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ABSTRACT

Little research of the occupational socialization of adventure educators (AEs) has previously been conducted. The research described in these papers built on the embryonic work in this field. The purpose of Study 1 was to determine how occupational socialization shaped the practices and perspectives of two experienced and expert AEs. The purpose of Study 2 was to describe (a) the perspectives and beliefs of recruits as they began adventure education instructor education (AEIE) and (b) the elements within the recruits’ acculturation that led to these perspectives and beliefs. The purpose of Study 3 was to determine the influence of one AEIE program on the perspective and practices of preservice AEs (PAEs).

Two experienced AEs participated in Study 1. In Study 2, 20 recruits beginning their AEIE participated in the study. Within Study 3, 15 PAEs and 1 instructor were the participants. All three studies used qualitative techniques to collect data which were analyzed by employing analytic induction and constant comparison.

Results for Study 1 revealed how the AEs’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization led them to possess sophisticated and advanced, but slightly differing, perspectives on adventure education, pedagogies for teaching it, and AEIE. Key factors in the development of these perspectives and practices were the AEs’ early and positive experiences of adventure and the outdoors and their master’s degree programs. Results for Study 2 revealed that recruits possessed one of three orientations (leisure orientation, outdoor pursuits orientation, or adventure orientation) along a continuum than ranged from weak to strong. Factors shaping these orientations were family and friends, experiences of outdoor and
adventurous activities, experiences working as counselors, timing of occupational selection and age, and various secondary attractors including the motivation to remain connected to the world of adventure. Results for Study 3 revealed how the PAEs’ orientations were shaped by the differing acculturation they experienced. The study’s findings also suggested that well-taught AEIE had helped those PAEs near to completing the program acquire a relatively sophisticated adventure orientation regardless of the orientations with which they commenced their training. Implications for each study are discussed in detail within each study.
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CHAPTER I

THE OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF TWO EXPERIENCED AND EXPERT ADVENTURE EDUCATORS

Abstract

Previous research of why inexperienced adventure educators’ (AEs) think and teach as they do has provided findings that suggested how AE instructor education (AEIE) might be improved. The purpose of this study was to determine how occupational socialization shaped the practices and perspectives of two experienced and expert AEs. Several qualitative techniques were used to collect data. Analysis involved using analytic induction and constant comparison to categorize these data. Categories were then collapsed into meaningful themes. Results revealed how the AEs’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization led them to possess sophisticated and advanced, but slightly differing perspectives on adventure education, pedagogies for teaching it, and AEIE. Key factors in the development of these perspectives and practices were the AEs’ early and positive experiences of adventure and the outdoors and their master’s degree programs. Implications for AEIE are discussed.

Introduction

Occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014; Schempp & Graber, 1992) has been used as a theoretical perspective by researchers intent on discovering how preservice physical education teachers learn to teach (e.g., Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009) and why in-service physical
education teachers teach as they do (e.g., Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008; Flory & McCaughtry, 2014). In general, scholars studying physical education teachers have focused on their *acculturation* (i.e., the effects of socialization from birth to the beginning of formal teacher training), *professional socialization* (i.e., the impact of teacher training programs), and *organizational socialization* (i.e., the influence of the school culture on newly minted teachers).

Key findings of this research with physical education teachers have indicated that acculturation and organizational socialization are much more powerful than professional socialization. During acculturation, major influences on physical education teaching recruits’ views and perspectives about their chosen profession are sport and their parents, siblings, peers, and coaches (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), and their experiences in school during what Lortie (1975) termed the “apprenticeship of observation.” Most importantly, this research indicated that physical education teachers who, as children and youth, attend schools in which physical education is well taught and prioritized over extracurricular sport are likely to acquire a “teaching orientation” and have the same priorities themselves. Conversely, those who attend schools in which school sport is prioritized over a poorly taught physical education curriculum are likely to develop a “coaching orientation” and regard teaching curricular physical education as a “career contingency”; a necessary chore they endure in order to focus on what they really want to do—coach extracurricular sport (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

Recruits entering physical education teacher education (PETE) with “hard core” coaching orientations are unlikely to have their perspectives about the subject changed during the program whatever its strength (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). Moreover, weak
PETE is likely to reinforce the perspectives of coaching oriented recruits (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Well taught PETE, however, can turn recruits with moderate coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1996) and strengthen the skills, perspectives, and resolve of those with teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Strong PETE programs appear to be those staffed by sport pedagogy specialists who do not coach university sports teams and agree philosophically on a “shared technical culture” (Lortie, 1975) (i.e., the skills and knowledge needed by physical education teachers). Moreover, instructors within PETE programs are more likely to be effective if they actively challenge faulty beliefs (i.e., coaching orientations) (Schempp & Graber, 1992) and are credible role models in the eyes of their charges (Curtner-Smith et al. 2008).

Important socializing agents influencing young teachers entering the workplace include pupils, administrators, senior colleagues, and parents (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). In general, these agents serve to preserve the status quo by forming what Zeichner and Tabachnik (1983) termed the “institutional press” and squeezing the pedagogical life out of new teachers with innovative ideas (i.e., teaching orientations). As well as “washing out” new perspectives (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981), schools with this kind of conservative culture also reinforce those new physical education teachers hired with coaching orientations intact (Lawson, 1983b). Schools with progressive cultures, however, can serve to nurture incoming teachers with teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith et al. 2008; Lawson, 1983b).

Teaching oriented novices can react to the conservative cultures they encounter in their new schools by employing a number of strategies. Many will “strategically comply” (Lacey, 1977) and go along with poor practice, rationalizing that when circumstances
change and they get the opportunity they will revert to using the pedagogies they know to be effective. If this opportunity does not arrive early in a new teacher’s career, however, washout can occur and teachers employing this tactic may “strategically adjust” (Etheridge, 1989) and permanently alter their practice for the worse. In contrast, some teachers faced with less than optimal school environments attempt to “strategically redefine” them (Lacey, 1977). Specifically, they openly challenge poor practice and attempt change it for the better.

**Occupational Socialization and Adventure Education**

Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, and Steffen (2009) noted that research on the occupational socialization of physical education teachers has given PETE faculty insight into teachers’ thinking, the pressures they face, and their reactions to different types of training and school cultures, and so helped shape stronger PETE. Believing that similar gains could be made in adventure education instructor education (AEIE), in the only study of its type, these authors examined the influences of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of two inexperienced adventure educators (AEs).

Prior to the study, Zmudy et al. (2009) hypothesized that AEs would possess one of three orientations to their subject matter. AEs exhibiting a *leisure orientation* would merely supervise their charges as they played at adventure activities and provide no instruction. By contrast, AEs with an *outdoor pursuits orientation* would teach the adventure activities in the curriculum. Finally, AEs with an *adventure orientation* would *teach through* adventure activities by drawing from the components of a variety of experiential models of learning with the goal of helping students make friends, lose inhibitions, warm up to and talk with each other, problem solve, trust each other, and
accept and take on group challenges within low and high ropes activities (see Bisson, 1999).

The AEs in the Zmudy et al. (2009) study entered their formal training program with leisure orientations that were shaped during the acculturation period by family members and their own experiences of outdoor pursuits. This unpromising start was, however, partially rectified by strong professional socialization (i.e., AEIE). Specifically, the AEs were taught by innovative instructors with adventure orientations themselves who were credible, promoted a shared technical culture, and included courses on adventure education theory and outdoor pursuits. In addition, these instructors supervised connected field experiences. This training led to the AEs shifting to an orientation that was between outdoor pursuits and adventure.

On the downside, two key factors in their organizational socialization led to the AEs regressing to a perspective between leisure and outdoor pursuits. The first factor was teaching a conservative version of school physical education which led to skills and values being washed out. The second factor was the children they taught. These children were difficult to manage and organize. Consequently, the AEs were hesitant to employ the kind of indirect teaching styles called for within an adventure orientation.

**Purpose**

Zmudy et al. (2009) suggested that additional research of the occupational socialization of AEs was warranted to determine whether or not the findings of their study would transfer to other individuals. In addition, they argued that this kind of research could provide an invaluable and more sophisticated insight into the motivation and thinking of AEs and the degree to which AEs were influenced by different forms of
socialization. Finally, Zmudy et al. (2009) suggested that such research might ultimately lead to enhanced AEIE and improved instruction for children and youth. The purpose of the current study, therefore, was to determine how occupational socialization shaped the practices and perspectives of two experienced and expert AEs. The specific sub-questions that drove data collection and analysis were as follows: (a) What were the perspectives and practices of the AEs? and (b) How had the AEs’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization interacted to shape these perspectives and practices?

Method

Participants

Two experienced and expert American AEs participated in the study. Both were given fictitious names so as to protect their anonymity. Jim and Mike possessed doctoral degrees in sport pedagogy and worked as faculty in different university PETE programs. Both were Caucasian. At the time the study was completed, Jim was 58 years of age and Mike was 45. Part of both participants’ duties involved training preservice physical education teachers and graduate students to become AEs. Prior to the study’s commencement, Jim and Mike completed forms indicating their consent to participate in this research in congruence with the university’s policy on human subjects (see Appendix A).

Data Collection

Five qualitative techniques were used to collect data. Jim and Mike completed four formal interviews. The first formal interview focused on gaining an in-depth understanding of the participants’ perspectives on and practices in adventure education. The second, third, and fourth interviews focused on obtaining data that explained how
Jim and Mike’s perspectives and practices were shaped by their acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization, respectively. The interview on professional socialization included questions on the participants’ initial professional socialization (i.e., undergraduate training) and secondary professional socialization (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011) (i.e., subsequent graduate training). All formal interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. Jim and Mike also completed informal interviews whenever possible and convenient. Informal interviews, for example, included conversations with the researcher following courses, lessons, field experiences, and expeditions. The aim of these interviews was to gain greater insight into the participants’ perspectives and practices and the socialization which helped shape them. Document analysis was completed on Jim and Mike’s teaching materials relating to adventure education. Documents examined included unit and lesson plans, textbooks, handouts, and assessment and evaluation instruments. In addition, Jim and Mike were asked to keep a reflective journal in which they recorded thoughts about their adventure courses, classes, lectures, field experiences, and expeditions they led over the course of 1 semester. Finally, Jim and Mike also completed two stimulated recall interviews. The protocol for these interviews involved Jim and Mike being shown a film of their teaching of an adventure class. Periodically, the film was paused and the participant asked to provide a rationale for his thinking in the most recent pedagogical moment.

**Data Analysis**

The first phase of analysis involved sorting data into two distinct sets, each of which focused on one of the study’s two sub-questions. Specifically, the first data set was concerned with Jim and Mike’s perspectives and practices and the second data set was
focused on how Jim and Mike’s acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization interacted to shape these perspectives and practices. The second phase of the analysis involved employing analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) to code and categorize the data in each data set. During the third phase, categories within each data set were collapsed into key themes. Trustworthiness and credibility were insured by triangulating the findings from the four data sources, searching for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), and extensive member checking (Creswell, 1998).

