure], you know having deinhibitizers and communication, and trust and stuff. You know, we try to do them somewhat'.

Factors influencing AEs' practices and perspectives

Acculturation. During their childhood and youth, three key factors led Nancy and Joel to get interested and eventually choose a career in physical education in general and adventure education in particular. Interestingly, none of them were school-based. First, as illustrated by the following extracts, both grew up in families that emphasized participating in outdoor activities:

I have to say that my parents are active, they both hike a lot . . . They used to camp . . . And my brothers will go mountain biking every once in a while (Nancy).

My brother is definitely active in adventure activities. He has hiked 1,600 miles of the Appalachian Trail, so he's been backpacking a bunch. He is always seeking new adventures. . . I would say my dad kind of got us both into adventure activities. He really enjoys the outdoors mainly, not necessarily ropes course stuff, but just getting us hiking and out in the woods doing stuff, just walking and that kind of thing. [We've been active] since we were little. We've gone cross country a couple times, and we always stayed in national parks and went hiking and camping, lots of camping as a family (Joel).

Second, both were 'more exposed' to 'the outdoors' when they attended camps run by private agencies in their mid-teens. These camps and the instructors/counsellors who ran them essentially served as the settings and role models for the AEs' apprenticeships of observation. While generally positive about his experiences, Joel noted that at his camps 'most of it was outdoor pursuits without [anything] actually being taught'. Nancy was a little more enthusiastic and explained that she:

Went to a Christian camp . . . like weekend camps for confirmation and stuff, where we got to go rock climbing. They had, like, the big wood walls and stuff like that. So we got to go rock climbing . . . I think that was like the breaking point, right there, where I got more interested in doing rock climbing and stuff (Nancy).

Third, as they got older, both AEs began to explore the outdoors with peers during informal trips. Joel, for example recalled that:

At 15, 16, I kind of took some more initiative and, partially because I started to have more freedom in general at that age . . . , you know, maybe me and my friends would go up to the mountains and hike around (Joel).

Professional socialization. Nancy and Joel's acculturation led to them entering their formal adventure education training programmes with orientations that appeared to be slanted toward the leisure. This training, however, was certainly designed to change these orientations for the better. The coursework in the various outdoor pursuits, adventure education theory, and the related field experiences clearly had a considerable and positive impact on both Nancy and Joel as evidenced by the following testimonies:

I think [outdoor pursuits] when I took it in college was really the turning point where I really came out of my shell as far as the liking adventure activities. We did orienteering here on campus. We did a rock climbing trip. We did rappelling . . . There were more trips that were available so . . . I did winter camping where I learned how to camp in the snow. That was an adventure and a half! (Nancy).

We were taught how to use a compass and shoot bearings . . . and how to make up different courses. And then we were kind of just taught how to develop a group . . . making sure people are warm, dry, and well fed all the time. And then taking adventure theory, that involved more of the ropes course and we did training on that, how to learn how to belay. Then I think just asking for the extra experience to go on trips and help lead them, my teaching skills and stuff evolved from doing that (Nancy).

I guess just going through ropes classes, . . . rock climbing, and adventure theory was the first class that I took that really caught my eye. My [training] background probably starts when I TA'd for this [adventure education pedagogy] class. That was probably my first official training. We just finished a . . . class in Colorado with rock climbing experience and I got the opportunity to do some mountaineering, which I'm pumped about. [In another class] we went through adventure theory, we talked about the stages of adventure (Joel).

In addition, the fact that the faculty who trained them were highly professionally trained, worked together to promote the same shared technical culture and perspectives on adventure education, and modelled that perspective also appeared to have a major impact on the two AEs. This was particularly so for Nancy who, in the following extracts, explained how she, some fellow students, and one of the faculty members worked with one particular pupil and how she got to teach adventure education within her undergraduate PETE student teaching experience:

There was a girl that came from the east part of the state and myself and three other people kind of hosted her for a week because she was failing PE and wanted to come up with an alternative way for her to pass the class. So we had her do different adventure activities. We took her caving. We took her on hikes . . . We took her camping. We took her rock climbing. And just to see how much she grew in a week and how much she had, how much more of an appreciation she had for PE by the end of the week, you know. She's like 'this is really cool! I never knew there were things like this before!' (Nancy).

