CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM

1.1 Background of the Problem

Historically, the research in outdoor and experiential education has examined such areas as: self-concept, self-efficacy, social integration, participation rates, program length and self-esteem, racial conflict, and recidivism, among others (Ewert, 1989; Cason & Gillis, 1994). The extent of research done in this area suggests that there are benefits from the participation in outdoor pursuits (Ewert, 1989).

Experiential education is cited as an approach to learning in many outdoor programs such as Outward Bound, Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Programs (ESOESP), and integrated curriculum programs (Druian et al., 1990; Horwood, 1994). The nature and underlying philosophy of experiential education suggests there are several desirable attributes of both the educator and the learner (Druian et al., 1990; Luckmann, 1996; Carver, 1996; Burger & Sakofs, 1987; and Joplin, 1981, cited in Warren et al., 1995). Joplin's (1981) model of experiential education is useful because of its flexibility and applicability within experiential and outdoor learning. What is presently lacking in the research is an investigation of an ESOESP, examining perceptions in an attempt to uncover the process contributing to the development of a particular outcome. The ESOESP is a generic term coined by Gray and Patterson (1992), which refers to schools offering an extended outdoor education program while maintaining the required curriculum for a particular year group.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

There is limited published research that investigates Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Programs (ESOESP) in Australia. There is less that focus on the investigation of processes that contribute to the development of a particular individual or group outcome. A review of the literature reveals numerous studies measuring and describing a particular outcome from the participation in outdoor and experiential education programs. Some of these outcomes include: self-esteem, self-concept, and confidence. However, an investigation to uncover and explain the process leading to these outcomes is lacking in the research.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine and uncover perceptions at an ESOESP, in order to investigate and develop a theoretical model representing the process responsible for particular outcomes, in the context of the outdoors. This is achieved through:

- The investigation of an Australian Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Program.
- An exploration of the literature.
- Examining student, staff, and parent perceptions concerning the rationale for taking part in physical outdoor activities.
1.4 Major Study Questions

The main question driving the research is: What are the stakeholders’ perceptions in relation to the process leading to an outcome at an ESOESP?

Additional contributing questions have been formulated so as to support the above focus:

- What are the perceptions of the staff at Timbertop concerning the program and its objectives?
- What are the perceptions of the students at Timbertop concerning the program and its objectives?
- What are the perceptions of the parents of students at Timbertop concerning the program and its objectives?
- To what extent do these perceptions relate to each other?
- To what extent do these findings relate to the existing outdoor and experiential literature?
- What themes emerge from the perceptions of the stakeholders?

1.5 Important Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions underlie the study:

- It is assumed that the stakeholders (students, teachers, and assistants) could voice their perceptions with some degree of accuracy in relation to the program at Timbertop.
• It is assumed that the responses to the surveys are genuine representations of the parents’ perceptions concerning the program at Timbertop.

• It is assumed that a causal relationship exists between the identified categories and sub-categories.

1.6 Rationale and Theoretical Framework

Within outdoor and experiential literature, there is a tendency to measure outcome variables and describe what is effective. There are numerous studies which measure self-esteem, confidence, and changes in these variables in a 'pre-post' format (Cason & Gillis, 1994). These studies are valid and contribute greatly to the acceptance of outdoor and experiential education. The quantitative studies, some of which measure a particular variable such as self-esteem or confidence (Gray & Patterson, 1994), are considered particularly beneficial to the advancement of outdoor and experiential education. Their 'scientific rigour' are deemed an appropriate forum to further validate and offer credibility to the research performed in this area, given the abundance of qualitative, anecdotal studies existing in this particular research area (Gray & Patterson, 1994). Cason and Gillis (1994: p.40) believe that qualitative literature reviews "are no longer sufficient tools for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of trying to measure change that results from adventure programming".

Having stated the positive attributes of conducting quantitative research in outdoor and experiential education, a qualitative approach was considered the most appropriate for this study. Ewert (1987) has
criticised the research in experiential and outdoor education as being overly concerned with the outcomes of the program, and not providing an understanding as to why and how these outcomes exist and occur. Further, Ewert (1987: p.5) suggests that experiential and outdoor education research is often "an exercise in data generation rather than the production of meaningful findings". In a similar view, Flor (1991) states that quantitative studies offer empirical data in support of theories on self-concept, self-esteem, motivation, socialisation, and group dynamics, but do not seek to explain the process behind these favourable outcomes. Ewert (1989) further suggests that there is too much in the way of measurement and a paucity in the research that attempts to conceptualise outdoor education.

Joplin's (1981) model of experiential education shows learning as a process, and is not overly concerned with the end result or outcome. Measuring an outcome attempts to determine the level of a particular variable within an individual. The results of such measurement are useful in the validation of the benefits of outdoor/experiential education. However, concerning oneself with the measurement of an outcome implies that the researcher assumes that this particular outcome, such as self-esteem, exists within all individuals within an outdoor education program. Unfortunately, it ignores the process leading to a particular outcome. This thesis attempts to examine and analyse the process by uncovering perceptions of stakeholders. By allowing these perceptions to emerge, a constructed reality, as described by Guba and Lincoln (1989), can be uncovered and examined.

The conceptual framework demonstrating a typical process model is shown in Figure 1.1., which represents a basic process model
(Abernethy et al., 1986). This particular model was selected for the purpose of conceptualisation; in this thesis, the emphasis will be on the process phase of the figure, with less emphasis on the other aspects. The thesis attempts to uncover and investigate the process phase through the investigation of stakeholder perceptions. It is expected that the result will be a theoretical model of how the process works and contributes to a particular outcome. In this thesis, the nature of the outcome is of less significance to the overall process and contributing factors to which it leads.

Figure 1.1 Typical process model

Adapted from Abernethy et al. (1986)

In order to uncover perceptions and allow what is relevant to emerge, a hermeneutic/dialectic approach and a grounded theory approach are the most appropriate. According to Corbin and Strauss (1990: p.24), "the purpose of grounded theory method is ... to build theory that is faithful to and illuminates the area under study". Hernandes-Gantes et al. (1995: p.4) similarly view grounded theory as "an appropriate framework for understanding student voices and experiences". With regard to employing the use of hermeneutic/dialectic circles, it is the underlying
paradigm which makes this particular research method most appropriate. A full discussion explaining the method appears in chapter 3, however, a brief description will support the rationale and provide a conceptual framework. The naturalistic (or constructivist) paradigm is based on the notion that individuals actively construct their reality (known as a construct) within an environment (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Constructs “do not exist outside of the persons who create and hold them... (and) come about by virtue of the interaction of the knower with the already known and the still-knowable or to-be-known” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989: p.143). Related to constructivism is interactionism, which views individual perceptions as “authentic experiences” offered by individuals who are experienced members of a particular environment, who “actively construct their social worlds” (Silverman, 1993: p.91). These paradigms are an essential ingredient to the interpretation of the data using both hermeneutic/dialectics and the grounded theory approach.

1.7 Importance of the Study

An investigation of perceptions and development of a theoretical model illustrating the process leading to a particular outcome will provide useful insight into outdoor and experiential research. The importance is grounded in an understanding of individual factors that contribute to an outcome. In order to understand how and why a particular program in outdoor and experiential education works, it is useful to develop a model based on one particular program. The model's applicability to other programs both in Australia and overseas will contribute to the understanding of outdoor and experiential education. Components of the model can be compared to and/or tested against existing practices. The result of this study will be an improved understanding of one particular
ESOESP and the creation of a model that can be applied to other ESOESPs or similar experiential and outdoor education programs.

1.8 Scope of the Study

The thesis seeks to uncover perceptions of stakeholders within an ESOESP. As such, students, teachers, and parents will be solicited for their perceptions concerning the ESOESP within which they are involved. It does not seek to determine a general view on ESOESPs in Australia, but rather, those from a particular program. Interviews, surveys, and observations will be the method of uncovering the perceptions of stakeholders. The questions asked to the stakeholders will be in direct relation to the contributing research questions. In order to uncover perceptions concerning the program at Timbertop, interview and survey questions will make specific reference to various attributes of the program, such as the hiking program, the relationship with teachers, the objectives of the school, the general perception of the school, and a discussion surrounding the individual's rationale behind each of these.
1.9 Description of the Setting

There are many different types of outdoor education programs existing within Australia. These include: Outward Bound; Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Programs (ESOESP); State-funded school camps; and Outdoor education within a school’s curriculum. An elaboration of these various programs is found in the literature review. In general, however, each program seeks to introduce the student to the outdoors and attempts to develop both skills and the individual, in terms of confidence, leadership, and teamwork (see for example, Hopkins & Putnam, 1993; Ewert, 1989).

The outdoor education centre examined in this thesis is an ESOESP, named Timbertop. Founded in 1952 by James Darling, Timbertop is one campus of four within Geelong Grammar School. Originally created for boys, the school has been a co-educational campus since 1975. The rationale for its creation was based on four ‘problems’: overcrowding at Corio, the main campus; financial problems at Corio; trouble makers at the main campus were predominantly year 10 boys; and, a reaction to the ‘urbanised’ Australian society (Montgomery & Darling, 1967). Given these difficulties faced by the main campus, the Timbertop campus was seen as a solution.

The Timbertop campus is unique in that it is comprised only of year 9 boys and girls; the original year 10 group was changed in 1975 (McArthur & Priest, 1993). It is located approximately 10 kilometres from the foot of Mt. Buller and roughly 200 kilometres from Melbourne, the state capital of Victoria. The town of Mansfield is the nearest community, isolating the school from the outside world. The campus
itself is approximately 2 kilometres off the main road, with no indication of its existence to those driving by, thus furthering its isolation.

There are approximately 206 students, 20 academic staff, and 10 Assistants at Timbertop in 1996. The following paragraphs will describe each group.

*Academic staff*

The teachers, on average, spend approximately 3 years at Timbertop before moving to another school. The turnover is due to the high energy requirement that makes Timbertop work. Several staff members indicated, via interview and communication, that the staff at Timbertop for the 1996 school year is generally a young group. The duties of staff, in addition to regular teaching, include: hiking with student groups, supervision of boarding units, and maintenance around the campus. In general, the staff is required to do exactly the same as the students, in addition to their regular teaching duties. In short, the staff expectations are generally greater than those at a traditional school. Expertise in the outdoors is not a condition of employment at the school. Table 1.1 summarises the demographics of the 1996 academic staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Male (as %)</th>
<th>Female (as %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1  Summary of staff demographics
Students

The students are organised in boarding units (known simply as units), living in groups of sixteen. It is within these units that the students sleep and study. For the most part, the students are responsible for everything within the units: from study hours, to wood splitting which heats the unit and the boiler for hot showers, to weekly duties. A duty wheel exists which designates a particular responsibility to each member of the unit. These responsibilities range from linen duty, to unit leader, to ‘slush’ duty. The slush duty requires the student to serve and clear the three daily meals to both other students and staff. The duty wheel provides the opportunity for each to assume a different role each week within the unit -- from leader to cleaner. The students are responsible for getting themselves to meals on time (i.e., there is no wake-up bell). The consequences of not arriving on time involve a short run to the woodshed. Table 1.2 summarises the student demographics.

Table 1.2 Summary of student demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Male (as %)</th>
<th>Female (as %)</th>
<th>Asian (as %)</th>
<th>American (as %)</th>
<th>Australian (as %)</th>
<th>Where they did year 8 (as %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Private=2 2 State=13 GGS*=65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistants

The assistants’ role at Timbertop is one of support to both the maintenance staff and the teaching staff. One assistant described the role as a liaison between student and staff. The age of assistants ranges between 18-20 years. As the Timbertop campus is composed of an

* GGS refers to students who attended another campus of Geelong Grammar School in year 8; these include: Corio, Highton, and Glamorgan.
entire year group, the assistants provide an ‘age-bridge’ between the students and staff. Their daily responsibilities are varied, and can range from automobile maintenance in the morning to teacher support in the afternoon. The assistants are managed by the deputy master and daily duties are often delegated during the breakfast meal. Table 1.3 provides a summary of the demographics of assistants.

Table 1.3 Summary of assistant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Male (as %)</th>
<th>Female (as %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The school structure*

Timbertop operates on a tight schedule, with very little free time for students or staff. McArthur and Priest (1993) offer a schedule of a typical day at the school and it is presented in Table 1.4.

Table 1.4 Schedule of a typical day at Timbertop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am</td>
<td>Students wake their unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Chores/duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Unit inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Morning academic classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Afternoon academic classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Preparation for run/hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Run/hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Shower and clean-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Chores/duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Snack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30/9:30</td>
<td>Homework/lights out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students complete the standard Year 9 curriculum for Victoria during their time at Timbertop. The expansion to the curriculum is found in the extra-curricular activities which make up the outdoor activities and the hobbies and include horseback riding, rock climbing, knitting, golf, et cetera.

School rules and consequences are unique at Timbertop. While detentions exist, running is a more common punishment. If students are late for a meal, they are required to run to the wood-shed and back (approximately 500 metres) before they are permitted entry to the dining hall. For a more serious misconduct, students are awarded a ‘buller road’, which is a 3 kilometre run. Serious infractions, such as bullying, result in ‘isolation’, where the student is removed from the unit for an allotted period of time. The units themselves are out of bounds to others and as such, students from other units may only visit when invited or with express permission of a staff member.

1.10 Outline of Remaining Chapters

Chapter two reviews the literature relevant to outdoor and experiential education. Presented in this chapter are dominant themes within the literature, research and evaluation methods, and an overview of the types of outdoor and experiential programs in an Australian context are presented.

Chapter three describes the research design, including the nature of the information gathered, how data was obtained, and how it was analysed. A justification of the case study site, the data collection method, the participants, and the data analysis process are offered in this chapter.
Chapter four presents the analysis of the data and the emerging categories as a result of the grounded theory analysis.

Chapter five presents the results of the data analysis and a discussion of the results. The discussion leads to a model of the process that attempts to explain how an outcome is achieved.

Chapter six discusses the findings in light of the literature and offers recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Experiential education

Experiential education is an elusive and abstract concept. The elusive nature stems from the fact that all learning and therefore education can be viewed as experiential (Joplin, 1981). This seemingly all encompassing statement provides difficulty when attempting to locate an exact definition. According to Chapman (1992, cited in Strano, 1994), experiential education involves students engaging in relevant and meaningful situations, and drawing conclusions which are both valid and meaningful from their experiences. This definition mirrors the belief of a constructivist. Briefly, the constructivist approach to learning has an emphasis on prior and present experience of the individual and how meaning and understanding are shaped, or constructed, based on these experiences (Horwood, 1994; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Carver's definition is equally constructivist as she believes that experiential education "makes conscious application of the student's experiences by integrating them into the curriculum" (Carver, 1996:9).

Prochazka has identified four levels of learning: memorisation, mastery of content, experiential, and internalised (in Warren et al., 1995). According to Prochazka, at the experiential level, learning is deeper and more personal and tends to be more process oriented than content oriented. Burger and Sakofs (1987) offer a similar explanation of experiential education. They identify two transformations that occur within experiential education: one is "the incorporation of information at the level which ... result(s) in intuitive understandings" and the other is that the "learner discover(s) that they need not be passive ... they have a
choice ... and a clear vision of how knowledge can be used” (Burger & Sakofs, 1987:25). The notion that experiential education appeals to the learner and involves him/her in the learning process is quite strong. Intrinsic in experiential education and learning is the acceptance of an individual’s past experience and the ability to use that individualised experience in a present learning experience. “Experiential programs expect and intend students to learn things that their fellow learners did not learn: it is the nature of individualised education” (Joplin 1981, in Warren et al., 1995: p.24). Finally, Kolb’s (1988) definition of experiential education indicates the difference between academic education (focus on intellectual development) and experiential education (focus on the whole person).

An intrinsic aspect of experiential education is the practice of reflection by both instructor and learner. One of the five stages in Joplin's (1981) model of experiential education is the debriefing stage, which is essential in ensuring that the experience (activity or subject matter) does not "drift along unquestioned, unrealised, unintegrated, or unorganised. Debrief helps the student learn from experience" (p.19). The debrief stage in the model provides an opportunity for reflection to occur. According to Kolb (1991), reflection "accounts for more growth and evolution within the experiential education field than any other form of professional training" (p.43). Further, Warner (1984, cited in Kolb, 1991) sees reflection as a key ingredient in experiential learning. Finally, Conrad and Hedin (1981) include in their definition of experiential programs the necessary practice of reflection: "experiential programs are educational programs ... where the emphasis is on learning by doing with associated reflection" (p.7).
To neglect Dewey and his work when discussing and locating a definition for experiential education would be an unforgivable omission. Dewey's *Experience and Education* (1938) was published at the height of the progressive education movement in the United States. According to Brandwein (1981, cited in Knapp 1994), the progressive movement peaked between 1910 and 1955. Dewey (1938) proposed that "every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes... (and) this modification affects, whether we like it or not, the quality of subsequent experiences" (p.27). Dewey, and the progressive movement, were dedicated to the development of student-centred, active learning and attempted to develop affective as well as cognitive skills in children. Dewey supports the importance of reflection, as it is only through reflection that the goal of education is achieved: "being able to understand and use our experience ... by developing the thought process with which we examine our experience" (Crosby, in Warren *et al.*, 1995:12).

The Association for Experiential Education (AEE) has endorsed the following definition of experiential education: "a process through which a learner constructs knowledge, skill, and value, from direct experiences" (Luckmann, 1996: p.7). While approved by the AEE Board of Directors in 1994, Luckmann (1996) suggests that any attempt to define such a term "falls short of the truth" (p.6). It would appear that the discussion and attempt to define experiential education has come full circle as the opening to this section cited the elusive and abstract nature of experiential education and difficulty in offering a definition.
2.2 Outdoor education

Where does outdoor education fit into the definition of experiential education? Is experiential education always outdoor education? or vice versa? As stated earlier, Joplin (1981) suggests that all learning is experiential. Therefore, if learning occurs in an outdoor setting, then by definition outdoor education must be experiential. There is a certain amount of confusion in attempting to offer a definition of outdoor education. Hopkins & Putnam (1993) use outdoor education, adventure-based learning, and adventure education synonymously. However, in a review of the literature, Strano (1994), cites two distinct definitions for outdoor education and adventure-based learning:

Outdoor education: the practice of teaching students about and in the natural environment (Eagles & Richardson, 1992).

Adventure-based learning: planned activities that challenge students and have a physically and often emotionally predictable result (Rohmke, 1986).

Priest (1986) has offered a further definition of outdoor education:

An experiential process of learning by doing, which takes place primarily through exposure to the out-of-doors. In outdoor education the emphasis for the subject of learning is placed on relationships, relationships concerning people and natural resources. (in Strano, 1994: p.1).

From this definition, coupled with the proposition that all learning is experiential (Joplin, 1981), the ‘experientiality’ of outdoor education is further delineated. With regard to adventure education and outdoor education, it is clear that within the realm of outdoor education, there exist such programs and activities that could be considered adventure education.

While definitions abound, the outcomes and aims of outdoor education and adventure education are quite similar. The development of self-
concept, growth, and responsibility are the cornerstones of most outdoor education programs and centres. The amount of research to measure and evaluate these notions dominate the literature (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993; Robinson, 1991; Estes, 1994; Cason & Gillis, 1994; Kolb, 1988; Gray & Patterson, 1994; Ewert, 1987). Priest's (1986, in Strano, 1994) definition offers the most applicable definition to this thesis, given its treatment of outdoor education as a process. With this background and understanding of the existing definitions, and an identification of a definition found to be most applicable to this thesis, it is now possible to develop the dominant themes found within the literature.

2.3 The Educator and Learner

The Association for Experiential Education (AEE) states that the learner includes: student, client, trainee, and participant (1994, in Luckmann, 1996). In this study, the learner is referred to as both the student and the participant. With regard to the educator, the AEE indicates that this term includes: therapist, facilitator, teacher, trainer, practitioner, and counselor (1994, in Luckmann, 1996). In this study, the educator is referred to as staff, teacher, and participant.

The Educator

The method of instruction in the outdoors is as varied as it is in an indoor setting. While the basics of communication are constant in any learning environment, such as communicator-receiver, noise and feedback, there are other notions to consider while teaching in the outdoors. Phipps (1988) identifies environmental sounds such as "roaring torrents or the wind ... whistling through the trees" as possible distractions to the message (p.9). He claims the instructor must also be aware of the basic needs of the learner in order to maximise the experience. Phipps (1988)
discusses Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and how this relates to 
motivation in the outdoors: “Needs for esteem, love, and belonging are 
taken care of by developing the positive group climate...and taking care of group dynamics” (p.11). The idea of self-actualisation, which is at 
the top of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is accomplished when 
individuals are attempting to realise their inherent potential.