Results and Discussion

Jim and Mike’s Practices and Perspectives

Adventures Orientation. Jim and Mike clearly possessed adventure orientations. For example, both of them described adventure education in terms of teaching through adventure activities, employing experiential learning models, and realizing a variety of affective goals. Interestingly, however, while Jim had an inward focus on realizing personal and social goals, Mike had shifted from this perspective and had an outward critical focus on improving society:

Adventures is going to be the same old Rohnke stuff. . . . It’s about putting people in unique environments, creating a sense of disequilibrium, and through the feeling of disequilibrium, providing the opportunities to make decisions about personal and social responsibility. I see the challenge course as a unique environment. (Jim, formal interview 1)

I used to define adventure education . . . as . . . putting people in situations that you do different activities during the different stages of adventure while working towards common goals and group development. And holding people accountable for the decisions and outcomes they come up with. . . . I look at it now, not just as a tool for group development, but also a tool for cultural competence and diversity education. Using adventure processes can be used to cross awkward barriers with people to learn about races, ethnicities, [and] to have conversations that really
force you to be vulnerable and to learn about yourself and other people. (Mike, formal interview 1)

Jim and Mike’s slightly differing adventure orientations were also reflected in their teaching. For example, at the beginning of his course on adventure theory, Jim stressed that personal and social development could only be achieved through adventure education if AEs provided a “safe environment”:

Early in the class, Jim defines adventure education, outdoor pursuits, and challenge by choice . . . . and explains the difference between adventure education and outdoor pursuits. He also provides examples of how challenge by choice and the full value contract can function within both adventure education and outdoor pursuits and can provide participants with a “physically and emotionally safe environment.” (Jim, field notes, adventure theory course)

Conversely, during a collaborative “adventure project” with faculty from his university’s Psychology and Social Work departments and staff from its Multi-cultural Center and Student Affairs office, Mike provided examples of how adventure education could be employed as a medium through which relations between different ethnic groups could be improved:

Sixty middle school students from two different schools, their teachers, and some of Mike’s student AEs are attending a workshop at Mike’s campus as part of the project. Mike leads all of the students and teachers . . . through the six stages of adventure. . . . Following the adventure games/activities, the group tours campus and Mike encourages them to use the skills he has focused on in the preceding practical session (communication, problem solving, trust, etc.). In a follow-up meeting with his students, Mike focuses on how students can use the stages of adventure to “bridge age and multi-cultural gaps on campus and within the K-12 system.” (Mike, field notes, middle school adventure project)

Finally, Jim’s inward focus and Mike’s outward focus within their adventure orientations were illustrated within their teaching reflections. For example, during one of his stimulated recall interviews in which he observed himself teaching “outdoor pursuits for physical educators,” Jim noted that
I would say that the adventure theory class sets the foundation on how you treat yourself and others with respect. Once the foundation is built, I am able to further develop the students' content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge so they can create a physically and emotionally safe environment in a variety of settings. (Jim, stimulated recall interview 1)

Similarly, Mike frequently wrote about "critical" issues in his reflective journal on which AEs could focus, including treating a "class [of students] as a small society;" "applying lessons to larger society," and examining "capitalist impacts" on culture.

Integrated Versus Differentiated Models of AEIE. In congruence the continuum of orientations described by Zmudy et al. (2009), and as alluded to in the preceding results sub-section, both AEs believed that there was a significant difference between adventure education and the teaching of outdoor pursuits. The latter, they agreed, involved teaching the "knowledge and skills associated with moving through the natural environment in a non-motorized way" (Jim, formal interview 1) and included "hiking, biking, canoeing, scuba diving, sailing, and skiing" (Mike, formal interview 1).

Reflecting their inward and outward foci, however, Jim and Mike had slightly different ideas about how to carry out AEIE. For Jim, with his inward personal and social focus, best practice involved employing a differentiated model of AEIE in which students took one set of courses focused on "teaching instructional strategies" for and content of various outdoor pursuits, and a separate set of courses on the principles of adventure that featured the learning of "problem solving" skills and "self-responsibility" through activity. At the end of their programs, however, students would be asked to use the principles they had learned in their "theory" classes while teaching the various outdoor pursuits to children. Conversely, Mike believed the best way to promote his outward focus to neophyte AEs was to employ an integrated model of AEIE in which adventure
principles and the content of various outdoor pursuits were taught simultaneously for the
duration of the program:

I look at outdoor pursuits as a potential venue in which to teach adventure education even though adventure education and outdoor pursuits are very different . . . I think you can teach adventure education through an outdoor pursuit. A ropes course doesn’t have to be the novel setting. A ropes course is just a tool, a novel setting. The novel setting could also be a really neat location like the everglades, or the mountains, etc. (Mike, formal interview 1)

Influences on Jim and Mike’s Practices and Perspectives

Acculturation.

Initial attraction to adventure. The root of the relatively subtle differences between Jim and Mike’s perspectives and practices as AEs appeared to be in their acculturation. Jim grew up in the relatively conservative rural Midwest and his initial interest in the field and subsequent “desire to learn about all things outdoors” was mainly “fostered and developed by his father” an accomplished “advocate of the outdoors” who took him “hunting, fishing, and rock climbing” from the age of 8 and through his youth. In addition, Jim grew up around male siblings, relatives, and peers who were also socialized into the “outdoor lifestyle” by their fathers or male relatives and adult friends in the same way. This collective socialization had the effect of normalizing participation in these kinds of activities and them becoming “common practice”:

Growing up in farm country led us to appreciate all things outdoors. It started with working outdoors on the farms with our dads, cousins, and siblings. When we did get time away from the farm, we were outside doing something else. We explored the local woods looking for places to hunt and fish. When we got old enough to drive we started exploring new places. That’s how I got into the rock climbing and hiking thing. (Jim, formal interview 2)

Conversely, Mike’s formative years were spent in the relatively liberal suburban West. Moreover, he was “encouraged to explore and be adventurous” by and during the
frequent camping trips he took with his “mom, dad, sister, and friends” as a child and youth:

It was very common for us to go sledding somewhere or go to a state park and swim in a river or grow a garden in the city. My dad especially instilled in us the sense of adventure. I just remember him over and over talking about how magical it is to be in a tent when it is raining. (Mike, formal interview 2).

These camping trips included two components which had a profound impact on Mike’s development of an outward critical focus on the community. First, they often included an “environmental element”:

We spent a lot of time outside doing various [camping and hiking] trips. We learned about the harvest and food process and how that happens. I found that experience to be wonderful and thought it was the greatest thing ever. (Mike, formal interview 2)

In addition, during lengthier camping expeditions with organized youth groups, Mike formed close bonds with some of the camp counsellors. His positive interactions with these young men and women served as his apprenticeship of observation into the outdoor and adventure education world:

In high school, I ended up going to leadership camps and summer camps. These really got me into teaching in the first place, because I enjoyed the process of group facilitation. I didn’t know it at the time, when I was 16-17 years old, that I was already learning the stages of adventure. Because it wasn’t spelled out that way. It was a Red Cross leadership camp. It was group facilitation, group development and processes, critical thinking, communication, problem solving, but they just didn’t name it by the same framework. (Mike, formal interview 2)

Career choice. Jim decided on training to be a physical education teacher and AE relatively late. Initially, he chose to go to university because he had the opportunity to participate on the wrestling team and his new teammates shared his passion for the outdoors. At this stage, he had little idea of the subject he wanted to major in:

On the recruiting trip everything was about the outdoors—hunting and fishing. There was way more exposure than I was used to growing up. To be honest, I
didn’t care what I studied. I just went to college to wrestle and shoot birds. (Jim, formal interview 2)

Once he arrived at university, Jim chose to major in Biology because “they gave me a very generous work study assignment, and the work study assignment happened to be working in the biology lab.” After 2 years, however, he decided to change to physical education because “biology was exciting for me to learn, but it wasn’t fun for me to teach.” In addition, Jim thought he would enjoy a career in physical education, mostly because it would allow him to “teach adventure education and outdoor pursuits stuff even though the formal stages didn’t exist yet.”

Mike decided his career path relatively early. Specifically, he knew he wanted to study recreational leadership before entering university, his goal being to obtain a

... professional degree [that] would allow me to have a career that was as close to being a camp counsellor as possible. And what I was looking for was to do fun and interactive work with people, not on a seasonal basis, but on an actual full time ... job basis. (Mike, formal interview 2)

Professional socialization.

Initial training. Mike entered his undergraduate program in recreational leadership with a perspective that was between an outdoor pursuits and adventure orientation with the goal of becoming “a camp counsellor forever.” Key “influences” on him during this program were “PE people [i.e., his instructors] because they were so inviting,” “outdoor pursuit experiences,” and his “recreational internship.” Specifically, these influences increased Mike’s “desire to teach and learn more about adventurous activities,” gave him the content and pedagogies to “make camping [and other outdoor and adventurous activities] fun,” and provided the tools and knowledge which would enable him to “collaborate with those outside his field.” Consequently, on graduation,
Mike enrolled in the newly designed “adventure program” in the university’s physical education department that gave him teacher certification. As Mike noted, three instructors, who possessed “good leadership traits” and “had really high expectations,” taught the seven courses within this component. Important content in these courses included “approaches and methods of teaching mountain climbing, hiking, ropes course facilitation, white water skills, etc.” In addition, Mike learned to “plan [adventure] content” and “the technical language of adventure.” Not surprisingly, then, the component had a profound impact on Mike’s pedagogical thinking and skills because “it really taught [him] about, active lifestyles through outdoor and adventure activities” and because he became “completely hooked” and came to believe that “our schools in the nation need this.”

Jim’s PETE program was rather less effective and influential than Mike’s program. Consequently, the leisure orientation with which he entered was largely untouched by the program’s formal curriculum. For example, Jim recalled that

> My college physical education teachers weren’t great. They were coaches with their master’s degree who were not prepared to teach what they were teaching. Even as ignorant as I was at the time, I could tell. (Jim, formal interview 3)

Moreover, Jim’s program did not include any formal coursework on adventure education. More positively, Jim explained that he learned “more about outdoor pursuits” at this stage of his life through the program’s “hidden curriculum”:

> A lot of my outdoor pursuit and adventure enthusiasm came from hanging out with my peer group who were also athletes. They also loved doing stuff outdoors. We liked the sense of adventure. We liked putting together trips and doing things off campus related to that theme. (Jim, formal interview 3)

**Graduate work.** Mike and Jim entered master’s programs within 2 years of gaining their initial teacher certification because they were ambitious and wanted
“something more.” Mike was prompted to do so by one of his undergraduate professors who told him that he “needed to get a master’s degree,” while Jim was encouraged to do so by “the older guys within his peer group” at his first school. At this stage of his career, Mike possessed a budding adventure orientation, while Jim’s enhanced content knowledge, experiences as a teacher, and the meagre pedagogical element he had encountered in his undergraduate program had led to him shifting to an outdoor pursuits orientation.