I would facilitate at the ropes course because it was kind of our job to go through the stages with the groups we'd bring in, so that gave me practice before hand to do the stages. But then, student teaching at the high school was the first time that I actually got to more or less do the whole entire seven [not including outdoor pursuits] stages like in a three week unit with kids (Nancy).

Organizational socialization. At the completion of their master's degree programmes both Joel and Nancy appeared to have shifted their orientations from leisure to somewhere between outdoor pursuits and adventure. What factors, then, led to a regression in their orientations by the time they were observed working in the two camps featured in this study?

First, it was apparent that their experiences teaching physical education in the public schools led to some of what they had learned during their formal training being washed out and this wash-out effect transferred to the camp setting. Both AEs were permitted to teach adventure units at their schools but their instruction, in this capacity, was interfered with by other more senior physical education teachers' 'views' about how 'adventure education' should be done and their curricular structuring. For example, while Nancy worked in 'deinhibitizers and ice breakers' and 'did a lot problem solving' which pupils solved 'as a group' in what was her 'favorite unit' she explained that her school's version of adventure education was called 'adventure building' and was only 'somewhat' close to what she had learned to deliver in her university training. Joel faced more significant 'situational constraints' (Hargreaves, 1984). The six other physical educators in his school were much more experienced and gave Joel little say in curricular decision-making. Consequently, he relayed that while 'adventure is taught within the school, it's not completely "adventure"'. He went on to lament that:

We have a cooperative games unit. It kind of takes games from adventure and makes students work together. In a lot of classes, there's a warm-up game, and they use some adventure games as warm-up games. And then they get into their activity, like a basketball unit or badminton. So they dip into adventure content. Sometimes what happens is people will take a whole adventure unit and divide it up into instant activities, and not ever actually teach adventure content. There's zero debriefing, and kind of, why are we doing this? There's not much talk about why we are doing this. What's the purpose of this activity? . . . I think it's kind of 'do we have enough energy to do this?'. It's kind of a pain I think for the teachers. They feel like they're burdened by it (Joel).

Both school physical education departments also primarily employed the multi-activity curriculum model which has been shown in the past, in the American context at least, to be the preferred model of non-teachers with coaching orientations who provide short units which involve very little instruction and a great deal of poorly organized and supervised inappropriate game play dominated by more skilled and physically able boys (Ennis, 1999; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). Neither AE was particularly impressed with this model of instruction and realized that the 'goal mainly was just to get the students exposed to the different activities . . . and get along with each other'. In their position as junior teachers, and in the face of such strong 'presses' however, they were powerless in terms of making any changes.

Consequently, they strategically complied with this form of 'instruction' and perhaps over time began to strategically adjust to it.

The second factor that appeared to lead to a regression in the AEs' orientations toward adventure education was the influence of the children they taught in the two camps and, by implication, the influence of the children they taught in the public schools. Like other novice teachers of physical education and other subjects, Joel and Nancy appeared to suffer from 'reality shock' (Veenman, 1984) in that they were not expecting the number and degree of behavioural problems that they faced on a daily basis at school and during the two camps. Moreover, in line with 'teacher concerns theory' (Behets & Meek, 1996), at this stage of their career they were heavily concerned with surviving themselves which, in turn, led to a focus on 'management' and specifically 'handling problems and behaviours' and being 'in charge'. Typical of the comments made about management by the AEs during the two camps were the following:

Management today was a big struggle. When we were heading down to the ropes course the first time today, the kids were just everywhere. We asked them to stay on the path, but that was not happening. So Joel and I had them sit down and talk about behaviour issues before we went to the ropes course (Nancy).

A lot of our management had to do with talking while we were talking. Also, there were a lot of campers messing with each other, which started to get old. This group is really going to test Nancy and I's management skills. We are going to have to be creative and keep the activities fun and entertaining (Joel).

One effect of struggling with managerial issues appeared to be the reluctance of Joel and Nancy to attempt to use more indirect styles of teaching in order to move through the stages of adventure for fear of losing 'control'. Another was engaging in negotiations over content with the campers. Joel, in particular, used this strategy and explained that 'sometimes maybe I'll bargain with them. I'll say, you know, let's do this for a little while, and then we'll do something that I think they might have more fun doing'. As with other teachers who 'negotiate their curricular' (Ennis, 1995), the goal of Joel's action was to secure campers' compliance by giving up some of his more rigorous and educational tasks and goals and replacing them with those that were more leisure oriented.

