



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

***Place responsive and culturally responsive outdoor
education in secondary schools: Examining teachers'
perspectives and experiences.***

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Education

at

The University of Waikato

by

Andrew James Skipworth



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2017

Abstract

Sustainability, place and human connectedness have increasingly become the focus of research and professional dialogue in school-based outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand. These developments challenge traditional practices that privilege adventure and individualistic outcomes in outdoor education. At the same time, the implementation of culturally responsive practices within many secondary schools has further challenged teachers of outdoor education to ensure that pedagogical approaches and outcomes meet the needs of their diverse student population. An increasing number of educators appear to have adopted place responsive and culturally responsive pedagogies within their outdoor education programmes or units of work at the senior school level, yet there is limited research examining teachers' perceptions and experiences in doing so.

Adopting an interpretive framework, and using qualitative research methods, this research focuses on the challenges faced and opportunities presented when secondary school teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand adopt place and culturally responsive pedagogies in outdoor education. Six teachers of senior level outdoor education from schools spread throughout Aotearoa New Zealand shared their stories. An inductive analysis of the interviews identified these teachers faced ongoing challenges with adopting new pedagogies in outdoor education, which was in part because many colleagues held perceptions that outdoor education was less important than other subjects and was primarily about having fun. In addition, the complexities of assessment at the senior level meant that teachers often faced challenges in formally assessing student learning. Teachers also found that undertaking change required shifts in mind-set which were further supported by targeted professional development, engagement in post-graduate study and talking with like-minded teachers. However, teachers' adoption of place and culturally responsive approaches generated notable opportunities to align to the front end of the New Zealand curriculum, promote the holistic development of students and nurture cultural diversity.

This study highlights that undertaking curriculum and pedagogical change in outdoor education in secondary schools is a complex process, which is greatly influenced by the attitudes and perceptions of others. The potential alignment of place responsive and culturally responsive pedagogies became apparent, as did the need for more targeted professional development for teachers of outdoor education. Teachers' adoption of these pedagogies also highlighted a greater capacity for authentic outdoor education experiences for students that also strengthened a commitment to their bicultural partnerships in schools. As the nature of education changes in schools, contemporary pedagogies in outdoor education have the potential to enhance the capacity of schools to facilitate learning that will meet the diverse needs of learners in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Mihi

Whāia te mātauranga hei oranga mō koutou

Seek after learning, for the sake of your well-being

Ko Ngāti Kahungunu te iwi

Ko Takitimu te waka

Ko Sarah Timu tōku tīpuna

Ahakoā ka tipu ake au i roto i te ao pākehā ka tika ki te mihi atu ki tōku whakapapa.

Tēnā anō ki tōku kainga o roto o Te Arawa, tēnā ka mihi ki te maunga o Ngongotaha kōrua ko Rotorua moana.

Ko Andrew Skipworth ahau.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the participants in this study. Thank you for taking the time to talk with me and share an insight into your world. I felt privileged and inspired hearing your stories, and would like to commend you on the outstanding work you do as teachers.

Next, I wish to thank my supervisors, Dr. Mike Brown and Marg Cosgriff for guiding and mentoring me through this amazing journey as a teacher researcher. To Dr. Mike Brown, thank you for providing me with a sound theoretical grounding and for your guidance and support in the first half of this thesis. To Marg Cosgriff, thank you for agreeing to take me on as a student; you challenged me to be better in all aspects by maintaining a critical eye on my work and offering support and guidance whenever I needed it. It was a privilege to have worked under both of you, and I admire your respective contributions to the outdoor education community and education.

To my wife Michelle, thank you for supporting me in pursuing my passion for learning. You probably know much more about outdoor education than you need to! Your willingness to listen to my endless discussions, and at times frustrations, has proved to be a huge support for me.

To my family and extended family, thank you for always supporting me in whatever I do and taking a genuine interest in my academic work. Your encouragement and belief in me has given me the motivation to put my best effort into this work.

Thank you to the teachers, academics, colleagues and friends who have engaged in critical conversations with me throughout my career as a teacher and challenged me to think critically about how I educate young people; those conversations that gave me the confidence to undertake this thesis.

I am also highly grateful to the University of Waikato for awarding me a Master's Research scholarship and to the Ministry of Education for granting me study leave. Their respective contributions enabled me to take a year out of the

classroom and undertake post-graduate study. I am also grateful to the Board of Trustees, Principal and colleagues in my department at my own school for supporting me to take time out of the classroom and further my own professional development.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Mihi.....	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The Research Context	3
My Journey.....	5
The Structure of the Thesis	8
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	10
Education in Aotearoa New Zealand	10
Background.....	10
The secondary school context in Aotearoa New Zealand	13
School-based outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand	15
Historical overview	15
Personal and social development outcomes through adventure.....	18
Senior school programmes	23
Shifts towards culturally responsive education in schools	25
Defining culturally responsive and relational pedagogy	25
Responding to calls for change.....	27
Culturally responsive outdoor education	29
Place responsive outdoor education	32
Place responsive pedagogy	34
Chapter Summary	38

Chapter 3: Methods	40
Introduction.....	40
Theoretical framework for the study	40
Data collection.....	42
Data analysis and reporting.....	44
Ethical Considerations.....	47
Factors influencing the study.....	50
Limitations	52
The research participants	52
Meeting the Teachers.....	54
Liam	54
Sarah	54
Dave	54
Emma	55
Jess	55
Ben	55
Chapter summary.....	56
Chapter 4: Findings	57
Changing mind-sets and pedagogical approaches.....	57
How changing ‘mind-set’s’ has transformed practice.....	61
The influence of others.....	64
The holistic development of students and nurturing culture	69
Developing cultural identity and legitimising indigenous knowledge	69
Developing the ‘whole’ student	72
Increased opportunities to align the ‘front’ end of the curriculum.....	75

Thinking creatively about assessment.....	78
Chapter Summary.....	82
Chapter 5: Discussion	84
Changing pedagogical approaches and mind-sets	84
The influence of others	90
The holistic development of students and nurturing of culture	93
Increased opportunities to align the ‘front’ end of the curriculum	96
Thinking creatively about assessment	98
What do the findings mean for the future of outdoor education in a culturally diverse society?.....	102
The alignment between place and culturally responsive pedagogies ..	103
Professional support for outdoor educators is critical	105
Authentic outdoor education for all students	107
Opportunities to reflect bicultural partnerships.....	108
Chapter Summary.....	109
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	111
Limitations to the study	112
Direction for future research	113
Glossary of Māori Terms	115
References.....	118
Appendix A - Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form	129
Appendix B - Principal Information Sheet and Consent Form	131
Appendix C – Interview Questions	133

Chapter 1: Introduction

In recent decades, increasing concern has been expressed that foundational educational policies and practices in formal schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand were developed within a framework of colonialism, which has denied Māori students opportunities to realise their full potential (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2009; Bishop & Glynn, 1999). In the secondary school system for example, Māori students are reported to consistently achieve at a lower academic level to non-Māori students. Recent initiatives, including *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success* (Ministry of Education, 2015), provide some indication of the ways in which calls to re-think the nature and delivery of school curriculum, to ensure that both Māori and non-Māori have equal opportunities to succeed, are being addressed.

In outdoor education, the focus of this study, several commentators have similarly noted the ongoing influence of British and North American practices and their emphasis on personal and social development outcomes on Aotearoa New Zealand (see, e.g., Cosgriff, 2008; Lugg & Martin, 2001; Polley & Pickett, 2003; Wattchow, 2008; Zink & Boyes, 2007). In turn, it has been argued that the prioritising of these personal and social development outcomes has potentially obscured what outdoor education could be within schools (Cosgriff, 2008). Increasing academic and professional concern has also been noted about the relevance of these outcomes for both Pākehā and Māori students (see, e.g., Cosgriff, Legge, et al., 2012), the limited attention paid to critically examining the educational value of outdoor adventure pursuits within outdoor education programmes (Boyes, 2012; Lugg, 2004), and the failure of decontextualized approaches to outdoor education to take into account who the learners are and where they are learning (Brookes, 2004; Brown, 2008b). Given that the ways in which we understand the world are largely socially and culturally specific (A. Macfarlane, 2015), the appropriateness of context-free and globalised outcomes in outdoor education comes into question.

Accompanying such critiques have been calls for more environmentally sustainable outdoor education to be developed, with an increased need for education about the environment and impacts of outdoor education on the environment (Cotton, 2006; Hill, 2010a; Irwin & Straker, 2014; Tooth & Renshaw, 2009). In Aotearoa New Zealand issues of sustainability, place, and human connectedness have become increasingly evident in academic and professional dialogue related to outdoor education (see e.g. Brown, 2008b, 2013; Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011; A. Macfarlane, Glynn, Grace, Penetito, & Bateman, 2008; Smith, 2002, 2007; Taylor, 2014; Townsend, 2014). A concern for the health of the *environment* and the lack of human interaction with *nature* has underpinned arguments that an understanding of our intimate connection with our planet and its ecosystems (Hill, 2010a; Tooth & Renshaw, 2009) is fundamental to being able to address environmental issues.

A small number of Aotearoa New Zealand studies have investigated the suitability of place responsive outdoor education in school outdoor education programmes (Brown, 2013; Cosgriff, 2015a, 2015b; Taylor, 2014; Townsend, 2011). Further studies have examined teachers' views and perspectives about outdoor education in an Aotearoa New Zealand context, including teachers' beliefs about outdoor education (Hill, 2010b), the way teachers' talk about outdoor education (Mikaels, Backman, & Lundvall, 2015), and their perspectives of EOTC [education outside the classroom] (Martindale, 2011). However, there is limited research specifically focusing on teachers' perspectives of delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in mainstream secondary schooling. This study aims to contribute to this identified research gap by exploring the experiences of six teachers and the challenges and opportunities they experience in delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in their schools. The second aim is to explore what these challenges and opportunities mean for the future of outdoor education in a culturally diverse society.

Considering the aims of the study, the two research questions guiding the research are:

1. What are the challenges and opportunities for teachers in delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in secondary schools?
2. What do they mean for the future of outdoor education in a culturally diverse society?

The Research Context

Outdoor education is a contested construct, which takes form in a variety of ways within secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand and is dependent on the context in which it is situated (Irwin, Straker, & Hill, 2012). Further, Boyes (2000) proposes that “current meanings of outdoor education are social constructions, specific to the time, place and ideologies of the proponents” (p. 75) whilst Brookes (2004) notes that essential aspects of outdoor education are specific to particular geographical, social, and cultural contexts. While the term ‘outdoor education’ initially revolved around personal and social development and the knowledge and skills of outdoor activities, more recently it has included sustainability education and a greater consideration of the places where learning happens (Potter & Dymment, 2016; Wattchow & Brown, 2011). Within this thesis, the term ‘outdoor education’ will generally be concerned with formal programmes of learning or units of work within schools, but it may also hold other meanings which are context specific and shaped by the views of participants in this study and the literature.

In 1999, outdoor education became an official part of the curriculum and was positioned as one of seven key areas of learning within the New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum [NZHPEC] (Ministry of Education, 1999). In 2007, the New Zealand curriculum was revised [NZC] (Ministry of Education, 2007), however, the place of outdoor education within curriculum policy remained relatively unchanged. In practice in the secondary school context, it

is common for schools to utilise a combination of physical education achievement standards (which are based on the NZC) and outdoor industry based unit standards (which assess vocational based skills) (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2016) as a means of formally assessing students learning in outdoor education.

In setting the broad context for the thesis, it is worth noting the influence of a number of recently introduced policies and legislation on shaping schools' decisions about outdoor education in their teaching programmes. In 2013, a circular was issued by the Ministry of Education clarifying that state-education is free in Aotearoa New Zealand and that schools should not demand fees from parents for curriculum-related expenses (Ministry of Education, 2013). An ombudsman's investigation also took place into the charging of school fees, and a report produced reminded schools that the Education Act 1989 entitles all students to free education (Paterson, 2014). Considering the increased attention about what constitutes students' school fees, it is likely that school Boards of Trustees will be placing into question the high associated fees attached to many senior outdoor education programmes in schools. In 2016, the Workplace Health and Safety Act (2016) also came into effect, imposing fines or imprisonment if health and safety obligations have not been met. Given that a number of significant tragedies have occurred within outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand over the past decade or so, alongside the increased concern about health and safety, critical reflection on the use of deliberately exposing students to risk in outdoor education programmes is timely. Discussions within schools about high associated costs of some outdoor education programmes, and how much 'risk' teachers are willing to expose students to as a means of achieving learning outcomes have the potential to alter the scope and form of outdoor education in schools as we move into the 21st century.

A third consideration that is pertinent to the context of this study concerns Māori students' underachievement in educational institutions. This disparity has been

evident and ongoing since first identified in the late 1950s (Hunn, 1960, as cited in Bishop, 2012). A number of government initiatives have been implemented in schools in an effort to bridge the gap in achievement, including the commissioning of initiatives which are underpinned by culturally responsive and relational pedagogy. Some examples are *Te Kotahitanga* which began in 2001 and provided a theoretical foundation for subsequent initiatives: *Ka Hikitia* (the New Zealand Government's strategy to accelerate Māori success from 2013-2017) and *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success* which brings *Ka Hikitia* to life and was implemented in some schools from 2013 to 2016. Since *the Te Kotahitanga* project first commenced, there have been notable changes in teacher practice and improvements in Māori student outcomes within the schools involved (Bishop, Berryman, Wearmouth, Peter, & Clapham, 2012).

In an effort to raise Māori achievement within outdoor education, Cosgriff, Legge, et al. (2012) call for educators to refine and adapt their pedagogical approaches to encourage exploration of Māori beliefs in the outdoors. This would entail including elements of Māori culture into planning and teaching and developing meaningful relationships between educators and Māori to support effective pedagogy (Legge, 2006). As shown in the following introduction to my journey as an outdoor educator, at a time when I was questioning my own practice such initiatives appeared to provide some direction to create new pathways to become a more culturally responsive and relational teacher.

My Journey

To date, my personal journey as an educator to date has largely involved teaching the health and physical education curriculum at secondary school level. As a part of many physical education courses I have taught, outdoor education based units of work have been intertwined within programmes.

My passion for outdoor education ignited as a result of my time spent as a soldier in the New Zealand Army Reserve, which also involved an overseas deployment. Through the experiences associated with this, I developed a strong attachment to the places I was working in. While on a training exercise

in 2009, I distinctly remember flying in an Iroquois helicopter with the doors wide open, staring at the picturesque snow-capped Southern Alps on a beautiful winter's day, and thinking 'Wow, our country is amazing!' It was my experience in the Army that influenced my decision to become an educator and further developed my desire to work, play, and learn in the outdoors.

During my first few years as a Health and Physical Education teacher, I facilitated various outdoor experiences and activities. In the first week of my first permanent teaching position, I went black water rafting with my new senior physical education class. What a way to spend a day at work! Over the years I organised as many outdoor activities as I could for my students, something colleagues would joke about while questioning if I still worked at the College given the number of days I was out of school. I believed that all the time, effort and resourcing put into organising these experiences were justified by student outcomes. Whether it was rafting, skiing or programmes at residential outdoor centres, I was just happy to be providing opportunities for students to be in the outdoors. I learnt more about the typical outcomes in outdoor education, such as 'building character' and 'pushing students out of their comfort zone'. Looking back, I largely assumed that just by being in the outdoors such outcomes would naturally come about, and further, that these outcomes were both achievable and desirable for all the students I taught.

As my teaching career progressed, I began to develop a more critical perspective on my own teaching practice and was less convinced that the type of outdoor education I was advocating for best met the needs of my students. I attended several professional development courses, such as the national Physical Education New Zealand [PENZ] conference, and listened to others question the relevance of current outdoor education practices within schools. I was troubled by questions about what learning was actually taking place and whether the primary outcomes of personal and social development were authentic and relevant to the students that I teach. I questioned how well these outcomes aligned to our key guiding document in education, the NZC (Ministry

of Education, 2007). My exposure to literature like Thomas (2005) meant I was also introduced to arguments that these traditional outcomes provide weak support to justify the existence of outdoor education in schools with an already crowded curriculum, as they are not unique to outdoor education. Maybe concepts of risk management and skill development could be taught more effectively in the school gymnasium, rather than an outdoor environment? Many students in my school community also struggled to afford the fees required for outdoor experiences, and too often, the students who staff at school thought would most benefit, did not end up attending.

I also became concerned about the apparent disconnect between our school curriculum and the places that we live, work and play in. This increasingly raised questions about whether students leave school as well-grounded citizens who take pride in their own community. It became clear to me that I needed to rethink my philosophy around outdoor education. Part of this rethink was recognising that my students needed to be placed at the forefront of all decision making around curriculum design and pedagogy. Our own beliefs and values are deeply entrenched in our day-to-day actions as teachers and I wondered how often decisions around pedagogy are based on the way in which we see the world, not necessarily our students. The more I engaged with literature, professional development and reflection, it became apparent that I needed to be open to new ways and ideas to become a more effective teacher.