This idea of realising potential and the motivation to do so is developed 
by Joplin (1981) in her description of experiential education. She 
indicates that the higher the degree of responsibility for learning given to 
a student, the higher the interest in the learning and the more the brain is 
turned ‘on’. Intrinsic in experiential learning is the need for the 
instructor to “empower ... (and) encourage transformation in their 
students through self-discovery” (Burger & Sakofs, 1987). The 
individualised nature of experiential education previously discussed is 
important for the instructor to consider and is eloquently reiterated by 
Phipps (1988):

Again, we are reminded of the importance of the individual in education; we have individual 
learning styles, potential, and motivation. Let us then integrate into our programs 
mechanisms whereby this individuation can take place (p.12).

Burger and Sakofs (1987) present the instructor in terms of “ministers of 
the Light of Understanding” (p.23). They suggest that the experiential 
educator is one who “has experienced a higher truth and is actively 
involved in liberating others” (p.23). Prochazka offers a similar 
description of the instructor as one who guides learners to a new level of 
awareness through questioning (in Warren et al., 1995). However, 
Prochazka states that in order to be an effective instructor in experiential 
learning, "the first responsibility of the teacher is to role-model what he 
wants learners to learn” (in Warren et al., 1995: p.146). This appears to
be contrary to the notion of individualised education and the reluctance to avoid specifics: “orient the student, but not too specific so as to rule out unplanned learning” (Joplin, 1981: p.17).

Otten (1985) described the teacher and student as being complementary to each other: “each exists for the other” (p.49). This idea is assumed in both Prochazka and Burger & Sakofs (1987) as the teacher is there to ‘guide’ the learner. In a more technical explanation, Zook (1986) identified the following as necessary characteristics of an instructor:

- have the technical knowledge and skill to lead groups in adventure activities, while ensuring that the perceived high-risk elements are safe.
- possess the common sense to reduce situations, circumstances, and life in general to their more basic issues (in McRae, 1990:67).

In an attempt to summarise the desirable qualities of an instructor in the outdoors, the following quote from Burger and Sakofs (1987) is appropriate. Essentially, it states that if the experiential educator is effective, the location of instruction becomes irrelevant.

The true minister that walks into experiential education does in fact maintain that connection with the ‘Other’ (higher truth). It may be through the wilderness, but more likely through the relationship with students who are having intangible experiences. Which means that those ministers can leave the wilderness and go anywhere that they can and share those intangible experiences (p.24).

Within the literature, there is the claim that experiential education has its roots in Progressivism and Liberalism (Knapp, 1994). Within these ideologies, there are certain characteristics of a teacher that are believed to be desirable. According to the Progressive Education Association (cited in Ornstein & Levine, 1989), "the teacher should be a resource person and a guide to learning activities" (p.223). Dewey (1938) suggested that instruction should begin with the experience learners already have, thus putting the onus on the teacher to adapt their teaching
style to mirror the needs of the individual. An underlying principle of both Liberalism and Progressivism is the treatment of students as individuals (Gutek, 1988; Knapp, 1994). In reference to Dewey and his desirable teacher attributes, Ensign (1996) sees the teacher as an active member in a community, who "selects experiences for the children, with their needs in mind and often their input, and who guides the children in their explorations of these experiences" (p.184). With regard to education, Liberals tend to see education in similar terms as do experiential educators, further delineating this ideology within the paradigm. A further characteristic of the Liberal approach to education favours a process approach over an 'end justifies the means' or outcome approach (Gutek, 1988).

The Learner

In general terms, the learner in experiential education is viewed in a relatively different manner than is the learner in the traditional school setting. According to Joplin (1981), the following are necessary characteristics of experiential education: learning starts with the student and continues at the individual’s pace; the student’s thoughts and feelings concerning a subject are considered and valued; the process to achieving an answer, action, or other is as important as the relative correctness of the answer; self-evaluation is considered important; and finally, development is viewed and measured in terms of the individual and not based on others.

As discussed previously, Progressivism and Liberalism are considered to be found amongst the roots of experiential education. Within a progressive program, according to the work of Dewey and Julian Smith (in Knapp, 1994), students "learn best by doing" (p.10). This is
consistent with Dewey’s (1938) notion of the continuum of experiences: “every experience enacted and undergone ... affects the quality of subsequent experiences” (p.26-27). With learning by doing, that is through direct ‘hands-on’ action or activity, the student will carry that particular experience into future experiences, thus learning ‘from’ doing and learning ‘by’ doing.

Druian et al. (1990) identify several essential elements of an experiential education program. Among these essential elements is a summary of necessary student roles which include: involvement in planning and engaging in activities; opportunity to experience various roles within a group; responsibility for their action; and opportunity to interact with both adults and peers. Imperative to both the Joplin (1981) and Druian et al. (1990) position is the notion of student ownership and responsibility of their actions and learning throughout an experiential program, course, or activity.

Burger and Sakofs (1987) suggest that the learner is not dependent on the instructor and Joplin (1981) stresses the need for greater student responsibility in learning. There is agreement within the literature that support and feedback are essential throughout the learning process (Otten, 1985; Phipps, 1988; Burger & Sakofs, 1987; Joplin, 1981). Phipps (1988) stresses the importance of avoiding miseducative experiences for the learner, echoing the words of Dewey that not all experiences are genuinely educative (Dewey, 1938). In outdoor education, the learner is provided the opportunity to learn about him or herself while learning about others and interacting in the environment (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993). Learning opportunities in the outdoors and through experiential education have been presented by McRae (1990) as
the following: clarification of student’s attitudes and values; development of positive attitudes to learning; improving understanding and relationships between students and teachers; and the opportunity to promote self-esteem, cooperation, and leadership.

The theory of self-efficacy has been declared as the "most heavily subscribed-to theories of human behaviour in outdoor adventure pursuits" (Ewert, 1989: p.91). How this relates to the learner is grounded in the notion that self-efficacy pertains to "the belief that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the desired and expected changes" (ibid, 1989: p.92). Self-efficacy, then, denotes an implied relationship between the learner and the instructor. In order for the learner to believe in him/herself and have the confidence to perform a certain task or activity requires a positive and supportive relationship with the instructor. This implied positive relationship can be related back to the model of experiential education (Joplin, 1981), in specific reference to the support and feedback stage of the model.

Studies dealing with self-esteem and the opportunity for development of the self-concept abound in the literature (Cason & Gillis, 1994; Kolb, 1988; Gray & Patterson, 1994; Hopkins & Putnam, 1993; Ewert, 1989). These opportunities are theoretically uncontested as desirable outcomes of education. However, their utopian nature results in a somewhat skeptical view of the general merits of outdoor education. Perhaps the extensive range of research in the effectiveness of outdoor education is an attempt to prove and give acceptance to these lofty outcomes. The following section will present and discuss the various evaluation methods used in outdoor and experiential programs.
2.4 Research and Evaluation

While the results ensuing from the various studies are important, this section is more concerned with the actual methods employed. Thus, the focus will be more so on methodology than outcomes of the studies.

The research and evaluation methods in outdoor and experiential education are seemingly varied. Both quantitative studies (among them, Gray & Patterson, 1994; Cason & Gillis, 1994; Kolb, 1988; Priest, 1993) and qualitative studies (among them, Robinson, 1991; Estes, 1994; Horwood, 1994; Linney, 1995; Dyson, 1996;) are found in the literature. While it is beyond the scope of this review to determine which is more effective, Ewert (1987) states that the majority of research done in experiential education is focused too much on the outcomes of the program. "This type of research does not provide an understanding as to why it happened or how it can be made to happen again" (Ewert 1987: p.5). This presents a paradox in the outdoor and experiential paradigm. What is the paradox? Joplin (1981) stressed the importance of process; that is, recognising 'how' a student arrives at an answer. If experiential practitioners are interested in the student's process of understanding, shouldn't the practitioner's process (and the program's process) of instruction also be of value? The question is posed in order to illustrate the apparent incongruity between practice and principles in outdoor and experiential education. Ewert (1987) raises an interesting point by indicating that in order to improve upon something, it is first necessary to know how it works.

This paradox between outcomes and process is further illustrated by Burger and Sakofs (1987) who describe an "ethical disservice" (p.28) of an outdoor and/or experiential instructor who is more interested in
technique than the overall process. However, Wichmann (cited in Hopkins & Putnam, 1993), confuses the paradox further by introducing three syndromes which form the 'Learning by doing heresy'. This is, briefly, experience for the sake of experience. One of the three syndromes is the process-centred syndrome, which is "the detailed description of the process of adventure education-the how-at the expense of what is to be learned" (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993: p.11). The confusion comes from the apparent contradiction in what is important in experiential learning: Joplin (1981) states the 'how' is important; Ewert (1987) criticises the emphasis on the 'what' in the research; and Wichmann (cited in Hopkins & Putnam, 1993) believes that the 'how' "can be miseducative" (p.11). This raises an interesting issue in the literature concerning the means versus the ends in outdoor and experiential education. As cited in Hopkins and Putnam (1993), Einstein offers a very relevant (and inadvertent) insight into the practice and principles in outdoor and experiential education: "A perfection of means and confusion of aims seems to be our main problem" (p.16).

Turning to the actual methods used in typical research studies in outdoor and experiential education, these include qualitative and quantitative methods. The following section will examine and describe some of the methods used.

*Qualitative Methods*

The qualitative methodology ranges from case and ethnographic studies (Horwood, 1994) to illuminative evaluation (Robinson, 1991) to a fourth generation evaluation approach to a grounded theory approach. Based on a review of such data bases as ERIC and APAIS, the fourth generation evaluation and grounded theory approach in outdoor and experiential
research have not been attempted. Case studies, while providing an in-depth examination into one area, school, program, or person, do have inherent problems. Guba and Lincoln (1989) state that "case studies in whatever paradigm have always represented an inclusion/exclusion, or selection, problem for their authors" (p.135). In a more positive light Burns (1990) views the case study as allowing "an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events" (p.313). With regard to ethnographic studies, Horwood (1994) sees the general merit in their ability to "shed light on factors that influence student learning" (p.14). He further stresses the importance of treating the data as 'lived experiences' which can be used to develop relationships that were not previously described or assumed to be existing.

Robinson (1991) approaches outdoor educational evaluation in terms of 'phenomenological theory', explained as the interaction of individuals to interpret experience (Greene, 1961, cited in Robinson, 1991). He cites the merits in using unscheduled observations, in that it "captures reality in a way which can be more readily communicated to others" (Robinson, 1991: p.12). There is a similarity between the view of Guba and Lincoln (1989) and Robinson (1991). Both cite the difficulty of inclusion of information and subjective nature of deciding what will be collected and retained. Robinson (1991) further criticises the practice of participant observer in research and evaluation due to difficulty in both teaching and observing, and the ensuing bias in selecting moments to observe.

Hermeneutic/dialectics is an approach to evaluation offered by Guba and Lincoln (1989). They suggest that in order to evaluate a particular program or environment, it is necessary to form circles of information; within these circles, 'constructs' are formulated by individual
respondents and offered to subsequent respondents for critical comment. The circle is completed once the information becomes redundant or when more than two constructs remain at odds (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The task in this approach is to “tease out the constructions that various actors in a setting hold and, so far as possible, to bring them into conjunction” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989: p.142). This approach is interesting in that it heavily relies upon the feelings and attitudes of individuals within an environment and attempts to evaluate these uncovered feelings and attitudes, rather than present an outsider’s views and perceptions and ask those on the inside to comment. This latter approach was conducted by Estes (1994) and while it does incorporate validity, through the creation of accepted principles of practice from experts in the field of outdoor education, it neglects the feelings and perceptions of those within a particular environment. As such, an evaluation in this latter approach is more concerned with data generation than the actual technique of data generation. O’Neill (1995) criticises Guba and Lincoln’s (1989) approach indicating that it is an unrealistic assumption to assume that individuals within an environment will fully participate, which is an intrinsic part of the approach.

Grounded theory as a research method and analysis technique was originally created by Glaser and Strauss (1967). It attempts to create a model or theory directly from the data. A more detailed description of the method and technique of analysis appears in both Chapters 3 and 4, following the guidelines created by Corbin and Strauss (1990), which is an updated and specific guide to grounded theory analysis.
Quantitative Methods

The variety in quantitative methods employed in research and evaluation range from ANOVA (Estes, 1994) to meta-analysis (Cason & Gillis, 1994) to MANOVA (Kolb, 1988) and chi square analysis (Priest, 1993). The rationale behind conducting quantitative analysis in outdoor and experiential education could be seen simply in terms of the apparent abundance of existing qualitative studies (Gray & Patterson, 1994). However, this cannot be reasonably seen as a primary motivation behind conducting quantitative evaluation. Cason & Gillis (1994) indicate that due to a large number of research projects in adventure education, "qualitative literature reviews are no longer sufficient tools for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of trying to measure change" (p.40). Gillis (1992) identified problems in research and evaluation within outdoor and experiential education as the following: lack of equivalent control groups; lack of randomization; and a lack of adequate follow-up (cited in Cason & Gillis, 1994). These problems were the rationale behind the meta-analysis conducted by Cason & Gillis (1994). Briefly, a meta-analysis provides a synthesis and statistical interpretation of the results of multiple data-based studies (Elliot et al., 1996). The meta-analysis study by Cason and Gillis (1994) provides a glimpse into the overall effectiveness of a large number of research projects in outdoor and experiential education. This method's applicability would found in a study of projects dealing only with research and evaluation in outdoor education in order to 'make sense' of the data and to synthesise it.

The other methods (ANOVA, MANOVA, chi square) employed by Estes (1994), Kolb (1988) and Priest (1993) respectively made use of questionnaires in order to generate their data. The questionnaires were
based on a Likert-type scale and provided numerical values to questions referring to self-concept (Kolb, 1988 and Gray & Patterson, 1994), and to the match between practice and principles (Estes, 1994). The merits of conducting quantitative studies eliminate the occurrence of subjectivity and provide a context in which to prove cause and effect. According to Burns, “controlled inquiry is an absolutely essential process because without it the cause of an effect could not be isolated” (Burns, 1990:4). Guba and Lincoln (1989) refute the notion of control, referring to it as ‘context-stripping’ and cite this practice as a reason why “evaluations are so often found to be irrelevant” (p.37).

With regard to the need for quantitative measures in the evaluation of outdoor and experiential education, Gray and Patterson (1994) state that anecdotal evidence is “not grounded in rigorous systematic research” (p.138). Guba and Lincoln (1989) reject the claim concerning a need for ‘hard data’, indicating that “measuring instruments take on a life of their own ... (and) they become, in the end, the variables themselves” (p.37). Qualitative and quantitative methods are varied in their approach and intent; to determine which would be more appropriate in an outdoor and experiential program goes well beyond the limitations of this review. Instead, the purpose is to identify the methods employed and to cite their relative merits in the context of research and evaluation. The following paragraphs will discuss the various types of outdoor and experiential programs offered.

2.5 Types of Programs
The various types of programs offered in outdoor education include: extended stay outdoor education school programs (ESOESP), Outward Bound, Curriculum Integration (Horwood 1994), and Educational
Camps. An example of an ESOESP would be the Timbertop campus of Geelong Grammar School in Victoria, where the students live and go to school for the year. The school is designed to promote self-reliance, personal growth, outdoor skills, and environmental awareness (Madin, 1986). The integrated curriculum (Horwood, 1994) is very similar to the ESOESP, in that both aim to integrate learning in the classroom with the surrounding outdoor environment. The integrated curriculum, while not a year long program like Timbertop and other ESOESPs, runs for the course of a term in a selected environment. Cason and Gillis (1994) found that longer programs, such as an ESOESP, result in a greater and more sustained effect in the participants, compared to the shorter programs.

The Educational camps are state-funded organisations offered to primary and secondary students of state schools. An example of such a camp is the Horizon Educational Camp program (HEC). The duration of the camps is 3-5 days and the programs typically offer activities such as canoeing, abseiling, group games, arts & crafts, biking, among others (HEC Resource, 1992) at an off-school site. Outward Bound is an outdoor organisation offering a range of courses for both school-aged children and corporate managers and employees. The Outward Bound courses can run between 1 and 28 days in length; the content of the courses is varied and ranges from the development of group cohesion to the acquisition of survival skills (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993). Outward Bound was created by Kurt Hahn during the Second World War. The rationale behind Outward Bound was grounded in the attempt to provide challenging activities and "victories" for young people. Hahn's philosophy on learning and experience was based on the following: "impelling people into experiences which show them they can rise above
adversity and overcome their own defeatism" (James, 1990, in Warren et al., 1995). The nature of impelling an individual has elements of 'compulsion', according to Lynch (1991). Rather than impel and compel the individual to participate, Lynch (1991) offers a variety of student-centred techniques to check the individual's desire to participate. Regardless of this issue, Hahn's philosophies are considered to be the cornerstone of many outdoor and experiential programs.

While the four identified programs differ in both their target market and their content, all strive to achieve similar goals. These similar goals include: promotion of self concept; acquisition of skills in the outdoors; awareness of social responsibility including environmental awareness; and self-confidence (Horwood, 1993; Cason & Gillis, 1994; Madin, 1986; and HEC Resource Book, 1992). Three of these four specifically cite the method of experiential learning in their attempt to achieve the stated goals.

A study conducted by Druian et al. (1990) attempted to determine the common features that exist in experiential education. Three distinct experiential education programs were examined (Experience-Based Career Education, Foxfire, and Outward Bound) for commonalities and a table of 33 essential elements emerged. Among these elements include 9 distinct categories : purpose; setting; participant characteristics; learning strategies; student roles; instructor roles; outcomes of learning activities; management and support; and, program outcomes (Druian et al., 1990). The Foxfire program involves the production of a magazine, with the students guiding all aspects of production. While these categories and 'essential elements' provide a reasonable checklist for experiential education programs to compare themselves, a caveat is necessary. That
is, each program may differ in terms of educational objectives; thus, what may be desirable at an Outward Bound school or Foxfire may not be equally desirable at an ESOESP or similar-type program.

The 'essential elements' list generated by Druian et al. (1990) raises an interesting question that mirrors the credibility, validity and generalisation debate in qualitative research (Kolb, 1991). For example, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) indicate that qualitative researchers have come under scrutiny due to a failure to attend to "the normal criteria of scientific adequacy in their work" (p.145). The response to this criticism is their warning that "there are problems with applying the same kind of evaluative criteria for both qualitative and quantitative research" (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995:145). Peshkin (1993) has suggested that "no research paradigm has a monopoly on quality" (p.28). Equally valid then is the caveat that the essential elements generated by Druian et al. (1990) may not be equally applicable across all programs in the experiential education paradigm.

Joplin (1981) makes an interesting point that is relevant to the type of program, suggesting that while all learning is experiential, "not all of it is deliberately planned or takes place through an educational institution" (in Warren et al., 1995: p.22). While different programs exist and their environments differ, there is a notion of consistency through inconsistency. What does this mean? An individual experience can not be planned or predicted, nor can the location of occurrence be consistent in a particular environment, either indoors or out of doors. Thus, experiential education is consistent in its inconsistent nature; an awareness of this would appear to be integral for the successful implementation of an experiential education program. Given the
subjective nature of experiences and the constructivist approach of experiential learning principles, this must be valid. For in constructing learning from an experience, relative to the individual, there MUST be inconsistency when attempting to define such a process. This inconsistency must be considered a constant in the learning process, thus giving validity to the notion of 'consistent inconsistency'.
CHAPTER THREE
CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

3.1 Nature of the Information Sought

Given that the aim of the study was to uncover and examine perceptions of stakeholders within an ESOESP, the data is varying and holistic. In order to uncover perceptions, it was deemed appropriate to rely on qualitative data; for the purpose of this thesis, qualitative data is defined as non-numeric, and is comprised entirely of verbal responses.

Given then, that this is a qualitative study, the nature of the data requires some explanation. Treating perceptions as the main source of data necessitates a certain belief or acceptance of a paradigm, which has been defined by Henderson (1993) as: “a world view used to organise our thinking about the nature of the world” (p.49). Based on this definition of a paradigm, the data was framed within the acceptance of the constructivist and interactionist paradigms. The interactionist paradigm treats data as “authentic experiences” offered by individuals who are experienced members of a particular environment, who “actively construct their social worlds” (Silverman, 1993: p.91). In the interactionist paradigm, responses to interview questions are not treated as either true or false versions of reality; rather, the data is treated as “displays of perspectives” (Silverman, 1993: p.107).