Both AEs believed that their master’s programs had been particularly influential because they were taught by “really good teachers” and had the “support of their peers.” For example, Mike explained that

My perception of an active lifestyle, especially that [master’s degree] year, expanded far beyond the notion of just exercise. “Active lifestyle” came to mean being socially active, active in leadership, active in professional development, . . . active in writing, active in everything you can think of. (Mike, formal interview 3)

Mike’s master’s degree program served to solidify his adventure orientation, while, crucially, Jim’s experiences at this stage of his career facilitated him shifting from an outdoor pursuits orientation to an adventure orientation. In addition, both AEs explained that during their master’s programs they learned to “develop content” and “analyze teaching” in different contexts. Only Mike’s program, however, included coursework specifically concerned with “adventure theory and content.” In contrast, Jim noted that his experience as a part-time instructor at the university while working on his master’s degree changed this thinking:

I got hired at the university as an instructor. . . . It was just part-time. It was better than a grad assistantship. . . . I taught classes for the university and I was a full-time grad student. I was primarily teaching . . . activity classes in adventure and outdoor pursuits. (Jim, formal interview 3)
Neither of the two sport pedagogy doctoral programs Mike and Jim completed included compulsory adventure elements. However, Mike read “about the 100 year history of adventure education” during his coursework and “applied theoretical frameworks from physical education to adventure education” within his dissertation. Coupled with his “supportive dissertation chair” who “forced [him] to look at the critical side of adventure education,” this latter experience had the effect of refining Mike’s adventure orientation. Similarly, Jim enhanced his content knowledge of adventure education during his doctoral work by “attending workshops and conferences” and working as “an assistant outdoor guide.” Both AEs also continued to participate in adventure activities at this stage of their lives, particularly “hiking” and “biking” (Mike) and “hunting and fishing” (Jim). In addition, they noted that the content, ideas, concepts, theories, research, and research paradigms they studied during their doctoral work led to them thinking more deeply about what adventure was and how it should be taught. Specifically, Mike explained that “the dissertation process really forced me to learn my stuff. It forced me to critically analyze adventure processes and how they can affect learning within the field of adventure education.” Furthermore, Jim noted that

Within my doctoral curriculum class, we studied the different models. I was naturally attracted to the adventure and wilderness model. I was able to implement the lessons learned in my curriculum classes within the adventure and outdoor pursuits classes I taught as part of my grad assistantship. (Jim, formal interview 3)

Organizational socialization.

Teaching in schools. Neither Mike nor Jim moved into ideal situations once they graduated from their initial training programs and began teaching. Rather than accepting
these situations as they were, however, both attempted to strategically redefine them and change them for the better.

Jim took a position in a private Catholic high school teaching physical education and biology. He was quick to point out that he received little help from the administration of the school, but incorporated ideas and practices he had learned in his undergraduate and graduate programs including “the use of curriculum models,” “effective teaching practices,” and “indirect teaching styles”:

I don’t know if they [i.e., the school’s administrators] were supportive as much as they just didn’t care. So what I did was take my stuff from college and added to the stuff that was already there. They were just happy they were getting good feedback from the students. There was no supervision. I had no feedback on my performance. It was a very loose arrangement on the aspect of teaching. (Jim, formal interview 4)

On graduating from his undergraduate program, Mike was unable to find a full-time job teaching physical education. Therefore, he spent 2 years substitute teaching “in three different school districts.” Although this meant he was “constantly on the move and detached” from other teachers and school staff, Mike made the most of this situation by attempting to incorporate many of the “adventure pedagogies” he had learned in college:

I rarely taught physical education. I spent most of my time subbing in math, social studies, and elementary classrooms. I had a really great relationship with the ... kids. I brought a lot of what I learned in adventure to the math classes and their other classes. I would direct their classes using stuff from adventure education and group development. (Mike, formal interview 4)

Specifically, the “adventure pedagogies” Mike incorporated into his teaching of classroom subjects included “creating an inviting atmosphere,” “group games,” and “letting them [i.e., the students] figure out social accountability.”

*Higher education.* Having finished their respective doctoral programs and with their own exemplars of the adventure orientation fully formed, Jim and Mike were hired
at two regional universities as “tenure-track assistant professors.” Both were asked to contribute to their respective university’s PETE programs and to implement AEIE programs and adventure-based service classes.

In this endeavor, Jim had to “start from scratch” and develop a program. Daunting as this prospect was, the fact that there were no existing agendas or faculty with which he had to compete made Jim’s work relatively easy and he was able to set about designing the program just as he wanted it:

When I got there, they didn’t have anything [in adventure] and there was nobody on campus that was interested in developing anything. I experienced no roadblocks when I tried to implement elective outdoor and adventure courses. The classes went over big, and we couldn’t offer enough of them. Once I obtained some professional development money, I obtained further training in my area of expertise [i.e., adventure education]. Eventually, what I did was obtain a grant to build a ropes course and the energy and momentum built from there. (Jim, formal interview 4)

Vital to Jim’s success was the high enrollment in the first set of service adventure courses he designed and taught. These included “a ropes course class, rock climbing, mountain biking, winter camping, backpacking, white water kayaking, and rafting.” This high enrollment led to the hierarchy of his department suggesting that Jim design an AEIE component to be housed within the PETE program. After 9 years, Jim’s success at his first institution and burgeoning reputation lead to him being head-hunted by another institution where he spent the next 21 years before retiring. At this second institution, Jim was able to replicate his successful undergraduate program and develop a master’s degree concentration in adventure education. The development of these programs was made relatively easy by the fact that Jim was hired as the “expert” and with a mandate, budget, and the “support of his colleagues and department chair.”
Mike’s induction into higher education was not as smooth as Jim’s had been. His ability to teach adventure education the way he wanted to was initially hindered by the fact that there were already extensive and well-established AEIE and outdoor pursuits programs on campus. This meant that Mike had to work within the system, as it existed:

You can’t just show up some place and start doing stuff, because it won’t work. You could have all the right tools in your box and even the tools that are needed at your new job. Your first attempt at using them is going to be clunky because the program you are walking into has a history that people are invested in. And the last thing you want to do is be the new person at the table shouting off all of your innovative ideas that you think are new cutting edge ways of doing things and see the rest of the faculty roll their cyces. (Mike, formal interview 4)

Crucially, Mike also had the support of his department head and was “cautious and patient” in his approach and interactions with his new colleagues. Initially, his focus was on learning about “the communication process that has to happen within a department” in general, and the AEIE program and outdoor pursuits service classes in particular. This was achieved by “listening to people in regards to how their personal ‘systems’ work”:

I started asking questions. First, “Where are you at with regards to your physical education philosophy?” “What is your standpoint on outdoor and adventure activities and their place within the physical education curriculum?” “What is the history of this program and how was it developed?” “What are the things you value?” [Eventually], things started to change. People started to be a bit more receptive and softened. (Mike, formal interview 4)

Since socialization is a dialectical process (Schempp & Graber, 1992), Mike’s interaction with the faculty in his new job meant that he was both shaped by the culture at his institution and helped shape it and the existing curriculum. Specifically, during his first 8 years on the job, Mike came to believe that “there [was] a difference between theory and application” and that “everyone really does care about the national standards and that adventure and outdoor activities belong in physical education.” Conversely,
Mike's main influence on the program came in the form of the new courses he designed and taught which included "a lifetime and leisure activities class," a "teaching outdoor activities class," and a "required adventure education curriculum class."

**Summary and Conclusions**

To our knowledge, this is the first study that traces the effects of occupational socialization on the perspectives and practices of experienced AEs. In congruence with the relatively large body of work on physical education teachers (Richards et al., 2014) and the one study of inexperienced AEs (Zmudy et al., 2009), the current study indicated that these experienced AEs' ideas about adventure education and pedagogies were formed and shaped by the interaction of their acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization.

A summary of these influences on Mike and Jim is provided in Table 1. The figure highlights the relative importance of the two AEs' acculturation and secondary professional socialization (i.e., master's degree work) on their orientations toward adventure education. It also emphasizes the differences between Mike and Jim in terms of the time it took them to become adventure oriented; Mike being relatively early and Jim being comparatively late.

A key result of the study was that it allowed us to refine the definition of the adventure orientation. Specifically, we were able to differentiate between an outward critical focus on culture and society and an inward focus on personal and social development. It is our hope that this refinement will prompt some of those responsible for designing ABIE curricula and courses to consider overtly examining and teaching both these foci.
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### Table 1

**Mike and Jim's Socialization Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Factor</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current orientation</td>
<td>adventure (outward critical focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractors to adventure education</td>
<td>camping trips, camp counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation at the end of acculturation</td>
<td>between outdoor pursuits and adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of career choice</td>
<td>relatively early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial training experience/adventure component/orientation at completion</td>
<td>positive/yes/adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in Schools/orientation</td>
<td>yes, as substitute teacher/adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate work/orientation</td>
<td>yes, master’s and PhD in sport pedagogy/adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in higher education/orientation</td>
<td>yes, one regional university/adventure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One previous study of sport pedagogy doctoral students indicated those who were late converts from a coaching orientation to a teaching orientation were still relatively conservative in their beliefs about physical education and PETE when compared to those who were teaching oriented at a much earlier stage of their development (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). The current study suggests that this finding may transfer to AEs since Mike’s (early convert to an adventure orientation) current beliefs and values were arguably more liberal than those espoused by Jim (late convert to an adventure orientation).

Another particularly salient finding of the current research was that, in congruence with the inexperienced AEs studied by Zmudy et al. (2009), the experienced AEs in the current study did not mention their own schooling as being a factor influencing their orientations to adventure education. Recall that the apprenticeship of observation is generally one of the strongest influences on the perspectives and practices of physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). We assume that school experiences were not referred to by the AEs in either study because adventure education was not taught within the physical education curricula or included as an extracurricular option at the schools they attended. It will be interesting to see if this finding is reversed if adventure education is more widely taught in American schools in the future.

Encouragingly, and in contrast to the inexperienced AEs studied by Zmudy et al. (2009), neither AE in the current study strategically complied with their unpromising first teaching positions or suffered from washout. Rather, they made the best of their situations, improved them, and continued to develop their adventure education skills. These findings suggest that those responsible for AEIE urge neophyte AEs entering the
workforce for the first time to act in a similar fashion. This could be achieved by providing their charges with the political skills to do so and describing the adverse conditions they might encounter, so insulating them from "reality shock" (Veenman, 1984).

The results of the study also suggest that those training AEs would do well to purposefully focus on moving their charges through the continuum of orientations; from leisure, through outdoor pursuits, and on to adventure; rather than this course of action being a hopeful by-product of their teaching. Specifically, trainee AEs could be asked to examine their own orientations to adventure education and to explore the factors that cultivated them. Such action should facilitate the deconstruction of faulty ideas and values and the reconstruction of more progressive and sound perspectives and practices.