As I considered how I could adapt my outdoor education practice to better meet the needs of my students, my school also embarked on a journey towards more culturally responsive and relational teaching practice; *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success*, which placed high importance on the Treaty of Waitangi, valuing Māori language, culture, and identity, while also enabling Māori students to reach their potential and excel (Ministry of Education, 2015). The underpinning philosophy behind *Kia Eke Panuku* challenged my delivery of traditional outdoor education practices that favoured context-free and 'one size fits all' outcomes. In line with *Kia Eke Panuku*, culturally responsive and relational

teaching practice requires educators to share power and decision making with students (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). However, in many traditional outdoor education programmes, the possibility for power sharing is often minimal given the nature of high-risk environments that typically require predetermined outcomes, therefore limiting students' agency and ability to determine their own learning pathways. The more I reflected, the more I was driven to find answers to resolve the contradictions I saw in my practice. In 2016, I was fortunate to gain a Teach NZ study award, which allowed me the time and space to focus on this research and extend my own understanding of pedagogies in outdoor education.

The Structure of the Thesis

To understand how outdoor education has come to be in its contemporary form, the literature review in Chapter Two provides a brief overview of education and, more specifically, outdoor education over the past 100 or so years. As part of this, several discourses that I argue to be key to shaping outdoor education practice in secondary schools are identified and discussed. The third section of the chapter considers culturally responsive and relational practices within schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. Drawing on this literature provides important insights into why many schools are calling for change that will enable Māori students to achieve their potential whilst in mainstream schooling. The final part of chapter two critically discusses the emergence of place responsive outdoor education within literature over the past two decades.

Chapter three explains the research design, key methodological considerations, and justifies the research methods used. My choice of a qualitative methods approach to the research and alignment of my processes to an interpretivist paradigm is explained, and the use of interviews and thematic analysis is examined. Information about participants and ethical considerations are discussed, and key factors influencing the study are also introduced.

Chapter four presents the findings, effectively answering the first research question of what the challenges and opportunities for teachers in delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in secondary schools are. Five key themes of: changing mind-sets and pedagogical approaches, the influence of others, the holistic development of students and nurturing of culture, increased opportunities to align to the 'front' end of the curriculum, and thinking creatively about assessment are identified.

Chapter five makes meaning of the findings, with the first part of the chapter structured so that each of the five themes are critically discussed. The second part of the chapter attends more specifically to the second research question and presents four key implications for outdoor education in schools given that we live in a culturally diverse society. Each of the implications of: the alignment between place and culturally responsive pedagogies, increased professional support, authentic outdoor education for all students and opportunities to reflect bicultural partnerships are then examined.

Chapter six concludes the thesis by summarising key findings and implications for outdoor education as a result of the research. Limitations of the study are discussed, along with several suggestions for future research within this field of study.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

To set the scene for the study, this review of literature comprises of four key and interrelated sections. The first section provides a brief introduction to education in Aotearoa New Zealand including some historical commentary and an introduction to secondary schools as educational settings. Following this, the second section critically examines school-based outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand by considering: outdoor education within curriculum policy, discourses that have shaped outdoor education, and contemporary programming and practices. In the third section, culturally responsive and relational pedagogy is examined and attention brought to government initiatives within schools designed to raise Māori student achievement. The final section of the chapter introduces the more recent development in place responsive outdoor education which has gained increasing attention in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is this intertwining of literature from the fields of outdoor education, education, Māori education and sociocultural theory that sets the scene for the thesis.

Education in Aotearoa New Zealand

Background

Aotearoa New Zealand is founded by the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi, an agreement between two peoples with different cultures and social systems, signed in 1840. Article 2 (a) of the Treaty recognises the right of Māori to define, protect, promote and control all of their treasures and resources (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2012). Hokowhitu (2004) claims that this statement includes considerations of pedagogy and epistemology, and therefore “addresses issues of curriculum development, teaching methods and educational research” (p. 76). Despite this guarantee, Pākehā have largely remained in control over decision-making processes in education over recent decades, which in turn has marginalised Māori language, cultural aspirations, and Māori preferred knowledge-gathering and information processing methods and contexts. (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Although it is common for schools to

recognise the Treaty, Glynn (2015) contends that there is a great deal of uncertainty and confusion about what the principles of the Treaty mean and how they might apply in different contexts.

Issues surrounding the delivery of formal education in Aotearoa New Zealand have been topics for debate since the early settlement of Pākehā. In recent decades, one focus of such debate has been the dominance of Western practices and ideologies in Aotearoa New Zealand's education system, mostly in relation to the marginalisation of indigenous ways of knowing and being. It is also argued that a key factor contributing to the ongoing disparity in educational achievement between Māori and non-Māori students is the creation of an education system and curricula that caters for white middle-class New Zealanders, and in effect holds little relevance for Māori (Bishop, 2011; Bishop et al., 2009; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Hokowhitu, 2004; Matthews & Jenkins, 1999). Further, Penetito (2015) argues that an ethic of responsibility must be developed between Māori and non-Māori in order to develop a mutually agreeable and equitable relationship between the two parties, in which the education system plays a key role.

When Māori first arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand they had already practiced a range of pedagogies and curricula. Māori education encompassed a range of curriculum areas such as: *waiata* (song/poetry), *whakatauāki* (proverbs), *korero tawhito* (history), *whakapapa* (genealogy) and *whaikōrero* (speech making). The concept of *ako* can be translated as *Māori pedagogy* which was “determined by and dependent on Māori epistemologies, values, knowledge and constructions of the world” (Pihama, Smith, Taki, & Lee, 2004, p. 13). When considered appropriate, young Māori were educated with relevant knowledge and skills to contribute effectively to their community. For example, this included learning the knowledge of fishing rocks, *iwi* (extended kinship group) boundaries, birding, and trees. Furthermore, people were viewed at the centre of education processes, life-long intergenerational learning was practised, and curricula was mixed and complimentary (Hemara, 2000).

As Pākehā migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand, they brought with them Western European concepts and ideals of education and curricula, which subsequently form the foundation of the education today. However, as Pākehā began to implement Western European ideals towards education, many Māori (and some Pākehā) became suspicious that curricula were irrelevant and a tool of colonial enterprise (Hemara, 2000). Bishop and Glynn (1999) argue that what developed as an education system in Aotearoa New Zealand after colonisation began, substituted "...a pre-existing and complex system, and subsequently attempted to deny or belittle the existence of such a system" (p. 16).

During the 19th century, historical reports concerning education tended to heavily praise governmental policy and direction and viewed Māori as objects of policy (McCulloch, 2011), meaning that much research and teaching since Pākehā migration has simplified and commodified Māori knowledge (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). An education system that has been shaped almost entirely by Pākehā ideals as Metge (1990) proposes, presents issues for our diverse range of learners. Further as Penetito (2010) asserts, although there have been serious attempts to integrate elements of *Te Ao Māori* (the Māori world) into the school curriculum, these have never been at the expense of sacrificing Pākehā consciousness and definitions of reality. These commentators raise many legitimate concerns about the foundations of our education system in Aotearoa New Zealand.

A pressing issue for many educators is that they are not properly equipped to respond to the needs of students from different cultural backgrounds than their own (Bishop & Berryman, 2010). However, Penetito (2015) suggests that this issue is not necessarily problematic for educators as there is a wealth of evidence to suggest that "what teachers do with students in classrooms is at least as significant – if not more so – than what teachers know about the home and sociocultural backgrounds of their students" (p. 46) (for examples of evidence see; Cazden, 1988; Corrigan, 1990; Hayes & Matusov, 2005). Such

research indicates the importance of pedagogical considerations for educators endeavouring to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Formal education in Aotearoa New Zealand is a contested construct, which is mirrored by Codd (2005) who argues that education exhibits a crisis of purpose between economic and social outcomes. In commenting on future directions, Hipkins & Spiller's (2012) findings from research with three schools in Aotearoa New Zealand mirror Orr's (1994) concerns that education must undertake immense change to meet the needs of learners in the 21st century. The former suggests that continuing with relatively traditional learning programmes "will not *adequately* address the NZC vision for a 21st century curriculum" (Hipkins & Spiller, 2012, p. 5). A further key challenge in our education system thus continues to be aligning traditional educational practices and pedagogies with a future-focused curriculum.

The secondary school context in Aotearoa New Zealand

The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) is a statement of official policy for English medium schools, and a parallel document *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* (Ministry of Education, 2008) serves the same function for Māori-medium schools. The two curriculum documents apply to all teaching and learning in schools from years 1 to 13. Together these curricula aim to "...help schools give effect to the partnership that is at the core of our nation's founding document, Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 6). The NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) prescribes how each learning area should be structured by providing key areas of learning, underlying concepts, and a set of achievement objectives for each level of the curriculum.

The NZC comprises of eight learning areas which guide educators in the delivery of curriculum, and although the areas are presented as distinct from one another, making connections across learning areas is highly encouraged (Ministry of Education, 2007). Further to this, the NZC presents a vision for all students to become "confident, connected, actively involved, lifelong learners"

(Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 8). This vision is supported by a number of principles and values which "...embody beliefs about what is important and desirable" (p. 9). Five key competencies of thinking, relating to others, using language, symbols and text, managing self, and participating and contributing are also presented as capabilities to help students "live, work and contribute as active members of their communities" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 12). The combination of these elements provide schools with a clear direction and "framework" around curriculum delivery and pedagogical considerations, without giving a "detailed plan" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 37).

The functions of assessment are central to teaching and learning (Barnes, Clarke, & Stephens, 2000), and in the senior secondary school context in Aotearoa New Zealand, the New Zealand Qualification Authority [NZQA] oversees the assessment of student learning from years 11 to 13. Every year, students work towards a National Certificate of Educational Achievement [NCEA] which consists of gaining 60-80 'credits' which are made up from achievement standards and unit standards that hold a particular credit value. Assessments are measured against national performance standards, and if those standards are met, students receive credits towards their NCEA qualification (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2016).

Recent research highlights a range of issues that schools face when aligning curriculum delivery to the NZC in the senior school setting. Hipkins and Spiller (2012) contend that although the NZC discourages excessive high stakes assessment, many secondary teachers "perceive that assessment drives the curriculum" (p. 2). Wylie and Bonne (2016) confirm the weight of assessment continues to be a primary concern for principals and teachers. It is also concerning that over half of the teachers surveyed by Wylie and Bonne (2016) thought that "NCEA pressures impacted negatively on student wellbeing" (p. 2). Although teachers and senior leaders place a high emphasis on adopting components of the NZC, Freeth, de Oliveira Andreotti, and Quinlivan (2014)

argue that there are “signs that this may be happening without a strong/deep or shared understanding of it or a cohesive plan” (p. 100).

Curriculum design is at the forefront of quality teaching and learning, yet these studies highlight the array of factors that impact on educators’ abilities to fully adopt the essence of the NZC. This is particularly so given Alcorn and Thrupp’s (2012) identification of: the complexity of teaching processes, conflicting aims with new pedagogies, and the speed in which schools are expected to implement policy, as three problematic issues in current schooling discourse. There is a need for schools in Aotearoa New Zealand to ensure their delivery of teaching programmes reflects the needs of diverse learners and the worlds they live in. While Bolstad et al. (2012) note that we now know a great deal more about how people learn and there have been significant shifts in the way that “knowledge is thought about and used” (p. 11), there are clearly challenges and contextual constraints that impact on teachers undertaking changes in curriculum design and pedagogical practice.

Now that the scene has been set for the context of education in Aotearoa New Zealand, the next section turns attention more specifically towards outdoor education in secondary schools.

School-based outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand

Historical overview

New Zealanders’ have a well-documented history of interactions with their natural environment, which can be traced back to the days of early settlement (Boyes, 2012). It has been documented that Māori from pre-European times engaged in outdoor activities such as: *whakaheke ngaru* (surf riding), *kaukau* (swimming) and *horua* (tobogganing) (Best, 1925). As part of a child’s education, Māori boys were taught outdoor skills such as hunting and trapping, while Māori girls were taught skills such as weaving and entertaining guests (Hemara, 2000). As European settlers flocked to Aotearoa New Zealand, they brought with them game animals such as deer, ducks, and trout. These, in turn, provided a means for outdoor activities, such as hunting and fishing (Boyes,

2012). In the early days of Pākehā settlement, many children spent their spare time engaging with nature by taking bush walks, swimming, fishing and eeling alongside other recreational activities (Stothart, 2012).

Outdoor education as a form of learning has been documented within Aotearoa New Zealand education for over 150 years (Lynch, 1998b). In the late 1930s, educators began to follow their British counterparts and took children camping, although these outings were not an official part of the school curriculum (Lynch, 2006). The first camp which was thought to have official sanction by the Department of Education took place in 1949 in Taranaki. The camp was organised by physical education staff and involved nineteen boys, aged between 13 and 17 years (Stothart, 2012). Throughout the 1900's, outdoor education was viewed as being on the margins of curriculum delivery. Learning outdoors took form as a combination of activities that could enrich students' education or develop their character. Field work, recreational study, social interaction and the development of social skills were among some of the desired outcomes. Although outdoor education took place within formal subjects such as biology and geography studies, it was not widely perceived as a valued area of learning (Lynch, 2006).

Outdoor pursuits began to gain popularity as British settlers migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand. Lynch (2006) asserts that "pursuits such as tramping and mountaineering were imbued with a middle-class morality that valued physical prowess, heroic journeying and the 'wholesome' educational benefits of travel, especially for boys" (p. 33). This romanticised understanding of adventure has shaped many outdoor education programmes, with Kane and Tucker (2007) for example, arguing that outdoor education in schools throughout the 20th century was widely centred around the positive narratives of adventure. Further, the rise of the adventure tourism industry within Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1980s (Cloke & Perkins, 2002) provided infrastructure for schools to easily access and make use of adventure-based facilities (Zink, 2003).

During the 1980s and 1990s, the establishment of 'Education Outside the Classroom' [EOTC] instigated a change in what learning took place in the outdoors as it became recognised as an official part of the curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1992). Although schools relied less on outdoor providers, Lynch (2006) suggests that "outdoor education continued to be understood as that part of EOTC which engaged students in outdoor pursuit activities in natural environments for the purpose of social and personal development" (p. 171). In 1999, outdoor education became an official part of the curriculum and was positioned as one of seven key areas of learning within the NZHPEC. The description from the NZHPEC states "Outdoor education provides students with opportunities to develop personal and social skills, to become active, safe, and skilled in the outdoors, and to protect and care for the environment" (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 46). Its placement in the NZHPEC (Ministry of Education, 1999) effectively means that outdoor education could be guided by the philosophical underpinnings of the health and physical education curriculum, including the holistic understandings of well-being and the sociocultural nature of learning. The NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) was revised in 2007, however, the condensed nature of the new HPE learning area statement compared to the depth of the NZHPEC (1999) means that educators have little further detail to work with.

Another milestone in the development of outdoor education was the updating and publication of the 'EOTC Guidelines' in 2002, which were intended to support educators in the planning and facilitation of learning that takes place outside of the classroom. The Ministry of Education (2009) defines EOTC as "a generic term used to describe curriculum-based learning and teaching that extends the four walls of the classroom" (p. 4). The guidelines provide clear direction for schools and educators and "aim to help boards of trustees, principals, and teachers to provide quality educational experiences, outside the classroom, that maximise learning and safety and that meet the relevant statutory requirements and best-practice guidelines" (Ministry of Education, 2016, p.1). The EOTC guidelines were again updated in 2016 primarily to

reflect the new Workplace Health and Safety Act (2016), but the primary purpose of the guidelines remains to “support teaching and learning of the national curriculum” (Ministry of Education, 2016, p. 1).

EOTC commonly takes form in secondary schools as subject-specific field trips or annual camps. Some schools offer a dedicated subject named ‘outdoor education,’ which typically incorporates learning and achievement standards from subject areas such as physical education, education for sustainability, geography, history, social studies and tikanga Māori. Outdoor education in takes shape in a variety of forms and has been heavily influenced by many historical events and discourses. The next section provides an insight into how outdoor education delivery is influenced by these in secondary schools.

Personal and social development outcomes through adventure

Historically and still today, personal and social development outcomes are frequently cited as chief outcomes in outdoor education programmes (Nicol, 2002; Thomas, 2005). Derived from historical movements such as Outward Bound and Scouts (Boyes, 2012; Cosgriff, 2008; Lynch, 2006), personal and social development in outdoor education is inextricably linked to notions of character building (Brookes, 2003a), despite critique of the relevance of these concepts and their associated social psychological theories to contemporary outdoor education practices (Brookes, 2003a, 2003b; Leather, 2013).

Contradictory claims are made about the gains students make from participation in outdoor adventure education. For example, Hattie et al.’s (1997) meta-analysis of 96 studies concluded that “adventure programmes have a major impact on the lives of participants, and this impact is lasting” (p. 70). In contrast, Leather (2013) argues that such claims oversimplify complex constructs and that outdoor education practitioners should take greater care in the language used and claims made. Sheard and Golby (2006) also report no significant increases in levels of measured positive psychological constructs after outdoor education participation over a three-month period. Similarly, Brown (2012a) argues that outcomes might be similar to other educational

interventions, and therefore, may not necessarily be unique to outdoor education.

Some of the research in support of outdoor education as a forum for character building is conducted 'in-house' and relies on anecdotal evidence and generalised claims for support (see, eg., Gass & Priest, 2006; Sutherland & Stroot, 2010). Further, *attribution bias* or participants' belief at the conclusion of the programme they have 'changed', as well as facilitation potentially having "...the effect of *exaggerating* belief that changed behaviour implies changed personal traits" (p. 122) is suggested to be another explanation for this continuing support for character building through outdoor adventure education (Brookes, 2003b).

