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The Spring 2003 issue of Pathways was devoted to the pedagogical implications of traditional versus emerging technologies. The submissions in that issue raised many questions that we thought warranted further debate and exploration. We therefore decided to continue the debate in the first section of this issue, and recognize that still the debate is far from over.

When considering what it means to have a relationship to nature, ways to facilitate this relationship with students, and the barriers and opportunities associated with technology, it is clear that this issue is not unique to outdoor education, but one that people from all walks of life face daily. For example, outdoor education shares several goals and means with outdoor recreation, some sectors of tourism, and conservation initiatives. In all cases, people are outside interacting with nature, and there is the potential to build human relationships with nature. And in all cases, technology can be both helpful and hindering. Accordingly, some papers in this issue speak directly to outdoor education, while others speak to and from the perspective of outdoor recreation. We feel that they address topics, issues, and practices relevant to outdoor activity generally — whether outdoor education, recreation or tourism.

We would like to thank the contributors for the time and energy they have given to continue this debate. Their research, thinking, and writing are important and appreciated. In the first section of this issue you will find six articles: one offering program ideas for using GPS, two addressing opportunities and barriers associated with photography, another presenting three successful approaches to providing engaging nature experiences, one encouraging broad environmental literacy, and, lastly, one that addresses specific ideas and themes raised in the Spring 2003 Pathways issue. We hope that you enjoy these articles and that somewhere in them you find a thought or idea that causes you to consider your own relationship to nature and ways you might improve the facilitation of building relationships between your students and the natural world.

Some questions have emerged from discussions among the authors and editors that indicate some possible directions for research and reflection:

• How can newer technology be used appropriately to reinforce critical outdoor skills that are based on older technology (e.g., GPS units, map reading, and compass work)?
• How can technology itself be used to stimulate interest in outdoor education among those with little interest in nature or outdoor activities (e.g., entry point to students living in the digital world)?
• What aspects of technology are barriers to fuller participation in outdoor education activities (e.g., lack of authenticity, cost, time to learn)?
• What are the key similarities and differences in using various types of technologies for teaching (e.g., reflection, evaluation, reinforcement)?
• What can be learned from other disciplines about ways participants desire, access, learn, and master new technologies (e.g., psychology, sociology, engineering, marketing)?

Finally, we would like to thank Bob Henderson and Connie Russell for the opportunity to be guest editors of this edition and for their outstanding support and direction in the process. It has been fun.

Glen Hvenegaard and Morten Asfeldt

A note from Bob Henderson and Connie Russell: Thanks to Glen and Morten for providing such interesting articles in their section of this issue and for their amazing attention to detail — this made our job much easier. In the latter section of this issue, you will find a range of items, including on a one-page flyer on page 36 on the upcoming COEO Conference; please distribute widely.

Sketch Pad — Art for this issue of Pathways is generously provided by Lindsey Daleo (cover and pages 5, 14, 24 and 29) and Jon Berger (pages 9, 19 and 27).
How do we convince “outsiders” (particularly decision makers) about the unique, powerful and lasting values of outdoor education? How do we “insiders” convince others that outdoor education is an essential part of every child’s education for the future? Could this line of thought help?

What do the following educator-led group activities share in common?

- Working with peers to traverse a challenging low ropes element
- Navigating through natural landscapes with map and compass
- Finding and capturing natural shapes, textures and colours on film or on canvas
- Drilling a 3/8” hole in a tree, collecting the sap and boiling it to make maple syrup
- Dipping a net into a stream to discover fish, insects and other life
- Going on a multi-day canoe, biking and/or hiking trip
- Looking for snails, bugs and salamanders in a woodlot
- Climbing to the top of a 10-metre hydro pole, then leaping for a dangling swing
- Designing and constructing (with cardboard and duct tape) two-person bob sleds, and then doing time trials on a local hill
- Building a fire and successfully cooking an outdoor meal
- Standing in silence during a night hike

At first, they may all appear as fun things to do, yet extraneous to a child’s core education. However, they all are experiential, actively engaging participants through hands-on learning; they all involve powerful and lasting connections, be they with oneself, with others, and/or with the natural environment; they all are education in, for and/or about the outdoors; they all are a part of what is called “outdoor education.”

As can be seen from the above examples, outdoor education (OE) embraces an incredible variety of activities, a range that appeals to all learning styles as well as various multiple intelligences. While this diversity means that OE can suffer from the lack of one clear and identifiable profile, its unique development of powerful connections and attendant values cannot be overestimated, particularly at a time when virtual and human-made experiences appear to outnumber real ones. OE is

1. **Education for Environment** — If ecological literacy is acknowledged as a key step towards creating responsible citizens for the 21st century, then OE must be viewed as an essential part of this preparation. Such literacy cannot happen without repeated experiences in the outdoors, and our school system is the best vehicle for the widespread offering of such experiences and development of such literacy. Outdoor education directly exposes participants to our natural environment in ways that spark and develop personal connections, knowledge, skills and a lifelong environmental ethic. OE powers the realization that this ethic is applicable to the very life support systems of this planet, be they found in urban, rural or remote settings.

2. **Education for Character** — The contexts, experiences and interactions of OE provide opportunities for significant personal and interpersonal growth. This includes the development of traits such as confidence, empathy, and a sense of responsibility, as well as the development of group skills such as effective communication and working together towards a common goal.

3. **Education for Wellness** — See “President’s View,” Pathways 16 (2).

4. **Education for Curriculum** — See “President’s View,” Pathways 16 (2).

**Why Outdoor Education is Essential to Education for the Future**

Well-run OE programs create powerful and unforgettable experiences that are transformational. They spark learners to “get it,” to move from awareness of static and isolated information to knowledge, skills and values that demonstrate the interconnections at the core of one’s relationship with oneself, with others and with the natural environment.

Well-run OE programs educate for environment, character, wellness and curriculum in unique and lasting ways that power today’s learners to become tomorrow’s responsible, productive and fulfilled citizens.

Grant Linney
COEO President
Building Relationships Through Engaging Nature Experiences

by Lesley Curthoys, Timothy O'Connell, Brent Cuthbertson, Janet Dyment, and Tom Potter

One of the most important and perhaps obvious ways that we can assist our students in developing stronger relationships with nature is to value and facilitate more direct learning experiences in natural settings. Yet simply being outdoors is not enough; we need to provide engaging experiences that bring our ever-present, yet sometimes forgotten, relationship with nature to the forefront of consciousness. This paper will explore the concept of “engaging nature experiences” and will highlight three successful approaches. First, however, it is necessary to set the context with a brief reflection on what it means to have a relationship with nature.

Relationship with Nature

The limited scope of this paper does not allow us to adequately explore the assumptions and meanings that currently weigh on the deceptively complex constructs we know as “relationship” and “nature” as separate words, let alone when their meanings are combined. Instead, we merely offer the following description of what we mean by the notion of having a relationship with nature.

At our core, we are natural beings. We share many similar biological systems with other life; we can comprehend and empathize with similar basic needs, and perhaps even more “advanced” ones such as the need for belonging and love. Whether we view the world through evolutionary science or spiritual guidance, it’s clear that we share some elements of creation and development with the rest of nature. It should not be surprising, then, that we yearn for a connection with this wider community of life.

The accordance of the honour of being “natural” should not be accompanied with an assumption that all forces of nature are good — or at least inevitable — and therefore taken as a licence to behave in whatever way we choose. One of our great gifts is to be endowed with a sense of morality, and when this works in combination with a sense of responsibility for others, say in a community of life, we enter into a relationship that could be said to be meaningful.

Being in a relationship with nature, then, must include at least two things: 1) we need to consider that relationship to include being in a relationship with ourselves (but not exclusively for our benefit) because we are nature, or at least part of it; and 2) that as with all relationships, there are degrees of how healthy they are. The first point is necessary for us to gain our philosophical bearings and provide a foundation on which to actually build a relationship. We can begin to see ourselves as part of a larger whole with unique talents and capabilities, but intimately connected with all life. The second is necessary for us to conceive of how we might begin to act on the morality that can — and must — be developed in the creation and maintenance of a healthy relationship.

Engaging Nature Experiences

While we may be born with an inherent affinity for non-human life (Pivnick, 1997; Shepard, 1995; Wilson, 1994) our daily immersion in increasingly human-dominated spaces serves to weaken and obscure inborn connections. Engaging nature experiences can counteract these factors, enabling students and teachers alike to remember their innate and sanguine sense of belonging, evoking that rejuvenating feeling of wholeness. What types of learning experiences best facilitate the reawakening of personal connections and a sense of belonging to, and perhaps even concern for, a larger community of life? Gary Snyder (1990) states that “a relationship with nature must take place in a place, and it must be grounded in information and experience” (p. 18). This place need not be
pristine wilderness, yet it must provide the opportunity for interactions with wildness, places that encourage us to slow down, listen, ponder, be in awe of life, and share our discoveries. Janet Pivnick (1997) suggests that educators can help to silence the noise that deafens us to nature’s song “by allowing time and space and quiet contemplation” (p. 62). She further comments, “we can turn [students’] attention to the wisdom which already exists within each of them by pointing to the small incidents which are bursting with signs of connection” (p. 62). Building on the importance of direct experiences in and with nature, Golley (1998) comments that “[experience] ignites curiosity and tests the muscles. It teaches us that we live in a world that is not of human making, that does play by human rules” (p. x). Weston (1996) advocates practices that “enable us to find connections ourselves, rather than disabling us by simply telling us what the connections are” (p. 42). Finally, there is a need for more student-directed and action-oriented projects that relate to students’ lives and interests, thereby providing meaningful and empowering ways to contribute to communities of life (Hammond, 1996; Jensen & Schnack, 1997).

In summary, nature experiences that facilitate meaningful participation in and with our more-than-human neighbours will be most effective if (according to Bell, 1997; Chawla, 2001; Orr, 1992) they
- are guided by life-affirming principles
- allow sufficient time to dwell unhurriedly and thoughtfully
- provide adequate time to capture personal expressions of felt connections
- are open to spontaneous discoveries and interactions
- respect existing connections and individual ways of experiencing nature
- are facilitated by positive, enthusiastic role models.

Three Effective Approaches

The following section provides three examples of ways to engage students in experiences that serve to strengthen inherent connections with nature. These approaches can be adapted for students of all ages from pre-school to university students (see Cuthbertson, Dyment, Curthoys, Potter, & O’Connell (2003) for a Canadian case study on engaging nature at the post-secondary level).

Greening Learning Grounds

In Canada, many educators are using their transformed or “greened” school grounds to help young people develop a relationship with the natural world. These initiatives vary (see, for example, Houghton, 2003). Typically they involve transforming homogeneous environments of asphalt and manicured grass into designed spaces (butterfly gardens, gathering areas, vegetable patches, etc.) using a variety of natural elements that complement or enhance the socio-ecological value of the space (Evergreen, 2000).