The constructivist paradigm (also known as naturalistic, Guba & Lincoln, 1989) is based in part on the notion that individuals actively construct their reality, known as a construct, within an environment (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Constructs “do not exist outside of the
persons who create and hold them ... (and) come about by virtue of the interaction of the knower with the already known and the still-knowable or to-be-known” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989: p.143). The perceptions uncovered in this thesis, that is, the data, are considered the construct of each participant and are treated as “created realities” (ibid, 1989: p.143).

Intrinsically linked to constructivism is interpretivism, because of its similar treatment of ‘reality’:

...in interpretivism, social reality is viewed as significantly socially constructed, based on a constant process of interpretation and re-interpretation of the intentional, meaningful behaviour of people - including researchers (Smith 1989, cited in Denzim & Lincoln, 1994: p.536).

Further, interpretivism includes the researcher as an important part of the study. According to Greene (in Denzim & Lincoln, 1994), an interpretivist study is “unabashedly and unapologetically subjectivist. It is also dialectic, for the process of meaning construction transforms the constructors” (p.536). Finally, an interpretivist study is conducted most effectively in a natural setting, employing qualitative methods such as interviewing, observing, reviewing, with an ‘emergent’ design, and “with hermeneutic understanding” (Greene, in Denzim & Lincoln, 1986: p.536).

The similarities between the interactionist, constructivist, and interpretivist paradigms are evident; they are offered in order to further justify the acceptance of the data as constructions of a reality. The rationale for explaining these paradigms is an attempt to frame the data and to give the reader an appropriate context for the study.
Miles (in Van Maanen, 1983) views qualitative data as "rich, full, earthy, holistic, (and) real" (p.117). Miles also suggests that qualitative data lends itself to the possibility of "unforeseen theoretical leaps" (in Van Maanen, 1983: p.117). In this light, the data collected are at least all of these. One further descriptor to add to this characterisation is eclectic, given the varying sources from which the information was obtained.

3.2 How the Information was Obtained.

This section will be further divided into the following categories: establishing contact and site overview, case study approach, participant overview and selection, the interview, the survey, and research design and data collection.

3.2.1 Establishing Contact and Site Overview

Prior to selecting Timbertop as the actual site for the case study, several relevant factors were considered. The researcher reviewed a listing of the state-funded outdoor education camps within a 300 kilometre radius of Sydney. This information was supplied by the program director of the Jindabyne Centre in NSW. Upon reviewing the program description and objectives of the state-funded centres, they were deemed inappropriate for several reasons. Primarily, the state-funded centres offer 3-7 day programs for primary aged students (6-12 year olds). The program length was not congruent with the intended study, which sought perceptions of individuals within a long term outdoor education centre.
From a review of the literature on schools offering outdoor education in Australia on both Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) and Australian Public Affairs Information Services (APAIS), other centres were discovered and included Scot's College, Marshmead, Blue Mountain Grammar in NSW, and Geelong Grammar School (Timbertop campus) in Victoria. A prospectus was obtained from both Blue Mountain Grammar and Geelong Grammar. While Blue Mountain Grammar's curriculum does include outdoor education, the extent and intensity of its program was not considered to be appropriate for this study. Upon reviewing the prospectus and literature on the Timbertop campus of Geelong Grammar (see for example, McArthur & Priest, 1993; Montgomery & Darling, 1967; Madin, 1986; Gray & Patterson, 1994), the decision was made to pursue this particular school as it contained the elements deemed necessary for research. These necessary elements included the program length (1 full year compared to 3-7 days) and student population (high school aged students). If access to Timbertop had been denied, Scot's College and Marshmead would have been pursued, given the similar long term structure of each school.

Further information was gained through communication with Tonia Gray, a lecturer in Outdoor Education at the University of Wollongong and currently completing doctoral research using Timbertop as one school in the study (see Gray & Patterson, 1994).

Based on this review of literature and communication with Tonia Gray, contact was established with Timbertop. Correspondence and telephone communication was made with both Robin Walker and Murray Guest, Personal Assistant and Headmaster, respectively (Appendix I). Between May and August 1996, correspondence was exchanged between both
parties, resulting in an agreed date of research - August 25 to September 1, 1996.

As Timbertop is a campus of Geelong Grammar School and not state-funded, approval from the Department of School Education was not required. Further, ethics approval was not required from the Human Ethics Review Committee at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean, as only one school was to be included in the study. The Headmaster of Timbertop provided the required approval and consent to student participation. While approval and consent were granted by the Headmaster, the researcher did mail consent forms to 60 of the parents. The rationale behind this was twofold: firstly, to inform the parents of the research and secondly, to solicit their perceptions via a survey that accompanied the consent form. Only 60 consent forms and surveys were sent because of financial limitations of the researcher, as return postage paid envelopes were provided to each parent. Limiting the number to 60 reduced the mailing costs by roughly a third, given that there are 206 students at Timbertop (as of September 1, 1996).

3.2.2 Case Study approach

A case study approach to the thesis was deemed the most appropriate, based on Cohen and Manion’s (1989) impression that the case study allows the researcher to “probe deeply and to analyse intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle” of a particular environment (p.125). The rationale for pursuing a case study was the following. According to Evans (1995), the purpose of a case study is a preliminary investigation and a method for “generating hypotheses rather than drawing conclusions” (p.81). Burns (1990) offers a similar view on
case studies and their purpose: "Because they are so intensive and generate rich subjective data, they may bring to light variables, phenomena, processes and relationships that deserve more intensive investigation" (p.313; emphasis added).

In this light, the perceptions uncovered during the data collection stage of the study, and the subsequent analysis and conclusions, will be treated in a similar form. The perceptions will be used as: a means of understanding the process leading to an outcome, a comparison between existing results and theories within the literature, and to provide further areas of research to be considered. Perceptions of the stakeholders will be treated as 'real', or as constructed realities as discussed by Guba and Lincoln (1989), and therefore can be used to understand contributing factors within a process. Uncovering perceptions will allow for what is relevant and important to stakeholders to emerge; with this, the opportunity to understand a particular environment, and therefore the processes that might exist within, is developed.

3.2.3 Participant overview and selection

Before attempting to uncover and examine perceptions of stakeholders, it was first necessary to identify the stakeholders within the environment. The stakeholders were identified as students, teachers, and parents. Assistants were identified as a fourth group only when the researcher arrived at the school and were included. 46 stakeholders offered their perceptions via interviews and surveys: 8 students, 4 assistants, and 9 teachers were interviewed and 25 (of a total of 60) parents returned surveys. The profile of each group will be briefly described in the following paragraphs.
Students

The number of students selected from the pool of 60 was eight, due to the fact that 60 parents had been sent consent forms (previously explained). These eight students were selected via a random choice of every third student on an alphabetised student list. An even gender mix was achieved (four males and four females). In order to achieve the even gender mix, every other student selected had to be the opposite of the previously selected student. If the second selection of a student, following a male, was another male, the researcher continued down the list until a female occurred. From this point, the selection continued, counting every third student, until four males and four females were selected. Of the eight students, four have attended another campus of Geelong Grammar School, two attended a Catholic school, and one attended a state school. The remaining student’s background data was lost due to a problem with the audio-recording technology.

Teachers

Nine teachers were interviewed. The criteria for their selection was based in part by the research method and will be discussed in the next section (Research Method and Data Collection). The gender mix was not even, as seven males and two females comprise the teacher participants. This is due to the demographics of the key personnel. The researcher identified three key personnel who were essential participants, and they included the Headmaster and Deputy (both males) and the Outdoor Master (male). Of the nine teachers interviewed, five were in their first year of teaching at Timbertop. The remaining four teachers had taught at Timbertop for at least two years. With the exception of one teacher, all had previous teaching experience. Four of the nine teachers had a
background in teaching in the outdoors, while the remaining five cited the outdoors as a personal interest.

Assistants
Four assistants were interviewed. This particular stakeholder group was identified upon the researcher’s arrival at the school. The role of the assistants in the school is to support the teaching and maintenance staff in any capacity. Their jobs are varied and can include wood splitting and auto-maintenance in the mornings, to teaching and supervising students in the afternoon. Assistants at Timbertop are often ‘old boys’ or ‘old girls’, that is, former Geelong Grammar School or Timbertop students. The age of assistants is generally 18-20 years of age. Three females and one male were interviewed. The rationale for their selection was based on several factors: an attempt to interview at least one or two ‘old’ boys or girls; a need for an even gender mix of participants in the interviews; and, recommendations made from staff and other assistants regarding unique perspectives on life at Timbertop. Interviews with assistants were limited to four due to time constraints. The assistants were an interesting group in terms of background: one Canadian, one Zimbabwean, and two Australian ‘old’ students.

Parents
Surveys were sent to 60 parents, based on the random selection described earlier. The response rate was just under 50%, as 25 surveys were returned. The surveys were anonymous and as such, background information is limited. However, the following was noted: one was Japanese, one was Korean, and at least two others were from another part of Asia, as noted from the postage marks on the return envelopes.
The remaining 21 parent surveys are assumed to be Australian, as indicated by the postage mark.

3.2.4 The Interview

The style of interview followed a semi-structured approach. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982), this type of interview provides the opportunity to achieve comparable data amongst a group of participants. A drawback to this approach is that the opportunity to understand how a participant 'structures' a particular topic is lost. According to Burns (1990), semi-structured interviewing allows "more valid response from the informant's perception of reality" (p.279). The advantages of conducting a semi-structured interview involve the position of the participant in relation to the interview. Specifically, Burns (1990) states that the perspective of the participant is encouraged, rather than that of the researcher's. In this light, the semi-structured interview was considered the most appropriate for this study because of its active involvement of the participant and their assumed perception of reality.

Participants were asked the same type of questions (Appendix II). The only difference between the student and teacher/assistant interviews was that the latter group were offered the 'construct' of previously interviewed staff members; this is further discussed in the section detailing the Research Design and Data Collection. The interviews ranged in duration from 15 minutes to 45 minutes. This range in duration is explained by three contributing factors: the researcher's ability to put the participant at ease; the researcher's ability in re-phrasing questions to suit individual needs; and, the participant's willingness to share his or her perceptions. The willingness of participants was based
on myriad factors and some include: their schedule, stress level on that particular day, and general mood.

The interview was conducted in a 'neutral' location and was audio-taped with the permission of the participant. Each participant was informed of the research objectives prior to starting the interview and each individual had the opportunity to ask any questions before the tape was turned on. The researcher also made clear to the participant that at any time during the interview, questions in order to clarify a particular word or idea were welcomed. During the eight student interviews, seven participants asked that the tape be stopped in order to clarify the term 'objectives'.

As mentioned, the interview followed a semi-structured format, in that 9 guiding questions were asked of each participant. However, within a particular answer, further questions were posed in order both to clarify a response and to pursue an emerging perception. For example, during the interview with T5, the initial question was "What sort of activities are the students involved in and why?". The response included the following concluding comment: "...but compared to where they started, the growth physically and in terms of maturation is quite stunning...". From this concluding response, the researcher then pursued this notion of growth and asked "What would you attribute that (growth) to?". While not a question included in the general interview structure, it was pursued given its perceived relevance to the thesis and in order to clarify T5's perception.
parent for a personal interview or conducting phone interviews was not a viable option. The survey questions were directly related to the student and staff interviews (Appendix III).

3.2.6 Research Design and Data Collection

*Research method upon entering the study*

Guba and Lincoln’s (1989) hermeneutic/dialectic circles were deemed the most appropriate for data generation, given its underlying acceptance of the interpretivist, constructivist, and interactionist paradigms. The hermeneutic/dialectic circles are one aspect of an evaluation technique named ‘Fourth Generation Evaluation’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Briefly, the method of the hermeneutic/dialectic process involves the creation of a ‘circle’ of respondents. In order to start the circle, an initial respondent must be selected. The basis of selection for the first respondent (R1) can be varied and may be: a nomination from a gatekeeper; his or her position within the environment; or any other "good or compelling reason" (Guba & Lincoln 1989: p.151). The researcher selected an outdoor education instructor to start the circle of respondents, due to her relevant position and three years of experience at the school. The teacher respondents in this study were referred to as T1, T2, T3, et cetera.

Once T1 was selected, an open-ended interview was scheduled and their ‘construct’ developed. At the conclusion of the interview, T1 was asked to nominate another respondent(s), who was considered to hold an opinion that differed from their own. The rationale behind this satisfies the dialectic aspect of the methodology. In order to produce a
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Once T1 was selected, an open-ended interview was scheduled and their 'construct' developed. At the conclusion of the interview, T1 was asked to nominate another respondent(s), who was considered to hold an opinion that differed from their own. The rationale behind this satisfies the dialectic aspect of the methodology. In order to produce a 'synthesis' of constructs, an antithesis must be present, and that occurs in the form of the nominated individual holding a perceived differing opinion. Before interviewing T2, the themes, concerns, or issues generated from T1 were analysed and interpreted (this aspect of the method will be elaborated upon in the data analysis section—section 3.3.1). This analytic process satisfies the hermeneutic aspect of the methodology, and leads to the creation of the construct (C1), according to Guba and Lincoln (1989).

Based on the recommendation of T1, T2 was approached, an interview requested, and an interview time was scheduled. T2 was given the same semi-structured interview as T1. However, at the conclusion of the interview, T1's construct was offered to T2 for comment. As a result, "the interview with R2 produces information not only about R2, but also a critique of R1's inputs and construction" (ibid, 1989: p.152). It is at this point that the 'multi-layered' dimension of reality, as suggested by Bogdan & Biklen (cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1989) is supposed to emerge; the first 'layer' being T2's thoughts and perceptions and the subsequent 'layers' being the impressions of T2 in relation to T1's construct (C1). T2 was then asked to recommend another member of staff with a perceived differing opinion than his or her own. Following the interview
with T2, the interview was quickly analysed in conjunction with T1's interview data and T3 was then approached to schedule an interview.

The process was unfortunately put to a stop after the interview with T3, due to two factors: firstly, the time required to analyse each interview for its construct was simply not available, given the limited amount of time at the school; and, secondly, the availability of staff members to participate in interviews was limited given their full schedule. A positive outcome of the hermeneutic/dialectic research method was that the three initial respondents (T1-T3) offered more than one recommendation for further interviews and as such, these made up the majority of the remaining interviews. The use of the hermeneutic/dialectic circles can now be viewed as stage one of the emergent Research Method and Data Collection. What followed was a variation of the intended approach. As mentioned, three interviews had been analysed for their themes (i.e. construct); as such, these constructs were offered to the remaining 6 participants as an attempt to develop ‘layers’ to the data. The remaining 6 interviews were identical in terms of questions asked; the only difference was that recommendations and constructs could not be as readily followed and offered, respectively.

The research method employed for data collection can be described as emergent. An emergent design is described as a process where “methodological steps are based upon the results of steps already taken” (Guba & Lincoln, 1985: p.102). The authors indicate that an emergent design may include “refinements in procedures or a simple adjustment in questions to be asked” (ibid, 1985: p.103). In this light, the modification on the intended approach is given justification. Further justification for this modification is found in Peshkin (1993):
To qualitative researchers, what is to be learned does not invariably necessitate a particular study design involving theory, hypotheses, or generalisation, though it may. It necessitates a judgment that leads them to decide what research designs they should frame to produce one or more of many imagined and as yet unimagined outcomes" (p.23).

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) offer a final justification to this emergent design, in their discussion of case studies. They indicate that a case study design is best represented by a ‘funnel’; over the course of the study, the researcher will modify the design and "choose procedures as they learn more about the topic of study" (p.59). As this study follows a case study approach, Bogdan and Biklen's view is particularly relevant.

An illustration of the hermeneutic/dialectic approach, as discussed above, indicating where it stops and where the modified approach begins is shown in Figure 3.1 below.
3.3 How the Data was Analysed

This section is divided into three main subsections: construct analysis conducted during the data collection phase; the transcription of the audio-recorded interviews; and, analysis of the data using the grounded theory approach.

3.3.1 Construct analysis during data collection phase

An essential component of the hermeneutic/dialectic method is interpretation of the data. Hermeneutics is the process of interpretation and understanding of language (Bullock et al., 1988). The philosopher Hegel viewed dialectics as the attempt to synthesise a thesis (one
construct) with an antithesis (an opposing construct) (Lavine, 1984). The interpretation phase in a hermeneutic/dialectic approach follows each interview, in order to uncover and clarify the construct of a particular participant. Following the interviews of T1 to T3, interpretation was conducted by listening to the audio-recording of the interview and recording notes. The construct of each participant was produced based on his/her perceptions of a particular facet of life at Timbertop.

In terms of analysing T2’s interview based on their reaction to T1’s construct, the following method was employed. Where there was agreement with a particular perception, this was noted and this similar perception was compressed into one perception that was carried into the next interview. For example, T2 agreed with T1’s perception that developing interdependence was a rationale for hiking; this similar perception was then carried into T3’s interview. When perceptions differed, the researcher had to note this difference within an individual’s construct. For example, T3 agreed with T1 and T2 and their notion of interdependence, however disagreed with T1’s notion that an individual would be a ‘drain’ on the group if s/he did not achieve the interdependence. As such, this particular aspect of T3’s construct was further offered to subsequent participants and his/her reaction was noted within the transcripts.

3.3.2 Transcription of Interviews

In total, there were approximately eleven hours of interviews that were recorded on 3 x 60 and 4 x 120 minute micro cassette tapes. The master tapes are available for reference if necessary. The process of transcribing the interviews was time-intensive; approximately 60 hours
were spent transcribing, generating a total of 100 pages of data. The process did have positive outcomes: it provided an excellent opportunity to become familiar with the data; it provided a hard copy of the interviews which allowed analysis to be thorough; the transcripts provided a context to particular excerpts, allowing a more complete understanding of the participants' perceptions; and, it allowed the researcher to send a copy of each interview to the corresponding participant in order for him/her to check and validate his/her responses. This last point will be discussed in the section detailing trustworthiness.

3.3.3. Overview of grounded theory analysis

This section will briefly describe and justify the grounded theory approach to analysis.

*Definition and justification of the method*

Before discussing the analysis component of the grounded theory procedure, it is first necessary to define a grounded theory. Based on Corbin & Strauss (1990), a grounded theory is one that emerges from the generation, interpretation, and analysis of a particular set of data, gathered from a particular area of study. When conducting a study using the grounded theory technique, the researcher "begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that study is allowed to emerge" (p.23). According to Corbin and Strauss (1990), "the purpose of grounded theory method is ... to build theory that is faithful to and illuminates the area under study" (p.24).

Having said this, grounded theory is an appropriate analysis technique for this study. The thesis aims to uncover and examine perceptions of
stakeholders within a particular environment (the ESOESP). The
individual perceptions within the ESOESP were not known prior to the
data collection stage. Therefore, the grounded theory approach is
appropriate given its underlying objective of allowing what is relevant to
emerge. Hernandes-Gantes et al. (1995) similarly view grounded theory
as "an appropriate framework for understanding student voices and
experiences", offering further justification to the approach for this thesis
(p.4). Bogdan and Biklen (1982) suggest that the researcher conducting
grounded theory constructs "a picture which takes place as you collect
and examine the parts" (p.29).

Conflicting opinions concerning grounded theory appear in the literature
and are worth highlighting in order to further justify the use of grounded
theory as a process of analysis for the study. Guba and Lincoln (1985)
offer a caveat to the grounded theory approach. Specifically, the authors
indicate that Glaser and Strauss (1967) "do not address themselves to
working within a naturalistic paradigm" (Guba & Lincoln 1985: p.339).
The naturalistic paradigm (also known as the constructivist paradigm,
Guba & Lincoln, 1989) has been described in this study as an accepted
paradigm in which to view the data. There would appear to be a
disagreement of paradigms, given that grounded theory has been
described as an appropriate research method for the thesis, in the
previous paragraphs. However, the disagreement is minor. Corbin and
Strauss (1990) indicate in their updated discussion of grounded theory
that qualitative research seeks to "uncover and understand what lies
behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known" (p.19). Guba
and Lincoln (1989) offer a similar view in their discussion of the
objective of a constructivist (or naturalistic) inquiry or study:
... to identify and describe various emic constructions and place those constructions in touch with the intent of evolving a more informed and sophisticated construction than any single one of the emic constructions... (p.138)

As a result, the differences are minor but worth inclusion as a justification to the research method. As a concluding observation, Guba and Lincoln (1985) elaborate in detail the analytical process of grounded theory, in a section entitled ‘Processing the Data’, in their book *Naturalistic Inquiry*.