In association with character building, outdoor adventure education programmes sometimes advertise exhaustive lists of skills that students will develop and retain simply through participation. There is an array of literature supporting the value of outdoor adventure education in developing explicit life skills that are transferable after participation in such courses (see, eg., Cooley, Cumming, Holland, & Burns, 2015; Ferguson, Little, & McClelland, 2000; Priest & Gass, 1997; Priest, Gass, & Gillis, 2000). However, a shift from character building to the concept of transfer does not put claims on sounder footing, as research in this field has generally failed to achieve transfer of learning on any significant level over the past 100 years (Haskell, 2001). Further, Brown (2010) proposes that educators would be "better served [by] ...focussing on assisting students to experience and understand the dynamics of social interaction rather than acquiring knowledge that can be supposedly transferred across contexts" (p. 1). This recommendation also aligns closely to the sociocultural foundations of the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007).

Alongside adventure and personal and social development, assumptions about risk taking have influenced the delivery of outdoor education. Hodgson and Bailie (2011), for example, argue that the exclusion of risky activities in adventure education would undermine experience for learning and "the

benefits of well-planned adventure education can justify exposure to controlled risk” (p. 61). Zink’s (2003) analysis provides clear insights into the ways in which adventure and the use of ‘risky activities’ have become inextricably linked with personal and social development outcomes in outdoor education practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. As Wattchow and Brown (2011) have noted, it appears that “the taking of organised risks at school camps, for example, supposedly prepares students for the risks they will face as they move into adulthood” (p. 35). In contrast, many commentators have questioned the assumption that risk is necessary for optimal learning, and further, whether deliberately exposing adolescents to risky environments is morally sound (see, eg., Beedie & Bourne, 2005; Brookes, 2011; Brown, 2008b; Brown & Fraser, 2009; Loynes, 1998; McKenzie, 2000).

Within the past decade in Aotearoa New Zealand, there have been two major incidents with outdoor education groups which have resulted in multiple fatalities (Brookes, Smith, & Corkill QC, 2009; Worksafe New Zealand, 2013). Brookes (2011) analysis of the most significant tragedy questions the 20th-century militaristic type outcomes associated with traditional outdoor education practices and subsequent risk exposure. He concludes that:

there is a place for heroic adventure, but not with other people’s children, and there is no place for popular but difficult-to-defend educational philosophies which posit deadly risk as good for children or necessary for the salvation of a generation (p. 30).

Such analysis emphasises that assumptions about the benefits of purposeful risk taking should be critically considered (Brown & Fraser, 2009), as there is a lack of supporting literature to endorse such practices (Brown, 2012a).

As a contrast to deliberate risk exposure, Estrellas (1996) argues that any level of stress will impact negatively on a learning experience. This belief could be seen as a challenge to common theories that support risk taking in outdoor education, such as the *adventure experience paradigm*, which is based on the premise that peak experience is achieved by matching individual competency

with the appropriate level of risk (Priest, 1990). In contrast, Brown (2008a) contends that students should be challenged in a manner that is supported by their genuine interest in learning and underpinned by practices that are based on sound educational principles. Further, Beames and Brown (2016) advocate for a rethink of adventurous learning and encourage a “conscious reconsideration of the role of adventure in educational contexts and how we might facilitate experiences that open up possibilities for different ways of learning about and knowing the world” (p. 101). They propose four key components in adventurous learning as being: authenticity, agency, uncertainty, and mastery. In considering these four components, educators will be better positioned to deliver outdoor education experiences that keep the learning real, give children power, ensure that outcomes are not predetermined and provide students with opportunities to develop mastery of skills (Beames & Brown, 2016).

Despite these ongoing academic debates and the questionable links between a pedagogical emphasis on self-development of the individual and the socioecological underpinnings of the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007), Zink & Boyes’s (2007) survey of 120 teachers which considered which learning outcomes that were most important in relation to the NZC, illustrate teachers’ continued belief in personal and social development outcomes as priorities in outdoor education. In contrast, sociocultural outcomes including the development of cultural/ethnic understanding and *Tikanga Māori* (Māori customs) were reported as less important. Similarly, Haddock (2007) reported 97% of respondent schools stated that EOTC is important in helping students achieve outcomes such as safety, knowledge, and skills, improved self-confidence, and problem-solving. These studies highlight the extent to which teachers’ beliefs influence practice and the apparent gaps between academic critique and programming in schools.

Hill's (2010b) study of a small group of outdoor educators in Aotearoa New Zealand extends this point and is of particular relevance to this study as it

“highlighted inconsistency or conflict between teacher beliefs and educational systems and institutions” (p. 30). The study further uncovered three key factors that impacted on consistency between teacher beliefs and educational institutions. These were: the tensions teachers experienced between their values and their practice, resource constraints, and assessment and curriculum pressures. Although these may not necessarily be unique to outdoor education, these findings remind us that what is intended to be delivered as curriculum may differ greatly from what is actually delivered; and as was the case in this study, teachers experienced difficulties in bringing their commitment to environmental education alive given the constraints of assessment. Fang (1996) elaborates on this tension, by identifying the *thesis of consistency* and the *thesis of inconsistency*. The former recognises that teachers’ theoretical beliefs and values shape their practice, while the latter recognises that the complexities of the classroom make it difficult for teachers’ beliefs to be consistent with practice.

Considering outdoor education’s placement within the HPE curriculum, it could be argued that the findings from surveys illustrating the importance teachers placed on learning outcomes of skill development, fun and enjoyment is unsurprising. However, outdoor education’s placement within the health and physical education curriculum has provided a distinct philosophical space to inform practice. Though, Australian commentators Gray and Martin (2012) report that the “outdoor education profession has not been proactive enough to ensure that the generalist HPE practitioner is aware of outdoor education’s distinctive contributions to learning outcomes in the broad areas of personal, social and community well-being” (p. 46). If teachers continue to value outcomes that are not unique to outdoor education, a weak argument for the value of programmes in an already cluttered curriculum is provided. Lugg (1999) poses two questions to teachers of outdoor education for reflection: “What makes it significantly different to other subjects and what educational imperatives exist to compel schools and education institutions to include outdoor education in the curriculum of the 21st century?” (p. 25).

Senior school programmes

The way in which secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand plan and implement outdoor education and its formal assessment in outdoor education differs greatly among schools. Campbell-Price (2010) interviewed three outdoor education teachers and discovered that they were highly innovative in their practice as was evident by their use of achievement standards outside of the HPE domain, not feeling pressured to assess all that is learnt, and incorporating more environmental learning in their programmes. Taylor (2014) and Townsend (2011) also advocate for place responsive outdoor education programmes at the senior level, which incorporate knowledge and assessments from a range of learning areas. These practices can be seen as a contrast to earlier studies such as Zink and Boyes (2007), which identified personal and social development as the primary outcomes sought in outdoor education.

Irrespective of programming distinctions, it appears common for schools to utilise a combination of both physical education achievement standards (which are based on the NZC) and outdoor industry based unit standards (which assess vocational based skills) (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2016). Skills Active is the industry training organisation which governs outdoor industry based unit standards. Some schools offer purely unit standard based courses in outdoor education and use pre-approved Skills Active resources as a compliment to the NZC (Mikaels et al., 2015). In this case, programmes of learning potentially move away from specific NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) outcomes, towards outcomes intended for vocational pathways in outdoor recreation.

Vocational learning and the commodification of education has seen changes in assessment structures (Hall, 2005), which has increased the weighting and emphasis of assessment in secondary schools. Within physical education, traditional assessment approaches have tended to focus on fitness or de-contextualised skills (Penney, Brooker, Hay, & Gillespie, 2009). This is relevant

to note, as outdoor education programmes generally operate under the physical education learning area. Programme design in outdoor education is arguably affected by the high stakes assessment culture in schools. Hills (2011) interviews with several outdoor education teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand identified that teachers felt pressure to link courses to measurable assessment tools, which in turn affected programme design.

Cosgriff and Gillespie (2011) propose five catalysts intended to support teachers in aligning assessment practice with contemporary curricula and pedagogical goals, such as the development of place connectedness, sustainability and bicultural learning in outdoor education. They suggest that teachers:

1. Review the alignment process (review of national assessment to align with the NZC which was undertaken in 2011)
2. Revisit and reconsider the curriculum in relation to assessment
3. View achievement standards with fresh eyes
4. Write programme-specific assessment materials
5. Engage in reflective practice and teacher decision making.

Although assessment should not be the driver of curriculum design, there is a dynamic and interdependent relationship between curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. The adoption of these catalysts is argued to support a focus on learning in outdoor education, rather than a focus on pursuits or technical performance (Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011).

Scholarship indicates that outdoor education in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand is experiencing a number of changes that will undoubtedly alter the scope of many programmes in schools. Brown (2013) for example, calls for outdoor education programmes to be more relevant to the lives of students. It is evident that such calls for change in outdoor education are based on a central concern for students as opposed to 'one size fits all' approaches. In correlation to this, there has been increased attention on outdoor education experiences that reflect bicultural partnerships between Māori and Pākehā. The next section

looks specifically into calls made by some academics, policy makers and educators who share a desire for a more bicultural approach in formal schooling.

Shifts towards culturally responsive education in schools

The NZC sets an ambitious vision wherein young people of all social groups will develop the competencies they need for study, work, and lifelong learning, and in doing so, realise their potential (Ministry of Education, 2007). In support of this vision, a number of nationwide projects have been offered to schools around culturally responsive and relational teaching practices. These projects have challenged educators to rethink the way they go about their everyday practice, and have dispelled common myths especially regarding the educational success of Māori students. In this section, and as a necessary foreground for this research, I critically discuss culturally responsive and relational pedagogy and associated projects in schools targeted at raising Māori achievement. I then highlight how some outdoor educators are responding to calls for a more culturally responsive curriculum.

Defining culturally responsive and relational pedagogy

Schools are rich in culture and history. Everything from school mottos, the physical environment of learning spaces, and curriculum delivery has an impact on a students' educational experience. Further, Bruner (1996) asserts that thinking and learning are situated in cultural settings and are dependent upon cultural resources. Taking this into account, a predominantly Western curriculum becomes problematic particularly for Māori students, as Māori thinking, feeling and acting remains distant from Western ways of thinking, feeling and acting (A. Macfarlane, 2004).

Culturally responsive and relational pedagogy is largely drawn from sociocultural theory and perspectives which have gained momentum in a number of professional practices globally (A. Macfarlane, 2015). According to Hollins (1996), culturally responsive practice includes “culturally mediated cognition, culturally appropriate social situations for learning, and culturally

valued knowledge in curriculum content” (p. 13). In the *Kia Eke Panuku* project, these features of culturally responsive and relational pedagogy are characterised as:

1. Contexts for learning where learners are able to connect new learning to their own prior knowledge and cultural experiences
2. Each learner’s *cultural toolkit* (Bruner, 1996) is accepted as valid and legitimate and students have opportunities to engage within their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1976)
3. Learning activities are interactive, dialogic and spiralling
4. Teaching and learning roles are interdependent, fluid and dynamic students and teachers are able to learn with and from other learners (*ako*).
5. Feedback and feed forward provides learners with specific information about what has been done well and what needs to be done to improve.

(Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success, n.d.)

Distinct correlations can be drawn between a commitment our nation's founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi, and the intended outcomes of the projects discussed. In commenting from a primary school perspective (but equally relevant in secondary schools), A. Macfarlane (2004) and S. Macfarlane (2009) discuss how culturally responsive and inclusive pedagogy must be aligned with the Treaty of Waitangi. They propose the following principles, which are intended to guide educators in enabling kaupapa Māori theory to become embedded in schools:

1. Partnership:

- Māori are consulted and involved in decision-making about everything that affects them.
- There are opportunities for both parties to listen and to learn from each other without one party imposing their cultural views on the other.

2. Protection:

- Māori are able to bring their cultural knowledge, experiences, beliefs and values to the interactions.

- Initial and ongoing interactions maintain and uphold Māori cultural knowledge, experiences, aspirations, beliefs and values.

3. Participation:

- Māori have equitable access to content and contexts that reflect kaupapa Māori

- Content and contexts promote equitable rights, opportunities, and outcomes for Māori.

(As cited in. S. Macfarlane, 2015, p. 107)

In mainstream schooling, at least, these principles signify that demonstrating a strong commitment to obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi will be of high importance when addressing the underachievement of Māori students. Teachers such as Townsend (2014) who re-envisioned outdoor education so that Māori students would excel indicate that some outdoor educators are leading the way in this respect.

Responding to calls for change

Commentators have raised concern that applying Western research approaches to Māori is ineffective (see, e.g, Bishop, Ladwig, & Berryman, 2014; Mahuika, 2008). As already noted, key concerns with the adoption of Westernised approaches within Māori contexts are the differences in worldviews and knowledge systems. A. Macfarlane et al. (2008) assert that:

A Māori worldview is characterized by an abiding concern for the quality of human relationships that need to be established and maintained if learning contexts are to be effective for Māori students, and for these relationships to balance individual learning and achievement against responsibilities for the well-being and achievement of the group (p. 102).

The focus on relationships in education led to the development the *Te Kotahitanga* initiative (Ministry of Education, n.d.-a), a research and professional development project implemented in mainstream schools. Stemming from the initiative in 2001, an Effective Teaching Profile [ETP] was developed using input from Māori students, their families, principals and some teachers. The need for teachers to “...explicitly reject deficit theorising as a means of explaining Māori students’ educational achievement levels, and...[take] an agentic position in their theorising about their practice” (Berryman & Bishop, 2015, p. 288) was seen as central to the ETP. The findings from research into *Te Kotahitanga*’s success are highly positive, with indications that the programme has had long lasting positive impacts for both Māori and non-Māori, (Ministry of Education, n.d.-a), and also that students benefit from higher quality pedagogical approaches (Ladwig, 2012).

Similarly, the *Ka Hikatia: Accelerating Success 2013-2017* project acknowledges a pressing issue that many Māori students disengage in school, and as a result don’t achieve to their highest potential (Ministry of Education, n.d.-b, p. 2). This project includes all areas of the state education sector and intends to support Māori students in enjoying and achieving educational success as Māori. *Kia Eke Panuku* builds on the previous work of past initiatives to raise Māori achievement in schools and “seeks to develop a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations across all levels of the school” (Ministry of Education, 2015). A survey of principals involved in the project reported that 93% found their involvement “very valuable or mostly valuable” (Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success, n.d.)

The presence of culturally responsive and relational pedagogies in education dialogue and school initiatives also impacted on expectations of teachers in this domain. Derived from the *Ka Hikatia* project, five cultural competencies were identified to support teachers in working with Māori learners and ensure they enjoy educational success. The competencies are:

1. *Wānanga*: participating with learners and communities in robust dialogue for the benefit of Māori learners' achievement.
2. *Whanaungatanga*: actively engaging in respectful working relationships with Māori learners, parents and whānau, hapū, iwi and the Māori community.
3. *Manaakitanga*: showing integrity, sincerity and respect towards Māori beliefs, language and culture
4. *Tangata Whenuatanga*: affirming Māori learners as Māori. Providing contexts for learning where the language, identity and culture of Māori learners and their whānau is affirmed.
5. *Ako*: taking responsibility for their own learning and that of Māori learners. (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 4)

These competencies present clear challenges for teachers working with a predominantly western curriculum and operating in traditional mainstream schooling where teachers hold power within classrooms. In respect to outdoor education, teachers of programmes that favour the delivery of traditional pursuits and decontextualised outcomes that are based on Western ideals may find attaining these competencies a challenging task.

Culturally responsive outdoor education

The traditional outdoor instructor (in control) and student (follower) relationship does not generally fit well with culturally responsive practice, and could immediately disadvantage students who are from cultures that value reciprocal relationship building as central to human interaction (Penetito, 2015). Brown (2008b) advocates for more culturally responsive outdoor education practices and suggests that:

“an authentic outdoor education for Aotearoa New Zealand in the 21st century may be one that seeks to understand the historical and cultural antecedents that have coalesced into the predominantly adventure based, “high impact” and “novel” activity based approaches to education in the outdoors” (p. 21).

The Western construct of outdoor education is also challenged in a Māori schooling context. Rather than a standalone subject, outdoor education in *kura* (Māori schools) is often woven through much of the curriculum, and may not necessarily be termed as a standalone subject or field of study as is common in a Pākehā context (Irwin, 2008).

Existing critique of the lack of culturally responsive practices and context-free outcomes evident in outdoor education programmes commonly reference the Treaty of Waitangi (see, eg., Brown, 2008b; Legge, 2008; A. Macfarlane et al., 2008). Further, Cosgriff, Legge, et al. (2012) affirm “one of the keys to understanding the cultural milieu of contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand lies in the foundational document signed between the British Crown and many Māori leaders in 1840” (p. 226). Brown (2008b) also calls for outdoor educators to adopt “a more modest pedagogy which acknowledges bicultural and multicultural imperatives which are inclusive of other world views and connect us with the land and our place in the landscape of Aotearoa/New Zealand” (p. 21). Such calls for change resonate with literature discussed in the previous section which is based upon a central concern for Māori students and their success and well-being in formal schooling.

Outdoor educators may have limited access to people or resources to support culturally responsive practices. Within *Te Ao Māori*, a large amount of knowledge has been lost, and much of what is retained is protected and shared with only select tribal members (Heke, 2014). However, there are some contemporary examples of outdoor education delivered within a culturally responsive context, that educators could draw on. One of note is the *Atua Matua Māori Health Framework* (deity to human expression) that was developed to provide “a set of environmentally-based Māori concepts that could help Māori move from the current deficit mainstream model of health to a Māori ancestral framework” (Heke, 2014, p. 2). The framework supports the integration of Western worldviews and considers humans’ interactions with the environment as a primary means to health and well-being. In another example,

Hauteruruku ki Puketeraki, a sub-tribal *waka* (canoe) club based north of Dunedin in the South Island, offers water safety programmes and shares a vision to “connect and reconnect all our members and members of our community with the local *awa* (river) and *moana* (sea) through *ngā waka* (canoes) and *Te Ao o Takaroa* [god of the ocean]” (Jackson et al., 2016, p. 26). What is distinctive about these forms of outdoor education is that they are driven by *Māori* pedagogies and knowledge so they provide authentic contexts for both *Māori* and non-*Māori* to engage in bicultural outdoor education.