Through formal and informal learning on green school grounds, young people are provided with daily opportunities to have direct contact with natural environments and to develop environmental awareness and stewardship (Bell, 2001; Malone & Tranter, 2003; Pivnick, 2001). According to Canadian researcher Anne Bell, who performed an in-depth study into the impacts of greening initiatives, students who attended schools with green school grounds have opportunities to engage with the natural world on an “intimate and embodied level” (p. 210). Through regular, hands-on involvement with the soil, rocks, plants and animals that are featured on these
sites, students are able to become more familiar with, and more caring about, the natural world. They learned to develop a “sense of place” in which they felt a connection to the environment that surrounds them. The underlying hope, of course, is that this sense of stewardship will develop into a deeper environmental commitment extending far beyond the school grounds themselves. Importantly, the process of greening school grounds (where students play a role in both the design phase and ongoing care) also provides fertile ground for action-oriented ways to strengthen connections. The importance of these hands-on experiences with nature on green school grounds is particularly important in large urban centres, where many children have little access to green spaces. Likewise, greening post-secondary learning grounds sets the stage for advancing ecological literacy in theory and practice across a wide range of academic disciplines.

**Nature-based Field Trips**

While advantages exist to nurturing relationships with nature in urban areas, opportunities to foster this connection away from human constructs can also be very effective. Moving students to environments where many of everyday life’s cultural artifacts are absent (e.g., telephones or watches), whether for an hour or two weeks, can be initially intimidating for some and ultimately empowering for most. As students come to learn to live comfortably in their initially perceived “estranged” environment, without the physical and emotional clutter of everyday life, their relationship with the natural world strengthens.

Incorporating heritage outdoor living skills and theories, with an emphasis on natural materials rather than high-tech innovations, can also heighten this natural connection. The pedagogical belief is that these traditional skills (e.g., fire lighting with flint and steel or basic shelter building) foster a sense of security in nature whereby nature begins to feel more like home.

Critical reflection upon experience within natural settings (e.g., gathered around a fire or lying under a blanket of twinkling stars) to draw deeper meaning is frequently an empowering aspect of developing a relationship with nature. Teachers or students can facilitate reflective experiences, but often it is just as important for facilitators to “get out of the way” and allow students to connect in their own time and rhythm. Perhaps in the long run a balance of facilitated and non-facilitated reflection is optimal; the challenge for leaders is to know when to encourage processing and when to simply let nature as teacher take centre stage.

**Journaling**

Whether in the schoolyard or farther a field, journaling is a powerful vehicle to assist students to connect to the natural world (Bennion & Olsen, 2002; Hammond, 2002). Journal writing allows students to collect information, knowledge, questions, and revelations, and serves as a means of reflection both during and after the learning experience (Kerka, 1996). This process of reflection often completes the crucial link between lived experience and traditional forms of learning (Priest & Gass, 1997), and may enhance student connections to the more-than-human-world.

Journals may take on several forms, including a record of nature observations, reflective statements, daily diaries, response articles, and personalized narratives. Educators should provide students with training, materials, feedback, and dedicated time in nature to enable the potential of journals to be realized (Dyment & O’Connell, 2003). Students should be encouraged to collect samples (when appropriate), make drawings, ask questions, write poetry and songs, have others make “guest entries,” and add photos to their journals to make them more personal and engaging. The portability of journals allows students to immediately respond to what they are experiencing, and capture feelings as they occur. By making journal writing fun and meaningful and by giving students some direction, educators may assist students in developing a deeper, more significant relationship with nature.

**Conclusion**

While the above examples are by no means the only approaches to facilitating engaging nature experiences, they have been shown to
be effective in fostering a more conscious awareness of our membership and obligations to a wider community of life. Regardless of how we come to know nature more intimately, the goal of nurturing healthy relationships with nature is paramount, and the rewards for all parties concerned are unsurpassed.
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Educating the Educators: Musings on Promoting Ecological Literacy

by Dave Verhulst and John Colton

Like many other people involved in park interpretation and environmental and outdoor education, we have both made a personal commitment to developing our own relationship with nature and helping others to develop theirs. In mid-season when tours are booked, and sometimes even over-booked, few of us have the time to pause and seriously evaluate the effectiveness of our programs in helping people to develop a relationship to nature. Indeed, the immediate concern is that participants are safe, having a good time, and learning something about the area in which they are travelling. As members of the Earth community, we all have some kind of relationship with nature, although that relationship may not be particularly healthy. One of the primary challenges we have as outdoor and environmental educators is to find ways to encourage and model a healthy relationship with the natural world.

Many people have theorized about what it means to have a healthy relationship with the natural world and many have developed theories and models they think are most effective for helping others develop this kind of relationship. There are considerable disparities and conflicting opinions in the environmental education literature (Verhulst, 2004). These range from Van Matre’s (1999) angry declaration that environmental education has failed in its quest to develop environmental citizenship, to Knapp’s (2001) suggestion that park interpretation should be distinguished from environmental education because it doesn’t have what it takes to effectively promote the development of an environmental ethic. What is particularly frustrating about these conflicting views is that the ultimate goal of Earth education, environmental education, and park interpretation (or “heritage appreciation,” as it is now called) is the same — the promotion of a healthier relationship between humans and the natural world. Given the magnitude of the goal there should be ample room for multiple ideas, theories, and methods of communication. Surely there could be more cooperation and tolerance for the “many roads that lead to Rome.”

Promoting a healthy relationship with nature requires the development of ecological literacy or ecological citizenship. Curthoys and Cuthbertson (2002) describe an ecologically literate citizen as “someone who knows about, cares for, and acts on behalf of the cultural and ecological integrity of their home place” (p. 227). Encouraging the development of ecological literacy is something that challenges environmental educators and park interpreters.

During the summer of 2003, seven park interpreters and five managers were interviewed to assess the perceived ability of heritage appreciation programming in Dinosaur Provincial Park (DPP), Alberta to promote ecological literacy. Although all interviewees felt that the promotion of ecological citizenship is the ultimate goal of heritage appreciation programming at the park, none of them suggested that current programming was capable of achieving this goal. One manager noted that he hoped programming at the park would “move to that level in the future,” but went on to state that how it “gets there . . . remains to be seen.” Interpreters remarked that visitors got excited and were often inspired by programming, but that they did not leave with a “tool box to protect the environment” or a “feeling that they should do something.” What is striking about these comments is that the promotion of ecological citizenship is something that interpretive programming in parks like DPP should be doing (Verhulst, 2004).

Interpreters in Alberta Parks are said to be “the advocates of environmental stewardship values and practices in [their] protected area...
and beyond” (Alberta Parks, 2003, p. 6). The goal of heritage appreciation programming is to “provide opportunities to explore, understand and appreciate the natural and cultural heritage of Alberta and enhance public awareness of our relationship to and dependence on it” (p. 1). Parallel goals are given to interpreters working for Parks Canada (2003) and the U.S. National Park Service. In the U.S. National Park Service (2001), heritage appreciation programs will “encourage the development of a personal stewardship ethic and broaden support for preserving park resources” (p. 1). Despite the fact that promoting ecological citizenship is supported by park mandates, interpreters like those at DPP feel challenged by the task.

Although there are several factors contributing to the perception that current programming at DPP is unable to promote ecological citizenship, we will only focus on the one that has the broadest implications for outdoor and environmental educators. Several of the interpreters interviewed suggested that they had difficulty communicating the “big picture” to park visitors. The “big picture” was a phrase used to illustrate the relationship between people and nature and more generally communicate how everything is connected to everything else. Despite extensive training, years of experience as interpreters, and university degrees in varied disciplines, many suggested that they had difficulty understanding the big picture themselves. One interpreter plainly stated that “there just doesn’t seem to be any place we learn that way — we don’t really learn the big picture anywhere.” Other interpreters made similar comments suggesting there may be a need to re-evaluate how we educate the educators (Verhulst, 2004).

Over the last century, education has become increasingly divided by discipline. As noted by Tudge (1996),

in school we learn of ice ages in one set of books and of history in another and we fail to see how the two are connected; we fail to perceive, therefore, that beneath the surface tremors of our lives there are much deeper and more powerful forces at work that in the end affect us and all our fellow creatures at least as profoundly as the events of day to day [life]. (p. 17)

Increasing divisions between “natural” or “scientific” disciplines such as biology and traditionally “cultural” disciplines, such as history, are particularly worrisome. Science, as Opie (1983) suggests, “is based on the idea that culture is largely irrelevant to its more "objective" study of the natural world” (p. 15). The “humanities,” in contrast, are generally based on the idea that science is less important to understanding the world than cultural studies such as history (Opie, 1983). One of the consequences of this fabricated division between nature and culture is the perpetuation of the myth that people are seen as separate and independent from the rest of nature. This myth is believed to be at the core of many of our existing environmental and social problems (Puk, 2002; Searle, 2000).

All but one of the individuals interviewed for the research study at DPP felt that there should be a division between nature and culture. As explained by one interpreter, “we’re part of the environment and culture has come out of the environment and the environment is changed by culture . . . so it’s [a] feedback system that goes on all the time.” What this suggests to us is that the problem interpreters (and many environmental educators) have with presenting and understanding the bigger picture is not associated with individual attitudes about nature and culture, but with how they themselves have been educated. Teaching subjects in isolation makes it difficult for educators to understand the primary ecological message that everything is connected to everything else. If educators have difficulty understanding this message, it is unlikely they will be able to effectively
communicate the message to others. Perhaps it is time to re-think how we educate outdoor educators, park interpreters, and others who are dedicated to the promotion of ecological literacy and/or environmental citizenship. Few people are trained to effectively cross traditional disciplinary boundaries. Although many schools and outdoor programs offer multidisciplinary education to their students, few of those experiences are interdisciplinary. The difference is simple, but profound. A multidisciplinary education typically involves teaching students in “units” or sections. The training manual at DPP is a typical example — it is divided into neatly ordered sections explaining geology, ecology, palaeontology and cultural history. Connections between these sections are not made. An interdisciplinary education is theme-based and draws information from different disciplines to inform a theme or a particular issue. The result is a more holistic or “big picture” view of the issue at hand. Making these connections and approaching issues from an interdisciplinary perspective is extremely challenging and is a skill that needs to be learned and practised.

There are resources available that present the big picture and these could serve as a model for educators who are eager to learn more about interdisciplinary narratives. Environmental history, for example, is an interdisciplinary and critical study and investigates how nature has influenced people and how people have influenced nature throughout time (Cronon, 1992; Tudge, 1996). To date, however, few educators dedicated to promoting ecological literacy are familiar with environmental history. We need to broaden our horizons as outdoor educators and seriously re-consider how we learn and how we teach. In doing so, we may be able to reduce the number of our peers who are frustrated and claim that we “just don’t learn about the big picture anywhere.”
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Beyond the Kodak Moment: Participants’ Use of Photography in Outdoor Education

by T. A. Loeffler

Introduction

We must remember that a photograph can hold just as much as we put into it, and no one has ever approached the full possibilities of the medium. (Ansel Adams in Levitt, Parks & Hosoe, 1998)

Photographer Ansel Adams’ quote provides us with insight into how we might think differently about photographs. Photographs are containers in which many things can be stored; they can hold details, memories, emotions, and meanings. They allow moments to be captured and stored for later recall and sharing. Participants in outdoor programs frequently document their experiences using photographic technology. By understanding the role of this technology in participants’ lives, outdoor educators can recognize photography as a powerful tool that can assist participants in both capturing and reflecting on their experiences. Beyond its value as a reflective tool, photographic technology can also be used to facilitate participants’ connections with the natural world in which they live and learn.