More sociological research of this nature will allow us to see the degree to which the findings of this study transfer to other AEs with a range of experience levels. If, as with physical education teachers, fairly predictable patterns of socialization emerge, they should enable researchers to provide those responsible for AEIE with more specific advice on how to strengthen their programs.
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CHAPTER II

THE ACCULTURATION OF ADVENTURE EDUCATION RECRUITS:
DEVELOPMENT OF PERSPECTIVES AND BELIEFS

Abstract

Little research of the occupational socialization of adventure educators (AEs) has previously been conducted. The purposes of this study were to describe (a) the perspectives and beliefs of recruits as they began AEIE and (b) the elements within the recruits’ acculturation that led to these perspectives and beliefs. Twenty recruits at the beginning of their adventure education instructor education (AEIE) participated in the study. Data were collected with three types of interview. They were coded, categorized, and reduced to meaningful themes by employing analytic induction and constant comparison. Results revealed that recruits possessed one of three orientations along a continuum than ranged from weak to strong. These were a leisure orientation, outdoor pursuits orientation, or adventure orientation. Factors shaping these orientations were family and friends, experiences of outdoor and adventurous activities, experiences working as counselors, timing of occupational selection and age, and a number of secondary attractors including the motivation to remain connected to the world of adventure. Should the results transfer to recruits into AEIE at other institutions, the main practical implication of the study’s results is that they should provide the basis for AEIE faculty to understand and deconstruct the faulty beliefs and perspectives with which recruits enter their programs.
Introduction

Research on the occupational socialization of physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, in press, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Hutchinson, 1993; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014; Schempp & Graber, 1992) has indicated that their acculturation (i.e., pre-teacher training biography) has a powerful impact on how they react to and the effectiveness of their physical education teacher education (PETE) programs. Experiences prior to PETE lead potential recruits to form personal views about what the occupation of physical education involves and their ability to do the job. These views, collectively known as the “subjective warrant” (Lawson, 1983a), act as a filter for fresh information that recruits encounter during their PETE. Also influencing the subjective warrants of potential recruits are several secondary attractors to the teaching profession in general and physical education in particular (Curtner-Smith, in press; Hutchinson, 1993; Spittle, Jackson, & Casey, 2009). These include a continued connection to physical activity and sport, helping the community, working with young people, and comparatively long holidays.

Key socialization agents that shape physical education recruits’ subjective warrants during the acculturation period include parents, siblings, peers, teachers, coaches, and the institutions of sport and schooling (Curtner-Smith, in press). Indeed, Lortie (1975) referred to the 12 years most prospective teachers spend in schools as an “apprenticeship of observation.”

Prospective physical education teachers whose apprenticeships involve observing a weak, poorly taught physical education program, where priority is given to extracurricular school sport, often form what has been termed a “coaching orientation”
(Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016). Such recruits enter PETE intending to “teach” much as their own teachers did. For them, teaching is merely a “career contingency” (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Coaching orientations are strengthened when prospective teachers have been successful in mainstream sport themselves and have peers, parents, and siblings that espouse views in support of this orientation (Curtner-Smith, in press; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). While stronger PETE programs can overcome and change the faulty perspectives of those preservice teachers who enter with moderate coaching orientations, they generally make little or no impression on those with “hard core” coaching orientations (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010).

In contrast, recruits who experienced well-taught physical education as pupils and went to schools in which the subject was given priority over extracurricular sport often develop “teaching orientations” (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016). For these recruits, coaching is a career contingency (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Teaching orientations are likely to be strengthened when prospective teachers have participated in non-competitive sport or physical activity and have peers, parents, and siblings who have had similar experiences and so voice support of this orientation (Curtner-Smith, in press). Such recruits are more likely to be inducted during PETE and take on the beliefs and values espoused by the faculty who teach in those programs (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Richards et al., 2014).

A limited amount of research also indicated that that prospective teachers of all subjects, including physical education, make the decision to enter the profession relatively early or comparatively late (Curtner-Smith, in press; Lawson, 1983a, Lortie, 1975). “Late deciders” in physical education have been shown to be more progressive
and more open to altering their orientations when presented with new ideas during PETE than “early deciders” (Doolittle, Placek, & Dodds, 1993).

The filter of the subjective warrant continues to impact the perspectives and practices of newly minted physical education teachers once they enter the workforce. Those who begin their first jobs with coaching orientations intact are likely to resist the views and pedagogies of colleagues and administrators who emphasize physical education instruction over extracurricular sport and go along with colleagues who believe as they do (Curtner-Smith, et al., 2008; Richards et al., 2014). Conversely, novice physical educators who begin work with strong teaching orientations and have a superior, deeper, and more sophisticated understanding of pedagogy may challenge and resist poor curricular practice and even attempt to change it (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lacey, 1977; Templin & Richards, 2014).

Understanding how acculturation impacts and interacts with professional socialization (i.e., PETE) and organizational socialization (i.e., the influence of the school culture) has provided teacher training faculty with valuable information as they attempt to design stronger and more effective PETE programs. Knowledge of occupational socialization has also provided the opportunity to improve the induction process for neophyte physical education teachers once they begin work.

Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, and Steffen (2009) suggested that gaining a similar understanding of how those physical educators who work as specialized adventure educators (AEs) are socialized might also help enhance the quality of this closely related field. Like Timken and McNamee (2012), they suggested that the perspectives and values
about adventure education developed during the acculturation period would strongly influence recruits’ reactions to their formal AE instructor education (AEIE).

In what we believe to be the only study of its kind to date, Zmudy et al. (2009) examined the occupational socialization of two inexperienced practicing AEs. A key theory coming from this research was that recruits enter their AEIE with one of three orientations towards adventure education. These orientations are on a continuum from weak to strong and it should, these authors argued, be the primary goal of the faculty who staff AEIE programs to move recruits through this continuum. Specifically, at the weak end of the continuum, some recruits enter AEIE with a “leisure orientation” and believe that the objectives of adventure education are merely to supervise students and insure that they have a safe environment in which to “play” within the adventure setting. In the middle of the continuum, other recruits begin their AEIE with an “outdoor pursuits orientation” in which the goal is to teach students the skills needed to perform a number of outdoor and adventurous activities. Finally, at the strong end of the continuum, a third group of recruits may enter AEIE with an embryonic “adventure orientation.” When it is fully developed, individuals with this orientation view adventure education as a process in which one teaches through a wide range of outdoor and adventurous activities and draws from a variety of components within several experiential learning pedagogies (see Kolb, 1984). The goals of AEs with this orientation are to enhance students’ personal and social development as well as teaching the skills of various outdoor and adventurous activities. Specific personal and social objectives include learning to trust others, lose inhibitions, build teams, take initiative, communicate, accept challenges, and enjoyment (Hastie, 1992; Rhonke & Butler, 1995; Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003). For this reason,
students are asked to learn through direct experience (i.e., participation) and guided reflection (Knapp, 2010; Seaman & Rheingold, 2013).

Zmudy et al. (2009) also described the key socialization agents that shaped the perspectives and practices of the two AEs in their study during their acculturation and prior to entering AEIE. These included parents and siblings who participated in and were enthusiastic about outdoor and adventurous activities, summer camps attended as children and youth, and the counselors and AEs who worked at those camps.

The goal of the current study was to build on, refine, and extend the work of Zmudy et al. (2009). Its specific purposes were to describe (a) the perspectives and beliefs of recruits as they began AEIE and (b) the elements within the recruits’ acculturation that led to these perspectives and beliefs.

**Method**

**Participants**

Twenty recruits at the beginning of their AEIE at one regional university in the Midwestern United States participated in the study. The recruits were entering a program that led to the bachelor of applied science (B.A.Sc.) in environmental and outdoor education. Thirteen of the recruits were men and seven were women. Their ages ranged from 19 to 37 years. Nineteen were Caucasian and one was Hispanic. Prior to the study commencing, the recruits signed consent forms and were allocated fictitious names to protect their anonymity (see Appendix B).

**Data Collection**

Initially, the recruits were asked supply demographic data (i.e., age, gender, ethnic origin) by completing a short electronic questionnaire. All recruits then completed
three formal interviews. During interview 1, recruits were asked directly about (a) their perspectives on and beliefs about adventure education and (b) their acculturation pertaining to adventure education. Questions on the recruits’ perspectives and beliefs examined their reasons for enrolling in an AEIE program, their short- and long-term goals, and their views about the purposes and pedagogies of adventure education. Questions about acculturation focused on the recruits’ own experiences of and expertise within adventure education or related activities, attractors to the field, the timing of recruits’ decisions to enter AEIE, and key socializing agents including both people and institutions.

Following Hutchinson (1993), during interviews 2 and 3 recruits were asked to participate in role-play. In interview 2, the first author took on the role of a newly hired AE in a school and the recruits were asked to provide advice on program purposes, content, pedagogies, assessment, and organization. During interview 3, recruits were asked to imagine that they had just been hired in their first position at a summer camp following graduation. They were then asked to respond to three fictional scenarios describing the adventure education programs they might encounter. The first scenario described a program staffed by AEs with leisure orientations, the second scenario described a program taught by AEs with outdoor pursuits orientations, and the third scenario described a program led by AEs with adventure orientations. All three formal interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

The first phase of the analysis process involved sorting data into those that described the recruits’ perspectives and beliefs about adventure education and those that
explained how they were socialized towards these perspectives and beliefs. Separate inductive analyses were then completed with each data set during which analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) were used to code and categorize the data. Thirdly, categories within each data set were collapsed into meaningful themes. Trustworthiness and credibility of the analysis were established through triangulation, member checking, and a search for negative cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984)

Results and Discussion

Perspectives and Beliefs

Orientations. Three distinctive groups of recruits were identified during the course of the study. The members of these groups had different subjective warrants and espoused beliefs and perspectives congruent with a leisure orientation, outdoor pursuits orientation, or adventure orientation.

Leisure orientation. Twelve of the recruits espoused views and perspectives consistent with a leisure orientation. This group suggested that the primary goals and purposes of the subject were to provide children and youth with the opportunity to “experience” the outdoors in a “fun,” “exciting,” and “enjoyable” manner. This was to be achieved by “getting outside” and “partaking” in outdoor and adventurous activities. Typical of their comments regarding objectives was the following:

It is all about getting outside and having a good time. I think people want that adrenaline rush that being outside gives them. I think that adrenaline rush is what makes things fun. So yeah, you have to figure out a way to give people a rush of some sort. (Shane, formal interview 2, leisure orientation)

Outdoor pursuits orientation. Six of the recruits provided purposes and goals of adventure education that were consistent with an outdoor pursuits orientation. As
illustrated in the following extract, members of this group identified strongly with the outdoor pursuits oriented AEs described in the second fictional scenario in interview 3:

I like instructors that are skilled and can break things down. Most outdoor skills are more complex than they seem. So in order to teach them you need to know all the little nuances of the specific skills. Making complex skills seem simple is the trick to getting people going and being active. (Alex, formal interview 3, outdoor pursuits orientation)

In addition to being interested in facilitating enjoyment and excitement, these recruits believed that students should be encouraged to “learn about... outdoor activities” and were focused on “sharing skills” with students that were “essential to” performing within specific outdoor pursuits:

I would really like to teach people how to get outdoors. I’d like to teach beginners how to do some certain skills or help people become independent and be able to do things by themselves. Things like pick out proper gear, read a map, pack proper food. (Kyle, formal interview 1, outdoor pursuits orientation)

Furthermore, recruits with an outdoor pursuits orientation included an “environmental/political component” within their descriptions of goals and purposes. Specifically, they suggested that students should “learn” to “connect” with “the earth” and gain an “awareness of environmental issues in the world.” Moreover, they believed that an AE’s duties should include “educating others on the importance of mother nature” and “making people aware of the environment and how they interact with it daily.”