Within the school context, concerns about the low numbers of *Māori* students taking outdoor education as a subject led to Townsend (2014) adopting a place responsive approach. In doing so, she discovered that a place responsive approach effectively engaged *Māori* students in outdoor education, as the “learning experiences more closely linked to the *Māori* students’ *whānau/hapū/iwi* whakapapa, traditions and stories” (p. 108). These findings support Penetito’s (2008) view that ‘place-based education’, which includes indigenous education, environmental and ecological studies and community education, would be educationally and culturally beneficial for not only *Māori* but all students.

Lynch’s (2012) assertion that there remains “a clear need, and wide scope, for research into; cultural elements of outdoor education programmes; cultural effects on participants; culturally appropriate research approaches; and programme effects on, and experiences of, people who identify as *Māori*” (p. 49) points to a clear research gap. Given the scarcity of literature examining culturally responsive pedagogies within outdoor education programmes in schools, findings from other subject areas that share critical similarities warrant consideration. Manning’s (2011) research with history teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand identified that there were several factors which inhibited history teachers in incorporating a *Māori* worldview. These included: inadequate resources, a lack of access to local experts, time constraints, a limited scope of teachers’ knowledge and skills, and curriculum control issues. Harcourt

(2015), a history and social studies teacher, suggests that combined with culturally responsive pedagogy, “teachers need to draw on place-based education to respond to their students’ unique historical, cultural and ecological contexts” (p. 37). However, a number of complex factors potentially inhibit teachers’ willingness and ability to incorporate a Māori world view, with Legge (2008) contending many Pākehā and other non-Māori alike have misconstrued attitudes towards Māori, primarily due to a lack of exposure to Māori culture, history, values and way of life.

It is vital that educators exercise caution to ensure Māori knowledge, principles and practices are not construed, oversimplified, misinterpreted or inappropriately used. However, with careful consideration, planning, and support, educators can work towards encompassing both Māori and Pākehā worldviews and engage in outdoor education practices that are culturally responsive to the students they teach. Perhaps, as Irwin (2008) contends, “in order for bicultural experiences to occur, a re-envisioning of outdoor education needs to take place” (p. 80).

Place responsive outdoor education

One way in which this re-envisioning has been expressed in the past decade in outdoor education here in Aotearoa New Zealand is through increased attention towards *places* within outdoor education, and the establishment of place responsive pedagogy. This section discusses these developments.

Gruenewald (2003) notes that “places are fundamentally pedagogical because they are contexts for human perception and for participation with the phenomenal, ecological, and cultural world” (p. 645). Such an understanding calls into question traditional outdoor education practices that utilise outdoor environments simply as *spaces* for individualistic outcomes, and in doing so, deny the *places* where outdoor education happens (Gruenewald, 2003; Leather & Nicholls, 2014; Mannion, Fenwick, & Lynch, 2013; Wattchow, 2008).

Although the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) advocates for a contextually relevant curriculum that is underpinned by values such as ecological

sustainability, Hokowhitu (2004) argues that there was a lack of consultation with Māori when developing the NZHPEC (Ministry of Education, 1999), which has limited Māori representations of place. For example, the *Whare Tapa Wha* model (Durie, 1994) was selected to portray overall well-being and acts as one of four underlying concepts that frame learning in health and physical education. However, the fifth component *Taha Whenua*, which exemplified the importance of one's connection with the land, was omitted. In light of this, Hokowhitu (2004) argues that:

Essentially, the inclusion of whenua within the NZHPEC would have enabled physical education teachers to provide contextually driven pedagogy, so that that the 'place' (including one's demography and cultural history) where one's school is situated gives the grounding for the curriculum delivered..." (p. 81)

Māori interpretations of place are highly complex and holistic in nature, and such claims about the misinterpretation of *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge) may provide some explanation as to why teachers in Zink and Boyes's (2007) study rated sociocultural outcomes so low. Insight into a Māori worldview describing the innate connection between humans and places is illustrated by Marsden's (2003) explanation about *whenua* (land, placenta) and its significance to Māori:

Whenua was both the term for the natural earth and placenta. This is a constant reminder that we are of the earth and therefore earthly. As the human mother nourished her child on the womb and then upon her breast after the child's birth, so does Mother Earth (p. 68).

Further, Murton (2012) explains how Māori thought about self, body, landscape, and place, represent a Māori 'geographical self.' These are summarised as:

1. *Genealogy as a way of knowing things*: for Māori, to know something is, first of all, to locate it in space and time through

genealogy (*whakapapa*), thus provides a cognitive template for which Māori “know” this phenomenal world.

2. *Understandings of time*: the symbol of the double spiral (*koru*) represents interrelationships between the past, present, and future and their connection to time, space and matter. Creation is a process of continuous action or coming into being.

3. *The importance of the spoken word*: which connects the breath of people to the world and brings life to place. Thought and spoken words exist together, with sound being the original foundation for thought’s conceptualisation and expression in word. (pp. 92-94)

A key point here is that interpretations of thought, body, landscape, and place will differ between cultures (Murton, 2012). In emphasising people’s understandings and experiences of places in different ways, Murton (2012) asserts that “mistakes of perception and interpretation will be made, and the idea that there is one single true or complete map must be dismissed” (p. 99). As these authors have illustrated, although Māori and Western ideologies share some similarities, they are ultimately culturally bound. Given this, Wattoo and Brown (2011) contend that it is important for outdoor educators to consider how different cultures understand places, as these “philosophical positions influence the way in which outdoor educators and learners encounter, locate themselves within, move through and identify themselves in outdoor spaces and places” (p. 56). Understanding Māori interpretations of place appears to be a key area for development for teachers of outdoor education.

Place responsive pedagogy

In commenting on future directions for outdoor education in the 21st century, Irwin, Straker, and Hill (2011) assert that “there is a call for change to more sustainable and equitable relationships with the places we inhabit, which stretches well beyond the bounds of education” (p. 187). Further to place-based education, which calls for the utilisation of local contexts and knowledge, *place responsive pedagogy* requires educators to respond to the places that

they are in. In advocating for place responsive education, Wattchow and Brown (2011) suggest that “the objective for the educator is to facilitate an experience of place so that the learner’s connections with it might be fostered and they understand the connections between individuals, places, and communities” (p. 196). Further, it is suggested that the development of place attachment through outdoor education can be seen a step in the right direction in addressing global issues, especially those concerning environmental sustainability (Hill, 2012).

Because place responsive outdoor education involves responding to the places that you are in, a generic prescription is not possible. However, in an attempt to guide educators, Wattchow and Brown (2011) propose four signposts for place responsive education. These are:

1. *Being present in and with place*: this requires careful planning to allow learners to attune to the environment, requiring stillness, silence, and patience. It is unlikely that this will occur if movement through places is rapid or if learners feel fearful.
2. *The power of place-based stories and narratives*: an experience that involves interpretation and reflection helps us to make sense of the world. This requires educators to become storytellers in the places they work to help build understanding and attachment to places
3. *Apprenticing ourselves to outdoor places*: this involves a combination of the first two and requires an understanding of how our experience is shaped through embodied encounters and knowing about places through history, geography etc.
4. *The representation of place experiences*: this involves developing learners’ capacity interpret how the places they are learning in are represented, and the personalisation of these interpretive works in ways that learners wish to respond, e.g., poetry, film, songs.

As highlighted above, being place responsive means that learning is particular to the places in which outdoor education occurs, therefore, apprenticeship to places is often necessary (Wattchow & Brown, 2011). This may mean educators are required to learn new skills and knowledge. Tan and Atencio's (2016) research with physical education teachers in Singapore highlighted that a key challenge associated with adopting a place responsive approach was that teachers "lacked deeper understandings to fully engage with the learning processes underpinning place-based pedagogy" (p 32). Similarly, drawing on interviews with teachers in the UK, Mannion et al. (2013) report that "before teachers attune pupils to a place, there is likely a need to develop new personal and professional orientations in teachers themselves towards these places" (p. 801). These studies highlight some of the complexities that arise with the adoption of new pedagogies in outdoor education and suggest that although educators may have a desire to change their practices, challenges may limit the extent to which new pedagogies are adopted.

A key consideration in the adoption of place responsive pedagogy appears to be the speed and pace in which people move through places. Leather and Nicholls (2014) research with students from the United Kingdom on a sailing experience concluded that students were able to discover a significance of the meaningful relationship between the sociocultural history of the place and the technical activity of sailing. Similarly, Wattchow's (2007) research with Australian university students' experiences on a river journey found that the technical demands of rivercraft and romantic notions of the outdoors had the potential to be problematic in becoming place responsive. However, on the days where the journey was on easy-going water, "participants' writings and articulations in interviews demonstrated a greater sense of connection to place" (Wattchow, 2008, p. 19). Given that much outdoor education in schools happens during short time periods and can require extensive travel, educators desiring to be place responsive have several challenges to consider if a key issue in being place responsive is that students must have opportunities to be present, in and with places (Wattchow & Brown, 2011). Outdoor educators' use

of place responsive pedagogy can be seen to exemplify resistance against the dominating discourse of adventure and pursuits in outdoor education (Mikaels et al., 2015).

A small number of Aotearoa New Zealand studies have identified the suitability of place responsive pedagogy in school outdoor education programmes (Brown, 2013; Cosgriff, 2015a, 2015b; Taylor, 2014; Townsend, 2014). Taylor (2014) found a place responsive approach to be an appropriate pedagogy for senior level outdoor education in secondary schools and one that students responded positively to. A positive student response to place responsive experiences was also noted by Brown (2012b), with students enjoying making connections with local places that they were familiar with, discovering new places in their local area and learning about the places they were in through stories. Importantly, students also enjoyed the challenge of the journey and the social interactions that came about. As previously discussed, Townsend (2014) revised her outdoor education programme which increased opportunities to meet the needs of Māori and provide students with the opportunity to engage with the unique histories, geographies and cultural understandings associated with their particular places. Through a local place responsive journey, learning became closely linked to the lived world of Māori students, as many Māori traditions and stories were shared.

Few studies have explored teachers' perspectives on place responsive education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Drawing on research with four outdoor education teachers, Brown (2013) reports that teachers thought a place responsive approach increased cross-curricular engagement, provided opportunities to build connections with places, and lowered the stress levels of teachers while facilitating experiences. The nature of slow movement through places also meant that students and teachers had opportunities to be present in and with places. In summary, Brown (2013) notes that "low costs, reduced environmental footprint and lowered teacher stress levels are clear benefits" (p. 9) to a place responsive approach. Similarly, Cosgriff's (2015a, 2015b)

research with two teachers and principal who re-placed outdoor education in a local neighbourhood, points to a more “experientially based curriculum” (p. 12) where students and teachers developed a greater connection to the local areas in which learning took place. These types of learning experiences closely align to the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007), which intends for students to engage in real-world learning experiences that have direct meaning in their own lives.

As highlighted in this chapter, educators are faced with a number of pressing issues which impact on effective teaching and learning, including the ‘weight’ of managing assessment which can negatively impact on student motivation levels (Wylie & Bonne, 2016). Teachers are increasingly being held responsible for student success (Alcorn & Thrupp, 2012), and are also being seen as a key driver in addressing underachievement of Māori students (Bishop et al., 2012). Considering the numerous obligations and tasks that teachers are required to meet, engaging in meaningful change is not likely to be an easy task.

Chapter Summary

As highlighted in this chapter, educators are faced with a number of pressing issues which impact on effective teaching and learning including the ‘weight’ of managing assessment, and as a result of that, student motivation levels (Wylie & Bonne, 2016). Teachers are increasingly being held responsible for student success (Alcorn & Thrupp, 2012), and are also being seen as a key driver in addressing underachievement of Māori students (Bishop et al., 2012). Considering the numerous obligations and tasks that teachers are required to meet, shifts in pedagogy must be effectively supported by allowing teachers sufficient access to resources and professional development, effective leadership, and most importantly, space and time to engage in critical reflection.

As outdoor educators in secondary schools Aotearoa New Zealand adopt place responsive and culturally responsive pedagogies, there will no doubt be opportunities and challenges associated. Given the research gap on teachers’ experiences of adopting and implementing such pedagogies, this study aims

to provide insight into teachers' experiences of becoming place and culturally responsive and putting 'theory' into 'practice' in their respective school programmes.

Chapter 3: Methods

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology and design of the research process that guided this study. Qualitative research methods, which emphasise the qualities of things being studied and understanding processes and meanings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), were employed. There is a growing body of literature to suggest that qualitative research methods are gaining popularity in the study of outdoor education (see, e.g., Beames & Ross, 2010; Brown, 2013; Taylor, 2014; Wattchow, 2007).

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework for the study and explains the philosophical positioning that underpins the research. I explain how data was collected, reported and analysed. I then discuss ethical considerations relevant to the research, factors influencing the study and how research participants were selected. The chapter concludes with a brief introduction to each of the six teacher participants.

Theoretical framework for the study

As has been noted in chapter 2, there is limited research analysing teachers' experiences of the challenges and opportunities provided by place and culturally responsive outdoor education practices in schools. In noting this gap, and as already established, the overall purpose of the research was to learn more about teachers' perspectives in respect to delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in secondary schools. Two research questions guided the study, which were:

1. What are the challenges and opportunities for teachers in delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in secondary schools?
2. What do they mean for the future of outdoor education in a culturally diverse society?

Firstly, it is important that I explain the philosophical stance (or *paradigm*) which underpins the research. Paradigms are simply ways of looking at the world (Mertens, 2016), and can be defined as a “basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigation” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 105). Assumptions about the nature and reality of things (ontology), gives rise to how we come to know things (epistemology), which influences the way in which we conduct research (methodology) (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). Further, it is the choice of a paradigm that guides the research design and subsequent selection of methodology, methods, type of analysis and evaluation (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006).

Paradigms that guided early research in education were labelled as *positivism* and *post-positivism*. These paradigms originated from the sciences and held an assumption that the social world could be studied using the same principles as the natural world (Mertens, 2016). Positivists hold the view that the application of scientific principles will uphold rigour in research, and in turn, will yield the clearest possible ideal of knowledge. Crotty (1998) asserts that the “attribution of objectivity, validity and generalisability” (p.41) is what defines positivist research. Even early forms of naturalistic inquiry, such as ethnography, adopted a positivist stance as researchers aimed to produce objective reports of lived experience (Patton, 2002).

However, these paradigms generally failed to take into account social and cultural considerations and the unpredictability of human behaviour, hence the adoption of naturalistic and interpretivist approaches to research involving people. These approaches are directly concerned with the way we apprehend things through our senses and tend to favour qualitative research methodologies (Cohen et al., 2011) that stress the socially constructed nature of reality and knowledge not being value-free or universal. Adopting an interpretative paradigm allowed me to interpret the meanings of participants’ responses and generate meaning from them (Bryman, 2016). As Borko, Liston, and Whitcomb (2007) note, “interpretive researchers attempt to capture

local variation through fine-grained descriptions of settings and actions, and through interpretation of how actors make sense of their sociocultural contexts and activities” (p. 4).

The interpretive paradigm was developed from the philosophy of interpretive understanding called *hermeneutics*, which is “the study of interpretive understanding or meaning” (Mertens, 2016, p.16). Given we all experience a slightly different reality as we interpret things in our unique way, a phenomenon of “multiple realities” exists. As experiences and interpretations will be unique to the individual, a challenge of the interpretivist researcher is to endeavour to make collective meaning of participants’ responses (Krauss, 2005). Through understanding participants’ lived experiences and comparing them to others, I envisaged that the essence of the phenomena being studied could be further understood (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

In line with the interpretive paradigm that provided the foundation for the study, I adopted a qualitative approach to guide the research. Qualitative approaches tend to align to paradigms that reject a search for one truth and objectivity from the research process and tend to “stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is being studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” Denzin and Lincoln (2011, p. 8). Further, qualitative research approaches explicitly identify the researcher’s position and actions, to present a credible argument to readers. Employing a qualitative methodology enabled me to gather thick descriptions from participants, which represented the complexity of situations and phenomena being studied (Cohen et al., 2011; Geertz, 1973).

Data collection

Semi-structured interviews were used as the sole method for generating data. Interviews were used because of their ability to explore participants’ perceptions, attitudes, and meanings in depth. Adopting a qualitative approach to interviews meant that the data could then be used to gain an understanding

of social actions and processes (Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin, & Lowden, 2011).

The four main interview types which researchers employ for a range of purposes are the: structured interview, the unstructured interview, the non-directive interview and the focused interview (Cohen et al., 2011). Structured interviewing tends to be employed to test a priori hypothesis; whereas on the other end of the continuum, unstructured interviewing tends to require participants to share rich descriptions of a topic to explore meanings and perceptions (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Menter et al., 2011). I adopted a semi-structured approach, which included a guideline for the interview process ([see Appendix C](#)). A strength of semi-structured interviews is the richness of data they yield (Harvey-Jordan & Long, 2001). This approach enabled me to probe deeper into topics of interest (Menter et al., 2011) and presented flexibility to reframe or add new questions on an individual basis, while still ensuring that my format remained relatively consistent between interviews. This format ensured that interviews flowed as more natural conversations, and allowed for participants to elaborate on topics.