This article is based on research that used photo elicitation to investigate the meaning of outdoor experiences (Loeffler, 2004). Photo elicitation introduces photographs into the research interview. In the process of conducting the research, the author came to a deeper understanding of how photography holds great potential in outdoor education.

Photographers, reflecting a successful advertising campaign, often refer to the act of photography as capturing a “Kodak moment.” Photographs, then, are an emanation of a past reality (Cronin, 1998). Some people use photographs as protection against time by using them as an anchor for past memories. Colson (1979) found that “people take up photography at times of rapid change in their lives when photography is most clearly expressive of the wish to hold time still, to have greater opportunity to consolidate the ordinarily fleeting experiences of the moment” (p. 273).

The Research

Data for this qualitative study was gathered using photo elicitation interviews with 14 participants of a college-based outdoor program. Of the 14 students who were interviewed, seven were female and seven were male. They varied in age from 18 to 21 years and ranged from first to fourth year students. The participants ranged in experience from beginner (started participating in outdoor activities within the current academic year) to expert (more than 10 years of outdoor experience). They participated in backpacking, rock climbing, whitewater kayaking, or sea kayaking programs varying in length from a weekend to three weeks. All participants in the study took photographs during their outdoor trips.

The participants brought a total of 511 photographs to the interviews resulting in an average of 36.5 photographs per participant. The fewest number of photographs brought to an interview was 13 and the largest number was 87. During the interviews, the participants and the researcher discussed the photographs that the participants took during their outdoor trips. The interviewer asked the participants questions about their outdoor experiences including trip memories, the meaning(s) they ascribed to their experience, and the value of the photographs in explaining their experience. During and after data collection, an inductive analysis was conducted using both the participants’ photographic images and the interview transcriptions.

Capturing the Moments

During the research, participants were asked why they took cameras on their trips. Their answers invariably involved the word
“capture.” Most felt a strong need to use photographs as a way to grasp hold of a moment. Jennifer (all research participants were assigned pseudonyms) explained why she took a photo of her group on a mountain summit: “I wanted to capture the moment.” Brian showed several nature pictures and revealed, “What I wanted to do was just capture the beauty of it, the natural beauty.” Jim said, “I just wanted to document the trip . . . so I paddled over there and captured them there in their kayaks.” Brenda found it fascinating to take pictures in order to capture “what was going on” on the trip.

Mike used photographs to remember the trip rather than keeping a written journal. Likewise, Kristen “wanted a record of where I’d been and what I saw.” Richard uses his camera to record the people he is adventuring with because he likes to remember them and the times they shared outdoors. There seemed to be a fear that, if a photograph was not taken, the moment could be lost forever. Brian described it this way: “What I try to do is to take pictures so that I remember the places I have been so that I won’t forget . . . so every once in awhile, I look at them so I know I was there and liked being there.”

For many of the participants, the photographs served as a memory trigger or “rubber band” back to the moment. By looking at the photographs, participants were taken back to that time and place. They could relive the feelings, thoughts and sensations of the experience. Jim described his photographs as “serving as a prompting device for things that happened on the trip.” Brenda mentioned, “It is nice to have pictures to bring back so you can look back at them and remember what went on.” Graham liked that photographs kept trips separate when memory tended to blend them together and that they held small details about the experience he might otherwise forget.

Oftentimes, participants described taking a larger number of photographs when the outdoor activity of the trip was new to them. Jim put it this way: “I’d never been sea kayaking before and I wanted to document it.” Jennifer put pictures of herself whitewater kayaking on her wall because “whitewater kayaking is just so cool I wanted to put it on my wall and say, look, I whitewater kayaked.”

Participants also used photographs to remind themselves of what they had accomplished in the outdoors. After every trip, Mike puts the photographs on his computer desktop and sets them to change every 30 minutes. He draws on these photographs to take him back to the trip whenever he is feeling stressed by school.

Besides preserving memories, the so-called “Kodak moments,” some subjects took pictures for their artistic, aesthetic or emotional values. Brian spoke about a deep desire to capture what he called “postcard moments.” He described these as “whenever you take pictures of joy without posing. If I had a point-and-shoot camera I’d take a picture of you here without you knowing it and I think those are the best pictures. They [postcard moments] spontaneously show energy and happiness.” Jim also described several of his photographs as “postcardish” because they had a certain quality of light and natural beauty.

Capturing the Experiences to Take Home

As well as using photographs to capture moments for their own memories, the participants also used photographs to explain and describe their experiences to others who were not there. Given the difficulty of describing outdoor experiences, they relied on the images to “speak” for the experience. Brenda talked about using her climbing pictures to “remember what the place looked like and being able to show others what it looked like. Especially . . . when people don’t have any conception or perception of what it is like out there.” Liz said, “The pictures are not just for me. They are for the people I know so I can try to share the wealth of stuff that I learned and experienced by showing them pictures of the experience I had.” Some subjects made photo posters, others made photo CDs or websites. Some participants put the pictures up in their rooms or in frames on their desks. Many piled them up in boxes or in drawers. Ross talked about his photos this way: “They normally go in a drawer. And then some time if I feel nostalgic I put them on the wall or I give them to friends.” Justine liked to turn her photographs
into greeting cards and post cards that she sent to friends.

**Limitations of Photography**

Many participants described the many photographs they wanted to take but couldn’t because of concerns over camera weight, camera fragility and difficulty in waterproofing. For example, Brenda wanted many more photographs of her climbing trip but was constrained by belaying demands and the difficulty of taking a camera on a multi-pitch climb.

Julie felt her photographs were only visual records because “it is so hard to capture what you are feeling and seeing out there. . . . you get the pictures back and they are nice to look at but the memories are much stronger. I’ve noticed lately I’m taking fewer pictures because I want to just try to take it all in.” Rayne said, “I took only two disposable cameras because I don’t like the idea of living through my camera . . . because I think that would be very easy for me to do. And I didn’t want to capture it all through my camera. I like fully experiencing it for myself. I really just wanted to take pictures of things that really called to me to take pictures.”

Ross only takes a camera on outdoor trips about one-third of the time because he fears it will change his memories of the trips. He consciously tries to have “different memories and have the photos complement them rather than having the photos form the memories for me.” Rayne shared, “I feel like my pictures definitely cannot fully represent the experience I had but I definitely cling to them and use them as a source to walk people through my trip. And I hold them dearly to myself as well and I love looking back at them.” She summarized by saying, “As much as I like to pretend that I don’t like pictures . . . I definitely like having the pictures to remind me because they trigger my memories. When I look at them, it is not just like, ‘Oh that is pretty’ — it is bringing back a whole experience.”

**Discussion and Implications**

For the subjects in the study, outdoor trips provided the opportunity for significant and intense experiences on many levels: personal, relational and spiritual. It is evident from this study that photography can play a major role in the way participants capture, record, share and make sense of their experiences. What some outdoor educators find a nuisance or waste of time is actually a critical reflective tool for some participants.

Photography can be a powerful reflective tool for outdoor participants who choose to use it. Photography enables participants to identify peak or significant moments during and after their experience. It aids in the visual and emotional memory of the experience and it captures a greater level of detail than the participants could retain by themselves alone. When an experience is new, participants generally take a greater number of photographs. There is a strong desire to capture every nuance of the excitement, intensity and learning of the new activity or environment. Participants draw on these photographs as proof to themselves and others that they did indeed participate in or succeed at some activity (e.g., climbing a peak, running a rapid, cooking a meal over a fire).

Participants also rely on their photographs in times of stress or lowered self-esteem to remind them of the powerful and moving times they had while outdoors. Given the power of photographs to keep the outdoor experience alive long after it has been completed, it is recommended that outdoor educators embrace and facilitate student photography during the outdoor experience. Of course, there are times when photography may be impossible or inappropriate for an experience, but importance and opportunity must be given to this vital tool whenever possible.

Photography can also be combined with other reflective tools such as journal writing, letter writing, drawing, found objects, and spoken debriefs. Participants can be encouraged to write commentaries about photographs they have taken as they go through the experience. With the proliferation of digital cameras, images of a past experience may be called forth during a reflection session almost instantaneously.
Photography gives participants a way to include others who did not participate in the experience to come to an understanding of it. Photographs provide an integral bridge from the field to home. They give participants a key with which to unlock their memories, trigger their emotional state, and vicariously relive their outdoor experiences. This key can assist with the transference of lessons learned from the outdoors to home. For participants, their photographs provide a chronological and phenomenological framework on which to develop their personal, reflective narrative of the experience. Most participants in the study used this anchoring framework when they shared the meaning of their experiences with friends and family members.

Along with their connections to the natural environment, the participants also valued and placed deep meaning in the bonds formed with other people during their outdoor experiences. As a result, photography can become an enabling force in forging connections between participants both during and after the experience. As painful as the proverbial group photo or summit shot can be to sit through, especially nine or ten cameras’ worth, it provides a crucial link to both the other participants and the experience itself.

Photography also offers important clues as to what the participants find meaningful and want to remember from their trip. Indeed, given the significance of photography found in this study, outdoor educators should have some cause for concern if cameras are not being used on their trips. Participants’ desire to photograph signifies that they are having valuable experiences that they deem are worth capturing.

Outdoor experiences and photography are both powerful tools for personal growth, learning, and forging connections. Combining these two creates a powerful synergy that provides opportunities for greater experience recall, deeper reflection, and more significant transference of the outdoor experience to home. This study provides eloquent evidence of this synergy and suggests that photography be embraced in outdoor education, rather than merely tolerated. In closing, this innovative research contributes greatly to both the understanding of outdoor experiences and to the ways in which photography facilitates participants’ connections to those experiences. The study also suggests that outdoor educators welcome and support participants’ photography during outdoor trips.
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Participants in outdoor education activities have a variety of motivations, but an important goal is to develop a relationship with nature (Priest, 1986). Given that wildlife photography emphasizes direct interactions with wild animals, as an outdoor education activity it should have a strong focus on developing this relationship with nature. However, La Rocque (1991, p. 33) claims that “photographic reproduction will fatally weaken our appreciation of an original nature.” Of course, each photographer’s motivation, whether documentation, comparison, collection, validation, social interaction, artistic expression, or reflection (Markwell, 1997), will affect how a relationship with nature is developed. The technology itself is also influential (Stalker, 1988). The purpose of this paper is to explore ways in which wildlife photography, using the common technology of cameras, can enhance and limit this relationship with nature.

Background

To begin, a few explanations are in order. First, the technology of photography is constantly evolving, which subsequently changes the cost, ease, and complexity of photography. Nevertheless, the essential characteristics of photography, such as exposure and framing the subject, remain unchanged (Kramer, 2004). I will focus my comments on these basic aspects of photography. In addition, I realize that each person’s choice about available technology influences, and is influenced by, broader attitudes and values (Winner, 1986).

Second, much more space is needed to fully examine issues related to our relationship with nature, so I offer a brief explanation only. A personal relationship with nature implies finding some connection that stimulates or allows for interaction, just as people develop relationships with other people. This connection may develop from our common evolutionary development, shared habitat, similar physiology, previous awareness, and so on (Wilson, 1984). Such connections have the potential to develop the relationship further, toward understanding, appreciation, respect, and ultimately concern and love (Canadian Environmental Advisory Council, 1991).