Typical of these environmentally focused comments was the following:

The purpose should be to get people aware of the outdoors. . . Most people don’t know the positive effects that it can have. And you want them to be respectful of the outdoors. To be able to enjoy it responsibly. (Elyssa, formal interview 2, outdoor pursuits orientation)

Adventures orientation. Surprisingly, two of the recruits indicated that they possessed the beginnings of an adventure orientation. Like their leisure oriented peers,
these recruits also stressed the importance of students “having fun,” and in a similar manner to their outdoor pursuits orientated colleagues, they argued that AEs should teach “skills” and “how information about the natural world can be used in everyday lives.” In addition, they included goals that involved teaching through the adventure medium to achieve health-related and a limited number of personal and social objectives. For example, they suggested that the subject should be concerned with “promoting healthy bodies and minds” and “about teaching people stuff that they can use in their everyday lives.” Examples of this “stuff” included “how to interact in groups” and “bond with others,” “allowing students to transcend [their] personal limitations,” “learning about peers,” and “helping others feel comfortable.”

Finally, adventure oriented recruits were particularly critical of the fictional program taught by leisure oriented AEs given to them in interview 3, suggesting that such instructors should be “fired.” In contrast, they were highly supportive of the fictional adventure oriented AEs described in the same interview, calling them “top performers,” and suggesting that they were “the kind of people you want to stay around” in a program:

I would say that in my experience in learning from different teachers, those like these [i.e., with adventure orientations] are the best. They can do it all. So I guess those people would be the people I put in charge of the other people, if that makes any sense. (Cort, formal interview 3, adventure orientation)

Characteristics of effective AEs. The views as to what constituted effective instruction in adventure education differed between the three groups of recruits.

Leisure oriented group. The leisure oriented group suggested that adventure education programs should typically involve children and youth “experiencing” a relatively narrow range of outdoor pursuits including “hiking,” “backpacking,” “canoeing,” and “camping.” Rather than teaching and evaluating the skills essential to
performing these activities, however, members of this group focused on student “involvement” and “keeping people from harm” and suggested any assessment conducted be based on “participation,” “following protocols,” and “attendance”:

Because the goal is to get outside and have fun, I don’t think we should worry too much about A’s, B’s, or C’s. More or less, outdoor classes should be pass or fail. If you do it, you pass. If you don’t do it, you don’t pass. (Abby, formal interview 2, leisure orientation)

Finally, this group of recruits were unable to suggest much in terms of the teaching skills needed by AEs. Instead, they focused almost exclusively on the personal and social characteristics that they believed AEs needed. These included possessing a “positive attitude” and being “easy to work with” and “approachable”:

Being a nice person goes a long ways. If a person is kind, caring, and understanding, they can get a lot out of their group. Just flashing a smile can go a long ways to getting people to do things and feel comfortable. (Sam, formal interview 2, leisure orientation)

Outdoor pursuits oriented group. The outdoor pursuits group argued that the adventure curriculum should include a relatively expansive range of adventurous activities. These included all of the activities listed by the leisure oriented recruits as well as “winter camping,” “snowshoeing,” “orienteering/geocaching,” “rock climbing,” “kayaking,” and “paddle boarding.” Moreover, they suggested “striking a balance” between “the fun stuff” (i.e., simply participating) and “learning.” As well as suggesting that effective AEs needed to build “positive connections with students,” this latter component, they noted, could only be achieved when AEs possessed “expertise” in terms of good content knowledge and pedagogical skill. They defined content knowledge as “understanding necessary skills” to be taught and suggested that AEs with exceptional content knowledge should be “persuaded . . . to help other [AEs].” They defined
pedagogical skill in terms of direct instruction, specifically “engaging students,” “clearly explaining objectives,” and “giving feedback”:

When teaching outdoor skills like camping/canoeing, you need to break things into little chunks. You need to learn the parts of the paddle and canoe. Then you need to learn the strokes and how to portage. When teaching camping you need to talk about menu planning and how to operate stoves. You also need to talk about how to pack and use certain equipment like tents and dry bags. You need to practice all these things before you can teach them. (Alex, formal interview 2, outdoor pursuits orientation)

Moreover, recruits in the outdoor pursuits group noted the importance of AEs being able to manage well by stressing the need to “have a plan,” in order to “manage risks.” Finally, they suggested that children and youth should be evaluated in the adventure setting based on “how they can perform tasks,” their “ability to process information” and their “knowledge of the natural environment,” as well as effort, and that this could be achieved by “testing” students and the use of “written exams.”

**Adventure oriented group.** Adventure oriented recruits also suggested that an adventure education program be organized around a series of units or “experiences” based on various outdoor and adventurous activities. The range of activities they included, however, was greater than that of their peers with either of the other two orientations. For example, in addition to the activities listed by the leisure and outdoor pursuits oriented recruits they suggested teaching “team building exercises,” “communication activities,” and “forestry practices,” as well as studying the “ecology.”

The adventure oriented group also realized that high quality AEs needed be good managers, “enhance group communication,” “create a level of excitement,” “understand group dynamics,” and were keen that “participants” “learned something new.”
addition, they championed the use of indirect teaching styles intended to promote personal and social growth:

I think it is important to get communication going. Get everyone talking. Once people feel comfortable talking then you can get them thinking a bit deeper about things, whether that be the subject at hand or life in general. Having a couple different plans in mind can help you deal with different types of learners. (Kevin, formal interview 3, adventure orientation)

Factors Influencing Recruits’ Perspectives and Beliefs

Five factors within the recruits’ acculturation appeared to be responsible for their perspectives and beliefs regarding adventure education. These were family members and peers, experiences of outdoor and adventurous activity, experience of working as counsellors, secondary attractors, and timing of occupational selection and age.

Family members and peers. Regardless of their orientations, and in congruence with research on the acculturation of physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, in press) and practicing AEs (Zmudy et al., 2009), the recruits’ initial interest in a career as an AE came from their sense of enjoyment and “fulfillment” from participating in “outdoor experiences” which was kindled by family members and peers:

Multiple people influenced my decision. Firstly, I would say my dad influenced me. Growing up he was always the person to encourage me to go outside and experience different activities. This shaped my appreciation for the outdoors and is what led me to where I am today. Friends ... also helped to encourage me to ... to do something ... I love. (April, formal interview 1, leisure orientation)

Moreover, nine recruits also recalled that their family members and peers had encouraged them to enrol in an AEIE program:

My parents and my friends were my main influences to enter my current program. My parents introduced me to hiking, biking, hunting, fishing, and camping at a young age. When my friends and I were old enough, we continued to do it on our own. When I was trying to figure out where to go to college my parents pushed me to my current school because they had heard from their friends that my school had a good outdoor program. (Scott, formal interview 1, leisure orientation)
Experiences of Outdoor and Adventurous Activity.

Apprenticeship of observation. Also in congruence with the study conducted by Zmudy et al. (2009) was the finding that the recruits’ experiences of outdoor and adventurous activities heavily influenced their initial interest in a career in adventure education and helped shape their orientations. Early informal participation in the outdoors helped solidify this interest. Moreover, those recruits whose main exposure to the outdoors continued to be informal were more likely to possess leisure orientations, reflecting the fact that they had received little in the way of instruction:

We had a trail in our backyard so we would go exploring back there. They dug a pond when we were little, so we could swim or skate in the wintertime. And camping started when we were 6 or 7ish. I always remember being able to play outside and had swing set and a playhouse and that kind of stuff. And forts. So it has kind of always been part of my life. (Kari, formal interview 1, leisure orientation)

In addition, the formal adventure education that recruits experienced within “summer camps,” and “school physical education,” “youth groups,” and “afterschool programs” served as their apprenticeship of observation and helped shape their orientations. Specifically, those recruits who experienced formal adventure education in which AEs provided little in the way of instruction were more likely to possess leisure orientations, while those who were taught by AEs who appeared to possess outdoor pursuits or adventure orientations were more likely to take on these orientations themselves:

Getting formal rock climbing training from a guide really opened my eyes to how complex rock climbing is. I had no idea how much technique was involved with simply climbing. I really enjoyed learning the tips and tricks to becoming a better climber. (Josh, formal interview 1, outdoor pursuits orientation)

When I was in high school we were taught how to belay. We learned that a belay team consists of three people that need to double-check each other before we
could climb. It was neat learning what to look for and how to perform each job. (Kevin, formal interview 1, adventure orientation)

Activity type and level of expertise. The type of activity in which recruits participated during their childhood and youth as well as the level of expertise they had developed in various outdoor and adventurous activities also helped shape their orientations. Those recruits who participated in more traditional and conservative forms of outdoor pursuits such as "hiking," "backpacking," and "canoeing" were more likely to possess leisure or outdoor pursuits orientations. Conversely, those recruits who had participated in more progressive and newer forms of outdoor pursuits including "orienteering," "geocaching," "rock climbing," and "winter camping" were less likely to possess a leisure orientation and more likely to have an outdoor pursuits or adventure orientation.

Furthermore, in contrast to the research on physical education teachers (Richards et al., 2014), those recruits who had extensive experience and skill in one or two outdoor pursuits were more likely to possess outdoor pursuits or adventure orientations than those who had less experience and skill. This appeared to be because the more highly skilled recruits had acquired "skills they wanted to share" with those they would teach:

Learning how to orienteer and geocache has turned into one of my favorite hobbies. Learning to run a compass helped me get a good sense of direction. Learning to run a GPS [Global Positioning System] helped me explore new places I would have not explored otherwise. I love teaching my friends and family how to use them both, too, because it's fun and you can orienteer and geocache most anywhere. (Sally, formal interview 1, outdoor pursuits orientation)

Experience of Working as Counsellors. Six of the recruits noted that they had also worked as "counsellors" in various "summer camps," "YMCA camps," and "outdoor education camps" during their youth. The culture of these camps and the AEs with whom
they interacted also appeared to shape their beliefs and perspectives about adventure education. Cort, for example, recalled working with an AE who was “energetic,” “outgoing,” whom he wanted to “be just like,” and who modeled an adventure orientation:

Mike was one of the main reasons I pursued this dream. Seeing the energy he brought to the course everyday. Seeing the way he worked with participants of all ages was inspiring. I wanna be that guy that helps participants work past their fears. I wanna be that guy that gets people working together. (Cort, formal interview 1, adventure orientation)

More negatively, three of the recruits recalled working with AEs who modeled a leisure orientation. Generally, recruits who worked in these contexts also aspired to “model” the AEs they worked alongside. In contrast, Kyle noted that he had been less than impressed with the “methods” of instruction he had observed while working in summer camps and was determined to do better himself:

The laid back atmosphere of camp was kind of cool, but kind of frustrating at the same time. I really like doing outdoor stuff and I like to do it efficiently as possible. The laid back atmosphere at camp led to frustration because it led things to be disorganized. In the future, I would like to run things more efficiently and be more organized. (Kyle, formal interview 1, outdoor pursuits orientation)

**Secondary Attractors.** In addition to wanting to “teach,” the recruits were drawn to a career in adventure education by four secondary attractors. Consistent with the research on physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, in press; Hutchinson, 1993; Spittle et al., 2009), these included being “able to continue doing the activities I love,” “working with youth,” and “helping local people.” Mentioned by all the recruits, the most powerful of these attractors, was the opportunity to be able to continue participating in the various outdoor and adventurous activities in which they were interested:

I love being outside and being in nature. Soaking up nature and trying new adventures is what led me to the program. I do a lot of hiking and camping on my
own. I’m looking forward to learning how to do more outdoor activities during the program in hopes that I can someday get paid to do what I love. (Sara, formal interview 1, leisure orientation)

One secondary attractor not mentioned in the previous physical education literature that emerged during the course of this study was the reputation of the AEIE program and faculty as being “high class,” “fun,” and “interesting”:

I was originally in wilderness maintenance. . . . I came here undecided [on my degree program] and was just trying to get some credits out of the way, so I took a rock climbing and a canoeing class. The instructor for those two courses runs the environmental and outdoor education program. After meeting him and seeing the different ways to instruct and run things, I was hooked. (Luke, formal interview 1, outdoor pursuits orientation)

Timing of Occupational Selection and Age. Eleven of the recruits in the study decided to enter AEIE relatively early, while nine made the decision comparatively late and moved to AEIE having begun in another degree program. The majority of the late deciders were older than the majority of early deciders. In congruence with the research on physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, in press; Doolittle et al., 1993), the early deciders were more likely to possess leisure orientations, and look forward to “learning outside” during the program, as well as “not being stuck in typical classes”:

Listening to lectures gets real old real fast. I know it is necessary, but I look forward to getting outside and seeing new places and being away from campus. I know we will have to do some stuff here, but yeah, I’m really looking forward to getting off campus and seeing some new places. (Justin, formal interview 1, leisure orientation)

In contrast, the majority of the late deciders possessed outdoor pursuits or adventure orientations and were motivated by the prospect of learning “new ways to teach” and “bring people together”:

I look forward to learning how to instruct different groups of learners in an outdoor setting. I am sure that learning how to teach new activities will show me ways of approaching my job. In the end I hope to be able to show people how to
work together in an outdoor setting. (Kevin, formal interview 1, adventure orientation)

Summary and Conclusions

This study provided a detailed description of the beliefs and perspectives with which recruits entered AEIE. It confirmed, filled out, and developed the three orientations to adventure education previously identified by Zmudy et al. (2009). Specifically, recruits into one AEIE program were categorized as possessing one of three orientations along a continuum that ranged from weak to strong. These were a leisure orientation, outdoor pursuits orientation, or adventure orientation. In addition, the current study indicated that these orientations were cumulative rather than trichotomous. That is, each successive orientation along the continuum incorporated the positive aspects and rejected the negative aspects of the preceding orientation(s).

Within this study, we also described factors during their acculturation that shaped the beliefs, perspectives, and orientations of recruits into AEIE. Since this study was the first to focus exclusively on the acculturation of recruits who wanted to become AEs, we were able to provide a more detailed description of and unpack those factors previously identified by Zmudy et al. (2009), and unearth a number of new factors. These included the kinds of adventurous activities in which recruits engaged, their level of expertise in these activities, experiences as counsellors, the timing of occupational choice and age, and a number of secondary attractors, the most prominent being a desire to remain connected to the world of adventure.

Not surprisingly, some of the factors identified as shaping the beliefs and perspectives of recruits into AEIE in the current study were the same as or similar to those which have been shown to shape the orientations of prospective physical education
teachers (Curtner-Smith, in press; Richards et al., 2014). For example, family members and peers. Some factors, however, were different including, for instance, experiences working as counsellors. Moreover, factors that were the same as or similar to those influencing prospective physical educators frequently operated in different modes or had differing effects on recruits who aspired to be AEs. For example, while the context for the apprenticeship of observation for recruits into PETE is primarily the school, for the recruits into AEIE in the current study it was mainly the summer camp. In addition, whereas relatively high levels of skill and expertise in sport frequently led to prospective physical educators entering PETE with an inferior orientation to physical education, they played a part in facilitating a superior orientation to adventure education for the recruits into AEIE the current study.

Should they transfer to recruits into AEIE at other institutions, the main practical implication of the study’s results is that they should provide the basis for AEIE faculty to understand and deconstruct the faulty beliefs and perspectives with which recruits enter their programs. In addition, knowledge of these orientations and the people, institutions, and processes that shape them should help faculty move their charges to an improved understanding of what adventure education can be and the pedagogies by which it goals are achieved.
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CHAPTER III

INFLUENCE OF ADVENTURE EDUCATION INSTRUCTOR EDUCATION ON THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF PRESERVICE ADVENTURE EDUCATORS

Abstract

The research described in this paper built on the embryonic work on the occupational socialization of adventure educators (AEs). Its purpose was to determine the influence of one adventure education instructor education (AEIE) program on the perspectives and practices of preservice AEs (PAEs). Fifteen PAEs and their instructor were participants. Data were collected with six qualitative techniques and analyzed by employing analytic induction and constant comparison. Results revealed that PAEs entered the AEIE program with one of three broad orientations to their subject matter: a leisure orientation, an outdoor pursuits orientation, and a simplistic adventure orientation. In addition, they revealed how these orientations were shaped by the differing acculturation the PAEs experienced. The study’s findings also suggested that well taught AEIE had helped those PAEs near to completing the program acquire a relatively sophisticated adventure orientation regardless of the orientations with which they commenced their training. Keys to the success of the AEIE program were the blend of personal and pedagogical skill displayed by the instructor and the nature and sequencing of the coursework in which the PAEs engaged.
Introduction

Research examining the occupational socialization of physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014; Schempp & Graber, 1992;) has been useful for those intent on strengthening physical education teacher education (PETE). The literature generated in this line of study has shown that recruits do not enter PETE as “blank slates.” Rather, they arrive with perspectives on and beliefs about physical education teaching which have been shaped by their pre-PETE experiences or acculturation (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Key socializing agents and sources during this acculturation period which shape these perspectives and beliefs include parents, siblings, peers, teachers, coaches (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008) and taking note of what occurs in schools during what Lortie (1975) referred to as the “apprenticeship of observation.”

Collectively, the perspectives and beliefs with which recruits enter PETE form the “subjective warrant” (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). That is, each recruit has a firm idea of what physical education involves and of his or her ability to do the job. Moreover, these perspectives and beliefs serve as a filter for values and practices espoused by faculty during PETE. Those perspectives and practices espoused during PETE which run contrary to recruits’ subjective warrants may be rejected and those that are congruent with them are likely to be accepted (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Unfortunately, research has indicated that many recruits enter PETE with faulty perspectives and beliefs. Specifically, their acculturation leads to them possessing a “coaching orientation” (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008) in which the main goal of the job is to coach extracurricular sports teams and teaching curricular physical education is given little time or effort and viewed as a
"career contingency" (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). In contrast, relatively few recruits enter American PETE with "teaching orientations" in which coaching is a career contingency and teaching high quality curricular physical education is the priority (Curtner-Smith et al. 2008, Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). These recruits have usually had positive apprenticeships of observation in that they have experienced strong physical education programs as children and youth (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009).

Moreover, research has indicated that weak PETE programs exert a weak professional socialization. That is, they have little or no impact on changing the faulty perspectives and values with which coaching oriented recruits enter and may even serve to reinforce them (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Smyth, 1995). By contrast, strong PETE programs can change the values and views of all but the most hardened coaching oriented students and reinforce and enhance the perspectives of those with teaching orientations (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). Stronger PETE programs are generally staffed by teaching oriented faculty with specialist qualifications in physical education pedagogy, who do not coach university sports teams, and who agree on a pedagogical ideology and a "shared technical culture" (Lortie, 1975) (i.e., the teaching skills to be learned). Moreover, these faculty are credible role models in the eyes of their students and are prepared to tackle the faulty beliefs and values of those who enter their programs with coaching orientations and hold preservice teachers accountable for good practice by supervising early field experiences and the culminating student teaching internship very closely (Curtner-Smith, 1996).

Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, and Steffen (2009) suggested that studying the occupational socialization of recruits into the related field of adventure education may
lead to knowledge that also enabled the design of stronger adventure education instructor education [AEIE] programs within undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In the only study of its type to date, these authors examined the occupational socialization of two inexperienced practicing adventure educators (AEs). Within the study, they hypothesized that recruits into AEIE would enter such programs with one of three orientations that had been shaped by their acculturation. The weakest of these orientations was termed a “leisure orientation.” Recruits with this perspective would view the AE’s job as one in which all that was required was the creation of a safe environment in which students could “play” at the various outdoor and adventurous activities and little instruction occurred. The second orientation to adventure education that Zmudy et al. (2009) described was an “outdoor pursuits orientation.” Those with this perspective would view the job as one in which students were taught the skills of and held accountable for performing various outdoor and adventurous activities. The third and strongest orientation discussed by these authors was an “adventure orientation.” When fully developed, AEs with this orientation would, they suggested, believe that the job involved both teaching the skills and strategies of outdoor and adventurous activities and sports and teaching a variety of personal and social skills such as losing inhibitions and taking on challenges in social settings, team building, trusting others, communication, and enjoyment (Hastie, 1992; Rohnke & Butler, 1995; Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003). This latter objective would be achieved by drawing on various experiential models of instruction (see Kolb, 1984) and teaching through the medium of adventure by requiring students to reflect on their efforts having engaged in specific activities (Brown, 2009; Seaman & Rheingold, 2013).
Zmudy et al. (2009) found that the orientations with which the participants in their study entered AEIE were mainly shaped by family members who were enthusiastic participants in the outdoors as well as AEs they encountered as children and youth when attending summer camps. In addition, these authors noted that these orientations were changed for the better by an AEIE, which was staffed by specialist adventure faculty who held, modeled, and espoused an adventure orientation to the subject. Key to the faculty’s success was their credibility and ability to convey a collective message to their charges.

The goal of the current study was to partially replicate, build, and expand on Zmudy et al.’s (2009) work, particularly with regard to professional socialization. Specifically, its purpose was to determine the influence of one AEIE program on the perspectives and practices of preservice AEs (PAEs).

Method

Participants

Fifteen PAEs enrolled in one American university’s kinesiology master’s degree track emphasizing adventure education were the primary participants in the study. Five of the PAEs were women and 10 were men. Their ages ranged from 23 to 40 years. All were able-bodied and Caucasian. Thirteen of the PAEs had completed undergraduate degrees in PETE. The other two PAEs had earned degrees in recreation. Four of the PAEs were just starting their AEIE and were categorized as early-stage students (Kerry, Richard, Scott, and Sara), five were in the middle of the program and were categorized as mid-stage students (Nancy, Bret, Britney, Thomas, and Sam), and six were at or near completion of their AEIE and were categorized as late-stage students (Jake, Raymond, Sage, Nicole, William, Oliver). A secondary participant was the male faculty member,
Jim, who was responsible for running and teaching the program. All participants completed consent forms prior to the beginning of the study and were allocated fictitious names to protect their anonymity (see Appendix C).

**AEIE**

PAEs enrolled in the master’s degree took a number of core courses in sport pedagogy. These included courses on effective instruction, analysis of instruction, assessment, diversity, curriculum design, supervision of neophyte instructors, current ideas and issues, and research methods. In addition, the PAEs took four courses in their specialization. Crucially, these courses were aimed at socializing students toward adopting an adventure orientation to the subject.