Three types of questions were used throughout the interview, which were:

1. Main questions: which provided the scaffolding of the interview
2. Follow up questions: which explored interviewee's answers to obtain more depth and detail
3. Probes: which were questions, comments or gestures used to help manage the conversation (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 119).

It was also important to consider the social environment of an interview and to reflect on how this might affect the outcomes of interviews. Bishop (1997) notes that "the interview itself can be a strategy controlled by the researcher and repressive of the position of the informant/participant" (p. 31). This point highlighted the need for me to consider how the nature of an interview could potentially limit participants' willingness to respond to questions. By reflecting on my conduct and building rapport, I hoped that participants would feel

comfortable answering questions. Before commencing interviews, I informed participants that it was not my intention to make judgements about their teaching practice, but instead, I was interested to hear their perceptions on topics. I also ensured that all interviews were conducted in a location that suited the participants, allowed for privacy, and was mutually agreed upon. Three interviews were conducted in person, and due to proximity, three were conducted online.

Successful interviews are built on mutual respect, so I was careful not to pretend to share participants' beliefs to elicit more information (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), and I attempted to portray myself in a friendly professional manner. Patton's (2002) interview strategies to maintain control and enhance the quality responses were particularly useful. These were:

1. Knowing what you want to find out
2. Asking focused questions to get relevant answers
3. Listening attentively to assess the quality and relevance of responses
4. Giving appropriate verbal and non-verbal feedback (pp. 376-377).

As with all data collection methods, there were inevitably weaknesses in employing interviews. Although interviews can produce rich data, they reflect participants' attitudes and feelings at the time that the interview was conducted (Harvey-Jordan & Long, 2001). The nature of interviews as a social interaction poses the question: "Was the dialogue in the interview a true reflection of participants' perceptions?" Interviews can also be time-consuming, and the data generated can be high in volume. Lastly, the quality of the interview highly depends on the technical ability of the researcher (Menter et al., 2011).

Data analysis and reporting

When considering what to do with the data, I adopted Cohen et al.'s (2011) idea of *fitness for purpose*. This concept suggests that there is no one correct way to analyse data but instead, researchers need to consider how the analysis process will best fit with the research questions posed. Qualitative data

analysis relies heavily on peoples' interpretations and their ability to make sense of what is typically a substantial body of data (Patton, 2002). In line with this, qualitative methods are themselves interpreted by researchers in their own way (Cohen et al., 2011). Considering these points, I was challenged to think about what type of questions I was asking, how I might collect data, and then what I might do with that data.

Inductive analysis was used to analyse the data generated from interviews. Patton (2002) asserts that inductive analysis involves "discovering patterns, themes, and categories within one's data" (p. 453). More specifically, thematic analysis was decided to be the most appropriate data analysis method, and this involved searching for themes and commonalities across all participants' responses to interview questions. This type of analysis is used for analysing and reporting themes within data and organising a data set in rich detail (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A theme according to Bryman (2016) is something which:

1. Is a category identified by the analyst through his/her data.
2. Relates to his/her research focus (and quite possibly the research questions).
3. Builds on codes identified in transcripts and/or field notes.
4. Provides the researcher with the basis for a theoretical understanding of his or her data that can make a theoretical contribution to the literature relating to the research focus (p. 584).

Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis should be classified as a data analysis method in its own right, and describe a six-stage process to conducting the thematic analysis:

1. Familiarising yourself with the data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the report.

These steps provided me with a structure to the analysis and a logical pattern to follow. Although I followed these steps, the analysis process was iterative as I worked backward and forwards to arrive at the final themes.

Thematic analysis has however been criticised because researchers can be vague about how themes were identified or emerged from the data (Bazeley, 2013). To alleviate this concern, Bryman (2016) suggests that researchers should show how the themes are significant and present the process whereby the themes were identified. I describe the processes I went through to arrive at the themes discussed in the next section below.

NVivo, a qualitative software package was employed to assist in organising the data into a format, so I could undertake the analysis efficiently. Qualitative analysis software assists in managing and organising data, and has some tools that aid the analysis process. However, it is important to note that unlike quantitative software packages, qualitative software does not *do* the analysis for you, it merely assists in making meaning of data (Cohen et al., 2011). Once I transcribed interviews in verbatim, they were loaded into *NVivo* and I began coding the data into categories.

Gathering thick description (Geertz, 1973) on topics meant that the essence of what participants said was captured fully, which would enable the reader to clearly understand the phenomenon being studied as the data was presented in the findings (Patton, 2002). My intention was to make transparent links between the data, analysis, findings, and discussion. I highlighted passages from the transcripts and placed them into codes. For example, one participant discussed how other teachers perceive his programmes of learning:

“But if, you know, they probably still don't really know what I do, and they still, you know, if I was having a discussion with a maths teacher, that maths teacher or that English teacher would still... believe that what they

are doing is more important than what I do, and would always choose to have kids in their class, rather than kids on my trip”.

I coded this particular passage under the heading ‘*Other teachers’ perceptions*’ as the key message from what was said related to the way in which other teachers perceived outdoor education. Some participant responses were placed into multiple codes, and some responses were placed in a code by themselves as they did not fit with other codes.

Once all the interview transcripts were coded, I proceeded to group the codes into clusters that shared critical similarities with each other. As an example, the sample passage above was grouped into a cluster named ‘*Attitudes and perceptions.*’ Using *NVivo* enabled me to print the codes and mind-map the clusters of codes so that I also had a visual representation. I then presented the codes and clusters of codes to my principal supervisor and we critically discussed what potential themes were emerging from the data. Following the discussion, five key themes that were relevant to the research questions were confirmed, which are discussed in the next chapter.

Ethical Considerations

Qualitative interviewing is a personal encounter and requires participants to share thoughts, feelings, and perceptions. Therefore, I had a number of ethical considerations to navigate through. Guillemin and Gillam (2004) distinguish between two different dimensions of ethics in research, which they term *procedural ethics* and *ethics in practice*. In this section, I discuss the actions taken to gain ethical consent to undertake research (procedural ethics) and discuss how my actions after I was granted ethical consent ensured my ongoing actions were ethical (ethics in practice). Differentiating between the two was important because it highlighted that ethics are involved with all stages of the research process, no matter how small the task appeared to be.

According to Cohen et al. (2011), interviews have an ethical dimension because “they concern interpersonal interaction and produce information about

the human condition” (p. 442). They identify three main ethical areas that the researcher should be concerned with, which are: informed consent, confidentiality, and the consequences of interviews. These are discussed in more depth below.

Informed consent requires researchers to make it clear to participants what exactly is required of them. The New Zealand Association for Research in Education (2010) declares that:

before participants make a decision about their involvement in a project they need to be given a clear description of why the research is being undertaken, what it involves, how it will be reported, and the extent of public availability (p. 6).

The University of Waikato Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee approved my research proposal. Information forms outlining the scope of the research, time requirements and nature of data collection were sent to all participants ([see Appendix A](#)). At the same time, information sheets for Principals were also distributed which outlined the research project and the general information regarding their employee’s participation ([see Appendix B](#)). Consent forms were then required from all participants and their Principals before interviews commenced. My supervisor’s contact details and my contact details were given to both participants and Principals in the case they had further questions. I took into consideration the language used in forms and attempted to use words and terminologies that possessed common understanding between all parties (Finch, 2005).

In respect to confidentiality, it may be near impossible to protect the identity of participants. Therefore, it is important that I was realistic about this, and ensured that participants were adequately informed (Menter et al., 2011), by stating that I would take all reasonable attempts to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, however, this could not be totally assured. To maintain anonymity, pseudonyms were assigned and each was only to be identified through general descriptive features, such as gender and teaching experience, and I used

general descriptors of participants. At times, this has meant the richness of descriptions (e.g. naming specific people and places) has been modified out of necessity to protect participants' identities. I am also aware of the relatively small population of Aotearoa New Zealand, and that many teachers of outdoor education are a part of close professional networks. Therefore, I was discrete about the information I disclosed to friends and colleagues interested in the progress of my thesis.

Considering the consequences of interviews required clear and open communication with participants. Allowing participants to check interview transcripts enabled verification that what I transcribed was an accurate representation of the interview dialogue. If participants felt that their participation in the interview would have negative consequences, they had full right to withdraw from the research.

It was important to me that I demonstrated a high level of care for participants. Although originally derived from the field of medical research, I found the principle of *beneficence* and taking all reasonable steps to minimise harm to participants (Marshall & Rossman, 2016) was essential. I ensured participants were well informed as to what I was requiring from them. Conducting interviews either at participants' workplaces or via digital means minimised the time required of participants and ensured that the interview took place in an environment they felt comfortable in.

I undertook this research in the hope of supporting new pedagogies in outdoor education that may better serve the future and diverse learners of Aotearoa New Zealand. As a part of the research process, I often reflected on how my research might be of value to others. In doing so, I had to view the research process as more than a technical exercise – it needed to add value to the lives of both the participants and their students. In relation to this, Cohen et al. (2011) describe *axiology* as “the beliefs and values we hold” (p. 3). Our axiological positioning is concerned with what we believe to be of value and worth pursuing, which in turn guides our ethical stance (Mertens, 2016). I requested

participants spend time with me in an interview and share their personal experiences. Therefore, it was important that my actions in the research process were well planned and considered, and based on sound theoretical principles. Part of this process involved developing a critical perspective on the research process itself so that I was aware of the potential impact of my actions.

Factors influencing the study

There are many factors which unavoidably affect research outcomes. Within this section, I discuss factors influencing this study and explain how they might impact on the final outcomes and then discuss limitations to the research.

Every aspect of the research process has been influenced by my values and beliefs, so it was important to be clear about 'where I was coming from' (Menter et al., 2011). The questions I posed were carefully considered in the initial research design and I also considered the time allowed to complete the research and ensured that the research process was achievable. Cohen et al. (2011) suggest that questions of timescale will affect:

1. The research questions which might be answered feasibly and fairly
2. The number of data collection instruments used
3. The sources (people) to whom the research might go
4. The number of foci which can be covered in the time
5. The size and nature of the reporting (p. 119)

Another factor involved my perception of the teaching profession which is heavily influenced by the policies, practices, and cultures within my school. I describe myself as a health and physical education teacher who facilitates a range of outdoor education experiences as part of my curriculum delivery. It was important to consider that my attitudes and beliefs will understandably be different from the teachers whom I interviewed. According to Eisenhart (2006), the overarching goal of representing qualitative data is "to provide as insightful, accurate, and comprehensive an account as possible of "what is going on" in social worlds beyond our own" (p. 580). Therefore, I endeavoured to be open

mindful towards participants' responses and conducted myself first and foremost as a learner.

I endeavoured to be transparent by describing all stages of the research process. Participants were also given time to check through the transcripts and confirm that they were a true account of what was discussed during the interview. By demonstrating transparency, it was hoped that readers would have adequate information to assess the trustworthiness of my research.

I also considered the importance of reflexivity in my research. Patton (2002) suggests that reflexive researchers should ask the following questions of themselves: "What do I know? How do I know what I know? What shapes and has shaped my perspective? With what voice do I share my perspective? What do I do with what I have found?" (p. 66). Being reflexive involved a constant questioning of my values, biases, and decisions I made, and what implications they had on study (Bryman, 2016). For example, when sourcing literature to support my research, I asked questions such as: Who are the authors? What are their motivations for publishing this literature? What other perspectives might challenge their stance? Asking questions of this nature helped to ensure that there was a critical component to the process of learning and selecting knowledge.

My final consideration was related to my position as a researcher, and the level of competence required to answer the questions I posed. This consideration is especially important because part of my research involved commenting on issues unique to Māori students in schools. As Bishop (2011) reminds us, "traditional non-Māori research has misrepresented Māori understandings and ways of knowing by simplifying, conglomerating, and commodifying Māori knowledge for "consumption" (p. 2). The voices that I represent in my research are those of teachers who made conscious decisions to adopt place or culturally responsive pedagogy, as alternatives to traditional Westernised approaches to outdoor education. Therefore, I have been cautious in drawing

from authors what I deem to be credible in commenting on Māori issues in education.

Limitations

My adoption of a qualitative approach utilised the researcher as a key methodological tool and aimed to paint a picture of participants' responses for others to reflect on (Bishop, 1997). Therefore, it is important that I state who I am as a researcher. Although I have taught for six years I am relatively junior in the teaching profession and my daily responsibilities are mostly concerned with the teaching and learning of students. Therefore, my understanding of school management and leadership processes is only viewed from an outsider's perspective. I have developed a particular stance towards place responsive pedagogy and culturally responsive pedagogy, but I have a limited understanding of how the adoption of these pedagogies impacts the school on a macro level. Factors such as: resistance by staff, budget constraints, wider-community expectations, Ministry of Education guidance and access to external support and resourcing, may all impact on the success and appropriateness of these pedagogies.

Lastly, given the small number of participants in the study, it is not possible to claim that these participants reflect the views of teachers of outdoor education across Aotearoa New Zealand. In saying this, the teachers involved resided in areas from the middle of the North Island to the lower South Island. A key group of voices not represented in this study are those teachers who oppose place and culturally responsive pedagogies and prefer to adopt traditional pedagogies in outdoor education. Hearing their perspectives would have been valuable in understanding what enables or constrains teachers in shifting mind-sets and adopting alternative pedagogies in outdoor education.

The research participants

Considering that the focus of this study was to learn more about teachers' perceptions of contemporary outdoor education practices, I established certain criteria for recruiting and selecting participants. Importantly, the participant

sample shared critical similarities related to the research questions (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). I invited teachers from schools who were reportedly implementing place or culturally responsive outdoor education programmes or units of work. Further, it was essential that the participants reflect the population from which they are drawn (Cohen et al., 2011), and so only teachers who were registered and currently practicing in secondary schools were selected. I promoted participation in my research through professional networking including social media and explained that I was looking to interview teachers who deliver outdoor education programmes or units of work that adopt culturally responsive or place responsive pedagogies.

Rather than generating a random selection of people, I chose people because of their relevance to the research questions (Bryman, 2016). However, my response rate via social networking and e-mail contact was surprisingly low, which limited the number of potential participants I could select from. I sent a group email to teachers who had previously participated in a place responsive outdoor education professional development course but received no responses. Further, my advertisement via dedicated outdoor education groups on social networking resulted in two responses. As I had already contacted two teachers who I knew through professional networking, I asked them to provide me with names of other teachers they believed may have fitted the profile I was searching for. Based on 'stratified purposive sampling' which involved selecting individuals within subgroups of interest (Bryman, 2016), I invited six participants to take part in my research project.

Patton (2002) suggests that "there are no rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry" (p. 244), however, I was conscious that selecting too many participants may have had a negative impact on the quality of data analysis due to time constraints. A group of six participants was deemed to be sufficient to generate meaningful themes from the data. Three male and three female teachers from schools from the North and South Island of Aotearoa New Zealand were

interviewed to ensure a balanced representation. To close the chapter, a short description of each participant is provided.

Meeting the Teachers

Liam

Liam (age 42) has more than 15 years' teaching in secondary schools. At the time of the study, he was a teacher of health, physical education, and science in a suburban all-boys college in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. Although at the time of the interview, Liam had limited involvement in EOTC and outdoor education, over the years he has facilitated a range of outdoor learning experiences. He frequently attends Physical Education New Zealand's annual conference and is committed to his own professional development as a teacher.

Sarah

Sarah (age 43) is a teacher who has over 15 years' teaching experience which involves outdoor education, health, and physical education in secondary schools. At the time of the study, she was the head of physical education and health at a suburban co-educational school in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. Sarah moved into outdoor education in a 'roundabout' way. She was heavily involved in running and multisport activities and events around the country and was given an opportunity at a school she was at to teach outdoor education. Sarah has completed post-graduate level study in outdoor education.

Dave

Dave (age 56) grew up on a farm, and as a kid, he always used to stare in wonderment at the great hills and mountain ranges that surrounded their property. Growing up, he recalls how his primary school teacher would take the class down to a local stream where they would swim, catch fish, and study fauna. He then went on to high school and was captivated by Geography, and developed a strong sense of place by exploring bush around the family beach house. He has over 20 years' experience teaching outdoor education, health,

and physical education. At the time of the study, he was a teacher in charge of outdoor education at a suburban co-educational school in the South Island of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Emma

Emma (age 35) has slightly less than 5 years' teaching at primary level, and 10 years at secondary level teaching a range of subjects, including: health and physical education and social studies. At the time of the study, she was second in charge of a health and physical education department at a suburban co-educational school in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. Her original involvement in outdoor education contexts could be considered as quite traditional, and was mostly driven by risk assessment standards, a focus on activities and personal and social development outcomes. Emma is a passionate teacher who is highly committed to her own professional development and has completed post-graduate level study.

Jess

Jess (age 31) has approximately 10 years' experience teaching outdoor education, health, and physical education at secondary level. At the time of the study, she was the teacher in charge of outdoor education at a semi-rural co-educational school in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. At her current school, she has had scope to fully create programmes of learning for outdoor education from years 10-13. Jess is a highly motivated teacher and advocates for outdoor education as a subject by networking with other educators and sharing her ideas.