This paper, then, will examine some ways that wildlife photography can contribute to, and detract from, such a relationship. It offers insight into the spectrum of possibilities for impact, many of which are applicable to other outdoor education activities and their associated technology (e.g., bird watching and binoculars, ski-touring and skis). The comments below reflect my years as an amateur wildlife photographer, interacting with other wildlife photographers, and a small, but growing literature on the subject.

Contributing to a Relationship with Nature

To initiate a relationship with nature, people first need a specific entry point into the natural world. The entry point may be birds, orienteering, insects, orchids, or cameras. Once an entry point is established, a personal relationship may broaden to include other aspects of the natural world. My initial interest in birds led me to learn more about their various habitats (e.g., forests, wetlands, grasslands), food sources (e.g., insects, fruit, grains), and behaviours (e.g., nesting, migration).

Photography offers a unique entry point in that it provides a potential connection to any aspect of the natural world. The depth and breadth of the relationship depends on the interest and effort of the individual involved. Both may deepen as he or she gains an appreciation of, for example, the subtle impacts of light on feather colouration. As one wildlife photographer claims, the “vitality of his images is based on the intensity of his relationship with nature” (Sherman, 2004, p. 1).

Second, after the direct experience, the photographs themselves can stimulate
memories and reflection on the experience (Markwell, 1997). While there are many other ways to remember experiences, people often rely on photographs. Even though photographs cannot capture the entire experience — indeed, they can misrepresent the experience (Stalker, 1988) — they can stimulate recollections of a past and current relationship with nature that might otherwise be forgotten or minimized (Russell & Ankenman, 1996).

Finally, wildlife photography can inspire others to develop a relationship with nature. Many use photography as a means of social interaction (Markwell, 1997); photographers may develop an interest in wildlife by following and socializing with other photographers. Sharing photographs with others can develop awareness, stimulate interest, and convey respect for the natural world (Shaw, n.d.).

At the same time, these photographs can serve as an educational resource for others. Many photographers have used such images in university courses, community workshops, and family gatherings to share a deepening relationship with nature, in the hopes that others might develop their own relationship with nature.

**Detracting from a Relationship with Nature**

While wildlife photography can enhance our own and others’ relationship with nature, there are some aspects of wildlife photography that have the potential to diminish that relationship. These include the creation of unrealistic expectations, a selective view of nature (Stalker, 1988), and environmental impacts.

First, viewing photographs in travel brochures or on websites can create expectations for an upcoming trip (Markwell, 1997). These images are usually close-ups, with perfect lighting, and display some unique behaviour of the wildlife; taking such images requires many hours, much skill, and specialized equipment (Kariel, 1991). For many people, these types of images create unrealistic expectations that can result in negative impacts on wildlife and others’ outdoor experiences. For example, expecting the same photograph as taken with a 500 mm lens, a photographer with a 200 mm zoom lens might approach a nesting swan too closely, thus disturbing the bird. This also limits the opportunity for other people to view or photograph it.

Second, because most of us cannot produce photographs of wildlife that equal the quality of those found in coffee table books and on magazine covers, our use of cameras and lenses can selectively limit wildlife photography in terms of focal species, timing, and field of view. We may limit our efforts to those types of wildlife that are, for example, common, approachable, and large, simply because they are the easiest to photograph. At the same time, we risk ignoring (and not developing a relationship with) species that are uncommon, unapproachable, or small.

Similarly, equipment constraints can cause us to select the timing of our wildlife encounters. Lighting and weather conditions are critical factors in wildlife photography (Kramer, 2004). Because of the limits of film speed and lens apertures, most photographs are taken on warm days with sufficient light, no rain, and little wind. Of course, this limits the possibilities to encounter nocturnal or crepuscular animals, especially in difficult weather conditions.

Many critics talk about how the camera’s field of view limits the subjects that can be seen and the things that can be seen along with those subjects. Of course, these limits are important in producing good photographs, through placement, focussing, and the like. However, the limits imposed by that field of view remain afterward, reducing our ability to see other parts of nature that represent important connections with the subject.

In addition, there is the potential to commodify wildlife, in the sense of pursuing, collecting, and storing images. The direct relationship often ends after a suitable photograph is taken. The commodification of nature changes the meaning attributed to the initial subject from intrinsic value to that of an artifact (King & Stewart, 1996). Once living things and their habitats are reduced to objects, the potential for a deeper relationship is substantially reduced.

Finally, there is potential to focus so intently on achieving the goal of a quality photograph
that we can cause negative environmental impacts. Our desire to take close-up photographs may push us to approach sensitive species too closely, potentially causing disturbances during critical periods of their life history. For example, bird photographers (especially advanced ones) spend more time off designated trails than do non-photographers (Butler & Fenton, 1987). Furthermore, we may not be aware of some impacts that occur after our encounters with prey species, such as leading watchful predators to previously unknown locations of their prey (Bart, 1977). As Kariel (1991, p. 44) declares, “the welfare of the subject is more important than the photograph.”

Conclusions

Initiating and deepening a relationship with nature is a worthy goal for leaders and participants in outdoor education. Wildlife photography, in particular, provides an excellent entry point and reflection tool to develop that relationship and may assist others to that end. However, we should be aware of how photography can create unrealistic expectations, limit a fuller relationship, and result in negative environmental impacts.

In a world increasingly separated from the natural world, it is important to promote and facilitate a variety of opportunities for people to develop a relationship with nature. We should, therefore, recognize ways that relationship is affected by a chosen outdoor activity. Participants can overcome the limitations posed by technology and enhance their relationship with nature by responding to those limits in a suitable manner. This may mean spending time with aspects of nature otherwise missed when using a camera (or any piece of technology related to an activity) or taking special care to alleviate impacts that can result from that activity. Such self-awareness of motives, limitations, and impacts will improve our relationship with ourselves, fellow participants, and the natural world.
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The Spring 2003 issue of *Pathways* continued a debate regarding the relationship between technology (emerging or modern) and learning in the out-of-doors. I read this issue with great interest and found myself wanting to respond — sometimes in agreement, sometimes in disagreement, but most often with additional questions.

First of all, I found myself asking “what is meant by traditional?” It seems that “traditional” was most often described as outdoor activities that are human-powered (e.g., snowshoe or canoe), involve non-petroleum-based products (e.g., wool clothing and fire), promote some connection to our heritage (e.g., European and Aboriginal), and afford reasonable comfort (e.g., warm and dry). In addition, there was a general anti-technology tone throughout, suggesting that modern technology hinders relationships with nature. It is my goal to challenge some of these ideas and suggest that, for outdoor education to be most effective, we must respect and encourage diverse program offerings that span the technological continuum from traditional to modern.

Traditional, as identified above, might be described as outdoor travel in Canada circa 1800 and early 1900. Clearly, technology had been emerging long before this time and the people who traveled during this time had with them canvas wall tents, metal box stoves, axes, and even wool clothing that were often mass produced and certainly more technologically advanced than, say, two or three hundred years earlier. This begs the question: Why have some chosen this place on the technology continuum as traditional? If traditional is better than non-traditional, then why aren’t the pre-wall tent, metal stove box, and axe style and technique of travel better? Is it because we can learn these travel skills relatively easily and quickly? Is it because this method of travel is comfortable, warm and dry? Is it because the equipment is reasonably affordable and accessible and allows us to take large groups into the wilderness? Is it because it elicits some romantic notion of wilderness travel that connects us to our historic roots (and routes)? Or is it because this type of travel really fosters greater connections to nature than more technology dependent programs? Perhaps it is a combination of all these factors coupled with our own personal preferences and skills.

Consider a metaphor. A few years ago, I attended a conference that included the speaker John Shelby Spong, a celebrated author and past bishop and minister of the Episcopal Church. He is a liberal theologian who has been a breath of fresh air for many, and who has also met with great resistance, and even death threats, from others. Some of his most well known books include *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism* (1991), *Why Christianity Must Change or Die* (1999), and *A New Christianity for a New World* (2001). I was struck by his view that Christianity is but one doorway to understanding the mystery of God. He feels that it is a valid doorway, but no more valid than many other world religions that also engage people in rich and meaningful journeys to understanding that great mystery. It is his feeling that the traditional view of the Christian church (i.e., that Christianity is the only doorway to the understanding of God) has in fact resulted in a lack of understanding of God and spirituality. In addition, this conservative view has also driven many people away from the church and stifled any further spiritual exploration.

I would suggest that in our quest for developing relationships and connections with nature, we must acknowledge that there are many doorways that all lead to very meaningful nature relationships. When I look back on my own experience growing up in northern Newfoundland and the Yukon, my doorway into nature included snowmobiling, fishing, hunting, and flying a plane. These activities
thrust me into a relationship with nature: I learned about snow and cold, where the fish were, where and when to find moose and caribou, and how to understand mountain weather and navigation. These experiences have been central to developing my passion and love for nature, understanding of ecosystems and ecology, and concern about issues such as deforestation, water pollution, antiquated mining practices, and recreational overuse. In addition, they have served as my primary source for developing self-awareness and confidence, developing leadership skills, and inspiring the lives of many people, young and old, through my teaching and guiding. Interestingly, these activities were all very consumptive and dependent on modern technology. Nevertheless, they were relationship-building experiences.

There are many doorways to nature. I speculate that the doorways to nature for the contributing authors of the Spring 2003 edition of *Pathways* would include heritage travel, learning primitive wilderness skills, working and living in native communities, crafting and winter snowshoe travel — all valid entry points. My friend and colleague Glen Hvenegaard often shares his story of growing up on the Alberta prairie and how he became a passionate birder. He would spend hours birdwatching in different prairie ecosystems and long winters anticipating their spring return.

Consider the current trends in ecotourism and adventure travel. These tourists travel specifically to engage with and learn about nature (e.g., birdwatching, whale watching) and to have different travel experiences (e.g., canoe, raft, camel, sea kayak). Many, if not most, of these tourism experiences are luxurious and highly dependent on modern technology; guests are often served lavish food and drink. Nevertheless, these experiences are often pivotal in the development of relationships to nature and wild places. These people often write letters, give money, and lobby for the preservation of natural areas as a result of their experience and subsequent relationship to nature (Asfeldt, 1992).

If developing a relationship to nature is a central goal of outdoor education, which I believe it is, then I think we should not be distracted by the means without assessing the outcome. Which is the greater good — the means or the end? Clearly, as outdoor educators, we have unique and individual preferences regarding the means for developing nature relationships that reflect our past experiences, skills, passions, and available resources. However, let’s not fall into the trap, as the Christian church has, of thinking that our way is the only way, for this will surely rob us and our students of a view and relationship with nature that we have simply yet to discover.

Also, let’s remember the many benefits that modern technology has brought to outdoor education. I remember attending a presentation by Steve Van Matre many years ago and, as we know, he was passionate about developing relationships to nature, encouraging us to literally “fully immerse” ourselves in the natural world. He spoke for about 90 minutes while projecting a single image on the screen behind him. It was an image of the planet Earth taken from space. It was a profound image to display as he talked about the finite resources on this little planet and how imperative it was that outdoor educators create in students an unwavering resolve to “care for the place.” Space travel is the quintessential high-tech adventure. Without space travel, satellites and high-tech environmental monitoring equipment, considerable knowledge would not be available to us about acid rain, global climate change, the thinning
ozone layer, and other environmental issues. We use this information regularly to assist our students in understanding our impact on the planet, the urgency of reversing environmental degradation, and the notion of being a part of nature, not apart from nature.