*Description of grounded theory analysis*

There are three distinct stages in grounded theory analysis: open-coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Open coding involves the process of “breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising, and categorising data” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.61). A conceptual label is attached to a category of data, which is derived either from the data or from the literature. Categories are developed in terms of properties and dimensions; properties relate to characteristics or attributes of a category and dimensions relate to “locations of a property along a continuum” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.69).

Axial coding involves the synthesis of data by connecting categories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). To synthesise the data, a paradigm model is utilised which involves: conditions, context, action/interactional strategies, and consequences (ibid, 1990). The result of axial coding is the development of main categories, based on connections made between existing categories and sub-categories.

The final stage of grounded theory analysis is selective coding, which involves the selection of a core category, which relates to the other categories and validates their relationships (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).
The core category is validated through the creation of a story line, which can take a narrative or diagrammatic form. Corbin and Strauss (1990) define the core category as the "central phenomenon around which all the other categories are integrated" (p.116).

Theoretical sensitivity is an on-going process conducted during the data-collection and analysis stage. Corbin and Strauss (1990) define theoretical sensitivity as a personal quality of the researcher: "the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn’t" (p.42). During the data collection process, the researcher made a record of ideas and thoughts. The source of these was listed as either 'coming from the data' or 'ideas'. The rationale was to separate the researcher's perceptions from those of the participants.

The preceding description of grounded theory analysis is purposely brief. Chapter 4 develops each stage in greater depth and highlights other aspects of the analysis procedure. The purpose of this brief description is to provide a general overview to promote clarity for a more in-depth discussion in the following chapter.

3.4 Limitations of the Study

Nature of the study

- The study involves the investigation of one site and as such, the results are not generalisable to all outdoor and experiential centres and schools.
- The time frame to conduct the research was relatively short (7 days). The limited time frame contributed to a modification of the research
design. It also restricted the development of relationships between researcher and participants, particularly with the students. The opportunity to develop student relationships may have limited the responses students were willing to offer. While this limitation is speculative, it merits inclusion because of the significance placed on the responses in relation to the overall study.

**Timing**

The data was collected during the third term of the school year. At Timbertop, this is the term where most time is spent within the school, compared to terms 1, 2, and 4, where students spend approximately two days per week out of the school and out of their units. As such, term 3 is not typical of other terms and may therefore affect the students’ and staff perceptions in relation to the school and the program.

**Nature of the analysis**

The data was collected, transcribed, coded, and analysed solely by the researcher. While grounded in a recognised analytical technique (grounded theory), there are obvious implications. The coding of the data and the subsequent creation of categories result in a potential bias in the analysis. Given various constraints, an unbiased coder to validate the groupings was not feasible. The resulting categories and analysis, entirely based on the initial coding by the sole researcher, may be limited in terms of validation.
3.5 Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness relates to the validity and reliability of the data and its subsequent analysis. The data collection method involved interviewing, observing, reviewing documents, and participating in the case study site. The evidence of the data collection takes the form of transcripts and field notes. In order to provide validity and reliability to this data, the following steps were taken.

*Member checks*
In terms of analysis, the transcripts of the audio-taped interviews were the source of information. The importance of the transcripts and their accuracy in relation to the subsequent analysis is therefore of considerable significance. In order to promote the accuracy of the transcription, each participant received a copy of his/her interview with an accompanying letter (Appendix IV). Participants were asked to review the transcript and if clarification or changes were required, they were to send the revised transcript to the researcher.

*Triangulation*
Burns (1990) suggests that triangulation provides confidence to the researcher that the generated data are not "artefacts of one specific method of collection" (p.272). Therefore, triangulation is the use of two or more methods of data collection, which attempts to improve the internal validity of the data (Burns, 1990).

Three different methods of data collection were employed: observation; interviewing; and surveys. The semi-structured interviews provided a reasonable amount of similarity within the data, given the guiding
questions on particular themes. However, the participants in the interviews were from three distinct stakeholder groups. The teachers, the assistants, and the students, although members of the same community, possess perspectives that are unique to their environment. Therefore, within the method of interviewing, the source of information came from three distinct groups. The survey sent to parents was completed with no interaction from the researcher, and therefore can be seen as a different method of data collection. The method of observation provided a third method of data collection, as the researcher recorded field notes and reflections based on observations concerning: the archives at the school; interactions between staff and students; and the environment in general.

These three methods were triangulated, or used together, in order to create a set of data that was generated from a variety of sources, and therefore promoted the validity of this data.

**Thick description**

According to Goldman-Segall (1993), “thick descriptions are descriptions that are layered enough to draw conclusions and uncover the intentions of a given act, event, or process”. While not overly concerned with quantity, a thick description attempts to provide layers to the data, similar to Guba and Lincoln’s (1989) hermeneutic/dialectic approach to uncovering perceptions. As such, the data achieved is both voluminous (21 participants resulting in over 11 hours of audio-taped interviews, creating over 100 pages of transcripts) and thick, from the integration of constructs to interviews. A desirable outcome of producing a thick description, is the understanding of a process (Goldman-Segall, 1992). This study attempts to uncover and describe a
particular process within an environment, thus justifying the use of thick description as a means of promoting validity.
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis followed the approach detailed in Corbin and Strauss (1990). Using the transcripts generated from the 21 interviews, each stakeholder group was separated and initially analysed on its own. The transcripts were read in their entirety so as to promote both familiarity and the contextual nature of the data. The survey data was summarised by grouping all responses to each individual question in one section (Appendix V). The following paragraphs will describe the stages of analysis.

4.1 Open Coding

“Open coding pertains ... to the naming and categorising of phenomena” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990:62). Reading line by line, data was categorised according to its nature. For example, responses discussing the nature of the unit life were labelled ‘unit life’; similar responses within the transcripts were then grouped under this heading. Perceptions regarding the rationale for doing the physical activity were labelled ‘rationale for hiking’, ‘rationale for doing jobs’, etc. The open coding process produced a compressed version of the data, and structured it in a way that was easier to read and analyse. Rather than having 100 pages of transcripts, the data was compressed to fourteen pages (Appendix VI). A summary of the categories and some examples for each are found in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Initial grouping of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rationale: hiking, jobs</th>
<th>Expectation: lead by example</th>
<th>Learning strategies</th>
<th>Unit life</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>coping with stress</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>different dynamics</td>
<td>outdoor program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>enthusiasm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>awareness of others</td>
<td>outdoor program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>real world experience</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>support of friends</td>
<td>teacher=friend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this initial grouping of concepts, thirteen categories were created. Each category was developed by first describing the properties found within each, and then detailing the dimensions. A property is an attribute or characteristic of a category and the dimension relates to locations along the continuum of that particular property (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). For example, the category ‘personal development’ contains the property ‘location’. The continuum of location ranges from indoors to outdoors. Therefore, personal development is seen to exist through participation in outdoor and indoor activities. The dimensional continuum serves as a comparison and a particular property does not have necessarily to exist at a particular end of the continuum. Instead, the category must exist somewhere along the continuum. For example, the category ‘curriculum structure’ has the property ‘level’, which can exist at either difficult or easy. Within the data, participants often referred to the academics as either rigorous or relatively easy.

It is imperative to note that the properties and the dimensions were generated from the data, and not from the researcher. For example, the category ‘interpersonal development’ contains the property ‘awareness’ with the corresponding dimension of self and others. This particular property of awareness was discussed at length by participants when discussing the rationale and characteristics of the outdoor program. Specifically, participant T3 stated:
...they can’t be self-centred, self-oriented, or self-opinionated in what they feel about that situation (member in group not keeping up on hike)... they’ve got to look at people beyond themselves. (T3: p.15).

As a result of this excerpt and others, a necessary property of interpersonal development is ‘awareness’, given its significance to the participants.

A summary of the thirteen categories, including the properties and dimensional continua, is found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Open-coding: categories, properties, and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>high ---- low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>often ---- never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>high ---- low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>high ---- low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>short term ---- long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>indoor ---- outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>indoor ---- outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>often ---- never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>high ---- low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>short term ---- long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>high ---- low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>often ---- never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>self ---- others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>Type, Duration, Frequency, Nature</td>
<td>physical — non-physical&lt;br&gt;long — short&lt;br&gt;always — never&lt;br&gt;essential — curricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Frequency, Intensity, Location, Purpose, Outcome, Purpose</td>
<td>often — never&lt;br&gt;high — low&lt;br&gt;indoors — outdoor&lt;br&gt;curricular — essential&lt;br&gt;individual — community&lt;br&gt;self — others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Role</strong></td>
<td>Position, Function, Intensity, Interaction between students, Reliance, Awareness</td>
<td>leader — team member&lt;br&gt;caretaker — care receiver&lt;br&gt;high — low&lt;br&gt;harmony — disharmony&lt;br&gt;individual — group&lt;br&gt;self — others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Attributes</strong></td>
<td>Enthusiasm, Energy, Student interaction, Reliance</td>
<td>high — low&lt;br&gt;high — low&lt;br&gt;teacher — friend&lt;br&gt;self — teachers/students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Frequency, Intensity, Purpose, Location, Outcome, Purpose, Experiences</td>
<td>often — never&lt;br&gt;high — low&lt;br&gt;curricular — essential&lt;br&gt;indoor — outdoor&lt;br&gt;uphold TT values — uphold&lt;br&gt;personal value&lt;br&gt;same as kids — different to kids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued) Open-coding: categories, properties, and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Teach Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high --- low</td>
<td>skill --- knowledge</td>
<td>short term --- long term</td>
<td>guide --- direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Attitudes to Learning</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process --- outcome</td>
<td>high --- low</td>
<td>individual --- group</td>
<td>didactic --- laissez-faire</td>
<td>experiential --- traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Structure</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tough --- easy</td>
<td>relevant --- non-relevant</td>
<td>high --- low</td>
<td>long --- short</td>
<td>always ----- never</td>
<td>unique ----- normal</td>
<td>individual -- standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Characteristics</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too much --- too little</td>
<td>draconian --- community</td>
<td>high --- low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Expectations</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Communicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high --- low</td>
<td>clearly --- not clearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high --- low</td>
<td>unique --- normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the naming of the thirteen categories, Corbin and Strauss (1990) both warn against and advocate caution with the choice of labels from the literature. The warning is grounded in the implied meaning the category may have, and the assumptions readers may make when interpreting a particular category. One positive aspect in naming from the literature is that the study may contribute to the development of related concepts surrounding this category. In this study, the categories ‘personal development’ and ‘interpersonal development’ are notions discussed at great length in the literature (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993; Cason & Gillis, 1994; Ewert, 1989). Therefore, the use of the literature in naming these categories is justified, as the surrounding concepts are in direct relation to them. The remaining categories, however, were named according to the related concepts and were not considered to be ‘borrowed’ from the literature. These are: activities; student
responsibility; student role; teacher attributes; teacher responsibility; teaching attitudes; learning outcome; curriculum structure; school characteristics; school expectations; and rules.

4.2 Axial Coding

Following the categorisation of the data, the process of axial coding was undertaken. Axial coding is defined as a “procedure whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding, by making connections between categories” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.96). This process was more interpretive and difficult than the previous process of categorising the data and detailing the properties and dimensions of each. In order to make connections between the data, the four stakeholder groups had to be analysed together, in order to present an accurate synthesis of the data. The result of axial coding is a category made up of sub-categories. The connections between the sub-categories must be directly related to the category created. These categories were created by using the ‘paradigm model’, discussed in Corbin and Strauss (1990). The following paragraphs will present a brief analysis of a particular category, employing the paradigm model, in order to demonstrate the method of analysis.

4.2.1 The paradigm model

The paradigm model is made up of six stages: causal condition; phenomenon; context; intervening conditions; action/interactional strategies; and consequences (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Each stage of the paradigm model and its accompanying example are not restricted solely to one sequence of the paradigm model. For example, the
consequence ‘learning process’ may be a strategy or a condition for another sequence of events and one causal condition may be, but is not limited to, the consequence of another particular sequence of events.

4.2.2 Causal condition

The causal condition of ‘teacher attitudes to learning’, has as its properties: emphasis; intensity; structure; style; location; and rationale, as previously developed during the open-coding stage (Table 4.2). This condition refers to a set of perceptions generated from the interviews.

4.2.3 Phenomenon

The causal condition teacher attitudes to learning leads to the phenomenon of ‘learning outcome’. The outcome of learning is a result of the causal condition and its associated properties (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The dimensions of ‘learning outcome’ include: high intensity; group and individual structure; hands-on learning; and process focus.

4.2.4 Context

The context refers to the properties of the phenomenon; context also refers to "the particular set of conditions within which ... strategies are taken to manage ... and respond to a specific phenomenon" (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.101). Referring to Table 4.2, a property of the phenomenon 'learning outcome' is teacher influence, which may range from guide to direct. For example, T3 described the way staff monitor the students' progress through hikes:
...to keep track of the kids, (you) hike between 3 groups of 5 kids ... moving between each group, you talk to those kids ... so you will walk with the kids that cry and bawl their eyes out and complain ... they sit down and you've got to encourage them to keep going and have the strength (T3:12).

Given this strategy of monitoring the students and encouraging those who are not as good as others, the context of managing the phenomenon 'learning outcome' is illustrated. Another example illustrating the intensity property of the phenomenon 'learning outcome' involves being lost in the bush and learning to make decisions without teacher direction. Once again, measures such as teacher back-up and patrolling are employed to manage and control this particular property.

4.2.5 Intervening Conditions

The intervening conditions facilitate or constrain the strategies undertaken to manage the phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Conditions that affect the learning outcome include: the age of the students; the age of the teachers; attitudes of students and teachers; the ideology and philosophy of the school; ability of teachers; and ability of students. These conditions may be both positive and negative. For example, teachers who are good for Timbertop are “the ones who make you try your hardest” (S4). Teachers who “slack in the community” (T4) are not good for the school. Younger teachers are an important condition to ‘method of learning’ because “the rapport with kids is 100% ... because we have younger staff, they’re just into everything - then the kids, they’re happier” (T1).
4.2.6 Action/Interactional Strategies

Strategies are purposeful and goal-oriented, and are undertaken to manage a phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The strategies to manage the phenomenon include: ‘laissez-faire’ approach; advising; judging a situation and determining what level of teacher direction is required; punishments; and staff meetings. The ‘laissez-faire’ approach has to do with the way in which teachers let students sort things out on their own. While the teachers are there for support, the students are left to their own devices to sort things out. This strategy facilitates the learning outcome at Timbertop.

4.2.7 Consequence

The final stage of the paradigm model involves the outcome, which can be positive and negative. Based on the context, strategies, and conditions of the phenomenon 'learning outcome', the consequence is 'learning process'. The consequence becomes a category made up of subcategories which are found throughout the paradigm model analysis.

Table 4.3 below summarises the sub-categories and related concepts pertaining to the category ‘learning process’. This category will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Process</td>
<td>Teacher attitudes to Learning</td>
<td>Not keen on outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus of activity is not necessarily the outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual experiences (project, solo camping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group work (hobbies, TEAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letting students sort out problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Growth from +ve and -ve experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intense, relevant learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills that will benefit the student in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher guided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academically tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not as rigorous as others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposely not 100% academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposeful classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 'busy' activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All round education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develops whole person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category 'student role' is found in Table 4.4, which was generated through analysis employing the paradigm model. It will be elaborated upon in Chapter 5.
Table 4.4 - Axial coding - categories and grouping of concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Student role  | Activities        | Community service
|               |                   | ‘Slushie’                                                                |
|               |                   | Wood collecting                                                          |
|               |                   | Running                                                                   |
|               |                   | Hiking                                                                    |
|               | Responsibilities  | Essential jobs                                                           |
|               |                   | Long jobs                                                                 |
|               |                   | Unit leader                                                               |
|               |                   | Unit second                                                               |
|               |                   | Care receiver                                                             |
|               |                   | Care giver                                                                |
|               |                   | Perception of others                                                     |
|               |                   | Responsibility to unit members                                           |
|               |                   | Getting along in units                                                   |
|               |                   | Not getting along in units                                               |
|               |                   | Joking around with teachers                                              |
|               |                   | Talking to teachers as friends                                           |
|               |                   | Friends are always there for you                                         |

The category ‘school climate’ and the related sub-categories and concepts are presented in Table 4.5. This category was named because of the descriptions and thoughts offered concerning the program at Timbertop. It was similarly analysed employing the paradigm model and will be discussed in chapter 5.
### Table 4.5 - Axial coding - categories and grouping of concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>School characteristics</td>
<td>Community, Like a family, Perceived as Draconian by outsiders, Perceived as militant by outsiders, Very structured, Limited free time for staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Student/staff do their best, Follow the rules, Honest, Uphold image of TT, Student/staff do the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules/Punishment</td>
<td>Clear consequences, Consistent, Unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category incorporating interpersonal relationships and personal skill development (hereafter referred to as interpersonal/personal skill development) is presented in Table 4.6. The creation of this category followed a similar approach to the other categories. It will be elaborated upon in Chapter 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/personal skill</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>Independence, Self: reliance, confidence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td>esteem, directed, Inner strength, Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to cope, Maturity, Character building,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility, Individual achievement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resourcefulness, Fitness, Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Maturity, Problem solving, Commitment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Interdependence, Socialisation, Cooperation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category teacher role is presented in Table 4.7 and was similarly analysed and created through the paradigm model. It will be further discussed in Chapter 5.
### Table 4.7 - Axial coding - categories and grouping of concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher role</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes</td>
<td>Enthusiasm, Energy, Interaction with students, Dependence, Role, Passionate, Understanding, Friend, Strict, Care-giver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Responsibilities</td>
<td>Same experience as kids, Uphold TT values, Lead by example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Selective coding

Once the axial coding was completed, selective coding took place which involved the selection of the core category. The process of selecting the core category involves “systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development” (Corbin & Strauss 1990: p.116). In order to justify the core category, all categories and subcategories must be analytically presented in order to present the ‘story line’ (Corbin & Strauss 1990). Essentially, the story line offers a framework which justifies the position of each category in relation to the core category. According to the authors, this framework can take the form of a diagram or a narrative (ibid, 1990).

The axial coding of the four stakeholder groups resulted in the creation of five categories: personal/interpersonal skill development; student role; teacher role; school climate; and, learning process. The selective coding resulted in the selection of ‘change in student’ as the core category. The
five categories and their position within the paradigm model will be discussed in Chapter 5. A discussion of the core category and its properties and dimensions is also found in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter will present and discuss each of the five categories uncovered within the data analysis. Each category plays a specific role in terms of the paradigm model. Through the discussion of each category, its appropriate location within the model will be presented. The positions of each category within the paradigm model are presented in Figure 5.1, which is a conceptualisation of the core category and its relationship to the other categories. The phenomenon is identified as the core category.

Figure 5.1 The core category within the paradigm model
5.1 Identification and Discussion of the Categories

5.1.1 Student Role

The student role category contains the sub-categories activities and student responsibility, as identified in Chapter 4. The role of students at Timbertop is intense, in terms of their responsibilities outside the classroom and the activities in which they are involved. Each student carries a two tiered responsibility: to him or herself and to the community. The community at Timbertop relates to the school community, the unit community, and the hike community (T7: p. 29).

Responsibility to self

The main expectation of students, cited by teachers, parents and students, is that they 'do their best'. This is supported by the nature of the activities.

The formal competitiveness is taken away at Timbertop. We don't play competitive sport at all ... a lot of activities are individually based ... there's just you that has to work and develop, not necessarily in the context of others (T8: p.34).

The expectation that students do their best is viewed by some staff in both positive and negative terms. The positive aspect is grounded in the expectation that by setting high standards, students will strive towards these expectations. The negative aspect, however, concerns the overly idealistic nature of expecting students to always do their best and is explained in the following teacher excerpt.

If you have incredibly idealistic expectations, the kids actually feel they've failed in some respects ... with the running, you can't run hard every run, yet there's the expectation you should ... the kids feel 'oh shit, I should be running faster and I can't so therefore I'm just going walk, because if I can't be good enough, I'm just going to walk' ... it's the perfectionist thing -- an all or none attitude (T1: p.3).
In response to this criticism, one teacher indicated that they try to remind students "that everyone is an individual and not everyone is going to be good at one thing and not as good at another ... you have to try and bring out the qualities of the individual that someone else may not have" (T3: p.15).