Ben

Ben (age 42) is a teacher with more than 10 years' experience teaching outdoor education at secondary level. At the time of the study, he was the teacher in charge of outdoor education at a suburban all-boys college in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. Ben has a degree in outdoor education and is responsible for all the outdoor education programmes offered in his school. He has created outdoor education programmes of learning at senior level which

are fully place responsive, and his curricula delivery and assessment contexts often branch out across multiple areas of the curriculum. He has completed post-graduate study in outdoor education.

Chapter summary

This chapter has critically discussed how I went about doing my research and explained key decisions that I made which impact on the outcomes. The process of social research can often be messy and unpredictable, but in light of this, Bryman (2016) argues that it is crucial “to have an appreciation of the methodological principles and the many debates and controversies that surround them” (p. 14). The processes in this study have been far from straightforward and neat, as this chapter might imply. The research process caused me to constantly check and evaluate what I was doing and why, and reinforced the importance of being transparent so that readers would build trust in the decisions I made. The next chapter presents the findings of the research which came about through the processes described in this chapter.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter addresses the first research question by reporting the five key themes that emerged relating to participants' challenges and opportunities in delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in their respective secondary schools. Each of the themes: changing mind-sets and pedagogical approaches, the influence of others, the holistic development of students and nurturing of culture, increased opportunities to align to the 'front' end of the curriculum and thinking creatively about assessment are discussed independently, with connections between them also noted.

Changing mind-sets and pedagogical approaches

Almost all teachers in this study had modified their delivery of outdoor education in recent years. Along with the adoption of new pedagogies, this meant they experienced a range of challenges, both personally and professionally. However, there was also acknowledgement that undertaking change is complex. Sarah felt that many teachers appear to be afraid of change and, that outdoor educators in particular:

...hold so many things dear to them. So, the debrief circles, the analogies about life, that we're going to change people, that you're going to come back as a different person. People hold these beliefs so close to their hearts, it's what they identify as.

For Ben and Sarah feelings of personal dissatisfaction with the current outcomes of outdoor education programmes in their schools initiated a search for alternative pedagogies. Initially, Ben thought he was the reason why his outcomes were falling short. He commented:

I guess, it was a gut feeling that it wasn't working, and that I was using all of these models and ideas, and I was following everything I should about them, and yet they were still failing me and my students.

Sarah also said that it was "just some feelings, and I guess instincts" about how they were doing things that triggered her to consider other possibilities.

For Emma, the exploration for alternative pedagogies in outdoor education was sparked by her involvement in *Kia Eke Panuku*, which challenged her practices and supported her shift in mind-set. She noted that *Kia Eke Panuku* "...made me think about my own background and my own cultural values, and it made me question, "Why have I never chosen in the past to bring them into teaching and learning?" Dave, on the other hand, reported that his outdoor education programmes have always been centred around "places" and that it was very much there in his early teaching days. Jess acknowledged that she was yet to fully make the changes she intends to in terms of becoming more culturally responsive within her outdoor education courses, especially because most of her students are Māori. She explained that:

...there's definitely the odd myth and legend, and stories about trees, and what they were used for... but, I don't think there's a huge focus in connecting them as Māori to history, and it's probably something I'd like to do more.

Jess went on to explain that she intends to call on members of the local community to assist her in delivering more culturally responsive outdoor education.

Some teachers discussed the challenge of needing to change or develop their own skill sets to be able to become more place and culturally responsive in their teaching. Emma explained that her shift in mind-set meant firstly that she had to relinquish control to engage in power sharing with her students in the learning environment. She also thought that students being more involved in the decision-making meant teachers didn't stop "teaching and guiding", as they needed to be "...quite skilled... You can't just hope it will happen, and not put support in place". Liam also found that changing approaches in a new unit of work meant teachers could facilitate more of the learning experience, as opposed to relying on external providers. He noted that "our boys enjoy doing stuff with the teachers, and actually being on their same level and doing it all together, they respond to that a bit better".

Like Emma, Ben noted that his own skill-set in outdoor education needed to change along with his changing mind-set and he “had to learn a whole lot of other stuff”. Through his degree, he had learnt about all the “standard” theories in outdoor education like the “experiential learning cycle” and “adventure based learning” but found that these were not achieving the results that he wanted. While he had a range of instructor awards from the New Zealand Outdoor Instructor Association (NZOIA) in outdoor pursuits like rock climbing and kayaking, he had found he did not use them anymore “...because I don’t do anything that requires that standard of instruction”. The new knowledge and skills Ben had to learn were largely concerned with changing his approach to teaching and learning in outdoor education. One of the biggest challenges for him initially in endeavouring to be place responsive in his programmes was that first he needed to become place responsive himself - which involved a lot of work to learn what certain places have to offer.

External triggers also played a part in challenging mind-sets and prompting many of the teachers’ decisions to search for alternative foci and means for their outdoor education programmes. For some teachers, attendance at professional development opportunities such as the annual Physical Education New Zealand (PENZ) conference, broadened their scope on what could be achieved. Learning about place and culturally responsive education through listening to keynote speakers, attending workshops on culturally responsive programmes within schools, and informal discussions with other outdoor educators while at conference ignited their interest and knowledge. Jess and Emma had also found that recent educational policy-related issues around schools charging students’ fees to participate in outdoor education were a key driver for their change.

Sarah appeared to be highly committed to her own personal and professional development by valuing ongoing learning as an educator and emphasising the need for educators to be lifelong learners ourselves. Sarah’s interweaving of professional and personal learning was evident in her observations that as her

outdoor education philosophy has changed over the years, so have her personal experiences and encounters with the outdoors:

I went with some friends last holidays and did a local trail, and I shared the photos and experience with my class. One of my friends brought along this information that she had got from the *iwi* representative from the area. Then, it came up on the way, that the other friend is actually from the *hapū* [subtribe] at Tarawera, and she sung the *waiata*. It was just amazing how things come together.

Sarah emphasised the enjoyment of making connections with places and the importance of social interactions with her friends as a part of outdoor experiences for herself and in turn, her students. She also highlighted her love of the “unexpected connections” that come about through place responsive outdoor education.

Three teachers had completed post-graduate level study which challenged their thinking and contributed to initiating change. For example, having a year off from school to complete a postgraduate study around place responsive outdoor education further prepared Ben to overhaul all his outdoor education programmes and start fresh, given his “gut feeling” that his outdoor education programmes weren’t meeting the needs of his students. Professional learning opportunities at a conference where there was a “bunch of chat around stuff that was happening around place and culturally responsive outdoor education” also influenced the new path he was going to take. He reflected on the impact of this, noting not only that it made “a lot more sense to me”, but that it “felt a lot more like truth - the truth that I was looking for in regards to my teaching”.

The programme changes that Liam made also followed attendance at a workshop on place responsive outdoor education at a PENZ conference, as well as his growing belief that this approach and use of local resources such as a nearby river would be a great opportunity for students to see the importance of the river to *tangata whenua* [indigenous people born of the land]. He wanted to provide students with an opportunity to see what’s in their

backyard. In a related way, Jess felt it was important for outdoor education teachers to “band together”, work more collaboratively, think outside the square, and attend conferences as there were “many good ideas out there that people have no idea about, and we really need to share those”.

How changing ‘mind-set’s’ has transformed practice

With most teachers indicating that changing their mind-set was integral to their adoption of place responsive outdoor education, this, in turn, meant some essential changes in pedagogical approaches and the local curriculum they designed and delivered in senior outdoor education classes. However, this did not mean that the six teachers uniformly interpreted place and culturally responsive practice in their school setting. Their varying interpretations and understandings were evident in the way learning contexts and programmes were differentially described. Where one participant discussed the importance of slow movement and feeling comfortable in a place in order for students to respond to places, in contrast, another described how they achieve place responsiveness through participation in a local adventure race.

Students co-constructing learning and contributing to the learning process are vital to the success of Sarah’s approach. She exemplified this when she described a “typical unit” with a senior class as involving a *haerenga* (journey) at the end of the unit, with students researching one area of the *haerenga* themselves. This meant some “super interesting” topics were generated including the local history, significant geographical events, how places came to be, and what used to be in the places they visited. She also gave examples of how students apply the knowledge that they have learnt in lessons, which in this case included preparing a thermal *hangi* (earth oven) at a geothermal bay using the knowledge that they learnt prior to the *haerenga*.

Liam also organised a *haerenga*, which involved completing several adventure based learning challenges, a waka journey down a local river, and a game of paintball. Liam’s integration of place responsive theory and traditional adventure based outcomes suggests that in practice, teachers may adopt

components of place responsive pedagogy or culturally responsive theory while still maintaining core components of traditional outcomes in outdoor education centred around personal and social development. Rather than just a focus on completing assessments, he wanted to make the area important to his students, “because if they can have a connection with the area then it means that much more to them”. During the *haerenga*, local guides explained the importance of significant areas to students. Although blending apparently distinct components, Liam commented:

...the focus initially was the leadership through their ABL activities, those were some of the activities that we actually did on the river. But I wanted to place the significance on learning the history of the river as well, so the boys understand the importance of the river to both Māori and European from this area.

For Jess, establishing and resourcing new programmes has come with some challenges. Initially, she had to figure out what was around her, purchase equipment and create resources, which all took time to do by herself. One barrier has been gaining access to local places. She noted that there are “...so many beautiful places that are right on our doorstep, but there's a lot of hunting and forestry rules that stop people going there”. Jess tried to get access to a local mountain but was told that she had to pay \$20.00 per student and also pull out wilding pine, which didn't sit well with her because “...with half of the kids - that's their mountain anyway”.

Dave's in-depth recollections of the places he visits with his students were full of stories of history and their significance. Throughout his teaching career, he has always attempted to respond to the places where he takes his students. Like Sarah, he used journeys to promote a more layered understanding of places. When describing the year 13 kayak journey he noted that the river wasn't just “a place to go kayaking”, rather students learn about the river, and they learn about “its spiritual qualities a wee bit”. He went on to say that “as some of the students say, 'I'm always goofing on about stuff, worse than their

parents.' But that's important to me, and I try and pass that on". The knowledge that Dave selects and includes within his teaching is drawn from a wide range of people and sources, including historical perspectives of Māori and Pākehā, flora and fauna, environmental concerns, current uses of places, and the importance of places for individuals and the community. He feels a strong connectedness to these places, which has developed over decades of 'apprenticing himself' to the local mountains and rivers. Stories about the "special places for learning" where he takes students were important to Dave, with one really capturing the importance he sees in coming to know places:

I've personally done quite a lot of research about historical use of that area in the place where we tramp. The deer culler used to go there and shoot the deer in the 60's, and built the airstrip, and built his little hut. He lived there for a long time, and made his livelihood out of that - I think it creates a bit of wonderment. It's like a previous life lived, and getting a bit of insight into what that was. We have fancy gears, like gas cookers, we have personal locator beacons, we have PLB trackers. But the guy that first built the airstrip when they first went in there, his father flew over in a plane, threw out a wheelbarrow, then took him back to a nearby town. He walked in, it took him two days to get there. Three weeks later, he had carved out enough on the flats to land the plane, and then he spent the next three months living there. And for students to get a grasp of that, and when they actually see it and try and visualise it. He's still alive, which is amazing. I haven't got him to come and speak to us yet, he's a bit reclusive. I managed to record some of his voice as well, so I played that.

In regards to Ben, his programme of learning uses a totally new format, as he aims to "satisfy the signposts of place responsiveness" described in literature (Wattchow & Brown, 2011). Thus, his year 13 programme involves spending five days on a property of an instructor who lives 'alternatively'; "he doesn't have power, he doesn't have running water, he lives in a tent, his family's

organic, all of that kind of thing". Preceding this experience, Ben described the whole of his teaching and learning programme as being "geared around responding to that place, and having the boys ready to go to that place, and be able to respond to it". This meant that the notion of 'risky activities' has been reduced, and therefore, students had greater autonomy over their learning. He sees a fully place responsive school as being a logical step in the future. Similarly, Emma noted that her transition from a traditional ski camp where she had control of outcomes to a more localised camp has shifted the focus of the camp away from 'risk.' Although this change initially took place after her school had introduced a policy placing limitations on the fees students could be charged for curriculum, it had provoked her dealing with the question, "What could we do that's more local and cost effective?" By adopting a place responsive approach, Emma noted that teachers faced new questions. In the level 2 programme involving a "Kotahitanga camp planning unit" these included having to look hard at "Where are we going? What does this place offer? What new learning can we get from this place?"

The influence of others

For the teachers in this study, the attitudes, perceptions, and actions of others served as both enablers and barriers in achieving place and culturally responsive outdoor education. While engaging in new pedagogies, teachers acknowledged how their teaching colleagues, senior management staff, parents and students impacted on the extent to which they can implement and sustain their desired programmes of learning.

For Dave and Ben, interactions with some of their university lecturers helped to shape their changed philosophy in outdoor education. Ben was influenced in post-graduate level study by the particular stance of a lecturer to place responsive outdoor education, while Dave recalled the ongoing influence of a lecturer he had at teachers' college before he first started teaching. His advice still helps to guide Dave's practice today: "If you don't have to travel for miles

and miles, don't. Use what you've got locally. Focus on a place or two and get going on it. Do some adventures around it, and then follow up with the learning”.

Although, Ben reported that his senior management seems to be “really happy with what I'm doing and what the programme offers”, he felt this was somewhat contingent on things going “really well”. He noted, “I think that if I was to dig a little deeper, they would definitely challenge what I do”. Although Jess also noted the impact of senior leaders on her programme, in contrast to Ben she found they “really try and help make things work”. Her innovative school timetable structure of having a whole subject for one day was one example of this and it provided her with more flexibility to get into the outdoors. In addition, the timetabling of an extra teacher during certain lessons allowed a wider scope to facilitate outdoor education learning experiences. Emma noted that as “...part of the *Kia Eke Panuku* project, we're told constantly; What are you doing to raise Māori achievement?” However, she feels she has to constantly justify the “validity” of her practices in outdoor education and has been told to limit her time out of school and give more consideration to the cost of the school in facilitating field trips.

Other staff's perceptions of what teachers in this study were achieving in their practice generally presented challenges to teachers' in adopting place responsive approaches. This found expression in a range of ways. At times, students were given misinformation when considering enrolling in senior outdoor education or physical education courses. Students were sometimes discouraged from attending outdoor education field trips. For example, Sarah said that while outdoor education was valued, teachers from other subject areas were “putting pressure on students when they go away on camp, that they're going to miss assessments and things like that”. Ben felt a similar way, commenting that he thought outdoor education is “...marginalised because of the perception that it is just games and fun”. He often had students not attend his field trips because they had assessments to complete in other subjects. Although, in contrast, Dave considered himself “lucky” to work with teachers

who are “similarly excited about places in the outdoors, and the importance of those places”.

Emma explained how other teachers’ perceptions of outdoor education can act as a barrier as people don’t understand the philosophy of why they are taking kids out of the classroom, they just see it as taking kids out of the school and out of their learning programme. Emma has worked closely with some of her colleagues in developing new outdoor education units of work over the past couple of years and has seen growth in others which has been really rewarding. However, some other teachers’ perceptions of outdoor education continue to act as a barrier as they did not seem to “understand the philosophy of why we are taking kids out of the classroom, they just see it as taking kids out of the school and out of their learning programme”. She also identified the importance of colleagues understanding what culturally responsive pedagogy actually entails in commenting:

I don’t think the *Kia Eke Panuku* project has filtered through to all staff to have a significant impact yet. I think it’s getting there, but just in talking to people, and we have done an evaluation recently, I still don’t think people get the ‘why.’ Why are we doing it? Why is this important? So, until we can get that, I don’t think it’s going to have a significant impact on outdoor education.

In a similar way, Ben picked up on colleagues’ misunderstanding and not really knowing what he did in proposing:

If I was having a discussion with a maths teacher, that maths teacher, or that English teacher would still believe that what they are doing is more important than what I do, and would always choose to have kids in their class, rather than kids on my trip

This time out of class on field trips and camps and the associated potential for students to miss assessments was noted as a source of tension for some staff by both Ben and Sarah. Ben wonders if some teachers of other subjects believe

the work they do is more important than outdoor education, and hence would rather have their students in their classes than on a field trip. He noted:

Even though I've been here for 11 years, and the staff know me and trust me, if I sit in the staffroom after I've been out doing some activity, they ask me "How much fun was it?" They don't believe educationally that I'm actually doing anything useful. Teachers will acknowledge that there is potential for a little bit of education, but they don't acknowledge that we are on the same platform.

The need to remind community members of the potential of place and culturally responsive outdoor education for achieving important curriculum goals was thus an ongoing professional consideration for several teachers. Sarah explained how she had to constantly remind people of the work she was doing within her subject as a means of validating its place within the curriculum. Although she felt overall that outdoor education in her community is valued, not everyone understands "what benefits our students are getting from it, and what potential there is". Working in a smaller town where the heart of the school is community, Emma thought that even more importance should be placed on a culturally responsive curriculum. However, she felt that her school has lost a sense of connection with community and is enthusiastically trying to reconnect students to where they're from so that they develop this sense of belonging. Ben thought society as a whole views education in a particular way, and teachers were pressured to conform to that view. For the parents in his school community, university was viewed as the "be all and end all of education; [and a] a mark of our success" and accordingly, "a mark of their student's success is whether they go to university".

Sarah reported that she had been questioned about her inclusion of *Te Ao Māori* (the Māori world) including *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge) within in her programmes by a person in the community commented on the "...strong bias towards a Māori view of land" that her programme appeared to have. In response, she had defended her decision making by explaining students have

been “exposed to European post-colonisation history through our education, institutions, and the media. So, it's not like I'm exposing them to different views, I'm exposing them to a Māori view”.