Unless we are prepared to greatly decrease our population and standard of living, and go back to the age of the horse and carriage, I think we are dependent on modern technology to assist us in finding solutions to our current environmental problems. Only with modern technology will we be able to create more fuel efficient cars, find alternate energy sources, and continue effective environmental monitoring. Modern technology has certainly contributed to our current environmental mess; primitive technology, however, has also been a contributing factor.

Sometimes I think it is easy for outdoor educators to become critical of modern technology: It seems like the “wholesome back-to-the-woods” thing to do. Perhaps we need to think carefully about this tendency. For example, there is a contradiction between the practice of using campfires rather than gas stoves to reduce the use of fossil fuels, and driving to our outdoor education sites in fossil fuel-powered vehicles (perhaps in trendy gas-guzzling SUVs and 4x4 pick-ups) from our natural gas-heated and electrically air conditioned homes. The amount of fossil fuels we collectively burn in camp stoves pales in comparison to the amount we will collectively burn driving to the next COEO conference.

I hope that what you hear is that I am a proponent of a wide spectrum of programs. I love fire and there is a time and place for it. I love the satisfaction of hauling water, being warm and dry at night, and traveling by traditional means on historic Canadian trails. In fact, I would love to experience more of this. I recently spent seven wonderful days dog-sledding in the Northwest Territories, sleeping in an Arctic Oven tent heated with wood — the richest heat on the planet. As the dogs pulled me gracefully down Pike’s Portage onto Great Slave Lake, I was cast back many years to a time when Chipewyan Indians used this route to travel to the barrens. It was a thrill to travel this historic trail hearing only the steady pat of the dogs’ paws and the occasional grinding of the sled’s brake. I felt as if I was there with the Chipewyan, and later European explorers, as they laboured across the portage headed for Artillery Lake (Norment, 1989).

I also love ski touring with the latest fat skis that turn fast, tight, and easy, and I certainly wouldn’t go without an avalanche beacon and the latest Internet avalanche bulletin in hand. Also, the more I travel in the back country, the more I like carrying a light pack, which I do by relying on light-weight high-tech gear. This light pack facilitates my enjoyment of nature by encouraging me to get out more; the more I get out, the more I experience nature; the more I experience nature, the more I understand and care for wild places and the state of our planet. As Bob Henderson (2003) states: “We must unlearn the misguided notion that modern is always better. There remains a strong case for traditional practice” (p. 16). I couldn’t agree more! However, it is equally misguided to think that modern is always worse.
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Geocaching is an entertaining adventure game using global positioning systems (GPS). It has the potential to serve as a way to introduce participants to the outdoors and to enhance outdoor experiences. A combination of geography and hide-n-seek, the idea is to place caches all over the world, share their location coordinates on the Internet, and have others find them using GPS units. After finding the cache, participants are asked to place it back in the same location and state that they found it (e.g., if it was covered by rocks when they found it, to cover it back up).

The cache finder then posts an e-mail to the cache owner to let them know the cache was found and comments on the condition of the cache. Geocaching.com provides information and guidelines for activity participation. Initiated in the spring of 2000 outside Portland, Oregon, today people in 197 countries participate in this sport (Chavez, Courtright, & Schneider, 2004). In just three years, more than 50,000 caches have been hidden to engage more than 100,000 participants worldwide (Hamilton, 2003).

Unlike most technology that competes with the outdoor world, using GPS for geocaching can enhance outdoor education and appreciation through exposure to a variety of natural settings, familiarization with geography and topography, and incidental wildlife viewing. Given the relatively recent emergence of this activity, much remains unknown about the participants and their motivations. A questionnaire administered to 221 geocachers in the Minneapolis–St. Paul, Minnesota area (Schneider & Powell, 2003) reveals opportunities for outdoor education professionals.

The respondents (133 geocachers, 60.2% response rate) were primarily Caucasian (96%), male (86%), middle-aged (average of 39.9 years old), with some college education (84%) and employed full-time (82%). They engaged in geocaching with immediate family members (48%), alone (25%), or with friends and family (19%). More respondents engaged in finding rather than hiding caches. Besides geocaching, GPS was used for navigation (39%), fishing (37%), hunting (25%), hiking (23%), travel (21%), and boating (15%). The most important benefits identified from the experience were enjoying scenery, exercising, experiencing new and different things, experiencing nature, and testing skills and abilities. Respondents agreed that geocaching had increased their visits to park and recreation areas.

The combination of technology use, increase in outdoor area visits, family interaction, and interest in new things that test skills creates a stellar opportunity for outdoor education professionals. First, professionals can “get in the game” through simple ideas like creating and hiding educational-themed caches. Second, professionals can incorporate the sport into programming for all ages and group types to scintillate the extant desire for skill and experience acquisition. Third, partnering with state or local geocaching organizations can enhance the environmentally strong behaviour already advocated by geocaching.com. Regardless of who or how outdoor education professionals engage with geocaching, if they don’t cache in now, they’re likely to be bankrupt as this new activity takes off.
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Below Zero is Above Expectations

by Adam Zita

I have been involved with outdoor education for only a short time, but during this time I have discovered many different organizations and people. These contacts have offered suggestions for developing lesson plans, gathering ideas for activities, and then implementing those activities. One organization with which I have had the pleasure to be involved is the Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF).

For over 40 years, the CWF has worked for the conservation of our natural heritage. As the nation’s largest non-profit, non-governmental conservation organization, it represents the voices of countless Canadians concerned about the well-being of wild species and spaces. CWF is dedicated to raising awareness of the impacts of human activities on the environment, promoting the sustainable use of natural resources, conducting and sponsoring research relating to wildlife and the environment, and recommending legislative changes to protect wildlife and its habitat.

The CWF has created and developed several useful and informative activity guides that should be close at hand for every outdoor educator. WILD Education programs, which have been developed in partnership with federal, provincial, and territorial wildlife agencies, include Project WILD, Fish Ways, Focus on Forests, WILD Schools, Blue Schools, National Wildlife Week and Oceans Day. Now, I would like to introduce CWF’s newest program, Below Zero.

As Canadians, we experience some form of winter for at least six months of the year. The Below Zero activity guide is an education supplement that concentrates on the understanding of, and conservation of, wildlife in frozen environments. Based on the Project WILD model, Below Zero is an easy fit with school curriculum as well as an easy fit for scout, outdoor, and park programs. The guide offers 46 activities organized into four thematic categories: Awareness and Appreciation; Habitat and Ecological Principles; Adaptation; and Responsible Human Actions. Below Zero also provides an appendix packed with additional information. To obtain the activity guide, you must attend a workshop, so that you can be introduced to these activities by a trained CWF facilitator. Here is an example of an activity found in the Below Zero activity guide.

---

**SNakes AND LADDERS**

**Age:** Grades 4–7  
**Subjects:** Science, Physical Education  
**Skills:** communication, critical and creative thinking  
**Duration:** 15 minutes  
**Group size:** 15 to 30 students  
**Setting:** outdoors, or can be adapted to gym  
**Conceptual Framework References:** 4a, 4b  
**Key Vocabulary:** hibernaculum, hibernacula (plural), predators

**Objectives**  
Students will be able to:  
1. Define hibernaculum;  
2. Identify the dangers snakes face on their way to and from a hibernaculum; and  
3. Describe how cold weather affects snakes.

**Method**  
An active game to simulate the annual migration of snakes from their breeding grounds to the hibernaculum.

**Background**  
Some snakes spend their winters below the frost line in communal hibernating sites called hibernacula. They move into these holes in the ground late in the fall and don’t start to emerge until the first warm spring days. (Canada’s most famous hibernacula are found near Narcisse, Manitoba, where tens of
thousands of red-sided garter snakes spend their winters.)

On the way to their winter dens, snakes are an easy target for owls, hawks, and badgers. If they have to cross roads, they are often flattened by vehicles. Because they are cold blooded, their metabolism depends on the temperature of the air around them. That is, reptiles move faster when they are warm than when they are cold. A chilly snake will sun itself on rocks or warm pavement so it can move around more easily to find food.

Anyone knowing the location of a hibernaculum should report it to a provincial or federal wildlife specialist. These winter dens are important areas that need to be protected.

**Materials**
Two blankets or towels; a hula hoop or marked circle; lines or skipping ropes

**Procedure**
1. Set up the playing area as outlined in the diagram below. Use the hula hoop or marked circle to mark the location of the hibernaculum and the lines or skipping ropes to mark roads.
2. The object of the game is for students to migrate from the breeding area to the hibernaculum before cold weather sets in. On their way, they will encounter hazards such as vehicles and predators (owls, hawks, and badgers).
3. Designate four students to be vehicles. Each vehicle is made up of two students with a towel or blanket. To become road-kill, snakes must be run over by the towel or blanket held between two students. The driver of the vehicle must then take the snake away to a separate area (the prey den) before the game resumes.
4. Designate players to be owls, hawks, and badgers. They attack in the fields and then take their prey to the side of the playing area before the game resumes.
5. Have snakes line up on their hands and knees in the breeding field. Explain that they must reach the hibernaculum at the far end of the field before winter hits. Position one vehicle on each of the roads and place one predator in each of the fields for every 10 snakes in the breeding area. When the command to start is given, the snakes begin crawling to the hibernaculum.
6. After a short period of time, yell out that the temperature has dropped, and colder weather is on the way. Students still trying to reach the hibernaculum must now slow down by crawling on their bellies.
7. Periodically, the teacher may announce that the sun is out and temperatures have risen. Allow about three minutes for the snakes to move through the course.

**Evaluation**
Ask students to:
1. List dangers that snakes face as they travel to and from their hibernacula.
2. Describe how cold weather affects a snake.

© 2003 Canadian Wildlife Federation. Reprinted with the permission of the Canadian Wildlife Federation from the Below Zero Activity Guide. For information on how to participate in Below Zero workshops, visit www.wildeducation.org or call 1-800-563-WILD (9453).
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Outdoor Education is Alive and Well at Montessori Schools

by Emily Foster

Velos Christou is the energetic young director of a new outdoor education centre starting up this fall. Yes, you read that right: A new outdoor centre, starting this fall in Bolton, Ontario. What’s the catch? How can this happen? In a time of budget crises, when many field centres across the province are going the way of the dodo bird, how does a new centre find arise?

It just so happens that Velos Christou works under the nurturing wing of Toronto Montessori Schools. Under the present circumstances in Ontario, where outdoor education is viewed as a frill, this makes all the difference in the world.

“The first impetus came from the Montessori philosophy,” Christou explains, “because it is very much rooted in the out-of-doors. It’s a hands-on teaching philosophy. There is a real expectation that students are going to get out and get their hands dirty.”

Marie Montessori, the movement’s founder, said, “When children come in contact with nature, they reveal their true strength.” This is one of Christou’s favourite quotes from the education philosopher. The heart of a child’s education at the Toronto Montessori School’s Caledon Campus is based on this belief.

Montessori also said, “When the child shows us his [sic] desire to escape from his house, let us attract his attention somewhat solemnly to his feet. . . . The foot is noble. To walk is noble. Thanks to the feet, the child who already walks can expect of the outdoors certain answers to his secret questions.”