**Responsibility to school, unit, and hike group community**

The responsibility to the three levels of community may appear to be in conflict with the responsibility to self. A valid question might be 'how can students develop individually, if they are responsible to more than just themselves'. Students are a part of the community and are aware of their position within the community. Through the responsibilities they have to the unit and to others, they learn that their role, from slushie to linen duty, plays an integral part and without it, the school community would not operate. The term community was derived from the participants; explicit reference was made to the school operating as a community (for example: T7, T8, S3, S7).

The responsibility to the school, unit, and the hike group communities requires that the individual tolerate, accept, and trust the other members. The importance and therefore responsibility of the students to get along is summarised by one teacher's belief: "If you don't have a happy unit, you can't possibly have a happy year" (T1: p.1). The responsibility of students to tolerate each other and get along is a source of difficulty for some students and is illustrated in the following quotes.

You're with each other 24 hours a day, 16 people in the unit, you're with them all the time. If you don't get along, you have to get along ... and that's very difficult (S3: p.8).

They try to achieve an environment where everyone's happy, which I guess can't be done because everyone can't be happy at the same place, but they try to (S5: p.14).
In response to the difficulties of living with fifteen other people, some teachers try to teach the students coping strategies (T1). The ability of students to cope with stressful situations has been cited as an attribute of personal/interpersonal skill development. An example of a coping strategy is described by one student: "unit life is pretty good but sometimes you get pretty sick of it, so I like to go outside and chop wood" (S6: p.18).

The physical responsibilities are an important part of the student role, but they do not define the role in its entirety. Over the course of the year, the student role seems to evolve from a teacher dependent, to a shared, co-dependent role. This shared role is alluded to in the discussion of interpersonal skill development and is seen as a positive aspect of personal growth towards independence.

At the start of the year, you're (the teacher) the carer and the nurturer, but that's not necessarily true by the end of the year. They're often the carers and the ones that will look out for you, as they grow in their independence (T1: p.4).

In support of the notion of the 'evolving' nature of the student role, one teacher related a story concerning his experience on a hike, delineating the potential for students to develop their care-giving potential.

I went out on a 4 day hike last term and I get vertigo. We went across a mountain top called Cross Cut Saw (and) I got vertigo in one section and completely lost it and broke down and burst into tears and couldn't move. The kids in that group took my pack off me on that cliff face and took my pack up to the top and encouraged me and helped me get up that cliff face by just pure verbal strength.

To this day the kids have never brought the topic up, have never mocked me when they've been cranky with me on that topic. It's an issue that's never been brought up outside the hike and even on the day when it happened, when I got to the top — and this is what really amazed me about the kids — I just sat there and burst into tears because I was so relieved I got up the cliff face. They just all sat there and talked amongst themselves and then the head of the hike said 'are you ready to go?' and the kids said 'if you're not ready we can wait longer; it doesn't matter if you're not ready to go, just take your time'. They were very supportive, which is something I've never experienced before (T3: p.12).
Each student is provided with the opportunity to develop leadership skills, through the daily activities and participation in the physical activities. The parents, in particular, made reference to the opportunities their children were given, in terms of leadership. Typical comments included: unit life develops leadership (P8); development of leadership skills (P4); leadership qualities developed in hike group and unit life (P16). The students indicated that they were responsible for a variety of activities: everyone has the opportunity to be a hike leader; the unit leader rotates on a weekly basis; everyone in the unit is responsible for a particular job, essential to the success of the unit.

The category student role was classified as the causal condition in the paradigm model. It is the causal condition given its relationship to the phenomenon of 'change in student' (the core category). The student role is a necessary condition and is made up of sub-categories that result in the change in the student. The student role can be seen as the starting point in the paradigm model. It is the input to the model; the corresponding categories and their placement within the model support and explain how the causal condition and subsequent phenomenon relate to each other. The following paragraphs will describe the supporting stages of the paradigm model, and will conclude with a discussion of the phenomenon, which resulted from student participation in the program.

5.1.2 Learning Process

This category is based on teacher attitudes to learning and its relationship to the curriculum structure at Timbertop. The teacher attitudes to learning are not necessarily restricted to the classroom. Instead, they
relate to the teachers approach to learning in general. Evidence of their approach is found in the manner in which they deal with the students, both on hikes and in the classroom, and the manner in which they allow students to solve their own problems. Some teachers made explicit reference to experiential education when discussing learning at Timbertop, while others alluded to it. As derived from the current literature, experiential learning can be defined as an abstract concept; the relationship between the literature and the findings of this study will be discussed in Chapter 6. The result of teacher perceptions concerning their attitude to learning provides insight into what teachers at Timbertop consider to be important in the learning process.

They understand through doing the activities ... experiential education teaches quicker than words (T1: p.2).

The fact that outdoor ed. has a very prominent position ... it’s a very good way for students to have that exposure to experiential education and learning by mistakes (T9: p.43).

The notion of learning by mistakes and learning by doing as a method of learning and teaching is consistent across several teachers, and is summarised by the following excerpt:

... what you have learned here will help you cope with the problems that you will encounter when you leave school ... your inability to do well at something, compared to somebody else ... the school helps you try to cope with that failing and view it as a learning experience (T3: p.16).

This approach is both supportive and positive. One teacher, in his first year at Timbertop and who instructs only one course, offered insight to this through his comment concerning the regular teaching staff:

They’re all extremely affirmative and encouraging and positive, and there’s very little put-down of kids at all ... the kids are encouraged to believe and soon realise that they can achieve (T5: p.23).
The rationale behind providing these experiences is a necessary component of the curriculum structure at Timbertop. The students are offered myriad experiences and opportunities in which to develop themselves. The choices allow each student to find his/her ‘niche’ and develop a particular skill.

The attitude is: there is so much to achieve; you’ll find your niche somewhere and achieve well (T5: p.23).

There’s an opportunity here for them to explore all kinds of avenues ... one of the fellas is not fantastic academically and not fantastic on the runs, but he’s a fantastic disc jockey (T6: p.26).

The teacher approach to learning results in a consistent perception of students concerning their teachers. The majority of students view the teachers as friends, advisors, and people with whom they can talk.

The teachers are much more caring here; I think it’s just a job for the other teachers (at a public school) compared to these teachers ... they’re much more caring here, they get right into it (S2: p.6).

They help you get through the year, they give you all the advice ... they’re still teachers but they know they can talk to us more like friends (S7: p.19).

When I was a kid, it made me feel a lot closer to the staff, that I could actually open up and actually voice my opinion ... I found I could relate to the teacher more and not feel ashamed to say something that might be wrong (A2: p.7).

The teachers actually care about you here, they actually care if you don’t hand things in ... the responsibility for yourself ... you’ve got to hand things in and you’ve got to do it for yourself (S5: p.14).

With regard to the activities in which they are involved, one student perceived them to be good because the teacher attitudes were realistic and allowed “people to do what they can do instead of just psyching them out the whole time” (S8: p.21). Another student indicated that the experiences gained from doing activities were beneficial:

I think at Timbertop they give you experiences so you can get experience from it (S6: p.16).
Gaining experience from experience is one of importance and significance to outdoor and experiential education. It relates to a similar sentiment indicated by teachers in terms of their approach to learning. Specifically, there is an emphasis on the actual experience the students are going through, rather than the outcome of the activity. Within this emphasis on process is also an interest in providing an intensity to the experience. For example, one teacher indicated that "if you are teaching students about mapping and you're lost in the high country, that's a lot more intense than learning in the classroom" (T8: p.39).

Teachers suggested that it is not rare for students in First Term to return from a three day hike past eleven o’clock in the evening. The rationale behind this is that the students learn to cope with the stresses of being lost and navigating their own way back. The manner in which the students are monitored while on hikes is consistent with the experience-focused nature of the school. One student indicated that the teachers “don’t do anything but follow you” on the hikes (S4: p.9). This perception may be naive, as teachers elaborated in detail their role through the hikes. Specifically, the role of teachers is to remain in the background, monitor the safety of groups and encourage those students having difficulty (T3, T7). Their role can be seen as ‘laissez-faire’ in that the teachers believe more in the value of letting students do it themselves, rather than showing them exactly how to do it.

... if you come across a group ... you’ve got to make a judgment ... if they’re simply tired or they’re cold or they’re not feeling well because they haven’t eaten anything because they’ve been too lazy to cook anything, you just pat them on the back and say ‘you can do it’ and you walk on ... and they make it ... the words like perseverance, commitment, endurance don’t have to be mentioned, but they actually grow and develop and it takes control of them (T7: p.30).
This emphasis on letting students work through a problem on their own is found not only in the outdoors, but in academic and social instances as well. The academic structure at Timbertop is based on the Victorian syllabi for Year 9 subjects. The emphasis at Timbertop is based on experience and process, rather than the achievement of a particular outcome, such as the production of a video. The TEAM (Technology, Environment, Agriculture, Marine) activities at Timbertop are run as an extra-curricular activity, though the emphasis on learning is still evident and the teacher attitude concerning process over outcome is equally evident. One teacher responsible for a TEAM activity related a story concerning the problems she was having with her group. Rather than directing the experience to produce a desirable end-product, she let the students learn from the experience and deal with the difficulties of managing, organising, and producing a video.

The focus of the activity is not necessarily just the outcome, it's how you're going to get there ... they figured out they have to have a plan, that they can't get their best friends to act out things if they don't have a script ... (if) they haven't produced the video, which is the outcome, they have learned things (T4: p19).

Similarly, in social instances, the emphasis on experience and process is equally evident. The units, which contain sixteen students, are primarily monitored and regulated by the students. When a conflict or problem arises, staff members, while aware of the problem, do not step in as an authority figure and resolve the difficulty. Instead, the unit members are left to solve the problem on their own, similar to the hike groups. The following excerpt relates one unit’s problems and how the assigned teachers dealt with the problem:

We've watched it slide (the unit) .. and we've let them go hoping that they would realise what was going on by themselves, by learning experience and they haven't ... so we've had a couple of meetings where we've stirred things up within the unit to bring out their problems to the surface ... and now they're starting to realise what is the problem with their unit ... and
we're not giving them solutions; we're hoping that they can come up with their own solutions as a group (T3: p.13).

The teacher attitude towards teaching and learning places an extraordinary amount of responsibility upon the students and provides them the opportunity to take control of their current situation. The consistency of the approach, as evidenced across three teachers in three different circumstances, suggests that teacher attitudes to learning is, generally, focused on experience as the process.

Curriculum structure
The curriculum structure at Timbertop supports the teacher attitudes to learning in most areas. The academics have been described as: lacking in rigour (T5); adequate (T3); academically challenging (T6); quite hard (S5); low academic emphasis (P18); secondary role of academics (P16); improving (P19). While the level of rigour may be debatable, the rationale as to why there is a secondary emphasis on cognitive learning in the classroom is clearly shared by teachers, parents, and students. The majority of teachers suggest that the sacrifice of academics is justified in the learning that occurs in a context outside the classroom.

I think academically the school could improve, but, having said that, the philosophy of the school is prepared to make some sacrifices in that regard because they believe in what happens outside the classroom (T2: p.7).

I tend to think that a lot of schools are incredibly academically focused ... and if you want a rounded product at the end of Year 12, that's not the way to go (T9: p.43).

The curriculum structure is driven by a desire to develop the total person and this is accomplished through a variety of methods. The students participate in individual and group activities, which are intense and relevant. One student discussed her perception of the classes as being
"unreal", meaning focused and meaningful (S6: p. 16). The source of this is grounded in the manner in which the classes are structured:

... they try to make it more fun for you. Like in geography we’re always going out to a weather station, to go see rivers, and other stuff ... for history, we do lots of local history, like Mansfield (S6: p.16).

The parents also perceive this to be part of the academic structure at Timbertop. To them, the curriculum content involves, predominantly, an ‘all-round’ education, taking advantage of the local environment. A typical parent's response referred to it as “holistic education by incorporating the environment into learning” (P12: p.17). As indicated previously, a property of the academic structure is intensity. The positive attributes of the intensity provide for more ‘real’ learning experiences, as indicated by T8. However, the intensity of the structure does have its perceived drawbacks, as evidenced by teacher and student perceptions. The most frequently cited criticism of the structure is its unrelenting nature. Teachers criticised the lack of personal time as a result of the program. Students also stated that there was limited time: “It’s a lot more difficult here because we don’t have as much study time and stuff” (S3: p.8). Another student indicated that the school is “too structured” (S4: p.10). The criticism is defended by one teacher who stresses the need for structure in order to provide each student the opportunity to experience the various attributes of the program.

The teacher attitudes to learning and the curriculum content and structure both contribute to the learning process at Timbertop. The result is an intense curriculum, with a focus on process. Learning process as a category can be seen as the action/interactional component of the paradigm model. The teacher attitudes facilitate the process of learning and work towards the accomplishment of the phenomenon,
identified as the change in the student. As shown, the students are provided with a multitude of opportunities to take control of their situations.

5.1.3 Teacher Role

The category teacher role contains teacher attributes and teacher responsibility as sub-categories. The teacher role refers to their position within Timbertop and does not include their attitudes to teaching. The teacher role describes what the teachers are like at Timbertop, how they conduct themselves, and the outcome or result of their role within the community.

*Teacher Responsibility*

The teacher responsibilities, in theory, are straightforward: do everything the students do (T2, T4, T8). However, in practice, this results in an overwhelming responsibility that becomes "unrelenting" (T2: p.9); "full on" (T4: p.21); "a pressure-cooker situation" (T6: p.27). The teachers are expected to take part in every student activity, while maintaining a professional standard in their teaching. The rationale behind the teacher participation is linked to the notion of the school operating as a community.

> It creates a sense of community and a relationship between students and staff, which would be impossible otherwise ... it often puts staff in positions where students will see them struggle and it creates a fantastic relationship (T8: p.35).

The teachers and assistants are generally of a similar opinion concerning the rationale for doing everything the students do. Typical comments are: "They'll see the sweat coming off your face as you're hiking and
they'll (students) realise that you're actually normal and you are human" (A2: p. 7). "They're not as threatened ... they can see you struggle and how you cope with it as an individual" (T3: p.12).

What do the students say? In an earlier discussion of the category 'learning process', several student excerpts were offered, that illustrated the teacher as a friend to the students. A further example extends this notion, to include how the students behave because of the teacher participation:

They're running along with you, so that you feel like you won't cheat because they're with you and they're doing the same thing. You don't feel like 'well, they're not doing it so I won't do it either' (S3: p.7).

The teacher responsibility extends to the maintenance of the values embraced by Timbertop. According to several teachers, when you work at the school, "you buy into the total package" (T3: p.11). This means that teachers must uphold the values and attitudes of the school. While not a unique feature of a secondary school, the difference exists in the location and intensity of the teacher responsibilities. All teachers live on site with the students and therefore live in close proximity to them. The types of questions the teachers and assistants are asked range from "sex, drugs, alcohol, pornography" (T3: p.11). Therefore, the teachers and assistants role and the frequency and intensity of their interaction with students on these issues are relatively high.

Teacher Attributes
The attributes of teachers at Timbertop can be characterised as: friend; enthusiastic; high energy; advisor; leader; and, surrogate parent. These attributes are identified as essential to the success of the program. The
attitudes to teaching, previously discussed under the 'learning process' category, contribute to the attributes of the teachers as these describe what teachers believe to be important. An implied but mistaken additional attribute resulting from the learning process category, would be 'laissez-faire'. The teachers provide the students with opportunities to sort out problems, to formulate their own solutions, and to allow an experience to teach them. Direction and authority are required, but equally intrinsic to their role is the ability to stand back and relinquish control to the students. Evidence of this has been provided in the discussion of the learning process, with excerpts relating to unit problems, hike problems, and the TEAM activity problem. Therefore, to include 'laissez-faire' as a necessary teacher attribute is to misinterpret the true nature of the apparently disinterested leader. The teachers are providing opportunities for intrinsic feedback to occur, rather than teacher centred extrinsic feedback (refer to Figure 1.1).

The responsibility of teachers to participate with the students relates to the attribute of leading by example. Specifically, T4 indicates that "whatever we expect of the students, we are expected to do the same. Very much a lead by example situation" (T4: p.18). This attribute results in the creation and maintenance of community at Timbertop, according to T8.

The parental perceptions of teachers reveal further attributes contributing to the teacher role.

I was impressed with the interested attitude of the staff in children as individuals (P16: p.3).

Teachers show respect to the students (P14: p.8).
Other attributes cited include: passionate teachers (P1: p.1) and an understanding of "where to draw the line as to responsibility" (P16: p.9).

The teacher role category has been identified as an action/interactional strategy that facilitates the phenomenon 'change in student'. The nature of the attributes and attitudes to teaching facilitate the phenomenon of change in the student. The teachers play a large role in the student learning, both directly and indirectly. It is perhaps the indirect attribute that provide the students the opportunity for change.

5.1.4 School Climate

The category school climate contains school characteristics, school expectations, and rules as sub-categories. This category is primarily descriptive as it describes the school in terms of its characteristics, expectations, and rules.

*School Characteristics, Expectations, and Rules*

A frequently cited characteristic was in reference to the school as a community. This attribute is intrinsically linked to other categories in the following ways. The role and responsibilities, for both teachers and students, are grounded in the nature of the community at Timbertop: the duties for each are a result of their role in the community. To neglect the responsibilities would be detrimental to the operation of the school. The manner in which teachers and students co-exist is a direct result of the intense nature of the community.
Teachers and students offered an interesting perception concerning what people outside the school may think of Timbertop.

I would suspect that this school would appear to be punitive on kids who are not physically fit, but it's not competitive; it's simply to achieve one's own personal best (T5: p.23).

I think it (the rules and consequences) sounds quite harsh initially, and if you try to explain it to someone, it can almost seem draconian from the outside (T9: p.41).

Everything is so clear here in terms of what the expectations are and what the consequences of not fulfilling them are ... it sounds draconian and military a lot of the time (T4: p.19).

These perceptions relate both to a perceived external view of the school and to the notion of rules and consequences at Timbertop. A student offered a similar comment relating to the outside perception of life at Timbertop.

I think it would be really weird looking in from the outside: it would just look like, well not slavery, but it would look like they're getting the kids to do everything, which they're really not at all, but I think it would look like that from the outside, but it's not really like that once you're here (S8: p.22).

Regarding the rules and consequences, these are considered to be consistent and uniform. "It's (the consequences) clear to the students because it's explained and reinforced by staff all the time, and through the uniformity of staff reaction all the time" (T9: p.42). The teachers believe that Timbertop is a relatively easy environment for students, because each student knows the consequences of his/her actions and inactions. The clear consequences and uniform reaction by teachers enables students "to be responsible for themselves and their actions ... they are in control" (T4: p.19).

In terms of the paradigm model, the school climate category exists as an action/interactional strategy. The climate facilitates the phenomenon and enables each student to become more responsible for his/her actions and
learning. The structure and characteristics of the school empowers students and places the onus on them to do what he/she individually believes to be correct. The community nature of the school also contributes to the phenomenon of change in the student because of the role the student must assume in order to ensure the effective operation of the various levels of community. In order to maintain the community, the rules and consequences are consistently adhered to by both student and staff. The result of this again empowers the student and puts the onus on the individual to act and behave in a particular way.

The previous three categories are included as action/interactional strategies, within the paradigm model. The immediate outcome of the action/interactional strategies results in the development of personal/interpersonal skills, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Within the paradigm model, the outcome of the action/interactional strategies is identified as the consequence (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

5.1.5 Personal/Interpersonal Skill Development

This category is based on the personal development and interpersonal skill development categories, as identified in Chapter 4. Within outdoor and experiential education literature, there are numerous studies measuring particular attributes identified as part of personal development concepts, such as: self-esteem, self-confidence, self-reliance, and independence (Ewert, 1989). When participants discussed the rationale concerning the participation in outdoor activities, such as hiking, these concepts were consistently identified. The following excerpts are typical statements from each stakeholder group.
Hiking, running, camping, canoeing ... they do a lot of that stuff to build self-confidence and self-esteem, to push through psychological barriers (T4: p.17).

The outdoor experience ... facilitate(s) the further development of his independence and self-reliance (P4).

... you learn to be independent and live in the bush, and work with people (S8: p.21)

The (rationale of) hiking is to give them independence, so that they can learn that they can cope on their own (A4: p.14).

While some students’ perceptions related to personal and interpersonal development, the majority believed that the main rationale behind doing physical activities was to get fit.

Participants cited attributes such as confidence, self-esteem, and personal growth as developing from the student experiences during the physical activities. However, another source of personal development and particularly interpersonal development, came from living in the units. Assistants, students, parents, and teachers cited the unit life as an excellent opportunity for the student to develop. Three teachers, of whom two were part of the outdoor staff, indicated that the unit life was perhaps more important than any of the outdoor activities. They saw this in terms of opportunity for the development of interpersonal and personal growth.