Summary and conclusions

The most important finding of this study was that it indicated that the practices and perspectives of the AEs in it were heavily influenced by their occupational socialization. Moreover, the patterns of socialization which served to shape Joel and Nancy were somewhat similar to those which previous research has shown impact physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1999, 2001).

Both AEs' acculturation led to them entering formal training with orientations comparable in PETE to *coaching orientations*; in our study, *leisure orientations*, toward adventure education. Their formal training, however, appeared to cause what

Sparkes (1991) termed a 'real' change in their beliefs and pedagogies. That is, change occurred at a deep rather than a superficial level, as evidenced by Nancy and Joel moving from solely having leisure orientations into the range of having *outdoor pursuit* orientations. Major reasons for this appeared to be the nature of type of coursework taken by the AEs and the credibility and teamwork of the faculty. There was certainly no attempt by the AEs to 'impression manage' (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) and pretend to go along with the faculty as coaching oriented recruits to PETE have been shown to do. Unfortunately, the AEs' organizational socialization served to partially wash out these gains. Key factors in this washout process were experiences while teaching in the public schools and the campers they taught.

What are the implications for AE training if the findings from the present study transfer to other settings and AEs? First, understanding that AEs can enter programmes with one of three different orientations to adventure education and that these influence how they interpret or 'read' (Gore, 1990) the pedagogies they are being trained to use has to be helpful in itself.

Second, it seems most likely that recruits into adventure education training will most likely enter with leisure or outdoor pursuits orientations. If this logic is correct, it would, third, seem reasonable to suggest that faculty tackle these orientations head-on and contrast them with an adventure orientation, just as more successful PETE faculty contrast coaching and teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1996).

Fourth, understanding the orientations with which recruits enter formal training programmes may have implications for the curricular structuring of these programmes. For example, it might be that shifting from a leisure to an adventure perspective is a developmental or maturational process. If so, perhaps faculty will be most effective if, during early coursework, they focus their efforts on shifting recruits who possess a hard-core leisure orientation to an outdoor pursuits orientation. Later coursework could then be devoted to a further shift toward an adventure orientation.

Finally, the study suggests that adventure education faculty need to focus particularly on providing AEs with the skills with which they can manage campers effectively in the adventure setting, a clear understanding of the realities they will face on graduation, and, in line with Fernandez-Balboa (2000), some idea of how to deal with and become a player in curricular politics. The latter will be particularly important for AEs who also teach physical education in the public schools. Crucial to realizing these objectives, logic dictates, will be the inclusion of more early field experiences with children in adventure settings, perhaps at the expense of outdoor pursuits and adventure trips with faculty in which AEs essentially take on the role of pupils.

More research of a similar type is needed to determine whether the findings of the current study, do, in fact, transfer and to unearth other factors within and interactions between AEs' acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization which may prove to be helpful. In particular, studies that examine different types of recruits, training programmes, practising AEs and adventure work-sites would be useful.

Note

1. The names of all individuals in this paper are fictitious.

Author biographies

Mark H. Zmudy is an Assistant Professor at the University of Minnesota—Duluth, in the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. He teaches adventure education and outdoor pursuits with undergraduate students working on degrees in physical education teacher education as well as recreation, and he researches adventure education and outdoor pursuits.

Matthew D. Curtner-Smith is a Professor in and Head of the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Alabama. He teaches graduate students working on master's and doctoral degrees in sport pedagogy and does research in the areas of physical education teaching and teacher education.

Jeff Steffen is a Professor, Director of Graduate Physical Education Teaching, and Director of Adventure Programs in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at the University of Wisconsin—La Crosse. He teaches graduate students working on master's degrees in physical education teacher education and adventure education, and researches physical education teacher education, outdoor pursuits, and adventure education.