The 300-acre property was the Bolton Fresh Air Camp for 75 years. Toronto Montessori Schools bought it four years ago with the intention of opening an outdoor facility where students from city-based Montessori schools could visit. First, they built a school for children aged 18 months to 17 years. They also built a teacher’s college, where teacher candidates live and attend classes that will prepare them to teach in Montessori schools across the province. This latter function is being returned to the Richmond Hill campus, leaving Christou with a ready-made residential facility for visiting students. The building, complete with classrooms and living accommodations, will become the Cold Creek Outdoor Education Centre.

Most of the old summer camp buildings are still in existence. Plans are being prepared for the rebuilding of those that require the most repair. One building is already a functioning woodworking shop for students. Other buildings house bicycle activities, drama, nature study, and staff accommodation. Toronto and Region Conservation regulates any construction taking place on the property to protect the environmental integrity of the floodplain.

A Montessori school in Richmond Hill has over 800 students. Originally, the idea was to provide these students with a place to get out into nature and get their hands dirty. Now, with the closing of so many public outdoor education centres, opportunities for visits from schools outside the Montessori system are multiplying. Christou sees this as a terrific
opportunity. Public school students are expected to come in droves. Four different school groups were expected this past June.

The Cold Creek Outdoor Education Centre is opening its doors to corporate groups as well, such as computer companies and administration groups. The centre already offers summer camp opportunities to the general public. It seems to be off to a good start, even before it has officially opened.

The outdoor centre will be run year-round alongside the school program. The outdoor centre and school will run separately, while sharing the same facility and outdoor resources. Activities such as snowshoeing, mountain-biking, animal tracking, and kick-sledding will be scheduled so that the programs can run smoothly side by side.

Classes at the Caledon campus are unique. The school doesn’t yet have a gymnasium, so all physical education classes are conducted outside. The connection to the outdoors doesn’t stop here, however. The curriculum is currently being designed so that all classes are flavoured with an environmental component. For example, music classes go outside and make instruments from natural artifacts. Math students participate in orienteering programs. Creative writing classes are held at the edge of the forest. Nature somehow affects every aspect of the students’ education. Madam Montessori would surely approve.

So, what does it take to start up an outdoor education centre in Ontario these days? Where does one find the optimism to do such a thing?

Christou was working as the director of the Montessori summer day camp at Caledon campus when he was presented with the opportunity to direct their upcoming outdoor education centre. Christou has been working in the outdoor education field for the last four years, after completing a phys-ed degree at McGill.

“At first I was overwhelmed by the sheer scope of it all. There are just so many possibilities, and so much to do. I knew this was a huge job coming into it. The secret was to chunk huge projects into manageable bits. The Board of Directors is very supportive for the most part. Naturally they want to see extra business generated before they give the go-ahead on projects that require extensive funding, such as building maintenance, and winterized plumbing.”

Christou’s advice, from one fledgling outdoor centre director to another, “Don’t read the news.”

Very funny. Seriously now . . .

“If you don’t absolutely love it, don’t even bother. It’s going to be a lot of hard work. Also, if you don’t have financial backing, it’s going to be really tough. It helps to be connected somehow to the private sector because they have the financial security to support programs that are disappearing in the public system. You have to have a realistic view of things, and be open to new ideas, even if it means bringing in groups of people that you may not normally bring in. You do what you have to do to survive. Corporate groups, for example. They are signed up to come here and do teamwork activities. We can’t afford to limit ourselves to school groups alone. It’s important to be flexible.”

The Caledon Campus Montessori school is located just east east of Bolton on the Nobleton Road. The land is comprised of abandoned farmland and orchards, grassy fields, maple forests and wooded river valleys. There are trails for walking, lawns for playing, animal tracks to study, trees to identify, birds to watch — all the wonders of nature at the doorstep of a school. For the 150 students at Caledon Campus, outdoors and education go hand-in-hand. For the thousands of public school students based in the city, the doors at the Caledon Campus are open.
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Emily Foster is an outdoor educator who is working at the Montessori Outdoor Education Centre this summer as leadership development and tripping specialist.
The Bruce Grey Education Foundation: A New Fundraising Model for Outdoor Education

by Daena Greig, with contributions from Stephen Woeller

Public education is changing and outdoor education is changing right along with it. New approaches to outdoor education have been, and will continue to be, needed to preserve outdoor education in our province. To maintain operations of outdoor programs, revisions have included, among others, staff changes, user fees, and partnerships with outside organizations. A new approach by the Bluewater District School Board has been designed to secure their outdoor education centre in perpetuity.

The Institute for Outdoor Education and Environmental Studies was established in 1972 to provide students and teachers from the Bluewater District School Board with outdoor experiences. Originally the board funded this experience exclusively, but in the fall of 2001 user fees were introduced along with a shift to Outdoor Education Specialist staff. It was at this time that the already established fundraising campaign was transformed from the original campaign format established in 1997. In six years, volunteers from the Grey and Bruce regions have raised nearly $600,000 to rebuild the institute’s dining hall, dormitories and laboratories through the “Inspired by Nature” campaign.

In 2002, the Bruce Grey Public Education Foundation was established to tap into community goodwill and generate funds to support education outside the regular classroom. The foundation works in partnership with the Bluewater District School Board, but operates at arm’s length, maintaining a level of financial independence. This situation is favourable for fundraising purposes.

The establishment of this foundation and this fundraising model can be attributed to Stephen Woeller, a professional fundraiser who was retained by the Bruce Grey Public Education Foundation in 2001. He was employed to assess the current status of the campaign and make recommendations on how to achieve the remaining 70% of the goal. Woeller completed a planning study to determine how best to bring the fundraising campaign to completion. The three main findings from his study were:

- The institute is considered a valuable community asset with great potential to enhance nature education and the local economy.
- Prospective supporters were less inclined to support the campaign as long as the facility was at risk of closure, as witnessed in other jurisdictions.
- Prospective supporters were more likely to support the campaign if the institute property was protected at arm’s length from the board.

This research reflected the need for a fundraising body not directly connected to the school board. Development of the Grey Bruce Public Education Foundation occurred through redefining the mission and values of the organization and gaining support from influential community members that would support these newly defined goals. Gaining school board approval for the development of the new fundraising body was also essential to the success of the newly created Foundation.

In December 2003, the establishment of the foundation led to an agreement in principal that had the 320-acre property move into the hands of the Blue Grey Public Education Foundation — Outdoor Education Trust. The arrangement has to receive final approval at Queen’s Park, but the intention is clear enough. The ultimate purpose of this transfer is to protect the facility in perpetuity and thus allow student and community programs to
continue to develop. The program and staff components will remain the responsibility of the school board. The foundation will finish the job of putting up new buildings.

The Grey Bruce Public Education Foundation is now ready to enter the final phase of its fundraising campaign. This includes building plans, construction and finally a twelve-month business plan for operations of the institute. Securing stable operating funds are a concern and therefore part of the foundation’s planning for the future of the institute. Sustainable funding for operations will be a challenge.

The success of a non-profit or charitable organization, like the Bruce Grey Public Education Foundation, is connected to volunteer leadership. Leadership combined with strong community support will allow the foundation to complete its capital fundraising and long-term business plan. Success of the fund development strategy will rely on the business experience, legal and financial backgrounds of key members and their willingness to use their connections to ask for money.

This model may prove useful for other school boards operating outdoor education centres. As long as education outside the regular classroom is threatened, this approach makes sense. Outdoor education provides valuable learning experiences for students and this resonates with the broader community. An arm’s length foundation may be an effective way to accomplish survival of outdoor centres that are at risk.

The main hurdle in this model is convincing school boards to relinquish direct control. While other school boards have similar foundations, the Bruce Grey Public Education Foundation is unique due to its arm’s length relationship with the Bluewater District School Board. The bylaws of the foundation maintain that school board members, trustees, teachers or staff cannot be part of the foundation board. The foundation’s office, management and financial operations are also independent from the school board. Even so, the two bodies are connected through their focus on meaningful and effective programs that support student learning.

Through its relationship with the Bruce Grey Public Education Foundation, the Bluewater District School Board has taken a leadership role in supporting an innovative approach. This school board has taken a progressive step by committing to education outside the regular classroom now and for the long term. For more information about the Bruce Grey Public Foundation, forward inquiries to PO Box 283, Wiarton, Ontario or phone 519-534-2767.
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Editors’ Note: In preparation for the Annual COEO Conference 2004, Pathways is pleased to provide readers a sample of writings from the conference Keynote Speaker, Chris Loynes. This article is revised from one published in 1999 in Horizons, 7. We hope you enjoy both this article and the one that follows, and are able to come to the conference to listen to and interact with Chris.

An English friend working abroad visits home occasionally. After a recent trip, he commented that it should not be outdoor education any more but outdoor educations. His point was that the practice has become so diverse it is no longer a single idea and has even lost touch with its roots.

When I spent some time as an outdoor management trainer, I was introduced to a model of leadership I was meant to use. It was cheekily known as John Adair’s three balls — three overlapping circles representing the task, the team and the individual as the elements in the leader’s scope. For years I presented this model, placing whichever of the three elements came to mind first in the top circle. It was only when I was asked to use the model to teach other trainers that I went back to the text book to find that there is a right way up in drawing the model and a good reason for it to be that way up (task on the top if you’re wondering. I’ll leave you to check out why!). From one point of view, you could say I had lost touch with the thinking behind the model and misrepresented it all those years. In my ignorance, I had disempowered the model’s voice. From another perspective I had noticed that my groups often got into conversations about the uppermost circle and a good reason for it to be that way up (task on the top if you’re wondering. I’ll leave you to check out why!). From one point of view, you could say I had lost touch with the thinking behind the model and misrepresented it all those years. In my ignorance, I had disempowered the model’s voice. From another perspective I had noticed that my groups often got into conversations about the uppermost circle and a good reason for it to be that way up. Some useful insights were generated and some new ideas set running that were not to be found in the original explanation.

Modern outdoor education is just over 50 years old — the normal life expectancy for a social movement, I’m told. Several generations of leaders have passed through in that time. For some programs you might argue that they have lost touch with their roots, as I had lost touch with the ideas behind John Adair’s model, and they are going through the motions with no connection to that which made the work speak to the participant. The multi-activity course runs the risk of falling into this category. For others, you would conclude that their distance from those roots has been liberating and their naive approaches have led to some exciting and radical new projects.

These new roots have taken us away from the technological approach of the last ten years; all that programming, sequencing, processing and framing that made it all feel like a production line set up to deliver the pre-determined outcome — guaranteed. The new projects I’m coming across emphasize the imagination rather than thought. Some have already appeared as case studies in Horizons.

There was Eden Community Outdoors working with principles of sustainability, camping in yurts, and creating environmental arts work, vibrant youth led youth clubs and adventure camps with a difference.

We also reported on Swedish work with primary school children using fantasy stories outdoors in which the children became involved. These programmes were delivering curriculum content six-fold faster than classroom approaches. The latest news is that the retention of learning seems also to be enhanced.

We have also reported on the “contemporary rites of passage for young people project” combining adventure and environmental education with the arts, music and traditional ritual. They are determined to contribute to a reduction in youth suicide and will be piloting this year.