The outdoors incorporates more than just the hiking, rafting, canoeing ... the unit life, I didn’t really think that was outdoors, but after spending time in their units, I started thinking that they were ... almost the unit life takes over on the outdoors (T1: p.1).

One of the components of Timbertop that I think are so important is the unit life ... the number one skill that they get out of this place is the ability to live with other people and accommodate other people (T9: p40).

Interestingly, these excerpts came from an outdoor leader and the outdoor master. The units provide growth in interpersonal skills because of the proximity and intensity of living with fifteen other people. The
unit operates as a micro-community, as each student has a responsibility within the unit. The consequences of this are that “if (you) don’t do what is expected ... it impacts on the lives of fifteen other people” (T4: p.17). “Peers become the impetus to fulfill the responsibility because if they don’t do it, they will hear about it ... and that’s a good way of learning responsibility at your own level” (T5: p.22). “Living ... with fifteen other people and doing all the jobs together and being with those people for such a long time ... I think it’s an extremely good quality that it instills in the kids -- tolerance” (T6: p.25). Clearly, there is a consistent view that the units provide the opportunity to develop interpersonal skills and to effectively work as a team.

Another frequently cited attribute pertaining to both personal and interpersonal growth concerns awareness. The development of this particular attribute comes from both physical activities as well as from living in the unit, as previously described. The awareness is manifest particularly in the physical activities and is considered an essential ingredient to a successful hike group.

It (hiking) teaches them to deal with people in a different way and to be more sensitive to other people’s emotions ... maybe more perceptive (A3: p.11).

This perception of other people's feelings is cited by teachers and assistants as something that has developed over the course of the school year.

They'll look at you and say 'you're not looking well today' or 'you look upset, are you alright?' and this is coming from kids to their teachers. They know who you are and they can sense things (T4: p.21).

The kids are just so perceptive. I can walk into my unit at night, and maybe it's because the kids know me so well, but they can take one look at my face and say 'hey, what's wrong?' (A3: p.13).
The source of this awareness appears to be from the intimate nature of the school structure and environment, especially from working and living in groups.

Intrinsically linked to the awareness of other's feelings is the development of communication skills. The link can be viewed as a cause and effect situation: the students are aware of other's feelings and develop the ability to communicate this awareness. The type of communication can range from introverted to extroverted; that is, the communicator voices a personal concern (introverted) compared to the communicator voicing concern for others (extroverted). The previously cited excerpts are examples of extroverted communication, where the students show concern for others. The following is an example of the type of introverted communication that is developed.

I think one of the things our kids come out of Timbertop really good at is communication, talking. You've got to speak up : 'I'm a bit tired, I want to stop' (T7: p.30).

The interpersonal and personal skill development is attributed to the structure of the outdoor program, the unit life, and the accomplishment of physical activities. Several students suggested that hiking had a 'cathartic' effect on them (for example, S6: p.16) and was responsible for a positive feeling and increased confidence. A majority of teachers stated that 'step-by-step' successes in accomplishments were responsible for the development of many attributes of personal development.

Within the paradigm model, the category personal/interpersonal skill development is located at the consequence stage of the model. Personal/interpersonal skill development is the outcome or result of
action and interaction, which includes the learning process category, the school climate, and the teacher role category. (Corbin & Strauss, 1990:97). The learning process created the strategies and conditions that result in the development of personal/interpersonal skills.

5.2 Selection of the Core Category

5.2.1 Change in the Student

The core category is defined as "the central phenomenon around which all other categories are integrated" (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.116). Based on this definition, the core category that resulted from the analysis of the data was 'change in the student'. According to Corbin and Strauss (1990), the paradigm model must be used by integrating each identified category into a relevant stage of the model. The resulting integration delineates the core category's centrality. Paraphrasing Corbin and Strauss (1990), the core category is the sun in systematic relationship to its planets - the categories.

The actual change in the student is beyond the scope of this paper, as the purpose of the study was to understand perceptions and from that be able to identify a process leading to a particular outcome. As such, a model of the process is presented in Figure 5.2. Remembering the basic 'input-process-output' model presented in Figure 1.1, the model in Figure 5.2 presents an expansion of the process component.

Each category surrounded by a box in Figure 5.2 represents a main category generated by analysing the data with the paradigm model (see Chapters 4 and 5). The previous Figure 5.1 (page 74), conceptualised
the relationship between the core category and the main categories, and here Figure 5.2 shows an expansion and elaboration of the relationship that exists between each category and sub-category, and the core category. It also elaborates the process stage of Figure 1.1, where the student role is the input, and the change in student (the core category) is the output.

Figure 5.2 Process model contributing to an outcome within an ESOESP.

The actual change that occurs in the student is not relevant to this model; rather, it is the variables that contribute to the change. The interaction of each variable or category can be viewed as the process leading to the outcome. The nature of change in the student can be viewed in the following ways: positive/negative change and short term/long term change.
Positive/Negative Change.

Change in the student can be viewed in both positive and negative terms. The nature of the process model in Figure 5.2 does not necessarily lead to a positive outcome. The change is specific to the individual and as a result, will differ accordingly. In a positive sense, change manifests itself in the form of personal/interpersonal skill development. Examples of this relate to the individual's self-esteem, confidence, communication skills, navigation skills, tolerance, sensitivity to other people's needs or feelings, and responsibility (among others), as discussed previously. In a negative sense, change manifests itself in the individual's experiences in the outdoors. For example, one parent made reference to his child's physical injury due to hiking and their bronchial infection from living in the unheated units (P2: p.14). One teacher suggested that "... it (Timbertop) doesn't mix with certain kids; some will never like it" (T2: p.9).

The unit life has been discussed as a positive source of change for students, in terms of developing tolerance and acceptance of those who are different. However, the unit life can also be seen as a potential for negative change within students. Several teachers and students discussed the difficulties of getting along with fifteen other people. One parent suggested that "the unit can bring about growth and personality development or it can be very painful and isolating - it depends on the luck of the draw" (P.24: p.16). One teacher suggested that "if you don't have a happy unit, you can't possibly have a happy year" (T1: p.1). The purpose of offering these negative excerpts is to demonstrate the different forms that change can undertake. The sources of this change
can come from the units or from participating in the daily life at Timbertop.

*Short term/Long term Change*

Change in the student can be viewed as both short and long term. Short term change can refer to physical, cognitive, and affective characteristics. The immediate physical changes are a direct result from participation in the activities: wood splitting, running, hiking, skiing, jobs, et cetera. The cognitive short term changes refer to the students ability to solve problems in a group, working independently on projects, or learning to navigate the bush via maps and compass. The affective short term change refers to: the heightened awareness of others, as mentioned in the discussion of the student role; the care giver attribute; and the ability to get along with fifteen other students of varying backgrounds. The short term nature of change is grounded in the notion that students go back to their 'old ways' after leaving Timbertop (T3: p.14).

The long term change can be viewed in a similar fashion to the short term change, with the exception of physical change. Teachers, assistants, and parents made reference to the ability students will have in the future, based on their experiences at Timbertop. A typical response is offered below.

I don't think there will be anybody who will be daunted by the prospect of something challenging. They might at first but I think if they sit back and think 'well hang on a tick, if I made it all the way up to the top of there and if I managed to live with fifteen other people for a whole year, I can do this' ... I think they would be at a stage in their life where they have the confidence that they can tackle new challenges (T4: p.20).

Given the age of the students (14 - 15 years old), their ability to project themselves into the future, and see the benefits of something in which they are currently participating, might be limited. However, some
students were able to reflect into the future, based on their current experiences.

I can tell you that right now I don't really like Timbertop. I guess after I leave I'll like it. I'll look back and think 'wow, I've done all that - the 3 day hike, the 6 day hike, the marathon at the end of the year' and I've done a lot of things that I wouldn't have done in my whole entire life ... and I think overall that Timbertop will be a great place (S1: p.1).

Another student offered her perception relating to the first term hiking and could already reflect on the experience: "I know I'll be angry at myself for saying this next term, but when I think about it (hiking), I kind of like it because it was so hard and stuff, but when you get back ... you feel really really good" (S6: p.16). The long term change within students is speculative, however, one teacher suggested that the benefits to the individual are often seen years after the experience.

There would be a percentage of those who don't see the benefits of the experience until a number of years later ... there's a doctor in town who lived here 30 years ago, who was telling me that it wasn't until a year or so ago, that he came to recognise how much Timbertop affected his life (T8: p.38).

The previous discussion on change is based on the perceptions of participants and analysis of the data. The short term/long term and positive/negative attributes of change were presented in order to describe the uncovered properties of change. Therefore, this is neither a definitive nor exhaustive description. Again, the actual change that may occur within the student is not the purpose of the study. What is of importance are the five categories and their relationship to the core category. The five categories are part of a process that exists within a particular Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Program (ESOESP). The relationship between these five categories and the resulting core category combine to form a model of how each category within the
process contributes to the core category of change in the student (Figure 5.2).
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Discussion

This section will discuss the findings in relation to the literature in outdoor and experiential education. The process model (Figure 5.2) identified in Chapter 5 summarises the findings and answers the main question of the study: "What do the stakeholder's perceptions indicate in relation to the process leading to outcomes at an ESOESP?" Within the process model are several categories and sub-categories, each contributing to the overall process and an unspecified outcome. Prior to discussing the findings in relation to the literature, a brief discussion of the research approach and its general effectiveness towards answering the questions of the study will follow.

The hermeneutic/dialectic approach was initially an appropriate methodology, given its treatment of stakeholder perceptions as constructed realities; theoretically, this approach was ideal for the study, given its reliance on perceptions in relation to the development of a model. However, in practice, employing a hermeneutic/dialectic approach relied too heavily upon absolute participation and willingness of stakeholders to both offer their perceptions and suggest peers with contrasting opinions to their own, especially within an environment that relies so much upon compliance and adherence to a particular philosophy.

With regard to the modified grounded theory approach, it was generally a useful method of analysis because of its focus on building "theory that is
faithful to and illuminates the area under study” (Corbin & Strauss, 1990: p.24). The paradigm model was particularly effective as it forced the researcher to provide a grounded rationale for the creation of each category and supporting subcategories. A drawback to the methodology was found not in the actual process, but in the resources afforded to the researcher. That is, the analysis and creation of categories would have been further validated by allowing another individual (or individuals) to follow through the coding procedures with the same set of data.

The nature of the process model (Figure 5.2) and its components relate to the outdoor and experiential literature in the following way. Firstly, as identified in the literature review, there are attributes of both the student and teacher, and the attitudes to learning that are consistent within experiential and outdoor settings. This will be discussed in the section 'experiential learning process' and the relevant components of Figure 5.2 will be specifically examined. Secondly, types of outdoor and experiential programs were identified within the literature review. The relationship between the findings of this study and the attributes of one type of program - the integrated curriculum program - will be discussed. Thirdly, the notion of a community environment and its relationship to this study will be examined.

6.1.1 Experiential Learning Process

Within this discussion, Figure 5.2 will be discussed with specific reference to the teacher role, the student role, and the learning process categories. The link between the literature and these categories will be examined. It is proposed that based on the relationship between the literature and the findings, the process model can be considered an
experiential learning process. A contributing question to the study was
to determine the extent of the relationship between the literature and the
findings. Given that the majority of the literature was experiential based,
it is therefore reasonable to propose that the emerging relationship
between the findings and literature be considered experiential. This will
be shown in the following sections of teacher role and learning process,
and the student role.

*Teacher Role and Learning Process*

The two categories are discussed in tandem because of the similarities
and connections between them; for example, a sub-category of learning
process includes the teacher attitudes to learning. The teachers at
Timbertop provide each student the opportunity to become actively
engaged in a particular activity, be it outdoors, in the classroom, or
within the units. Within this active engagement, students are given
relative autonomy in their decisions. The teachers support the students
and provide direction, based on their judgment and assessment of the
current situation. The nature of the support and guidance, and active
engagement with an activity or problem is consistent with both Joplin
(1981) and her five step model defining experiential education, and the
Association for Experiential Education (AEE) and their endorsed

The teacher attitudes to learning is consistent across all areas of learning,
as evidenced in the discussion in Section 5.1.2 of Chapter 5, specifically
referring to the teacher approach to a problem on a hike (T7), a problem
within the unit (T3), and a problem within a classroom (T4). The
'laissez-faire' or student-centred approach is equally consistent with
Dewey (1938) and his view of teacher direction within an experience:
It is worth while, accordingly, to say something about the way in which the adult can exercise the wisdom his own wider experiences give him without imposing a merely external control ... he must, if he is an educator, be able to judge what attitudes are actually conducive to continued growth and what are detrimental (Dewey, 1938: p.33).

Thus, in Dewey's view, it is not the teacher's role to dominate and direct an experience; rather, it is teacher's role to assess the situation and allow the student to be in control, only until that point where it is no longer beneficial to the student. This is confirmed at Timbertop based on the teacher's attitudes and value placed on an experience, be it outdoors or indoors.

The location of the experience leads to an interesting connection to the literature. As discussed, the teachers at Timbertop are consistent in their attitude to student experience in relation to learning, regardless of the location of this experience. Burger and Sakofs (1987) suggest that an experiential instructor is not defined by his/her proximity to the outdoors, but rather "through the relationship with students who are having intangible experiences" (p.24). Therefore, it is not the outdoors which makes an instructor experiential, but rather his/her attitude and relationship with the student having the experience. This is consistent with the teachers at Timbertop.

Concerning the relationships with the students, the teachers at Timbertop are perceived as being a friend, care-giver, adviser, and authority figure (S1, S2, S5, S6, S7, T1). Further, some teachers have discussed the notion that it is sometimes the student who is the care-giver to the teacher (T1 & T3). This is consistent with Otten (1985), who views the relationship between teacher and student, within an experiential setting, to be co-dependent.
The development of positive relationships between student and teachers at Timbertop is based on the role of the teachers. Specifically, each teacher has the responsibility to take part in everything the students do. The resulting relationship has been described as "fantastic" (T8: p.35) and contributes to the community feeling of the school. Community will be discussed in a subsequent section. The teacher responsibility to actively take part in all aspects of the student learning at Timbertop is consistent with the essential elements of an experiential program, identified by Druian et al. (1990). It is also consistent with Carver (1996) and her comment that teachers "are role models and influence the experiences of students by the way they react, respond, and take action in the combination of settings in which they are viewed by students" (p.11). As many of the teachers at Timbertop indicated, their role is one of 'lead by example' (T4). Finally, the teacher participation at Timbertop is in direct relation to Joplin's five step model, where a necessary responsibility of teachers is to take part in "mutually experienced activities" (Joplin, 1981, in Warren et al.,: p.19).

Learning at Timbertop is viewed as addressing the entire individual and incorporating the surrounding environment (T2, T9, P12, P19, A3). This is given evidence through teacher, student, and parent perceptions relating to personal/interpersonal skill development. Through the participation in the outdoor activities, in the unit life, and in the classroom, physical, emotional, social, and cognitive skills are developed. This confirms Joplin's (1981) view that learning in an experiential context is "physical, mental, emotional" (in Warren et al., p.17) and agrees with Kolb's (1988) definition that experiential education focuses on the whole person. The focus on the whole individual through the
development of social, physical, emotional, and cognitive skills at Timbertop is also a focus of the Progressive education movement, in which experiential education has its roots (Knapp, 1994). Thus, the learning process at Timbertop, which focuses on experiences and is complemented by the role of the teachers and their attitudes to learning, is further illustrated in an experiential context.

Related to the discussion of the learning process at Timbertop is one student's view that "(teachers) give you experience so you can get experience from it" (S6: p.16). This delineates the discussion concerning the focus on experience as a teacher attitude to learning at Timbertop and relates to the continuum of experiences, discussed by Dewey (1938). Dewey believed in a continuum of experience, which is underpinned by the notion that "every experience influences in some degree the objective conditions under which further experiences are had" (Dewey 1938: p.30). Further, Dewey suggested that a primary responsibility of educators was to know how to "utilise surroundings, physical and social, that exist so as to extract from them all that they have to contribute to building up experiences that are worthwhile" (Dewey, 1938: p.35; emphasis added).

How does this relate to Timbertop? There is a consistent approach to the use of both physical, social, and academic surroundings in order to facilitate a particular experience. "A lot of what they do here is in units, in the outdoors, and by doing say ski tours, they’re put into a different situation and different conditions ... so they have to put into place some of the skills they have learned in unit life and socialisation" (T9: p.41). Based on the student experiences in one location, they are given the
opportunity to utilise these previous experiences in order to facilitate and succeed in an existing experience.

This relates to the philosophy of the school and its view of experience in general. One of the main objectives of the school is to offer students "a plethora of new and unusual challenges, obstacles, and hurdles which resemble those which they will come across throughout their lives" (Guest, 1995: p.2). By providing challenges and experiences to students, which are intended to benefit the individual in the future, the school is operating within the principles of the continuum of experiences, as discussed by Dewey (1938).

**Student Role**

The student role at Timbertop has been described as varied. They are responsible for a variety of tasks outside the traditional Year 9 curriculum. For example, students are given the opportunity to act as both hike and unit leader as well as a member of the unit and hike group (S3: p.7; P16: p.12; T4: p.17). This supports the study of Druian *et al.* (1990), which indicated that an essential element of the student role within an experiential program is to experience a variety of roles within a group.

With acceptance of various roles comes responsibility at different levels, because of the context in which the roles are played. The majority of the student activities are done through group work - hiking, living, classes, and jobs around the school. As a result of this group focus, the responsibility for each student increases. Failure to split the wood to heat the unit and the showers will lead to the discomfort of fifteen other students; an inability to navigate or keep up with the rest of a hike group,
will have an immediate affect on the other members of the group.
Students at Timbertop learn responsibility based on the consequences of
their actions or inactions. This responsibility is consistent with the
AEE's definition of experiential education which suggests that the
individual must assume responsibility during the learning process
(Luckmann, 1996).

The role of students in the learning process at Timbertop is one of active
engagement. Teachers and students indicate that it is the student who is
in control of what they get out of the year (T4, S5). This is achieved by
learning by doing and actively experiencing various activities with little
interference from the teachers. This is congruent with Burger and
Sakofs (1987), who suggest that learners in an experiential setting "have
a choice over what they learn and a clear vision of how knowledge can
be used in this world" (p.25). Students offer further congruence to this
application of knowledge when discussing why they do so much hiking:

It's because you go through lots of hard times while you're hiking and you really can have
some difficult times and it can really suck. You get that in life. Like if your parent dies, that
would really suck or if something terrible happens, that really sucks. I think at Timbertop
they give you experience so you can get experience from it (S6: p.16).

This is a powerful statement from a fourteen year old, who sees the
application of what she has learned while in the outdoors and how it can
be used in dealing with life. It is consistent across several students who
discuss hiking in terms of building their confidence and living in units as
developing tolerance. It reinforces both Burger and Sakofs (1987) and
Dewey (1938) and his discussion on the continuum of experiences.
6.1.2 Community

Timbertop is described as operating on a three-tiered community: the school community, the unit community, and the hike community (T7). To offer a definition of each is difficult and confirms Totten and Manley (1969) and their view that community is more readily described than defined. The community structure at Timbertop is based on teachers and students undertaking the same tasks. While friendship amongst members is a result of the community, which is similar to Horwood's (1994) description of community, it is not the raison d'etre at Timbertop.

Community at Timbertop is based on several inputs. The isolation and self-sufficient nature contributes to the community 'feel' of the school. Through this self-sufficiency, students and teachers each play essential roles that allow the school to operate. Through the isolation, students and teachers are dependent on each other to get through the year and complete the tasks with each other's support. Isolation as an ingredient to a community is discussed by Kiewa (1991), who views it as an attribute providing "the dynamics that encourage the growth of a close-knit caring community" (p.9). Another input to the community at Timbertop is the removal of competition; the rationale behind this is to allow the individual to develop in the context of him/herself, with the support of others (T8). This is consistent with Kiewa (1991) and her view that competition is "not conducive to the development of caring communities" (p.9).