Somewhat in contrast, Dave's approach to outdoor education appears to have strong support from his community given the feedback consistently received on surveys: “The thing that keeps coming through about the strength of the school is its outdoor education programmes”. Liam also encountered few obstacles from his community when planning and overseeing his *haerenga*, with the main challenge being planning for uncertainties around the safety of students on the water, as his school had not been involved in waka journey of this scale. Having trialled elements of place responsive pedagogy, however, he identified “multiple” challenges that other teachers might face if they choose to take a similar path. Foremost among these were those associated with staff that are not comfortable talking about *Te Ao Māori* noting “that's going to be a challenge for some staff...and shifting focus away from a result based outdoor education programme, and moving into something that's a bit more meaningful - well I think it's more meaningful”.

In order for Ben's place responsive programme to be successful, “the student mentality had to change”, and he had found students transitioned fairly well from a traditional outdoor education course the previous year. Although Sarah's journey has been enriching for herself and her students, she identified “some resistance” that students haven't always appreciated the place responsive approach. When describing the impact of students' resistance at one point, she commented that “it gutted me actually. There were some things that some students said that were ignorant and racist”. In turn, she found she had to “just question, and resist the urge to dislike them as a person”.

Finally, a number of teachers in this study stressed the importance of surrounding yourself with like-minded people so that you have a support network of people “going in the same direction” to bounce ideas and offer

advice. Sarah and Jess both felt that maintaining a strong network within the outdoor education community was also essential.

The holistic development of students and nurturing culture

Every teacher in this study spoke with animation and enthusiasm about the opportunities that adopting place and culturally responsive pedagogies provided for the development and learning of their students. These outcomes appeared to be strengthened when students had some level of agency over their learning pathways. All teachers viewed assessment outcomes as highly important, but they were considered to be only one piece in the puzzle when defining and measuring student success. A comment from Dave perfectly sums up the importance placed on the holistic development of students in outdoor education:

There's still a place for skill, and everything that goes with that, like safety management. I still think the best learning and the best co-operative - relational aspects happen from students on a trip, and the hardness and the softness that goes along with that. Like, the good kayaker who despite doing a great kayaking move, can still understand and appreciate the spirituality of kayaking down the river.

The nature of place and culturally responsive outdoor education as practiced by the teachers in this study commonly meant they drew upon a *kaupapa Māori* (knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society) approach within their teaching and learning contexts. In being place responsive, many teachers explained that the places where learning happens help to prescribe curriculum.

Developing cultural identity and legitimising indigenous knowledge

For Sarah, Dave, Liam and Emma, an enhanced appreciation and understanding of *Te Ao Māori* (the Māori world) as a part of learning experiences was particularly evident. For almost all teachers, the concern for the development of the whole individual was evident, and particular attention was drawn to the development of students' cultural identity through learning

experiences. Emma holds the view that place responsive pedagogy and culturally responsive pedagogy are intimately connected:

I don't think you could separate culturally responsive and place responsive [pedagogy] from a Māori world view. Because to define yourself as Māori, your *whakapapa* (genealogy) connects to your *whenua* (land) - where you're from. For a lot of our kids, this is their standing place - their *tūrangawaewae* (standing place). This is their place; therefore, this is their culture.

Sarah also noted the many benefits to students that she has observed within her place responsive senior outdoor education courses. Through connecting with places, she has noticed students develop a strong sense of cultural identity, particularly her Māori students. She explained that a “real benefit” she had seen was “students who come back from camp, they go and change their enrolment information, and they put on their *iwi*”. She also recalls standing on the summit of a prominent mountain not far from their school, and a student saying “Oh miss, there's my mountain over there, and that's where my Mum's family is from”. The next holidays the student spent time there.

Teachers thought increased student agency and autonomy in learning provided Māori students with authentic opportunities to share their own culture, and in turn legitimise Māori ways of knowing and being. For example, Emma and her colleagues have utilised several *Marae* as the base for their senior physical education camp, and for many of her Māori students that was their *Marae*. This meant “they are the experts, they have the knowledge of what it means to be in that place, and what practices and customs are acceptable and not acceptable”. Sarah also provided students with opportunities to learn more about places that are significant to them, and her *haerenga* allowed for students to then share knowledge that they had learnt with each other. Although most teachers reported that their Māori students were highly engaged in learning experiences out of the school grounds, Liam explained that for his

Māori students, reactions were mixed; some found the experience boring, however, some enjoyed assuming leadership roles.

Almost all of the teachers now preferred to utilise local places for their outdoor education programmes, believing that keeping experiences local was beneficial for student development. This was a little tempered for Jess though, as she thought her students were already well connected to where they are from, and living in quite an isolated area meant that many of them haven't been far out of their own town. She recognised the benefits of “the other side of the spectrum, where they actually get to go out and explore other parts of the country”.

Some teachers felt that their learning contexts and programmes gave Māori students an opportunity to thrive, and non-Māori students an opportunity to learn about *Te Ao Māori* (the Māori world). Sarah explained that in her programme, the cultural aspect is “just normalised” and then went on to give the example of a student intervening when they were about to go on a *hīkoi* (walk) and no one had said a *karakia* (prayer, grace). The student's comment, “Wait, Miss, we haven't done a *karakia*” typified how much a part of the programme, *tikanga Māori* (Māori procedures/customs) had become. For Emma, the changing attitudes of some of the Pākehā students in her programme who were initially disappointed that they were not going to ski camp exemplified the potential of place responsive approaches. This was evident through an end of camp reflection, one student wrote “I would do this camp over again because what I got from this was far more than what I would have got from skiing... I got to be immersed in a Māori world, and it's not scary anymore”. From Liam's perspective, an emphasis on place was both “natural to Māori” while still offering a lot to European students and other ethnicities, in terms of their learning about “connectedness to the land”. As he summed it up, “What I like is that a lot of stuff that works for Māori, works for all the boys”.

Emma believes that her revised outdoor education units of work are effectively meeting the diverse needs of her students, who come from a range of cultures.

Practices such as *karakia* addressed the demographics of the community. Emma noted that “we've tried to get some of our international students with different backgrounds, and from different religions, to share their *karakia* with the group. So, we've had one from Zimbabwe, Jordan, and Japan”. Although Māori customs and protocols are observed on the *Marae*, Emma emphasised that the *Marae* environment welcomes contributions from all cultures. She explained that:

...for our New Zealand European students, they've been really open to the learning experience this year, and I think that's a real switch from last year, where we had some kids who completely opted out. For those students' as well, it's not just about a Māori way of doing things. Yes, Māori have a history in that place, but so do all our students.

Sarah believed that her outdoor education programme also creates a spark for some students when transitioning into a future career. She recalls one example of how a particular place responsive experience impacted on an ex-student who at the time of the interview was completing a law degree. She commented:

We went and stayed on a nearby island. She got so upset when the *kaumātua* [elderly man] was talking about how the land was taken away for the Works Act to install the lights coming into the harbour, and the struggle that the *iwi* has had to try and get the land back, and the rules imposed by the council and the conditions to get their own land back. That student became impassioned, and was like “This is the law that I want to do”. So, she's pursuing that.

Developing the 'whole' student

Many of the teachers in this study believed that students would leave their courses as “better citizens”. Some commented that they observed rich personal and social development in students through place and culturally responsive outdoor education, but they considered these to be primarily incidental outcomes. Ben identified that increased attention was given to students' emotional well-being and development while other teachers in the study also

described “broadening” students’ scope through experiences, and providing life experiences that develop their sense of attachment to their school and community. Dave has observed his students learn and grow in a number of ways throughout his career as a teacher of outdoor education. He feels that “it’s primarily about the sense of belonging, or the sense of understanding [and] it's about creating better people as opposed to creating highly skilled, highly technically proficient creatures”. One story about an ex-student indicated that his outdoor education programme has a positive and lasting impact on students that extends beyond their schooling years:

We had a student who went off and joined the air force, So, he’s just done his first three months. He came back last week and goes “Gee I still remember that day when we got to the start of the five passes”. So, he just can't get enough of places now, and understanding their significance. He continues and will continue, to go and explore and learn from all those places that he finds himself near too - as well as coming back to his own special places.

The nature of learning in Emma’s outdoor education units of work helped prepare students for the modern world as there was “no one right way to do it”. Students are encouraged to think collaboratively and think on the spot, as they are fully involved in the planning and implementation of their *Marae* stay. She also hoped that they were encouraged to “think beyond themselves, the whole concept of *manaakitanga*” (hospitality, kindness, generosity, support - the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others) and see themselves as being “a part of the puzzle, not the whole puzzle”. Like other teachers in this study, Emma particularly emphasised the contribution that students having ownership of their learning had on their holistic development, in noting her belief “it’s a really empowering thing, to have a say in what you do and what you learn”.

Dave is very conscious of the significance that places play in his own life, and he tries to pass this idea onto his students. He noted that he had endeavoured to:

...foster inquiry into places, rather than just seeing them as a place to play or recreate – but a place that other people have used, a place that is important, a place that we want to continue to have significance in our lives.

Liam also felt that students had opportunities to develop stronger connections to places as a part of his haerenga, compared to traditional units of work that he used to teach. He viewed the haerenga as a way of “getting more meaning and understanding of places, and just looking at the whole thing of becoming a better man - that's our focus here at school”.

Some teachers found the adoption of new place responsive approaches often meant learning environments were much more calm, which impacted positively on students. Catering for the increasing number of students with anxiety issues and “giving them the confidence to be able to do things”, Sarah noted that a “traditional outdoor education programme would destroy them”. Similarly, Liam reported that students enjoyed the calmness of the river journey part of their *haerenga*, as it allowed them to sit back and engage in the activity. For some teachers' therefore, reducing risk activities and shifting away from 'risk' related contexts has created new opportunities for student learning. Ben exemplified this in commenting that students who typically opt into outdoor education classes are socially different from most students. Many did not have a “normal circle of mates at school” and appeared to struggle to make connections with the College. He sees participation in his place responsive programmes as playing an important part in making these connections for students, and suggested that “in subtle ways, that benefits the whole College community a whole lot more. At the end of the two years, they're a lot more connected”. He noted that he dealt “a lot more with their emotions and their personal

development” than he used to and that feedback from teachers suggested that “this definitely filters into other areas of their life and their other subjects”. Feedback from parents of students in Sarah’s classes also pointed to the benefits for students’ development and positive growth among their children. She shared an instance when a mother came in the previous year to see her and commented:

Thank you so much, I'm in my forties and feel like I'm in a bit of a rut, and now my daughter organises us to go cycling, and I'm learning all about our local place. I really look forward to weekends, I'm not putting energy into organising things, she's doing it all.

Both Ben and Emma had both observed students develop ‘empathy’ for places, cultures and one another. This was especially evident when on field trips or camps. Ben thought that his students became “a better quality of citizen, they're more empathetic, they care more for the environment, they're more motivated”. Although many outcomes were reported that support the holistic development of students, Emma and Dave both proposed that student outcomes may be hard to define and are not necessarily quantifiable. Emma felt that her student outcomes are “beyond assessment” as she didn’t feel that things like “building confidence in themselves to plan and manage something, to learn about a place, to just enjoy being in a place” were easy outcomes to quantify. Dave’s point about this was that desired outcomes might not be achieved at the age of 16-17 years of age, rather a lot later in life like a “remembering or a re-awakening at 40. I think it just depends on, for one of a better word 'how much other shit is going on in your life,' because some people have a lot”.

Increased opportunities to align the ‘front’ end of the curriculum

Almost all teachers discussed how their programmes of work align well to the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007), and in particular complement the NZC’s vision, principles, values, and key competencies. Although the NZC presents learning areas as being distinct, it is made clear that “all learning should make

use of the natural connections that exist between learning areas and that link learning areas to the values and key competencies” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 16). That this was occurring in programmes was evident through teachers’ explanations of how their curriculum scope expanded across multiple learning areas and their accessing of a range of achievement standards outside of the physical education domain, including health, social sciences, earth science, and te reo Māori.

Dave’s explanations of how a focus on place can lead to cross-curricular learning exemplified this. For Dave, places are generally associated with “different things”, including “people, flora, and fauna, and that’s all important - the intertwining or the relationships of all those factors is a big part of me and my teaching”. Within his school, outdoor education encompasses knowledge from a wide range of curriculum areas and has some form of cultural, historical and environmental perspective. This reflects his belief that education should consider the development of the ‘whole’ person and so in junior camps, for example, teaching components include “looking at early Māori and how they used the area that we camp in and swim in, or their food gathering, and also passing through looking for *pounamu* (greenstone)”. Dave also has more scope to broaden his curriculum delivery so that the places they go to learn can prescribe local curriculum delivery. Emma also questioned why schools aren’t creating more units of work that are integrated across the curriculum and felt that learning should continue in the outdoors just as it does in the classroom.

Another point of alignment between place and culturally responsive outdoor education and the NZC was pedagogy-related concerns. For example, Sarah’s learning environments share critical similarities with a number of the NZC’s recommendations on effective pedagogy, such as ‘enhancing the relevance of new learning’ by “[looking] for opportunities to involve students directly in decisions relating to their own learning” (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 34). As an example, her students co-construct the outdoor experience:

The first thing is that they have to come up with personal and group goals - what they want to get out of the experience. I teach them all about the place responsive approach and then they come up with the goals...over the few years that I've taught it, they talk about connecting to each other, connecting to the place, learning about the place that they're going to be travelling through. Then they have a proposal, so they give a presentation about where they think would be the best place to achieve these goals.

Sarah was organising a *haerenga* with her Level 2 class, and as a part of the learning process students pre-visited the mountain biking location. She noted that

...we were concerned about confidence on the mountain biking because you want everyone to be fit enough to enjoy it and to be able to enjoy the place and make those connections. If they're struggling or their worried that they're going to fall off their bike, they're not going to have that same experience.

Her concern for students' confidence while mountain biking parallels another recommendation by the NZC around effective pedagogy "creating a supportive learning environment" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 34), as she demonstrated a willingness to adapt learning environments based on students' particular needs.

Emma believes that her new units are "exactly" what the curriculum is about, "creating life-long learners who are contributing to a sustainable society and people who care beyond themselves who are willing to contribute and participate in society". She noted how her outdoor education unit of work required different types of thinking processes, fostering "innovative thinkers as opposed to compliant thinkers" as students are able to make decisions that have real life outcomes and can contribute to the success of the group. In line with the NZC's focus on inquiry, Emma noted that:

We're saying [to students] here's your blank canvas, the outcome can be whatever you want it to be, we're just going to help guide you and help you to do what you need to do to get there. That's a real foreign concept, but also for us as teachers because it's relinquishing control, and also realising that the outcomes aren't predictable. It also means you need to be quite skilled, it doesn't mean you stop teaching and guiding.

In relation to another of the NZC's key indicators on effective pedagogy, "enhancing the relevance of new learning" (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 34), Jess felt that if students were to fully grasp the concepts she was trying to teach, such as 'safety management' that they needed authentic contexts to apply their knowledge. As an example, Jess explained:

For example, with that adventure race; because they participated in it and have all these experiences... they actually are enjoying writing up their little presentation about safety. So, they really understand it, it's something real and they really understand it. It's not just like an accident that happened in the South Island- they're not studying that- it's something real.

Ben also employed the essence of the NZC to successfully advocate for new or additional courses. He explained that in the NZC came out with a new vision, and "there were sections in there about sustainability, connection to biculturalism, and it actually fitted far better with what I was doing than anything it ever did before".

Thinking creatively about assessment

Challenges and opportunities around assessment were particularly evident throughout all teachers' responses in this study. Many explained how place and culturally responsive practices created opportunities for richer learning environments where learning experiences were highly engaging for students and assessment practices had a high level of authenticity. However, the notion of formalised assessment generally seemed to work against or get in the way

of desired outcomes in many of the teachers' programmes. In saying this, teachers fully recognised the importance of effective assessment practices as a means of further validating outdoor education within the school curriculum. Outdoor education as a subject in Ben's school was now viewed less as a dumping ground for disengaged students unlike "the old days when people came to me because it was a 'dumb' subject... [students] just came for the shits and giggles and the trips, they weren't really interested in credits". This has come about because of the curriculum and pedagogical changes Ben has made, and also because of his decisions around assessment that have developed student attitudes that outdoor education is a worthwhile subject to enrol in.

While Emma thought her outdoor education units of work really capture the essence of the curriculum, she also identified how assessment practices potentially limit learning potential, and that teachers own skillsets could often act as a barrier commenting,

As much as I think the New Zealand curriculum is world leading, I don't think assessment is world leading. So, we have a curriculum that wants us to be creative, but we have an assessment system that wants compliant thinkers - there's a right, there's a wrong.

Generally, achievement standards were much preferred over unit standards because of their flexibility to modify contexts, assess students in different ways, and in many cases, students and teachers could select and apply knowledge that was most appropriate to the learning context. Dave noted that achievement standards offer far more flexibility than unit standards that contain set performance criteria, as "it's not just the technical skills as such, it's the whole thing – the whole deal, and you can modify them accordingly". All teachers in this study had used achievement standards in their programmes, and for many, this meant a shift away from unit standards that were centred around the demonstration of technical skills. However, Jess noted that she prefers to utilise

a mix of achievement standards and unit standards cater for students' varying academic capabilities.