References

- Allin, L., & Humberstone, B. (2006). Exploring careership in outdoor education and the lives of women outdoor educators. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 11(2), 135–153.
- Association for Challenge Course Technology (ACCT). (2004). *Association for Challenge Course Technology Challenge Course Standards*. Martin, MI: ACCT.
- Autry, C. E. (2001). Adventure therapy with girls at-risk: Responses to outdoor experiential activities. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 35(4), 289–306.
- Baldwin, C., Persing, J., & Magnuson, D. (2004). The role of theory, research, and evaluation in adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26(3), 167–183.
- Barnes, P. (1999). *The motivation of staff working in the outdoor education industry* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow).
- Barnes, P. (2003). Outdoor leaders as cultural phenomena. In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. Richards (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors as social and cultural phenomena* (pp. 241–252). Penrith: IOL Publications.
- Barnes, P. (2006). Influences on a modern outdoor education organisations' philosophy. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* 10(1), 22–38.
- Barrett, J., & Greenway, R. (1995). *Why adventure? The role and value of outdoor adventure in young peoples' personal and social development*. Coventry: Foundation for Outdoor Adventure.
- Behets, D., & Meek, G. A. (1996). Physical education teachers' concerns. In Y. Vande Auweele, B. Bakker, S. J. Biddle, D. M. Seiler, & R. Seiler (Eds.), *Psychology for physical educators* (pp. 479–500). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Birmingham, C. (1989). *Factors effecting turnover and retention of staff in outdoor adventure organizations* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus).
- Bisson, C. (1997). *The effects of varying the sequence of categories of adventure activities on the development of group cohesion* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley).

- Bisson, C. (1998, November). *Sequencing adventure activities: A new perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education, Lake Tahoe, CA.
- Bisson, C. (1999). Sequencing the adventure experience. In J. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 205–214). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Brown, M. (2006). Adventure education and physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Handbook of physical education* (pp. 685–702). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bunting, C., Tolson, H., Kuhn, C., Suarez, E., & Williams, R. (2000). Physiological stress response of the neuroendocrine system during outdoor adventure tasks. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(2), 191–207.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (1996). The impact of an early field experience on pre-service physical education teachers' conceptions of teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 224–250.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (1997). The impact of biography, teacher education, and organizational socialization on the perspectives and practices of first-year physical education teachers: Case studies of recruits with coaching orientations. *Sport, Education and Society*, 2, 73–94.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (1999). The impact of biography, teacher education, and organizational socialization on perspectives and practices of first year physical education teachers: Case studies of recruits with coaching orientations. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 2, 73–94.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2001). The occupational socialization of a first year physical education teacher with a teaching orientation. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 6, 81–105.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., & Sofo, S. (2004). Pre-service teachers' conceptions of teaching within sport education and multi-activity units. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 9, 347–377.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport Education and Society*, 13(1), 97–113.
- Department of Education and Science & the Welsh Office. (1992). *Physical education in the national curriculum*. London: HMSO.
- Dewey, J. (1997 [1938]). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dyson, B. (1995). Students' voices in two alternative elementary physical education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14(4), 397–407.
- Dyson, B. (1996). Two physical education teachers experience of project adventure. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 19(2), 264–281.
- Dyson, B. (2001). Cooperative learning in an elementary physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 264–281.
- Dyson, B. (2002). The implementation of cooperative learning in an elementary school physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22, 69–85.
- Dyson, B., Griffin, L., & Hastie, P. (2004). Sport education, tactical games, and cooperative learning: Theoretical and pedagogical considerations. *Quest*, 56, 226–240.
- Ennis, C. D. (1995). Teachers' responses to noncompliant students: The realities and consequences of a negotiated curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 445–460.
- Ennis, C. D. (1999). Creating a culturally relevant curriculum for disengaged girls. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4, 31–49.
- Etheridge, C. P. (1989). Strategic adjustment: How teachers move from university learnings to school-based practices. *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(1), 31–37.
- Evans, J. N., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Ewert, A. (1987). Research in outdoor adventure: Overview and analysis. Retrieved January 26, 2007, from <http://www.iub.edu/~outdoor/bponline/bp1987/bp87ewer.doc>
- Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (2000). Prospective physical educators' perspectives on school micro politics. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy*, 6(2), 1–33.
- Ford, P., & Blanchard, J. (1993). *Leadership and administration of outdoor pursuits* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Publishing Horizons.