The first of these courses was concerned with “adventure education theory.” It was centered on the seven stages of adventure education (acquaintance, deinhibitors, communication, problem solving, trust, low elements, and high elements) described by Bisson (1999) and activities that could be used and taught within each stage. In the second course, PAEs were taught how to set up an adventure education program within schools and the technical skills required to teach various outdoor pursuits and adventure activities. In addition, this course included components on risk management, the production of instructional materials, and how to plan field trips. There was also considerable emphasis on PAEs developing a “personal philosophy of adventure education.” During the third course, PAEs engaged in a seminar in which they discussed topics about and related to adventure education (e.g., teaching adventure education to diverse populations, influence of adventure education on self-concept, adventure education within physical education curriculum), and presented reviews of research they
had conducted on areas of adventure education in which they were interested (e.g., training protocols for adventure educators, impact of adventure education on self-esteem, assessment within adventure education programs). During the final course, the PAEs completed an off-campus field experience in an adventure education setting. This experience was of at least 48 hours in duration and included at least 10 children or youths.

**Data Collection**

Six qualitative techniques were employed to gather data. One *formal interview* of Jim, the faculty member, was conducted. This interview was focused on the goals of the AEIE program; the beliefs, values, and practices espoused within the program; and the pedagogical tactics and strategies Jim employed to realize his objectives. In addition, whenever possible follow-up *informal interviews* were completed with the Jim on the same topics.

Formal interviews of the PAEs focused on their acculturation, orientations to adventure education, their beliefs about and values for the field, the practices they espoused in the name of adventure education, and the degree to which they believed their AEIE had changed their perspectives and practices. Again, whenever the opportunity arose, informal interviews with the PAEs were completed on the same topics. All formal interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Notes on informal interviews were made as soon after each interview's completion as possible.

*Observations* of Jim’s teaching within the specialist adventure education coursework were also carried out, and two classes, identified by Jim as “typical,” were *filmed*. Copious notes were taken on the perspectives and practices that Jim espoused
during his teaching and on the PAEs’ reactions to these perspectives and practices. In addition, *document analysis* was completed on unit plans, lesson plans, assessment tools, and other teaching materials supplied by those PAEs who engaged in the field experience. Finally, PAEs were asked to write a one-page *narrative description* of the “perfect adventure education lesson” they would hope to teach on graduation.

**Data Analysis**

Initially, data pertaining to the PAEs’ perspectives and practices regarding adventure education and data pertaining to the effectiveness of the AEIE program were identified. Each of these sub-sets of the data were then coded and categorized using the techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Categories were collapsed into meaningful themes. The main goals of the analysis were to show any change in PAEs’ orientation to adventure education and to describe key components of their AEIE that led to this change. Trustworthiness and credibility of the analysis process were established by member checking, triangulation of data collection techniques, and the search for discrepant and negative cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

**Results and Discussion**

**PAEs’ Perspectives and Practices**

**Initial orientations to adventure education.** At entry into the AEIE component of their programs some PAEs were further along the continuum of adventure education orientations than others. Specifically, three of the PAEs (Kerry, Nancy, William) indicated that they possessed a leisure orientation at this stage in their training, while five (Richard, Sam, Bret, Jake, Sage) espoused views and practices that indicated they possessed an outdoor pursuits orientation. Surprisingly, seven of the PAEs (Scott, Sara,
Britney, Thomas, Raymond, Nicole, Oliver) suggested that they entered their AEIE with a crude and simplistic version of an adventure orientation.

At this stage, when asked about the purposes of adventure education, those with leisure orientations focused on “letting participants guide the lesson” and “having fun.” Typical of their comments was the following:

I start out trying to make an adventure lesson as fun as possible. I think adventure is different and fun—it is not something that is traditional. There are no skill-based activities. It is about having fun. Keeping it non-competitive takes some of the edge off and enhances the fun. (Kerry, early-stage, informal interview)

By contrast those AEs who entered AEIE with an outdoor pursuits orientation believed the purposes of adventure education to be primarily concerned with “teaching outdoor skills,” “checking for understanding when teaching skills,” and “teaching sport specific skills like how to build climbing anchors and do wet exits in a kayak.” Typical opinions on what the purposes of adventure education should be from this group are illustrated by the following data extract:

Knowing how to do outdoor activities such as camping, climbing, and belaying is important because it is the outdoor activities that make adventure education special. Without experience doing some of those things it would be difficult to teach adventure activities. (Richard, early-stage, formal interview)

Finally, those who began AEIE with an embryonic adventure orientation suggested that the purposes of their subject should include enhancing “personal and social responsibility” “within . . . the affective domain,” improving “decision making skills,” and “teaching students to be well rounded people.” The following data extract illustrates these beliefs:

You meet the group, you lay down expectations for the group. You make sure the group is physically and emotionally safe. You make the experience worthwhile for everyone in the group. Then when you are done you try to bring everything
full circle, hopefully by showing the group the benefits of working together.
(Scott, early-stage, narrative description)

When asked what they believed exemplary pedagogy in adventure education to be at entry into their programs, not surprisingly the three groups of PAEs had rather different responses. Specifically, those with leisure orientations focused on “well organized,” “safe,” and “fun activities.” Conversely, those with an outdoor pursuits orientation were concerned about “structured learning experiences,” “getting outside,” and “teaching the hard skills related to outdoor pursuits.” In contrast, those with an early adventure orientation described exemplary practice as being centered on “getting students to think differently,” as well as “moving [students] past their comfort zone,” and “promoting growth.” Thoughts on adventure education pedagogy at entry into the AEIE program by members of each of the three groups are illustrated in the data extracts below:

Adventure educators need to be organized because of the physical dangers that are presented by outdoor environments. Once the physical dangers are dealt with, it’s time to make things fun. We need to make sure we pick activities that the students are going to enjoy. I think the best way to do this is by using non-competitive activities. (Kerry, early-stage, philosophy statement)

When teaching outdoor adventure activities, it is important that everyone is familiar with the equipment that is necessary. If you are teaching orienteering, you need to show your students how a compass works. If you are teaching snowshoeing, you need to show your students the different parts of the snowshoe and how they work. (Richard, early-stage, informal interview)

Depending upon which age group you are dealing with, they are going to have their own unique needs. We need to make sure we are aware of those needs so we can teach them what personal and social responsibility looks like for them. (Sara, early-stage, informal interview)

**Changes in orientations.** During the course of the study, it became apparent that the 11 participants who were categorized as mid- and late-stage PAEs had shifted their perspectives and practices so that they were more closely aligned with what was
espoused in the AEIE program. Specifically, and as illustrated in Table 2, Nancy, who had commenced AEIE with a leisure orientation and was at the mid-point of her program, had shifted to an outdoor pursuits orientation. Further, William, who began AEIE with a leisure orientation and was near to completing his program, had shifted to an adventure orientation.

Moreover, those PAEs who began their AEIE with an outdoor pursuits orientation and were at the mid-point in their programs (i.e., Sam and Bret) had shifted to an adventure orientation. Similarly, those PAEs who began their programs with an outdoor pursuits orientation and were close to completing their coursework (i.e., Jake and Sage) had developed a relatively sophisticated adventure orientation.

Finally, those PAEs who began their AEIE with a crude adventure orientation and were at the mid-point (i.e., Britney and Thomas) or end (i.e., Raymond, Nicole and Oliver) of their programs had also developed incrementally more sophisticated adventure orientations over time.

Nancy, who had shifted from a leisure orientation to an outdoor pursuits orientation by the mid-point of her program, realized that her former perspective had been non-educational, but was not prepared to move to an adventure orientation at this stage mainly because she did not fully understand it:

When I got here I believed adventure education was just about being outside and doing something different than goes on in the gym. After taking a couple courses with Jim, I found that there is more to it. It’s about knowing what’s going on and having a skill set so you can teach others how to do something new. (Nancy, mid-stage, informal interview)

William, who entered AEIE with a leisure orientation, possessed a relatively conservative version of an adventure orientation by the time he was the end of his
Table 2

*Orientations to Adventure Education at Entry, Mid-point, and the end of AEIE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry into AEIE</th>
<th>Mid-point of AEIE</th>
<th>End of AEIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outdoor Pursuits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adventure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kerry (early-stage)
Nancy (mid-stage)
William (late-stage) | Nancy (mid-stage)       | William (late-stage) |
| **Outdoor Pursuits**     | **Adventure**           | **Adventure**     |
| Richard (early-stage)
Sam (mid-stage)
Bret (mid-stage)
Jake (late-stage)
Sage (late-stage)      | Sam (mid-stage)
Bret (mid-stage)            | Jake (late-stage)
Sage (late-stage)            |
| **Adventure**            |                         | **Adventure**     |
| Scott (early-stage)
Sara (early-stage)
Britney (mid-stage)
Thomas (mid-stage)
Raymond (late-stage)
Nicole (late-stage)
Oliver (late-stage)  | Britney (mid-stage)
Thomas (mid-stage)            | Raymond (late-stage)
Nicole (late-stage)
Oliver (late-stage)            |

Note: 1 Denotes the stage within the AEIE program each PAE was at during the study. Program compared with those PAEs who had started their programs with outdoor pursuits or adventure orientations and were at the same stage of their training. Specifically, William provided relatively broad and vague examples of adventure oriented goals and tasks such as “using the adventure sequence to get groups working together” and “helping students work together to solve problems.” Conversely, those PAEs who began their programs with outdoor pursuits or simplistic adventure orientations provided more
focused and specific examples of adventure oriented teaching such as “using a canoeing trip to teach people how to work as a team,” employing “anchor building . . . as a means of getting groups of students to take personal responsibility,” and “teaching belaying skills . . . to promote social responsibility” within their adventure orientations during the final stage of their AEIE:

I initially entered the program because I thought it would be fun to work with Jim. Like I said I was really into the outdoor pursuits thing and just did it on my own for fun prior to working with Jim. After working with Jim though, I see the value of front-loading things with the adventure sequence. Using the sequence prior to going on trips makes things flow much better. (Jake, late-stage, informal interview)

When I worked down south, I had the opportunity to go to some experiential learning workshops as part of my professional development. I implemented some of the things I learned with my high school students. Working with Jim I was able to take that work a step further and implement experiential learning with a more diverse group of students. Working with corporate groups and college students helped me better understand the model. (Raymond, late-stage, informal interview)

**Influences on PAEs’ Orientations to Adventure Education**

**Acculturation.** The PAEs’ initial orientations to adventure education were clearly influenced by their acculturation. Similar to the findings of Zmudy et al. (2009), the key people that influenced their attraction to adventure education and shaped these orientations were family members with whom they shared their first experiences in an adventure setting and AEs who worked with them as children and youth:

I was fortunate to grow up with my Mom and Dad. They always wanted to travel. And we took a vacation every summer and we always went to national parks and we went hiking and we went basically to all of the western side of the country. I got to explore the wildlife, I got to be outside, I got to learn all that stuff and I was like I want to do this forever. (Sage, late-stage, formal interview)

In middle school we went to an outdoor ropes course at a local camp. It was only a two-day deal. But it was fun nonetheless. On the first day we played a bunch of games. On the second day we got to go on the high course. It was a lot of fun. The workers showed us how to tie in for the climbing wall and clip in for the ropes
course. That experience definitely got me thinking about doing the outdoor thing. (Bret, mid-stage, informal interview)

Moreover, four PAEs explained that their attraction to a career in adventure education had been enhanced by working as “facilitators” during their youth and while completing their undergraduate degrees:

I worked summer groups at our local challenge course. It was fun. It was a lead facilitator and the rest of us specialists. The lead facilitator was in charge, but the rest of us specialists facilitated most of the program. We led the group through initiatives and then facilitated the high elements. It didn’t pay well, but it gave us experience, which made us want to keep working at it. (Thomas, mid-stage, informal interview)

In addition, six PAEs’ interest in adventure education was enhanced through activities they experienced and instructors they encountered during their undergraduate degree programs:

After I did my physical education methods work during my undergraduate days, I knew at some point I wanted to go back and do my masters in adventure education with the director of adventure. I just loved the way he taught classes during my undergrad program. (Nicole, late-stage, formal interview)

During my undergrad, I majored in political science and minored in rec management. So my freshman year I went on some trips through the outdoor recreation program. I knew I wanted to continue doing that kind of thing so I got in contact with a friend of the adventure director and he got me involved with working on the ropes course and things. (Jake, late-stage, formal interview). Finally, six of the PAEs mentioned other less significant influences on their initial interest in adventure education and outdoor pursuits. These included “missed opportunities” to participate in a “adventure education class” in high school due to swimming commitments, “outdoor education sessions” during elementary and middle school, and “hunting and fishing trips” with high school peers.