What is conducive to creating and maintaining a community is discussed by Reimer et al. (1983, cited in Howard-Hamilton, 1995). The authors suggest that responsibility must be extended to all members of the
community, that there must be a clear, flexible procedural order, and that a collective responsibility is developed (Reimer et al., 1983). The students and teachers at Timbertop each have responsibilities, which are clearly stated and reinforced during the year (T3, T4, T1, T8, A2). As discussed previously, the relationship between student and teacher is co-dependent, and part of this co-dependency stems from this 'collective responsibility'. Further agreement with Reimer et al. (1983) relates to the procedural order. As one teacher states, the students "have something in particular to do all the time, and a particular way to do it, and there are very strong expectations that they will follow the program" (T8: p.37). While not lending itself to flexibility, the procedural operations at Timbertop are incredibly clear and are therefore consistent with the work of Reimer et al. (1983) concerning the creation and maintenance of a community.

The similarity of responses within the teacher, student, assistant, and parent participants gives evidence of a relationship that seems to exist within the members of the Timbertop community. The three-tiered community at Timbertop, described by T7, has a common element and that is the implied relationships between members. Within the school community, there is a positive student-teacher relationship. Within the unit community, there is a necessity of a tolerant and accepting relationship amongst the sixteen members. Within the hike group, there is an interdependent relationship between the four to six hike members. Each relationship is an essential component to the success of the community and is complemented by strict policies and procedural rules. The notion of relationships is consistent to the approach taken by Fletcher (in Allen et al., 1987), who views relationships as an implied component of a community.
The previous discussion on community is descriptive as the nature of community, as suggested by Totten and Manley (1968) and Garth et al., (1987), is difficult to define. The community at Timbertop is characterised by a group of people working towards a common goal. The structure of the community varies from the large scale school community to the small scale hike community. In each instance, the members are actively engaged in pursuing a common goal (for example, to complete the hike), based on clearly defined rules and consequences.

6.1.3 Integrated curriculum program

The findings from a study of an integrated curriculum program are relevant to the discussion of the findings from this study because of their similarities. The implications of similar findings within two distinct programs, in two distinct cultures, offer confirmation and support to the findings of this study.

Horwood’s (1994) study of an integrated curriculum program (Tamarack) in Ontario, Canada generated the following concepts: complete process; authenticity; community; and responsibility. These four concepts were viewed as the “transcendent qualities integrating the ... curriculum” (Horwood, 1994: p.5) and emerged from interviews with students, teachers, and parents. An integrated curriculum program does not exist in Australia, based on data base searches on ERIC and APAIS, and communication with John Gore, the Chief Education Officer responsible for secondary curriculum, at the Curriculum Directorate of the NSW Department of School Education. Interestingly, although the program does not exist in Australia, the similarity in findings suggest that
the two programs, ESOESP and an integrated curriculum program, have much in common.

Responsibility as a concept in Horwood’s (1994) study relates to the “processes” within learning, and leads to “a feeling that they are in charge of what is going on” (p. 9). In addition to the responsibility to their school work, students were also responsible “to the developing community”, identified as both the group of students and teachers participating in the program and to the outside community (Horwood, 1994: p.8). The nature of the student role at Timbertop impels the students to be responsible to themselves, to the hike community, and to the larger school community. The consequences of their actions are heavily discussed within the transcripts, and it is through the student understanding of the consequences that responsibility is developed. The consequences relate to their role within the community: if a student does not chop the wood, clean the toilets, or consider the feelings of others, fifteen other people suffer the consequences of the individual’s inaction.

Horwood’s (1994) identification of authenticity at Tamarack (site of the study) is of interest in comparison to the finding of consequences at Timbertop. Authenticity referred to the ‘real-world’ feeling of the student activities at Tamarack, and applied to both academics and outdoor education (Horwood, 1994). Simulations as a means to practice a skill were viewed in a positive light at Tamarack, despite their lack of authenticity. For example, getting the class to stand simultaneously on a suspended plank “was valued by the students because it gave a critical rehearsal of group process skills required in earnest later” (Horwood, 1994: p.7). In this instance, skills developed in one area were transferred to another area.
As discussed earlier, in relation to Dewey (1938) and the connection of experiences through both social and physical surroundings, this is equally evident at Timbertop. However, the intensity and consequences of applying a particular skill, or the failure to apply a particular skill, may be more severe at Timbertop. For example, it has been discussed that students learn socialisation within the units (a social surrounding). The use of these skills of tolerance, communication, and perception must transcend disciplines and surroundings in order to succeed both in the woods (a physical surrounding) and within the community (a social surrounding). Thus, authenticity is equally important at Timbertop. However, the nature of authentic or ‘real-world’ experiences at Timbertop may be more intense because of the circumstances and consequences of not viewing the experiences as real-world, or important.

6.2 Recommendations for Future Research

There are several areas of research that could be pursued based on the findings of this study.

- Conduct a similar investigation at another ESOESP to determine the validity and generalisability of the process model.

- Conduct a similar investigation within an integrated curriculum program in another location.

- Investigate male and female hike and unit groups, in order to determine if there is a difference in the personal and interpersonal attributes. Within
the gender specific groups, problem solving skills, group work abilities, and communication skills could be observed and examined for similarities and/or differences. This research would offer gender specific insight into the participants of outdoor and experiential programs, which could lead to the refinement of strategies and activities employed by practitioners. While not an area addressed within this study, it is one that became of interest after observing the co-educational environment at Timbertop.

- Investigate those individuals who have experienced negative change because of their experiences within the outdoors. Investigate the source of this negative change, why the individuals considered the experience to be negative, and how this has affected their lives. The importance of this research is grounded in the individual nature of experiential education. If experiential education seeks to develop the individual, an understanding of the negative experiences will promote proactive rather than reactive behaviour of program developers.

- Similar to Gray's doctoral research (on-going), conduct a longitudinal study investigating two or more ESOESPs, to uncover the perceptions of participants and to see if they are congruent and contribute to the same process, leading to an unspecified outcome. This research would provide validity and generalisability to this study. Further, the process could be refined and improved upon, thus benefiting practitioners in the field.

- Focusing on particular components of the process model, such as learning process, teacher attitudes to learning within an ESOESP, and reflective feedback, studies could investigate the relative importance of
these components to the overall program and/or outcome. The value of such studies relate to the strategies employed within outdoor and experiential programs. The existing strategies and attitudes could be refined and enhanced based on the results of the study.

6.3 Conclusions

Timbertop as a school is unique in several ways. These include the nature of the student role, the student-teacher relationships, the responsibilities of each individual, and the perception of the school as a community. Timbertop as an outdoor education centre is equally unique: the intense focus on hiking, the location of the school within the mountains, and the duration of the program. The combination of these characteristics of the school, in relation to the literature, suggests that Timbertop is an experiential school, focusing on the outdoors. The objective of the outdoor focus, however, is not to gain experience and skill within a particular environment. Instead, the outdoors is used to facilitate and develop the individual. The outdoors can be seen as a vehicle to promote what the students learn both in and out of doors.

The aim of the study was to uncover perceptions at an ESOESP and to develop an understanding of how the process contributing to an outcome works within the context of the outdoors. The model presented in Figure 5.2 offers an explanation of how this process works and it is not restricted to the outdoors; rather, it is facilitated by the outdoors. Before the data collection process and interviews, the researcher considered the outdoors to be the main focus at Timbertop. However, what emerged was somewhat different. While important to the overall process of learning and contributing to an outcome, and this outcome is
not of importance to this study, the outdoors is complemented and facilitated by other contributing factors. These are identified as: the student role; the teacher role; the learning process and its associated sub-categories of teacher attitudes to learning and curriculum structure; the school climate; and the development of interpersonal and personal skills. The outdoors is a necessary component of each factor and facilitates the process, however, it is not the dominant feature of the program.

The term or paradigm of experiential education requires clarification and perhaps this can be offered based on the findings at Timbertop. Experiential education involves a focus on the process of learning, and may make use of physical and/or social surroundings. What is essential to experiential education is the connection and ‘transcend-ability’ of experiences, whether they occur during a climb, a hike, a classroom project, or a conversation between students and teachers. An essential element must be connection and consequence; students must see a consequence of their actions, social or physical, and understand how a particular experience can be used in order to enhance a future experience. A further essential element is the development of a community of learners within an experiential setting. The development of a community provides the individual a connection and relationship with those around him/her, and may provide the support and encouragement required for the completion of outdoor and indoor tasks.

If it is accepted, based on the previous discussion concerning the findings at Timbertop and the cited experiential literature, that Timbertop supports and employs experiential techniques and philosophies, the model presented in Figure 5.2 is of value. Remembering the simplified process model from Figure 1.1, the area of particular relevance is the process
stage of the model, of which Figure 5.2 is conceptualised as an expansion. Equally important, however, is the reflective feedback component of the model. The perceptions of stakeholders can be viewed as reflective feedback found within and outside the process model in Figure 5.2.

As Ewert (1987) suggested, more is needed in the way of understanding a particular process: "without the ability to explain how and why an outcome (e.g. enhanced learning) is realised, we lose our ability to predict that outcome in different situations or with different participants" (p.5). Further, without the ability to understand the factors that contribute to an outcome, the ability to improve and modify these variables is lost. Therefore, the process model contributing to an outcome (Figure 5.2) is of value, because it explains what occurs at a particular ESOESP, based on the perceptions of those directly (students, teachers) and indirectly (parents) involved with the program.
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APPENDIX I

July 2, 1996
Murray Guest
Headmaster
Timbertop
PO Box Mansfield
3722

Dear Sir,

re: explanation of research to be conducted at Timbertop.

Following our conversation on May 31, I am writing to further indicate the nature and structure of the research that will be conducted at Timbertop as part of my Master of Education requirement. Again, I greatly appreciate your cooperation in this endeavor.

Briefly, the aim of the study is to investigate and determine whether there exists a relationship between the principles and objectives of an Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Program (ESOESP) and the perceptions of students, staff, and parents within the ESOESP. In order to determine the perceptions of staff and students, I will need to conduct interviews. The length of each interview would range between 30-40 minutes and 20-30 minutes for staff and students, respectively. The interview and questions would be open-ended, and students and staff would be given the opportunity to withdraw at any point during the interview.

In order to determine parent perceptions, a brief questionnaire would be used. The questionnaire would be mailed in tandem with the necessary parental consent form, and each is included for your consideration. Parents would be asked to return the completed questionnaire to my address. The details of the project will be briefly presented to them in a letter accompanying the consent form and questionnaire. This would be mailed at the beginning of August 1996.

Approximately 5-7 students and 5-7 staff members would be needed for the study. With regard to selecting students, this can be done either on a random basis or on a volunteer basis; the student selection method is flexible and can be determined according to your wishes, if so desired. Regarding staff interviews, I would like to interview the outdoor master
and yourself; the remaining staff interviews would occur based on an initial recommendation from the outdoor master.

Given the nature of the research, I would be audio-taping the interviews and transcribing them. Anonymity and confidentiality of all responses would be guaranteed to all participants. A full view of the results would be offered to you during the write-up stage.

With regard to the time frame of conducting the research, I would be interested in coming down to Timbertop between August 26/September 2. I am proposing 3-4 days of strictly observing and becoming familiar within the environment. These 3-4 days would also be used to schedule interviews; I appreciate how busy both staff and students are and interviews would be scheduled at a time least disruptive to their routine. Your input is greatly appreciated and welcomed concerning this matter. Following the 3-4 day observation, approximately 3-4 days is proposed for conducting the interviews. In total, the duration of my stay at Timbertop would be approximately 8-9 days.

If you have any comments, questions, or concerns regarding the enclosed proposal, accompanying parent letters, or the proposed time period, please feel free to call me at: work (047) 360-106 or at home (047) 316-826 or fax (047) 360 400. Again, your cooperation in this is greatly appreciated and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Simon Jimenez
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW

To the students:

THE FOLLOWING INTERVIEW IS STRUCTURED AND ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THIS INTERVIEW WILL BE ASKED THE SAME QUESTIONS. THE INTERVIEW WILL BE AUDIOTAPED. ALL ANSWERS WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND ANONYMOUS. A CODE WILL BE ASSIGNED TO EACH SET OF RESPONSES, KNOWN ONLY TO THE INTERVIEWER. EACH PARTICIPANT WILL BE READ THIS STATEMENT PRIOR TO STARTING THE INTERVIEW. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR ME BEFORE WE START THE INTERVIEW?

Quick overview of the research: I am asking you these questions in order to find out your thoughts and perceptions concerning life at Timbertop. I will be interviewing teachers, other students, and the headmaster for their perceptions about Timbertop.

1. Can you give me a brief educational history (what schools you have attended in the past) and how it is you came to be at Timbertop?

2. Tell me a little bit about Timbertop.

3. What activities are you involved in at Timbertop? Why?

4. What does the school expect of you?

5. Is this school unique from other schools you have been to or have heard of? how? how is it the same?

6. In your experience, what kind of person does Timbertop strive to develop?
7. In your opinion, what kind of person does Timbertop develop? (i.e. in reality, what sort of people does it develop?)

8. What do you like most about Timbertop?

9. What do you like least about Timbertop? (or, Is there something about Timbertop that you don’t like?).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR ANSWERS WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL; A CODE WILL BE ASSIGNED THAT ONLY THE INTERVIEWER WILL KNOW. I APPRECIATE YOU SHARING YOUR THOUGHTS WITH ME ABOUT TIMBERTOP.
APPENDIX II (continued)

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW

To the teachers/headmaster:

THE FOLLOWING INTERVIEW IS STRUCTURED AND ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THIS INTERVIEW WILL BE ASKED THE SAME QUESTIONS. THE INTERVIEW WILL BE AUDIOTAPED. ALL ANSWERS WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND ANONYMOUS. A CODE WILL BE ASSIGNED TO EACH SET OF RESPONSES, KNOWN ONLY TO THE INTERVIEWER. EACH PARTICIPANT WILL BE READ THIS STATEMENT PRIOR TO STARTING THE INTERVIEW. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR ME BEFORE WE START THE INTERVIEW?

Quick overview of the research: I am asking you these questions in order to find out your thoughts and perceptions concerning life at Timbertop. I will be interviewing teachers, other students, and the headmaster for their perceptions about Timbertop.

1. Can you give me a brief teaching history (what schools you have taught at in the past) and how it is you came to be at Timbertop?

2. Tell me a little bit about Timbertop.

3. What activities are the students involved in at Timbertop? Why?

4. What does the school expect of you?

5. What does the school expect of the students?

6. Is this school unique from other schools you have been to or have heard of? how? how is it the same?
7. In your experience, what kind of person does Timbertop strive to develop?

8. In your opinion, what kind of person does Timbertop develop? (i.e. in reality, what sort of people does it develop?)

9. What do you like most about Timbertop?

10. What do you like least about Timbertop? (or, Is there something about Timbertop that you don’t like?).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR ANSWERS WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL; A CODE WILL BE ASSIGNED THAT ONLY THE INTERVIEWER WILL KNOW. I APPRECIATE YOU SHARING YOUR THOUGHTS WITH ME ABOUT TIMBERTOP.
APPENDIX III

August 9, 1996

Dear Parent,

My name is Simon Jimenez and I am a Master of Education student at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean. I have recently been given permission by Headmaster Murray Guest, to conduct research at Timbertop towards the completion of my degree.

Briefly, the aim of the study is to investigate and determine whether there exists a relationship between the principles and objectives of an Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Program (ESOESP) and the perceptions of students, staff, and parents within the ESOESP. In order to determine the perceptions of staff and students, I will need to conduct interviews. The length of each interview would range between 30-40 minutes and 20-30 minutes for staff and students, respectively. The interview would be audio-taped and transcribed; copies would be made readily available to all participants.

There are several reasons why I am writing to you. First is to inform you about the research being conducted at Timbertop. Second, while permission has been granted, parental consent is a necessary step for ethical and legal reasons. Approximately 5-7 students are required for the interview process (which will take 20-30 minutes). The scheduling of interviews will be done in a manner least disruptive to their daily routine. Again, the interviews seek to determine the perceptions of the student at Timbertop. Thirdly, you are an important part of Timbertop and I am interested in YOUR perceptions concerning the school.

Enclosed in this letter is a brief questionnaire that I would ask you to fill out and return in the addressed envelope. Given the nature of this research, all responses would be assured anonymity and confidentiality. The results of the study will be given to the Headmaster and made available to all participants.
Your cooperation in this endeavor is greatly appreciated and I look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Simon Jimenez, B.A., Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary).
CONSENTFORM

I, ________________________________, hereby give permission for my son/daughter, ________________________________, to participate in the postgraduate research being conducted by Simon Jimenez.

Signature: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________

***Please return this consent form to the following address before August 30 1996:

Timbertop
c/o Murray Guest (re: consent form)
Headmaster
Private Mail Bag Mansfield
Victoria 3722
QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire has been designed to determine your perceptions of Timbertop. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability. If you require more space, please attach your additional comments to a separate page and indicate the corresponding question number to your response.

Please forward your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by September 15 1996. I appreciate your cooperation and I look forward to your responses. If you have any questions concerning the research or the questionnaire, I can be contacted via email at: sjimenez@harpo.nepean.uws.edu.au

**Please note that the consent form is to be returned to Timbertop and the questionnaire is to be returned in the enclosed envelope to the University of Western Sydney.
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Why did you send your son/daughter to Timbertop?

2. What activities (physical and academic activities) is your child involved in at Timbertop?

3. In your opinion, why do they take part in these activities?
QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

4. In your opinion, is Timbertop different from other schools you know of? If yes, how is it different?

5. To your knowledge, what are the expectations Timbertop has of your son/daughter?
QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

6. Are there benefits to sending your son/daughter to Timbertop?

7. In your opinion, what are the educational objectives at Timbertop?
APPENDIX IV

October 18 1996

Dear participant,

Enclosed is a copy of the interview you took part in at the end of August 1996. Please take the time now to read through this transcript. The transcript is a duplicate from the audio-taped interview. If you have any concerns or comments regarding this transcript, please feel free to contact me, either by phone or via correspondence. My contact phone number is 047 360 107 and the mailing address is:

Simon Jimenez
University of Western Sydney, Nepean
PO Box 10
Kingswood, NSW
2747

The information is confidential and anonymous. I have signed the envelope with my signature to ensure that no one else has seen this prior to you.

Thank you again for your participation and good luck with the rest of the term.

Sincerely,

Simon Jimenez
APPENDIX V

PARENT DATA FROM SURVEY (tt = Timbertop).

1. Reason for sending child to tt?

p1:
- important time in child's development
- tt has good rules and traditions
- passionate teachers
- ability to overcome challenges through experience

p2:
- no particular intention to send child to tt; just part of ggs

p3:
- friend was going to tt
- believed in the tt philosophy
- yr. 9 girls at her previous school were not particularly happy

p4:
- ability for child to explore internal/external horizons
- outdoor experience will facilitate independence and self-reliance
- development of leadership and interpersonal skills
- understanding and appreciation of group dynamics

p5:
blank

p6:
- brother attended
- opportunity to cope with challenge

p7:
- reduced cost (staff member)
- believe in the philosophy
(WHY TT.... cont.).

p8:
Unit life, which promotes:
- team building
- leadership development
- confidence building
- independence
- assertiveness growth
- responsibility

Outdoor life, which promotes:
- fitness
- stamina
- self-confidence

Academic, which promotes:
- practical application of theory

p9:
- sibling attended, as did other family members
- develops independence
- great experience
- develops support for 'fellow man'

p10:
- b/c of philosophy and ethos of school
- build confidence through outdoor challenges
- development of self-discipline

p11:
- won a scholarship

p12:
- opportunity to test themselves, physically/mentally
- small community forces them to rely on that community and selves
- learn obligations to 'fellow man'
- self-discovery of capabilities

p13:
- seems nice to be there--environment and friends
- no department stores
p14:
- brothers attended
- teaches responsibility
- reliable for their own behavior
- develop independence and responsibility
- respect of other people and their feelings
- challenging

p15:
- child loves outdoor education
- always wanted to go to boarding school
- belief that child would make the most of the opportunity

p16:
- brother attended
- impressed by interested attitude of staff
- treating children as individuals
- positive moral attitude—self respect
- aid to broadening of confidence and self-esteem through interaction of a variety of children
- physically demanding environment ideal for age of child

p17:
- past member of staff
- old g’s value their time and consider it a highlight of their schooling

p18:
- quality time spent with appropriate role models (single parent)
- skill development
(WHY TT... cont.)