- Gass, M. (1993). *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gore, J. (1990). Pedagogy as text in physical education teacher education: Beyond the preferred reading. In D. Kirk, & R. Tinning (Eds.), *Physical education, curriculum and culture: Critical issues in the contemporary crisis* (pp. 101–138). London: Falmer Press.
- Grenier, M., Dyson, B., & Yeaton, P. (2005). Cooperative learning that includes students with disabilities. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 76, 29–35.
- Hargreaves, A. (1984). Teaching quality: A sociological analysis. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20, 211–231.
- Hunt, J. S., Jr. (1990). *Ethical issues in experiential education*. Boulder, CO: The Association for Experiential Education.
- Joplin, L. (1995). On defining experiential education. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs, & J. Hunt, Jr. (Eds.), *The theory of experiential education* (3rd ed., pp. 15–22). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Kelley, M. P., & Coursey, R. D. (1997). Therapeutic adventures outdoors: A demonstration of benefits for people with mental illness. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 20(4), 61–74.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London: Methuen.
- Lawson, H. A. (1983a). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2, 3–16.
- Lawson, H. A. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: Entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3, 3–15.
- Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 107–116.
- Locke, L. F. (1977). Research on teaching physical education: New hope for a dismal science. *Quest*, 28, 2–16.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McKenzie, M. (2003). Beyond the outward bound process: Rethinking student learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26, 8–23.
- Miles, J. C., & Priest, S. (1990). *Adventure education*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Mortlock, C. (1994). *The adventure alternative*. Milnthorpe: Cicerone.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education (1991). *The physically educated person: Outcomes and benchmarks for quality education programs*. Reston, VA: NASPE.
- Neill, J. T. (2003). Reviewing and benchmarking adventure therapy outcomes: Applications of meta-analysis. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 25(3), 316–321.
- Neill, J. T. (2004). Experiential learning cycles. Retrieved April 18, 2006, from <http://www.wilderdom.com/theory/ExperientialLearningCycles.html>
- Neill, J. T. (2006). Project adventure historical timeline. Retrieved April 18, 2006, from <http://www.wilderdom.com/projectadventure/ProjectAdventureTimeline.htm>
- O'Sullivan, M., & Tsangaridou, N. (1992). What undergraduate physical education majors learn during a field experience. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 63, 381–392.
- Outward Bound. (2006). The history of outward bound. Retrieved April 14, 2006, from http://www.outward-bound.org/lic_sub3_history.htm
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Paxton, T. S. (1999). Self-efficacy and outdoor adventure programs: A quantitative and qualitative analyses. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(7-A), 2717.
- Priest, S. (1996). The effect of two different debriefing approaches on developing self-confidence. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 19(1), 40–42.
- Priest, S., & Gass, M. A. (1997). *Effective leadership in adventure programming*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (2007). *National Curriculum online: PE*. Retrieved February 19, 2007, from <http://www.nc.uk.net/webdav/harmonise?page/@id=6004@subject@id=4006>
- Reed, C. (2003). Fancy a career doing therapy in the outdoors? *Horizons*, 21(1), 33–35.
- Rhonke, K. (1989). *Cowstails and Cobras II*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Rhonke, K., & Butler, S. (1995). *Quicksilver: Adventure games, initiative problems, trust activities, and a guide to effective leadership*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Rickinson, M., Dillon, J., Teamy, K., Morris, M., Choi, M. Y., Sanders, D., & Benefield, P. (2004). *A review of research on outdoor learning*. London: National Foundation for Educational Research and King's College.
- Sage, G. H. (1989). Becoming a high school coach: From playing sports to coaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 60, 81–92.
- Schempp, P. G., & Graber, K. C. (1992). Teacher socialization from a dialectical perspective: Pre-training through induction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 329–348.
- Sparkes, A. C. (1991). Curriculum change: On gaining a sense of perspective. In N. Armstrong & A. Sparkes (Eds.), *Issues in physical education* (pp. 1–19). London: Cassell.
- Stetson, P. (2005). *An essay on Kurt Hahn, founder of Outward Bound*. Retrieved November 25, 2005, from <http://www.kurthahn.org/writings/writings.html>
- Stroot, S. A. (1993). Socialization into physical education [Monograph]. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 337–469.
- Templin, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (Eds.). (1989). *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 143–178.
- Warren, K. (1996). *Women's voices in experiential education*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Watts, P. B., & Drobish, K. M. (1998). Physiological responses to simulated rock climbing at different angles. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 30(7), 1118–1122.
- Williams, N. F. (1996). The physical education hall of shame, part III: Inappropriate teaching practices. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 67(8), 45–48.
- Wurdinger, S., & Steffen, J. (2003). *Developing challenge course programs for schools*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 3–9.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnik, B. R. (1983, April). *Teacher perspectives in the face of the institutional press*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Montreal, ON, Canada.