In September, I took part in a Hero’s Journey for senior managers. After days of preparation, the group set out on a fantastic coastal traverse to reveal the hidden secret of the coast and
the hidden treasures of their own learning. I will long remember one man who, having thought heroes were only found in armies, discovered in himself the desire to become a hero as a father, a decision that kept together a family he had contemplated leaving.

Tom Price said it for me: “Outdoor education is simple. That doesn’t mean to say that it’s easy.” The technological approach was a necessary time for us to rationalize our work. It certainly needed a defence. This time coincided with Lyme Bay and drastic changes in centre funding that led some of us to say, “Outdoor education is dead.” But of late the creative spirit of our field has transformed us again. Centres are full and imaginative projects are turning up all over. There is even hope for funding through teenage summer camps, a return of outdoor education to the Scottish curriculum and a revitalised youth work agenda. I think we can now say, “Long live outdoor education!” We can revisit that simple formula of helping people to find a dream and supporting them to learn the skills to realise it.

There are still issues. As we explore the many meanings that can be attached to experiences in nature the question will be, “Whose dream is being realised?” We have published critical pieces that have named some of the dreamers; the marketplace commodifying the outdoors and the activities in them; society attempting to create good citizens to their own design; academics interpreting our world in terms of personal efficacy or adrenaline hits as though that were the whole story; the profession tied to its institutionalised badges and sports. All have a dark side to their good will for outdoor education.

Outdoor education is a political world and these politics will occupy our minds and consciences in the years ahead. Let me nail my politics to the mast. I’ll use a quote to help, the source of which is unknown to me: “If you have come to help me then you are wasting your time, but if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine then let us work together.”

My own research has touched on the core experiences that motivate outdoor leaders to be in this work. After some five hundred interviews, all but one had no hesitation in naming a profound moment in a remote location, usually in solitude and wrapped up in a deep sense of nature and self combined in one.

I have a feeling that these many outdoor educations still are one field and that in many new ways, we will make sacred again the people we work with and the places we work in. We will allow enough time for the dream to emerge, we will have enough compassion to help people to realise these dreams and we will have enough heart to celebrate with them when they are achieved.

Sail on outdoor education.

Note

1. Lyme Bay is the location of a multiple fatality in 1993 in which students and staff on a canoe trip drowned at sea. It is of the same scale as the 1970s Temiscaming/St. John’s school drownings and the recent Rockies/Strathcona–Tweedsmere School avalanche disaster.

Chris Loynes is a lecturer at St. Marten’s College in Ambleside, England.
Editors’ Note: This second article by our upcoming conference Keynote Speaker was originally given as a keynote speech in Australia. This version was revised from the 1998 Proceedings of the First Australian Outdoor Recreation Conference (Sydney: ORCA).

The field of, as we call it in the UK, outdoor education, recreation and training (in strict alphabetic order as those towards the end of the line are always quick to point out) is, in Australia, evolving from its roots as a social movement into a profession or an industry. As Simon Priest points out, social movements and industries alike are noted for having life cycles of growth, steady maturation, plateau and decline after which they reinvent themselves or disappear. He places Australia at the point of maturation, some way behind the UK which he places in decline.

This paper then is written by one immersed in decline. Elsewhere I have written “Outdoor education is dead!” My purpose, like the warning from the grave, is to encourage you to structure yourselves in such a way that decline and reinvention is your future, and not disappearance. Maybe you can go one better and prove the textbooks wrong about this life cycle thing. Perhaps you will be able to add to my line “Long live outdoor education!”

That all sounds somewhat gloomy! I’ll continue on that theme and get the worst over with! Don’t have a “Lyme Bay” before you’ve got your act together. In the early 1990s, the UK was where you are now, exploring competencies, self regulation and quality standards. The UK is now dead in the water as a result of the caution, institutionalisation and bureaucracy that have resulted from that multiple fatality. There is hope, but it is not in the mainstream. I will come back to that later.

Don’t get me wrong, the market is very strong. Centres are full. Freelance staff are rushed off their feet, instructor training courses and degree programmes are full. I am not referring to turnover or bed nights but to the way in which the quality of the experience and the meaning that experience has for the participant has changed. The title for the keynote address, which this paper follows, was “Never mind the quality, feel the width!”

Roots

Outdoor recreation has many beginnings:
- The Woodcraft Folk, a Europe-wide liberal response to utopian ideals of democracy and natural living gathered from native Americans.
- Baden Powell seeking the moral equivalent to war after watching boys grow up as scouts in the Bohr War.
- Kurt Hahn’s ideas of Outward Bound and the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award Scheme based on the same German liberal education concepts about addressing moral decline in society that led to the Hitler Youth Movement, brought to the UK before exported worldwide.
- Jack Longland’s post-war educational idealism that dared to dream of things being different for the next generation and which led to White Hall Open Country Pursuits Centre, the first of many outdoor education centres blossoming under the wing of education authorities in the UK.
- The Brathay Hall Trust, founded on profits from insurance by philanthropist Francis Scott and established to broaden the horizons of urban young apprentices.
- The muscular Christianity of the YMCA youth camps and their belief in the wholesomeness of nature, community living and physical exercise.

The Sting

All have survived the test of time to date. All are based on the social ideal of helping people realise their potential in order to
create a better society. All have seen many of their dreams achieved though they often do not have time to notice whilst immersed in the dilemmas of the current age.

All are also suffering from massive structural changes. Funding from the government education purse has substantially declined. Programme directors who typically were lucky to have a petty cash budget within their control are now required to become managers exhibiting marketing, planning, finance and leadership roles instantly. Charity funding has literally become a lottery requiring managers to add fundraising to their portfolio.

By default, the social movement became an industry. It turned for its role models to the commercial sector, a growing and healthy but often ignored group involved in activity holidays (PGL, the UK-based company, is probably the biggest outdoor provider in the world) and corporate training (in the English Lake District alone, there are over 400 registered training companies, the biggest concentration in Europe).

I have written elsewhere about the consequences of becoming an industry. In summary:

- **Commodification.** The place, the activity and the outcomes become commodities with a trade value protected for their commercial worth and packaged like a product.
- **Commercialisation.** The goal of an outdoor organisation shifts from social good to business performance, especially surplus or profit.
- **Language.** The field describes itself as an industry with products, markets and customers.
- **Contribution to society.** Umbrella bodies and institutions start to talk about contribution to the nation and the economy. Your minister for sport and recreation opened your conference in just these tones.
- **Process.** Production line ideas capture a linear and logical model of programming with design, process, product, output and delivery.
- **Managerialism.** Outdoor organisations become obsessed by quality assurance, professionalism, qualifications, risk management and performance indicators.
- **Nature.** Once considered a home shared with many species, it is described as a resource and then an asset. Peter Hillary did just that at your conference.

**The Baby and the Bath Water**

You may say, “No bad thing.” The field needs to mature to reach more people, avoid environmental degradation, create a capital base, resource national and state infrastructures, and, crucially, ensure you do not have a “Lyme Bay.” After all, John Gans, in his keynote address to you, demonstrated how a non-profit organisation can hold true to its core values without being submerged by the consumer society.

I think outdoor education (I am using this term as the UK generic term for all that goes on outdoors) is in an unusual situation. Our relationship with nature and belief in community were not products with life cycles to be replaced by new lines once the market had dried up. They are, by default, in danger of being so treated now.

We, like society around us (and to which we were in part a remedial response), have become disembedded from our world. Place is no longer a home but a resource, an asset or, at best, an oxygen factory. Family and community are harder to define. More people are lonely. Capitalism and the market exemplify that disconnection and the rate at which we are unplugging ourselves accelerates. As we join in with the capitalist model (along with many other previous services including, in the UK, education and health care despite a labour government), we buy into the disconnection. Our core is no longer value-based but product-based.

As a result, outdoor education, in marketing speak, becomes demand rather than supply led. Instead of holding to our values as part of our culture, we respond to niches in the market wherever they are. What are those niches?

**Hypermodern Demand**

Again I have written elsewhere about the way in which outdoor experiences have
responded to hypermodern demand for
  • risk-free, instant adrenalin
  • quick-fix training solutions to
    organisational problems
  • instant behaviour modification for
dysfunctional youth
  • citizenship in a week for hard-pressed
  schools

The result is a growth in closed environment
facilities, by which I mean operations with
all their activities on site and constructed
rather than natural features. The typical
programme, with varying degrees of
facilitation and progression, will be a series
of multi-activity sessions led by instructors
with limited experience, unable to give
responsibility to the client for safety reasons.
An increasing number of centres in the
English Lake District make little or no use of
the national park outside their own grounds.
No local authority centre in the area camps
any more. The benefit being sought by these
trends is programme, safety and cost control.

Another emerging trend has been the
courting of outdoor education by the new
social institutions.

The Nanny State

Outdoor education is being courted by those
concerned with the moral order. In the UK,
non-government institutions are exploring
the value of outdoor education to address
problems of gender, ethnicity, drug use,
criminality, unemployment and emotional
deprivation. The education department is
considering outdoor education as a vehicle
for values, moral, multicultural, development
and environmental education. Citizenship
and sustainability are the buzz words.

I could get very excited about what outdoor
education could contribute to most of these
topics. What does concern me is the degree to
which outdoor education is being seen not as
a vehicle for exploring individuals' own
understanding and values in these areas, but
as a delivery mechanism for centrally
determined understandings and values, a
means of enculturation.

Liberation and Oppression

When the outdoors was twinned with
education, it was always going to be a paradox.
Adventure has always been a safety valve
where personal self-expression and freedom
from social constraint could be found.
Education at its best requires a sacrifice of
some of that self-determination in return for
the benefits of civilisation. Sometimes it is
reduced to vocational preparation or social
manipulation. This paradox is part of the
human condition. We are a social animal with
a strong inquisitive streak. It is inevitably part
of our work to work within this paradox. My
premise is that it is a central part of our work.
To stay in the swim, we cannot become an
agency of one or other worldview. Our desire
to survive in the marketplace for all the right
reasons is in danger of leaving those ideals
behind. What emerges may be a “good”
thing. It won’t be outdoor education. On the
other hand, I believe we can sustain outdoor
education whilst staying within, just, the
system and, even more, make a contribution
to the transformation of that business world
and to society. And I believe I have evidence.

The Phoenix Rises

Inevitably, for a radical domain such as
outdoor education, there are signs of a counter-
current. I will finish with a case study of one
such reinvention with which I have had the
pleasure to be involved. It, I believe, offers
lessons far beyond its watershed limits.

Eden Community Outdoors (ECO) is a non-
profit group based in the Eden River valley of
northwest England. The founders were
interested in reconnecting people with nature
and community. They believed that a
revitalisation of a sense of place was the way in.
By this they meant appreciation of that place,
attitudes to it, and action and involvement in
it. The place was defined by the bioregion, in
this case, the watershed of the river. They also
believed in minimal impact and revitalising
the local economy.

The group is a mixture of local people: two
part-time employed by the project, others
part-time freelance and volunteers. They do
not have a market or customers. Their approach
is partnership with other local organisations such as schools, youth groups, local businesses, villages, conservation sites, etc. Money, when it is involved, comes from the local community and is spent back in the local community, keeping it in the valley for that bit longer before it goes to a multi-national supermarket or petrol producer. They see employment as making a living, not creating (financial) wealth.