-opportunity for maturity
-interact with nature and develop awareness of environment

p19:
-part of going to Glamorgan is to move to tt in yr9
-believer in ‘outward bound’ tt year
-supporter of ggs and philosophy

p20:
-acceptance of tt philosophy
-develop child to be part of the community and live up to take responsibility

p21:
-natural progression to go to tt in yr9 (yr7-8 at Corio)

p22:
-no yr9 at Corio
-gain an all-round education at tt

-learn self-reliance and caring for others
-team work developed through living in units

p23:
-siblings/father attended
-broad education from experiences apart from the academic
-skills development
-learn to live with others
-tolerance of others

p24:
-physical/mental challenge
-discover capabilities among peers
-to help in self-reliance, decision-making (w/o parents looking over shoulder)
-environmental appreciation - live in it and with it
-sibling/father

p25:
-independence in a supportive environment
-being part of team will help in development of interpersonal skills

3. Why do they take part in the activities they do at tt?

p1:
- b/c child is interested in them
- b/c they are challenges

p2:
- b/c they are part of the curriculum
- they have to; half the students would prefer conventional sporting activities to the outdoor education, in p2's opinion.

p3:
- b/c they have to

p4:
- school pressure (for religious education)
- competitive nature
- establish ability and skill development
- personal challenge

p6:
- part of the routine

p7:
- good for development as a total person
- speeds up transition from child to adult (dependent to indep.)

p8:
- partly b/c they are compulsory
- intrinsic desire to do them (this comes through skill development)

p9:
- school routine

p10:
- part of the year at tt
- physical challenges are best context for progress through adolescence; develops them socially as well

p11:
- character building experiences
p12:
-challenges them in activities not necessarily available at home

p13:
-b/c child likes it

p14:
-they enjoy the challenge to learn with peers
-develop skills and confidence to survive on their own
-determination to do well

p15:
-physical challenge
-take on responsibility
-cooperation within a group
-self-confidence
-fitness
-appreciation of environment

p16:
-child's competitive nature is given opportunity to develop, but success is placed in perspective
-everyone given opportunity to achieve best performance
-leadership qualities developed (in hike group and unit life)
-respect from peers in achieving success

(why activities...cont.)

p17:
-child likes them
-seen as a challenge
-child enjoys group nature of many of the tasks

p18:
-child's background in living close to nature and love of sports are probably what motivates him

p19:
-there is no sense of failure b/c they don't have to win, just try
p20:
-to learn and live like the other students
-child enjoys new things

p21:
-to provide an all-round education

p22:
-learn a lot from the activities: teamwork, support and help others, that they can achieve more than they thought possible.

p23:
-broader education via hands-on experience
-tolerance of others
-confidence in ability

p24:
-compulsory
-fitness
-challenge and develop new skills
-teamwork
-responsibility for actions
-decision making
-sense of achievement
-importance of a Christian community and how to live in it

p25:
-encourage fitness
-appreciation of bush
-sense of achievement
-improve self-esteem

4. Is it different from other schools? If yes, why?

p1:
-time spent in outdoor activities (esp. compared to Korean schools)
-study on weekends

p2:
-based on outward bound/Gordonstoun type of school
-it is different but not unique
p3:
-teaches kids about environmental issues, survival, natural highs, and spiritual matters
-toughens them up
-child is more independent as a result of this experience

p4:
-eccentric timetable
-all boarding population
-isolation
-single year group
-development of responsibility, self-reliance, INTERDEPENDENCE

p6:
-isolation forces student to negotiate problems with peers and staff
-unit life and the amount of time spent together
-unit life and learning of responsibility

(unique....cont.)

p7:
-intense nature leads to a mix of emotions and challenges to deal with
-forces adolescents to deal with issues that most wouldn't deal with until early 20s

p8:
-most schools do not offer an ESOESP
-provides a model of a microcosm of society

p9:
-full year structure
-isolation
-intensity

p10:
-full year

p11:
-isolated
-no weekends
-intensity
-cooperative learning
-physical aspect

p12:
-addresses the whole person: physical, academic, and emotional
development, which other schools simply do not address

p13:
-not as boring as high school in Japan
-opportunity for community service, cooperation and independence
-focus on other than academic and to get into university

(unique....cont.)

p14:
-teachers show respect for students
-self-controlled nature of discipline at tt; student is responsible for own
behavior

p15:
-full year structure
-Spartan existence
-challenging nature of hiking
-young staff
-self-reliance developed

p16:
-broader range of participation in activities, with varying background
(culturally, socially)
-develops more responsibility within students
-staff have excellent understanding of student--know where to draw the
line

p17:
-structure of school (extended time)
-limited parental contact
-no TV
-basic living conditions
-the unit forges strong bonds of friendship

p18:
-staff and student relationship
-outdoor ed. program
-discipline
-community based organization rather than an individual based organization
-skill development in community living
-NEGATIVE: no psychologist to support student/staff

p19:
-opportunity for student to explore physical/emotional/academic abilities
-tolerance of others and support through group activities
-proximity to nature
-appreciation of ‘real’ world, not just tech. world

p20:
-outdoor program
-location
-supports and promotes student lives

p21:
-location
-not just an academic focus

p22:
-setting
-isolation from other yr. groups
-structure of program
-challenges that are not normally come across

p23:
-structure which allows for self-esteem development

p24:
-structure
-accepting of ALL students regardless of behavior/psychological problems
-opportunities for challenges
-isolated

p25:
-structure
-challenges which allow for gains in self-confidence
5. Expectation of student?

p1:
- develop self-confidence
- overcome challenges
- socialize with other students

p2:
- develop group solidarity
- make friends
- apply classroom learning to real-life situations
- self-reliance/responsibility (in jobs, physical conditions, objectives)

p3:
- obey the rules or suffer the well-defined consequences

p4:
- self-reliance
- persistence
- determination
- improvement
- honesty
- integrity
- responsibility to rules and own actions

p6:
- respect of others privacy
- acceptance of responsibilities within the unit
- adherence to safety rules in the outdoors
- to do their best
- accept challenges put before them

p7:
- to do their best in everything

p8:
- involvement in the curriculum and activities and do his best

p9:
- child was prepared to take it how he found it

p10:
- learn to cope with all the challenges
mature in a way which develops good and puts aside what is second rate

p11:
-trust
-responsible conduct
-hard work (physically and mentally)
-tolerance of others

p12:
-to do their best (as an individual)
-put in as much as possible to make unit life positive

-know themselves better at the end of the year
-responsible for everyone in the unit

p13:
-to spend every day with joy and happiness

p14:
-develop into responsible, well-meaning, caring citizens
-respect for others, regardless of race, religion....

p15:
-participate to best of their ability
-cooperate and tolerate others
-abide by the rules
-challenge oneself
-enjoy the year
-gain self-confidence, stamina, and personal satisfaction

p16:
-develop leadership qualities
-self-esteem/confidence
-consideration/respect for others (teachers and students)
-respect/appreciation of outdoors
-develop initiative and decision making skills
-abide by the rules

p17:
-meet challenges
-to do their best
-work with unit for benefit of all
-to do share of domestic tasks
-honest and reliable

p18:
- teamwork
- communicate with a range of students (NEGATIVE: unrealistic of t concerning student’s ability to do this without support)
- adherence to rules and regulations, with threat of expulsion/suspension if not adhered to (NEGATIVE: may negate the aim of sense of belonging, and promote bullying)

p19:
- contribute to world, school, and family -- not just think about themselves

p20:
- makes child tough and strong
- confident
- responsible
- gain value of experiences which others may not have

p21:
- don’t know

p22:
- self-reliance and responsibility
- challenges which are similar to those they make encounter in the future

p23:
- tolerance
- confidence in coping with oneself

p24:
- meet the challenges
- accept ‘good’ with bad
- involvement and contribution in a community
- do their best
- obey rules

p25:
- participate in all activities
- follow rules
6. benefits to sending son/daughter to tt?

p1:
- according to child, learns about pleasure in overcoming challenges
- self-confidence
- love of nature

p2:
- socialization
- developing group solidarity
- toleration of difficult conditions
- independence

NEGATIVES FROM P2:
- failing to provide things that are harmful to health; child suffered back injuries, asthma and bronchial disorders from cold conditions in units.
- going through cold conditions (which are very different from an Asian climate) with no heating is absurd, as fees are high enough to afford heating.

p3:
- confirmation numbers may be higher at tt, which may indicate a greater spiritual development at tt, which is very important
- removed from peer pressure with smoking, drugs/alcohol, while in school. May give them more time to develop the maturity for sensible decisions

p4:
- to him, not us

p5:
- communication skills developed
- time management
- appreciation of 'life' aspects (hot shower, warm clothes, roof....)
- accepting of people's faults
- coping with interpersonal issues
- appreciation of nature
- feeling the outcome of struggle and pain and appreciating the rewards of it afterwards
p7:
-personal growth

p8:
-providing opportunities may not have had (at another school)
-development of confidence

p9:
-self-confidence developed
-believes more in himself
-Spartan conditions help them appreciate what they have
-achievement comes from themselves, not from others helping

p10:
-group work facilitates maturation, organization, socialization
-confidence
-appreciation of activities which are different from the TV/sport dominated life in suburban schools (i.e. the outdoor activities)

p11:
-N/A

p12:
-growth and maturity
-opportunity to take part in activities not otherwise available

p13:
-she is happy

p14:
-independent citizens, reliable on their own actions
-maturity in thinking
-individual able to grow and develop to their potential b/c of responsibility bestowed upon them

p15:
-boarding experience
-hiking programme
-survival skills

p16:
-see other answers
p17:
-interpersonal relationships developed

p18:
-survive? self-esteem high
-other answers

p19:
-fitter
-more positive attitude
-better understanding of their parents
-more confidence

p20:
-respect for others in a community
-physical accomplishments
-teamwork capabilities

p21:
-opportunity to participate in outdoor activities not offered elsewhere

p22:
-taking responsibility for their own learning
-develops their full potential

p23:
-yes

p24:
-satisfaction of achievement of challenges
-accept others
-UNIT LIFE: most difficult to handle at tt; it can bring about growth or it can be very painful and isolating.

p25:
-sense of achievement upon completion of challenges
-absence of home/family makes student appreciate them more
-confidence increases from achieving, acquiring new skills.
7. What are the educational objectives at tt?

p1:
-strengthen ability to overcome difficulties or circumstances
-ability to mature and deal with things in the future

p2:
-create a unique community
-help them know and understand themselves
-achievement of objectives
-experience natural conditions and fend for themselves
-rediscovery of natural skills lost in the technological age

p3:
-maintenance of academic standards
-acad. standards are secondary to the development of a whole, well-developed person

p4:
-personal development
-opportunity to sort out who is real, what is real, and how to handle it
-responsibility for own education
-appreciation of non-academic activities (i.e. outdoors)

p6:
-resourcefulness in project research
-academic standards achieved
-relevant syllabus around environment
-academic effort comes from self, with support from peers/teachers

p7:
-total person is addressed
-all aspects of life highlighted and dealt with in some way

p8:
-academic standard complemented by a physical environment
-physical environment used to challenge students to increase self-confidence
-respect for others

p9:
-rounded education
p10:
-provide a learning context that challenges and extends students

p12:
-holistic education by incorporating the environment into learning
-valid/relevant learning

p14:
-develop independent learning (no parental assistance), and study habits

to give student completely different perspective on school life
-to challenge
-to live with others in a cooperative/friendly/peaceful/tolerant manner
-create a sound learning environment

p16:
-an interest in environmental matters
-develop communication skills
-get along with a variety of children
-respect for staff
-interest in their studies (**although, studies tends to take a secondary role due to physical demands and activities and the less than conducive study environment (rustic conditions))

p17:
-produce well rounded student, able to contribute to society
-appreciate that people are not the same

p18:
-develop study habits (but unrealistic sometimes)
-low emphasis on academic achievement and unrealistic expectations at times.
p19:  
- put all your effort into what you do  
- discover what you can do well

p20:  
- skill and confidence development  
- self-sufficiency  
- live with others

p21:  
- initiative  
- self-reliance

p22:  
- develop full potential of student  
- respect for self, others, school  
- self-reliance

p23:  
- same as #5

p24:  
- realize physical/mental/social potential  
- develop self-esteem, reliance, initiative, confidence  
- understand environment  
- understand meaning of community  
- acceptance of individual differences and needs

p25:  
- to tie the subject matter with the experiences of tt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Rationale: Outdoors</th>
<th>Rationale: Other</th>
<th>Student Expectation</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Objectives for students</th>
<th>Future Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>To get fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>Unit life</td>
<td>Be a respectable person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Try your best</td>
<td>Teacher = friend</td>
<td>Uphold the image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Fitness = academics are better</td>
<td>Teacher = friend</td>
<td>Keeping up the TT spirit</td>
<td>From doing jobs, know how to do in future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save money</td>
<td></td>
<td>Having a go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent with self-sufficient nature of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Help out community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Traditional nature</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers doing everything students do</td>
<td>Fitter</td>
<td>Fitness: helps in sport for the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote self-sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>In life, you have to do jobs (cleaning, etc) and serve others</td>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>Know your abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiking is like life</td>
<td>To be good</td>
<td>Teacher = parent</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do your best</td>
<td>Feel like somebody</td>
<td>Change and help you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grow up</td>
<td>Intimacy of things</td>
<td>grow up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do things w/o thinking about it</td>
<td>Have a go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be more ‘rounded’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Increases responsibility</td>
<td>Self-sufficient nature of the school</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Academically intense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes you do things for yourself</td>
<td>It’s your responsibility</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Happy people and happy environment (unrealistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong peer rel’ship</td>
<td>Teacher = someone you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher = someone you can talk to</td>
<td>can talk to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers care</td>
<td>Teachers care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility for self</td>
<td>Responsibility for self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Provides life experiences</td>
<td>Promotes responsibility</td>
<td>None: onus is on teachers to help students</td>
<td>Classes more fun</td>
<td>Close to environment in +ve way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain experience from life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical nature of school</td>
<td>Physical nature of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher = friend</td>
<td>Teacher = friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Rationale: Outdoors</td>
<td>Rationale: Other</td>
<td>Student Expectation</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Objectives for students</td>
<td>Future Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Explore mountains</td>
<td>Keeps campus clean</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>A lot of teamwork</td>
<td>Give different outlook on life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of tradition</td>
<td>Help out in community</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Develops skills in life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you don’t do it, you get punished</td>
<td>Experience a range of things</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Develops skills in different areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Maintain image of TT</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with people</td>
<td>No one else will do it if you don’t</td>
<td>Expectations are hard but realistic</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX VI: OPEN CODING FOR ASSISTANT TRANSCRIPTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rationale: Outdoors</th>
<th>Rationale: Other</th>
<th>Teacher expectations</th>
<th>Student expectations</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Positive reflection</th>
<th>Unit life</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>See the bush</td>
<td>Academics: to get</td>
<td>Do what they're told</td>
<td>Structure of program</td>
<td>Liking the outdoors after it's finished</td>
<td>Matures the student</td>
<td>The individual is different because of the experiences they've had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get to know others</td>
<td>through year 9</td>
<td>Enjoy</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time away from</td>
<td>Make sure unit</td>
<td>Make sure unit</td>
<td>Good teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
<td>stays together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Time away from</td>
<td>Jobs: self-reliance</td>
<td>Have a go</td>
<td>To do their best</td>
<td>Students = more than a face</td>
<td>Kids may not like what they’re doing at the moment, but they will appreciate it</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing as much as</td>
<td>Appreciate the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the students</td>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Healthy body</td>
<td>Jobs: learn to</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Everyone's</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of others</td>
<td>TT is not for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentally strong</td>
<td>take care of</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>expectation is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialisation</td>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased sensitivity</td>
<td>Being part of</td>
<td>Support for the</td>
<td>Awareness of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the community</td>
<td>mission statement</td>
<td>-environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of TT</td>
<td>-people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Do same as kids</td>
<td>Give their best</td>
<td>Outdoors aspect</td>
<td>“Some hate it and will never do it again, but still look back”</td>
<td>Teaches them to live together</td>
<td>Assistants are the link between students and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve your self</td>
<td>Young staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Rationale: Outdoors</td>
<td>Rationale: Other</td>
<td>Teacher Expectations</td>
<td>Student Expectations</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Objectives for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unrealistic (+ve and -ve)</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapport with kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kids as care givers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Try your best</td>
<td>Outdoor ed. Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to cope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do what kids do</td>
<td>Not keen on outcomes</td>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge/ Stimulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>Outdoor ed program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Spartan life in units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do what kids do</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Values taught through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uphold TT values</td>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Satisfies their role in community</td>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>Participate with energy</td>
<td>Intensity of program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Do your best</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resourcefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do what kids do</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapport with kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Responsibility within community</td>
<td>Embrace philosophy of school</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Give best</td>
<td>Maximise opportunity</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-directed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>Do their best</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same experience as kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect from kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Surrogate' parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opp to explore many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>avenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentally strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well-rounded person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good moral fibre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX VI: OPEN CODING FOR TEACHER TRANSCRIPTS (continued)
**APPENDIX VI: OPEN CODING FOR TEACHER TRANSCRIPTS (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rationale: Outdoors</th>
<th>Rationale: Other</th>
<th>Teacher Expectations</th>
<th>Student Expectations</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>Objectives for students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Purposeful activity developing confidence, self-esteem</td>
<td>Do same as kids do</td>
<td>Do your best</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Create independent people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tough for teachers</td>
<td>No competition</td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>No particular type of person is strived for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop self</td>
<td>Singular focus on hiking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect others</td>
<td>Unit life</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept school philosophy</td>
<td>Learn about consequences</td>
<td>Embraces Kurt Hahn philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process of school</td>
<td>Well-rounded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not 100% academic</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Future Benefits</td>
<td>Unit Life</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>Teaching/Learning Strategy</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Negatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Happy year = happy unit</td>
<td>Experiential education</td>
<td>Younger staff maintain energy of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Encourage now so kids not future in future</td>
<td>TT not very academic +ve: outdoor learning</td>
<td>Use of local env. for learning</td>
<td>TT not for everyone Community feel of TT</td>
<td>Unrelenting nature of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>TT tries to develop empathy that can be taken with you</td>
<td>Group dynamics</td>
<td>Outsider view is that TT not academic</td>
<td>Care giver role of kids TT = +ve environment Support network +ve: kids see staff struggling with hikes</td>
<td>Intensity of ideology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Develops people not daunted by challenge</td>
<td>Cope with differences Leadership skills Ability to be lead Consequences of not doing jobs</td>
<td>Aware of non-academic criticism</td>
<td>Process focus Encouraging Rapport in class from doing everything with them</td>
<td>Support network School as community Kids’ awareness of others is high</td>
<td>Intensity of program People who ‘slack’ in the community No personal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs more rigour</td>
<td>Results in confidence Step-by-step process Extending horizons</td>
<td>+ve support network</td>
<td>Academic rigour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develops tolerance</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore different areas of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stressful Exhaustion Limited personal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposeful, relevant activities Advise; let kids solve Encourage env. awareness b/c you live in it</td>
<td>School as community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Project work prep: them for yr. 11/12 Isolation benefits kids when they go back Achievement is high: confidence for future</td>
<td>Spartan Resp. developed More important than outdoors</td>
<td>Independent learning Relevant learning Intensity Puts responsibility on them to do work</td>
<td>School as community Indep. Strived but little choice for students (irony) Compelling students None want to repeat year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Future Benefits</td>
<td>Unit life</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>Teaching/Learning Strategy</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Negatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning in unit is very</td>
<td>Not 100% academic, which is a +ve attribute</td>
<td>Students learn by mistakes</td>
<td>Social problems on hike</td>
<td>Losing contact with kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>applicable to outdoors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoors facilitates</td>
<td>Spirit of TT: do things well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance developed</td>
<td></td>
<td>depth in learning</td>
<td>Hard to make b/c of tradition of TT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Outdoor and experiential education as a means to supplement or complement traditional learning has existed throughout most of the twentieth century. However, there is limited published research concerning Extended Stay Outdoor Education School Programs (ESOESP) and the processes that exist within these programs that lead to a particular outcome.

This is a case study approach which seeks to uncover and examine the perceptions of stakeholders within an ESOESP, in order to understand and highlight the process leading to an outcome. A grounded theory and hermeneutic/dialectic approach was used to collect and analyse the data. Interviews, surveys, observations, and participation complemented the process of data collection.

The analysis of the data, employing a grounded theory approach, resulted in five categories that are essential components to the process leading to an outcome at a particular ESOESP. The five categories are: Student role; Teacher role; School climate; Interpersonal/Personal skill development; and, Learning process. Based on these five categories and their related sub-categories, a process model was developed. The relationship of the categories to the literature suggests that this model represents an authentic representation of an experiential learning process. The results of this study provide a starting point for further research in this area.
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