Differing experiences during their acculturation led the PAEs to developing the different orientations to adventure education with which they entered AEIE. Those who
entered AEIE with a leisure orientation had mostly been supervised without instruction while participating in outdoor pursuits and adventure activities in their childhood and youth:

During our eighth grade canoeing trip we canoed a local river. The trip was a lot of fun, but I did not learn a thing about canoeing outside of how not to fall out of a canoe. Most of the groups zigged and zagged down the river on both days because our teachers taught us zero paddling skills. (Nancy, mid-stage, informal interview)

Conversely, those PAEs who entered AEIE with an outdoor pursuits orientation had experienced traditional direct teacher-centered instruction in adventure activities during their acculturation:

I started working on challenge courses when I was 18 years old. A company professionally trained me. I learned how to build and run challenge courses. Along with building and running challenge courses, I worked as a climbing guide. Both trainings were very skills based due to the potential dangers. (Sage, late-stage, informal interview)

Finally, those PAEs who began AEIE with the beginnings of an adventure orientation had experienced more progressive indirect instruction reflecting this orientation prior to entry in their training program:

I was a Boy Scout for probably 10 or 11 years. I went through all the stages [of adventure] and this was the old Boy Scout movement, so it was a very progressive group. We had very little money, but we went to the forest or the little mountains that we had near by. We played games, we built things, and we did cross country obstacle courses. We were very active and very group and goal-oriented. (Oliver, late-stage, formal interview)

Professional Socialization

Jim. All of the PAEs in the study were very positive about their AEIE. One key reason for this was Jim, their instructor, who taught their concentration of specialized adventure education courses. Keys to his success in the PAEs’ eyes were his “ability to model effective teaching behaviors” and “prepare lessons that were meaningful to the
group.” In addition, the PAEs appreciated Jim’s “flexibility,” “experience,” willingness “to trust” them, and his creation of a “positive vibe” and “good karma” in his classes:

I always felt Jim was very well prepared at all levels. He had clear objectives each day that were related to the final objectives for the class. He knew exactly what needed to be done. That was based upon years of experience and exploration. He also responded to the needs of the specific group. We all learned how important it is to be flexible. (Raymond, late-stage, formal interview)

In addition, the PAEs realized that Jim was “well trained,” “easy to approach,” and a “stellar communicator.” This meant that he was a credible “role model”:

Jim seemed to know a little bit about everything that was going on on campus. Initially, I was scared to go up to his office and ask him questions about class or the program in general, so I would just email him rather than talk to him. But one day he broke down those barriers by telling me to come to his office and call him by his first name. After that, I was in his office nearly everyday asking him stuff about adventure as well as the rest of my classes. (Scott, early-stage, formal interview)

Moreover, the PAEs were quick to point out that Jim modeled the pedagogies he was attempting to teach them to employ and noted that they learned a lot from teaching children and youth alongside him:

Working with Jim taught me the values of using student-guided instruction. The whole idea that you never give kids the answer. You give them the parameters and you let them work. The first thing we always did was create a classroom environment that was inviting and respectful. We spent a lot of time in the first two stages so people could get to know each other and feel comfortable being around each other. (Sam, mid-stage, formal interview)

Jim also believed his modeling of pedagogies to be important. Further, he noted that his concerted efforts to deconstruct the faulty orientations with which PAEs began his program and to reconstruct an adventure orientation were vital to his success:

To set the tone for the school year I teach an adventure theory class. I use the lessons learned within the class to build the rest of my instruction off of. I use components of the adventure model within all of my classes. For instance, I use “challenge by choice” and the “full value contract” within my outdoor pursuits
classes. I use communication and problem solving activities within my analysis and supervision and teacher effectiveness classes. (Jim, formal interview)

When students enter the program they tend to have mixed feelings about what adventure education is or should be. I believe some of those mixed feelings come from mixed messages they received prior to enrolling in the program. I believe the length of the program and the amount of time we allot to practicing adventure principles, communication, problem solving, and trust helps our students move to practicing the same principles when they are teaching themselves. (Jim, formal interview)

Coursework. The content within the coursework in which the PAEs engaged was also obviously important to their development. Several PAEs were of the opinion that the core sport pedagogy courses were useful because they learned to “analyze and interpret” “teaching” and “practice [effective] teacher behaviours.” In addition, they explained how “extra experiences” outside coursework were helpful:

I took the two-year track to get my masters degree. Taking the two-year track allowed me to work in the pedagogy lab and on the ropes course for another year. While working on the ropes course, I was able to work with Jim to build some challenge course analysis tools. We built the analysis tools to help train our course employees. Later on a few of us were able to present these ideas at a conference. (William, late-stage, informal interview)

It was the content of the specialized adventure courses, however, which the PAEs believed was the real key to their improving conception of adventure education and pedagogical skill. For example, a number of PAEs noted that they gained a good deal from studying the history of adventure education while others explained that the research project, which they had carried out, was invaluable:

Within the adventure theory course, we were able to learn about the origins of adventure education. We learned about Kurt Hahn, Jerry Pieh, Paul Petzoldt, and Karl Rohnke. Learning about these guys helped us see how and why the adventure movement got started. It also showed us how adventure theory had evolved over time and could be used in different contexts. (Bret, mid-stage, formal interview)
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Within our seminar class, we were able to pick out a topic of our choice and study the research focusing on that area. I was able to look at how self-concept had been researched within the adventure realm. Putting together the 13 research abstracts helped me better understand what self-concept was and how adventure education can help enhance self-concept. (Britney, mid-stage, informal interview)

The most valuable coursework in which the PAEs believed they had engaged, however, was that in which they learned specific adventure content and technical teaching skills and the “real world” field experience in which they got to test and hone these skills and their newly developed philosophies:

We learned a large number of activities that fit into the specific stages of adventure. We learned to implement those activities with our peers. We also learned the hard skills involved with running groups. Meaning we learned how to set up all of the low ropes elements as well as the high ropes elements. We were able to practice these elements with our peers also. (Thomas, mid-stage, formal interview)

After we had completed the formal course work in our adventure theory course, we had to shadow experienced AEs for eight hours. Following our shadow hours, we were able to work on the course if we would like. I was able to work my way up to lead facilitator. Being a lead allowed me to run a wide variety of groups through the seven stages of adventure. I facilitated everything from elementary-aged groups to older adults. (William, late-stage, formal interview)

**Summary and Conclusions**

The results of this study provided an example of highly effective AEIE. They illustrated how PAEs entered their program with one of three broad orientations to the subject matter. These ranged from the non-educational leisure orientation to a simplistic version of the progressive adventure orientation. In addition, they revealed how these orientations were shaped by the differing acculturation the PAEs experienced.

In contrast to the majority of preservice teachers who enter PETE with faulty ideas about physical education teaching and possess a coaching orientation, a significant group of PAEs in this study entered AEIE with relatively advanced ideas and
perspectives about adventure education and possessed the beginnings of an adventure orientation. This was due to the relatively positive acculturation that these PAEs had experienced, particularly through contact with adventure oriented AEs.

The study’s findings also suggested that well taught AEIE helped those PAEs who were close to completing the program acquire a relatively sophisticated adventure orientation regardless of the orientations with which they commenced their training. Keys to this success were the blend of personal and pedagogical skill displayed by the instructor and the nature and sequencing of the coursework in which the PAEs engaged. This universal impact was in marked contrast to the effectiveness of apparently well-designed PETE programs staffed by instructors as dedicated to their jobs as Jim. Recall that such programs often fail to change the faulty perspectives of those students who enter them with hard core coaching orientations (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010).

Future research should examine the extent to which programs like the one described in this study exist and to see whether they are equally effective. One important factor contributing to Jim’s success was that he was the lone adventure education specialist working with the AEs. This meant that he did not have to work with other instructors to forge a shared technical culture or ideology (Lortie, 1975). Research examining similar programs taught by multiple instructors who have to go through this process, or provide slightly differing and competing perspectives, should prove enlightening.

Research investigating the impact of AEIE programs with different designs and coursework, and staffed by less experienced and expert instructors than Jim, would also obviously be of use. In addition, studies which examine how newly minted AEs fare once
they have graduated from such programs and move in the world of work should be completed. Previously conducted studies of neophyte physical education teachers have been depressing in that they have indicated that school cultures are often hostile to new physical educators with progressive ideas and pedagogies, marginalize them, and serve to “washout” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981) the perspectives and practices they acquired during PETE (Curtner-Smith, 2009). Discovering whether the same fate befalls AEs who work in schools and other contexts would provide further insight into the influence of AEIE.
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What are the benefits to scientists or society?
This study will provide information to teachers, teacher educators, and adventure educators about what components of adventure programs are most effective.

Participant’s Initials ___

PART 4: ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA 1993
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 9-18-93
EXPIRATION DATE: 9-18-93

73
What are the risks (dangers or harm) to me if I am in this study?

There are no known risks associated with participating in this study outside of the risks of every day living.

How will my privacy be protected?

Your privacy will be protected by asking you study questions in a private room or a site of your choosing.

During interviews, your privacy will be protected by limiting the entrance of individuals into the study area to only yourself and the principal investigator.

Following interviews, the primary investigator will transcribe interviews and change the name of each participant. A pseudonym will be randomly assigned by the primary investigator. Pseudonyms will be used in all documents, interviews, and field notes. Only the primary investigator will know which real names correspond with the pseudonyms in order to protect participant’s privacy.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
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What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?

The alternative or other choice is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary—it is your free choice. You can refuse to be in the study. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. There will be no effects on your care or your relations with the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (IRB) is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.
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