They provide experiences tailored to suit the partner but always from within their philosophy. For example, a senior school group worked with a local woodman to produce mobile shelters that are taken to local primary schools. A paid worker co-ordinates a group of sixth form volunteers previously trained in workshops to provide an outdoor experience involving expressive arts, craft work, martial arts, storytelling and adventure gaming.

Later, the young volunteers will undertake a journey into the next watershed to camp with their peers and exchange ideas and experiences. Meanwhile, the primary school revisits the shelters now set up in a local wood where they overnight whilst exploring the wildlife and working with wood to make bowls and spoons to take home.

A Metaphor for Ethical Business

As I write about ECO I can’t help making metaphoric connections with the kinds of relationships an emerging industry might aspire to developing and the sorts of issues it might need to address if it is to transcend the simple commercial model. For instance:

- Keeping the money in the family
- A self-sustaining resource base
- Partnership working
- Valuing diversity without straying from the core values
- Learning from other industry cultures and traditions
- A mixed economy of volunteer, non-profit and commercial work
- Thinking globally, acting locally
- Working from the ground up, embedded in our community
- Valuing and sustaining nature as an ethic
- Listening to intuition as well as rational argument
- Nurturing the radical for their creativity and new thinking

It is interesting to note how many of these criteria are just now being explored by the business world, including multi-nationals concerned about a customer base increasingly interested in the ethics by which goods are produced and supplied. Workforces, where they are not oppressed, are also expressing similar concerns about their labour being applied in ethical ways.

Just at the time that our current Western version of growth capitalism is widely accepted as having no clothes on, we are jumping on the band wagon. Since it is the dominant paradigm, we do need to relate to it and make it work for us. At the same time, we need to have an eye out for alternatives and nurture them. With our special connection with nature and community, we have an opportunity to make a contribution to any emergent new directions that will nurture our values at the same time as steer nations and economies into a new and hopefully sustainable future.

At the same time, we can be involved with, as a student recently put it to me, “a class in philosophy — a search for the truth — touching the real.” Not a bad endeavour to adopt as a career.

Notes

1. In this conference keynote, Simon Priest suggested that social movements have a lifecycle of 50 years and that outdoor education in the UK was coming to the end of that period whilst the USA and Australia were maturing, and initiatives in South Africa were just setting out.

Chris Loynes is a lecturer at St. Marten’s College in Ambleside, England.
Abstracts of Recent Research

Editor’s Note: Here are three abstracts taken from leading academic journals, for papers focused on craft and technology (following up on recent Pathways theme issues). Please send abstracts of other papers on these topics to Bob Henderson, Editorial Board Chair, so that we can continue to build on these themes in future issues.


In this paper I discuss issues concerning pedagogical practice and inquiry in Outdoor Education raised by recognition that the human body inhabits a “technological lifeworld.” The intent is to challenge certain assumptions regarding interpretations of “experience,” “the environment” and “the body” in Outdoor Education practice. The theory and practice of Outdoor Education recognizes that knowing becomes embodied through action. This process is often aided by pre-action focussing and post-action reflection. I argue that the stated educational goals of many Outdoor Education programs are made vulnerable due to the “hidden work” of technologies encountered and inattention to the significance of technology in experience. The approach employed in this paper is to relate a brief overview of philosophical inquiry into technology and the body to the discussion of two exhibits (a spoon and a three-legged stool), both objects, crafted by secondary school students as a part of their outdoor and environmental education. I conclude that human and environmental well being cannot be separated in the technological lifeworld that humans are destined to inhabit, and that Outdoor Education must sustain a broad range of technologically mediated experiences of the environment through, with and in the body.


This paper begins with the author’s personal experiences and interest in relating to the land through crafting activities. It then briefly outlines some historical context about the ways craft curricula has been associated with environmental education. The significance of using crafting activities as a way of attending to embodied knowing and creating a practical context for learning/making is discussed. Crafting activities are recognized as a way of engaging and interacting with the environment in a manner that may encourage a sense of reciprocity with the Earth and ultimately a deeper relationship with the land. Based upon a collection of crafting narrations, the author outlines eight guideposts and how each guidepost can be used to explore various perceptions of the environment.


Many experiential education programs are developed on pillars promoting craftsmanship. Changing cultural situations have altered both our definition of craftsmanship, and the experiences offered to participants that influence their concept of craftsmanship. By using Kurt Hahn’s educational ideas, various experiences are explored and critiqued to determine what they offer the participant. Presented is an exploration of Kurt Hahn’s ideas and why they encourage the concept of craftsmanship to arise from craft making experiences.
COEO Annual Awards

The Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario (COEO) depends upon members stepping forward to carry out the mandate of the organization. Our annual awards provide an important opportunity to recognize individual and group efforts, as well as to celebrate the many and varied expressions of outdoor education within our organization and the province of Ontario.

COEO members are encouraged to put forward the names of deserving candidates for these awards. Nominations should include the following information: name and contact information for nominator; name and contact information for nominee; award category; and a summary of achievements related to award criteria.

Nominations may be sent to Mary Gyemi-Schulze, the COEO Past President, no later than Friday, September 10, 2004. See the inside cover of Pathways for contact information.

Robin Dennis Award
This award was created in tribute to Robin Dennis, one of the founders of Ontario outdoor education in the 1950s and 1960s. It is presented to an individual, outdoor education program, or facility that has made an outstanding contribution to the promotion and development of outdoor education in the province.

1976 Murray Finn
1977 Toronto Island Natural Science School
1978 Ron Frenette
1979 Ralph Ingleton
1980 Bob Pieh
1981 Jack Passmore
1982 Bill Andrews
1983 Audrey Wilson
1984 Jean Wansborough
1985 Leslie M. Frost
1990 Cathy Beach
1991 No award given
1992 No award given
1993 No award given
1994 Frank Glew
1995 Bert Horwood
1996 Outdoor Ed., Etobicoke Board
1997 Seneca College
1998 Outdoor Recreation Technician Co-op Program
1999 Camp Tawingo
2000 Alice Casselman
2001 Kortright Centre for Conservation
2002 Toronto District School Board
2003 No award given

Dorothy Walter Award for Leadership
This award was created in 1986 to recognize an individual who, like Dorothy Walter, has shown outstanding commitment to the development of leadership qualities in Ontario youth through outdoor education.

1986 Dorothy Walter
1987 Ginny Moor
1988 Clare Magee
1989 Jim Smithers
1990 Jerry Jordison
1991 No award given
1992 Grant Linney
1993 No award given
1994 Cathy Beach
1995 Mary Jean Barrett
1996 Rob Heming
1997 James Raffan
1998 Bob Henderson
1999 Linda Leckie
2000 Skid Crease
2001 Bert Horwood
2002 Grant Linney
2003 No award given

Honorary Life Membership Award
This award recognizes the substantial and lasting contributions of long-time and esteemed members of COEO who are a vital part of its traditions and successes. A candidate should meet the following criteria:

- 10 or more years of distinguished service in the field of outdoor education
- Held leadership positions within COEO for several years
- Nominated by three COEO members

1980 Bud Wiener
1981 John Aikman
1983 Dorothy Walter
1984 Lloyd Fraser
1985 Clarke Birchard
1986 Jan Stewart
1988 Harris Gibson
1990 Ralph Ingleton
1991 Audrey Wilson
1992 Rod Ferguson
1994 Chuck Hopkins
1999 Mark Whitcombe
2000 Bob Henderson

President’s Award
This award is presented to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution to the development of COEO, and to outdoor education in Ontario.

1979 Jim Coats
1980 Dorothy Walter
1981 Bob Houston
1982 Lloyd Fraser
1983 Clarke Birchard
1984 Alice Casselman
1985 Brent Dysart
1986 Barrie Martin
1987 Sue Brown
1988 Dennis Hitchmough
1989 Jan Stewart
1990 Mark Whitcombe
1991 Bob Henderson
1992 John Aikman
1993 No award given
1994 Margit McNaughton
1995 Linda McKenzie
1996 Gina Bernabei
1997 Ian Hendry
1998 John Etches
1999 Glen Hester
2000 Jim Gear
2001 Bonnie Anderson
2002 Mary Gyemi-Schulze
2003 No award given

1986 Dorothy Walter
1987 Ginny Moor
1988 Clare Magee
1989 Jim Smithers
1990 Jerry Jordison
1991 No award given
1992 Grant Linney
1993 No award given
1994 Cathy Beach
1995 Mary Jean Barrett
1996 Rob Heming
1997 James Raffan
1998 Bob Henderson
1999 Linda Leckie
2000 Skid Crease
2001 Bert Horwood
2002 Grant Linney
2003 No award given

1980 Bud Wiener
1981 John Aikman
1983 Dorothy Walter
1984 Lloyd Fraser
1985 Clarke Birchard
1986 Jan Stewart
1988 Harris Gibson
1990 Ralph Ingleton
1991 Audrey Wilson
1992 Rod Ferguson
1994 Chuck Hopkins
1999 Mark Whitcombe
2000 Bob Henderson
Interested in Outdoor & Environmental Education?

The Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario presents

ROOTS and WINGS

COEO Conference

September 24-26, 2004

Tim Horton Onondaga Farms - Cambridge, Ontario

"Celebrating strong traditions while seeking innovative programmes and new conceptualizations in Outdoor Education"

Keynote Speaker: Chris Lyones, International OEE Speaker
Live concert by Ian Tamblyn - Canadiana Folk Music

Sessions include: Greening curriculum, Wilderness survival & cookery, Teaching strategies for the outdoors, Batik, Digital Photography, Agriculture in the classroom, Yurts & Structures, Songwriting, Democratic Education, Northern teacher experiences, Birding, Bias balance in OEE, & much more!

Register before July 31/04 & Be Eligible to Win an ABS Canoe!
Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario

Membership Application Form
(Please Print)

Name: (Mr./Mrs./Ms/Miss) ____________________________________________
Street Address ______________________________________________________
City/Town ____________________________ Province _________ Postal Code _______
Telephone (Home) (___) _________________ Business (___) ____________________
E-mail ____________________________________________

Type of Membership

☐ Regular $50.00       ☐ Student $35.00       ☐ Family $60.00
☐ Library $60.00 (Subscription to Pathways only) ☐ Organizational $100.00

(Organizational Memberships are for business, conservation authorities, outdoor education centres, etc. This rate will include 1 copy of Pathways, a web link (if requested in writing), maximum of 3 people at a members rate for conferences and workshops, reduced cost of add space in Pathways and display space at conferences.)

United States orders please add $4.00 International Orders please add $10.00

COEO Membership is from September 1–August 31 of any given year

Please send this form with a cheque or money order payable to:

The Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario
1185 Eglinton Ave. East, Toronto, ON M3C 3C6

Each member of COEO will be assigned to a region of the province according to the county in which they live.

Central (CE) Niagara South, Lincoln, Hamilton-Wentworth, Halton, Peel, York, Simcoe, Metro Toronto


Far North (FN) Patricia, Kenora, Thunder Bay, Algoma, Cochrane, Sudbury, Rainy River, Timiskaming

Northern (NO) Parry Sound, Nipissing, Muskoka, Haliburton, North Bay

Western (WE) Essex, Kent, Elgin, Lambton, Middlesex, Huron, Bruce, Grey, Dufferin, Wellington, Waterloo, Perth, Oxford, Brant, Haldimand-Norfolk