Sarah and Dave discussed how they have used some of the newer PE achievement standards (3.7 - *Analyse issues in safety management for outdoor activity to devise safety management strategies* and 3.9 - *Devise strategies for a physical activity outcome*) to fit a place responsive approach. Dave sees these standards as a really nice fit for relating his learning content to the 'places' where students learn, such as in a nearby mountain range. Sarah noted that:

Even though the 3.7 is still doing the safety management, ... a lot of it is talking about the culturally significant areas; *tapu* (sacred) – *noa* (to be free from the extensions of *tapu*). If they're going to really succeed in these areas, they really need to have that understanding - not things like 'a drop off on the track'.

Teachers in this study demonstrated a strong ability to adapt and overcome issues that were presented when blending assessment practices with their outdoor education programmes. Ben explained how he would 'beg, steal or borrow' standards in order to fit his learning contexts and gave an example where he uses a standard from the health domain that is about developing an ethical standpoint and relates this to his students by only eating organic food and killing and preparing their own meat while on camp. He also considered, however, that the accessibility of achievement standards can act as a barrier to becoming place responsive, as he is aware of many outdoor education teachers who are unable to broaden the scope of their programmes because of their limited access to achievement standards outside of the physical education domain. Sarah also reported that she is aware of outdoor education teachers who are not even permitted to use physical education achievement standards within their courses, and she personally has been restricted from using some achievement standards in the science domain.

A key challenge Ben has faced when using achievement standards from a range of curriculum areas is that his senior outdoor education programme could not be counted as a university approved subject. This is because university approved subjects require at least 14 credits from a single approved domain to count as an 'approved subject'. Each of the standards he uses are university approved when they sit in their own domain, but when he blends them into one course, they no longer count as a university approved subject. Other related challenges that Ben has encountered include issues in moderation upon adapting achievement standards to fit the context of his place responsive course:

I quite often run into problems where the people who moderate those aren't outdoor ed'ers. So, the science [achievement standards] for example; the people who moderate them are science teachers, so they challenge what I do because they go 'it's not scientific enough.'

Sarah discussed how selecting the most appropriate forms of assessment and maintaining a fine balance has been a key to her success and that "what is taught doesn't necessarily have to be what is assessed". Placing a high importance on learning, she noted that "I dropped a standard from my year 12 course because I'd rather them do what's available, and do better". By doing so, she has been able to create programmes of learning both and year 12 and 13 that are fully place responsive.

As a result of his place responsive programmes, Ben has noticed an increase in students' formal assessment grades with more students getting Achieved grades than previously, and in general, students are gaining a higher number of credits compared to his traditional programme of learning. Similarly, Sarah reported noticeable increases in student achievement, and often she finds that Māori students academically outperformed non-Māori students.

Jess offers students a mixture of both unit standards and achievement standards so that she can cater for their diverse needs, noting that "the thing I realised is that I do need the mixture of achievement standards and unit

standards, otherwise the results aren't that good as the students that struggle with the achievement standards come away with nothing". She explained how she feels assessment in outdoor education should take form in the future by separating from physical education as "they're two completely different subjects, and have different outcomes and for outdoor education to have its own domain". Her primary concern with achievement standards is that she thinks they don't give students enough scope to demonstrate acquired knowledge suggesting instead the creation of specific outdoor education achievement standards which should have a more "place responsive approach and be different from PE, so students can take both subjects", so that "outdoor education teachers don't have to look through the left-over ones". Jess also suggested that assessing learning throughout a unit of work would better suit her students' needs, rather than presenting a final piece of work or completing a final assessment.

Chapter Summary

The findings presented in this chapter clearly suggest a number of challenges and opportunities for teachers when delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education in secondary schools. While teachers in this study reported challenges and opportunities that were exclusive to the students they teach and their respective schools, common themes also emerged. Changing mind-sets and pedagogical approaches in outdoor education were essential in re-thinking what outdoor education could be. However, the influence of others greatly affected the extent to which new pedagogies in outdoor education could be adopted and implemented, and many colleagues continued to perceive outdoor education as primarily about having fun. Through the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies, teachers reported much more meaningful outcomes in outdoor education that impacted on the development of the whole student, which included catering for cultural diversity among students. Many teachers also felt that their outdoor education practices now align much more closely to the new curriculum, which has helped to legitimise their outdoor education programmes of learning and units of work. A number

of challenges around assessment were also identified, but many of the teachers in this study took critical steps to ensure that their assessment practices complimented the learning taking place.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The previous chapter reported findings associated with the first research question about the challenges and opportunities that teachers reported when delivering place and culturally responsive outdoor education. Six passionate educators shared their stories about teaching outdoor education, and through thematic analysis, five key themes were identified in their stories. In this chapter, I critically discuss each of the themes by drawing on relevant literature. The second part of the chapter attends to the second research question more directly by discussing what the challenges and opportunities might mean for the future of outdoor education in schools given the increasingly culturally diverse population in Aotearoa New Zealand. It does so by identifying and examining implications related to: the need for a greater alignment between place and culturally responsive pedagogies, increased professional support for outdoor educators, providing authentic outdoor education experiences that are inclusive of all students, and increased opportunities to reflect bicultural partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Changing pedagogical approaches and mind-sets

Almost all of the teachers in this study reported they had recently adopted new pedagogies in their outdoor education programmes or units of work. There were a range of reasons for making changes to pedagogy, some of which were initiated 'internally' by the participant, while other reasons involved external factors, such as changes to school policies or the introduction of new legislation.

Considering the mind-set of teachers is important because what teachers believe and value has a direct impact on the way that they teach (Hill, 2010b). There was a strong indication that all teachers in this study had dedicated considerable time and thought into 'what they stand for' and how they were going to achieve outcomes based on their beliefs, although these outcomes weren't always realised because of various constraints. Campbell-Price (2012) similarly reports that teachers who instigated innovative practices in outdoor

education in secondary schools “paused for some philosophical space” (p. 101) which better enabled them to meet the curricula vision and principles.

Two key stimuli ignited teachers’ desire for change. The first that was particularly evident for Ben and Sarah, were feelings of personal dissatisfaction with traditional outdoor education practices and whether they actually met students’ needs. The need to change practice based on ‘feel’ and ‘gut instinct’ is evident in other teachers’ accounts of adapting outdoor education practices in Aotearoa New Zealand also. For example, teachers involved in Cosgriff’s (2015a) study of curriculum change in outdoor education in the primary school setting similarly reported that in order to reimagine what outdoor education could be in their school, firstly they needed to critically question the philosophical precepts that should underpin pedagogical practice. Hill’s (2012) work with secondary school outdoor educators also revealed the importance of ‘wrestling’ with and modifying philosophical and conceptual understandings in order to successfully initiate personal change in outdoor education practices.

The second key stimulus for change for these teachers came through professional development opportunities, including post-graduate study and participation in school-based professional development. For example, Emma’s involvement in the *Kia Eke Panuku* initiative caused her to reflect on why she has not brought her own background and cultural values into her teaching. Becoming culturally responsive meant that she had to re-envisage her role as a teacher to one where teachers and students learn with and from one another (also termed *ako*) (Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success, n.d.). The importance of ongoing professional development and support being available for teachers is highly evident in this study. However, given the inconsistencies and ambiguity surrounding aspects of place responsive pedagogy that was apparent in teachers’ perspectives, there is clearly a need for more targeted professional development concerning place responsive outdoor education. Not surprisingly, the two teachers in this study who shared fairly consistent beliefs with concepts and approaches highlighted in the literature, such as (Wattchow

& Brown, 2011), had undertaken post-graduate study specifically in place responsive outdoor education.

The attitudes of teachers in this study towards place responsive pedagogy or placed-based learning finds parallels in Mikael's et al.'s (2015) research, which uncovered outdoor educators in Aotearoa New Zealand incorporation of environmental aspects and adopting a place responsive approach as forms of resistance to traditional practices. However, teachers in this study had differing interpretations about what constituted place and culturally responsive pedagogies. As Brown (2013) reminds us, "being in a place does not necessarily mean that outdoor education is place responsive" (p. 5). The differing interpretations of pedagogies are also mirrored in Zink & Boyes's (2007) study which uncovered a "considerable ambiguity in terminology and understanding around teaching and learning in the outdoors" (p. 77). This inconsistency does highlight a need for greater collaboration and professional support for those teachers wanting to adopt new pedagogies in outdoor education. Jess reiterated this point by highlighting that teachers of outdoor education should be coming together more often and sharing examples of good practice. Her view is consistent with findings from Wylie and Bonne's (2016) secondary schools' survey in Aotearoa New Zealand that teachers wanted more time to work together and collaborate with one another. It appears that the outdoor education community would benefit from establishing and maintaining an accessible and supportive network between educators where they are able to discuss the challenges and opportunities they are facing in adopting new pedagogies.

Shifts in mind-set inevitably meant teachers also needed to develop new 'soft skills' in outdoor education to align practice with philosophy, as opposed to 'technical skills'. Tan and Atencio's (2016) argument that outdoor education teachers "need to invest time in understanding and unpacking the local history, culture and ecology of specific places" (p. 32) resonates here. Ben's example of dedicating time to be in places and learn about what they had to 'say' prior

to taking his students there, exemplifies Wattchow and Brown's (2011) third signpost for place responsive education. This involved educators "apprenticing [themselves] ...to outdoor places" wherein "...a felt, embodied encounter with a place and an engagement with knowing the place through various cultural knowledge systems, such as history, ecology, geography, and so on" (p. 190) occurred. Dave's passion for learning about the places that he visits and takes students was achieved through various ways, such as interviewing people to learn about their experiences with the places. Other teachers were also able to utilise connections that they had within the community to uncover place-specific knowledge. Such actions directly align to one of the cultural indicators expected of teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand, *Tangata Whenuatanga* (place-based, sociocultural awareness and knowledge) (Ministry of Education, 2011). In addition, drawing on knowledge from members of the community finds similarities with traditional Māori pedagogies whereby education involved intergenerational teaching and learning, and older *whānau* (family) members were often relied upon to raise children and provide knowledge (Hemara, 2000).

Another shift in practice that was evident was the move away from 'risk-centred pedagogies' and risk themed units of work. Cosgriff, Legge, et al. (2012) contend that outdoor learning focusing on culture "is sowing the seeds for some very different ways of doing outdoor education than those that are premised on adventure and risk" (p. 232) and this was highly evident in teachers' accounts of their altered programmes. Moving away from a focus on risk effectively opened up new opportunities for learning contexts, which led to a totally different type of learning environment whereby students were able to have greater input into teaching and learning processes.

Teachers noted students had greater autonomy over their own learning and a lot more choice in their learning experiences as they are fully involved in every stage of the planning and implementation of field experiences. In Sarah's case, for example, students plan what they want to get out of their camp, decide on

the group and individual goals and then collaborate to plan and implement the entire experience. The idea of giving students greater autonomy in learning environments finds parallels with Beames and Brown's (2016) idea regarding the development of learner autonomy, where they encourage educators to "shift their gaze from primarily focusing on activities that may restrict the development of autonomy and opportunities to be responsible for one's learning" (p. 78). By lowering risk in outdoor education environments, students had much greater scope to become co-constructors of the learning experience. It was evident through the findings of this study that the place and culturally responsive pedagogies employed, also allowed teachers to 'sit' in the learner's seat and disregard traditional notions of the 'teacher as the holder of all knowledge, or 'the outdoor instructor who is in control.' The idea of 'letting go of control' is mirrored in Cosgriff's (2015a) research, where teachers' initial reservations about sharing power with students were offset by the learning possibilities and excitement for both students and teachers in outdoor learning environments. As teachers positioned themselves as learners, the learning process itself became more reciprocal between teachers and students. This resonates closely with Māori pedagogies, specifically *ako*, whereby it is appropriate for the teachers and learners to shift roles (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Bishop and Glynn (1999) propose effective relationships in the classroom promote the knowledge of learners as 'acceptable' or 'legitimate', and encourage teachers to act in a way with students whereby knowledge is co-constructed. Many of the teachers in this study exemplified effective relationships through their outdoor education practices. Importantly, Emma highlighted that relinquishing control meant that you actually had to be more skilled to ensure that students didn't completely fail. Her comment finds parallels with Beames and Brown's (2016) caution that educators think carefully about types of choices that students have, as "too many choices can be bewildering" (p. 75) and cause unnecessary confusion for students. Teachers in this study indicated that the act of power sharing creates a range of new considerations of a pedagogical nature. In support of this, Hipkins

(2015) also highlights that “greater learner involvement does not mean an abdication of teacher responsibility” (p. xii), but instead, learner involvement and teacher responsibility go in tandem.

For many teachers in this study, part of their shift in mind-set required a broadening of what constituted legitimate knowledge, which often involved weaving together both Western and Māori epistemologies. The weaving together of both worlds is something that S. Macfarlane, Macfarlane, and Gillon (2015) suggest requires a genuine willingness to challenge and change your own worldview along with a willingness to look through another lens which is possibly a different way of seeing the world. For Sarah and Emma, part of this willingness to incorporate a Māori worldview of places stemmed from involvement in culturally responsive initiatives at their schools. For Liam, a key outcome from his *haerenga* was for students to learn about the significance of the river and surrounding area to *tangata whenua*. Penetito (2015) suggests that whether and how to include *Māoritanga* (Māori practices, beliefs, culture) in the Aotearoa New Zealand curriculum will require educators to move into a dynamic interface that is not only complex but also challenges people’s understanding of knowledge.

Liam thought some teachers may be limited in their capacity to adopt place and culturally responsive pedagogies if they were not comfortable within *Te Ao Māori*. Manning (2011) mirrors this concern, arguing that many non-Māori teachers fear the Māori ‘other,’ which is compounded by a lack of professional development opportunities to assist teachers in the creation and delivery of curricula that meets the obligations of the Treaty of Waitangi. Although many secondary schools have engaged in culturally responsive professional development, Hynds et al. (2016) suggest that participation in such programmes “by itself cannot remediate generally poor teaching skills, deeply ingrained racism, and general lack of knowledge of the histories, cultures, and worldviews of marginalized groups” (p. 245). For the teachers in this study, the adoption of new pedagogies generally indicated a willingness to view Māori

knowledge as worthwhile knowledge, which helped to foster a ‘culture of care’ (A. Macfarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh, & Bateman, 2007) within their programmes, as they recognised the valuable contribution that their Māori students could bring into the classroom.

The influence of others

As highlighted earlier, all teachers in this study who reported a realisation that their programmes were falling short of meeting students’ needs also indicated that they had invested significant time and thought into how they could improve their practice. However, many reported that they have felt both supported and constrained by others in adapting their practice, echoing Fang’s (1996) idea that while theoretical beliefs and values shape practice, the complexities of schooling make it hard for teachers to maintain consistency between beliefs and practice. In addition, the apparent low status of outdoor education in some schools presented a challenge to teachers endeavouring to deliver high quality outdoor education programmes of learning and units of work.

Jess and Dave both reported that overall they felt supported by their colleagues, which was something they valued. In particular, Dave noted that he really values the support he receives from his colleagues towards his outdoor education programmes. Sarah also commented on the importance of surrounding herself by other like-minded teachers within her school. The importance of establishing support “a climate of support” was also found to be essential to primary school teachers in achieving meaningful curriculum and pedagogical change in outdoor education (Cosgriff, 2015a, p. 348). Importantly, all teachers in this study felt that their senior management team were generally supportive of the work they were doing in outdoor education. These views find parallels in the literature, where Ferrier-Kerr, Keown, and Hume (2008/2009) report that the fostering of a professional learning environment by senior leadership is critical to the successful adoption of the new curriculum and innovation among teachers.

Although most teachers felt supported by their colleagues, a number still expressed concerns that some colleagues were misinformed about their outdoor education programmes, held the belief that their own subjects were of higher value, or gave misleading information to students about outdoor education programmes. Similarly, Manning's (2011) research with history teachers revealed that the culture of competition for students in schools "undermined collaboration between teachers of rival subjects" (p. 108). These concerns are also consistent with findings from previous surveys of outdoor education teachers who thought that "...school perceptions of outdoor education were somewhat of a barrier" (Zink & Boyes, 2007, p. 74).

Teachers' concerns that colleagues were putting pressure on students not to attend field trips or camps are mirrored in Haddock's (2007) research where a key barrier to effective EOTC was students missing lessons in other subjects, and Hill's (2012) research which reported that issues around students missing other classes and other time constraints presented challenges to effective outdoor education delivery. Although teachers in this study expressed disappointment at these attitudes, importantly all took critical steps to inform and advocate the value of their outdoor education programmes to other teachers. Though, in contrast, Jess reported that the structural changes her school had made to the timetable acted as a key enabler to the effective delivery of outdoor education.

The perceived low status of outdoor education in the curriculum by some teachers does warrant a cause for concern. Most teachers in this study demonstrated a willingness to ask hard questions about their own outdoor education practices so that they can better meet the needs of their students, yet they also wondered if other staff still perceive outdoor education as primarily about having fun. This finding raises critical questions about the continuing influence of historically privileging outdoor pursuits on other teachers' attitudes, as it appeared the subject still was seen to be centred around the 'consumption' of high profile adventurous activities, mirroring Loynes (1998) definition of the

commodification of outdoor education: “adventure in a bun” (p. 35). Beames and Brown (2014) caution to educators to consider the unintended consequences when students’ experiences are driven by consumer culture seems timely. However, teachers found that their adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies minimised the need to rely on external providers to deliver ‘templated’ outdoor education experiences, which may go some way to offsetting such concerns.

Although teachers in this study interpreted pedagogies in different ways, they all shared critical similarities in respect to the significant role they thought outdoor education could play in the lives of students. In contrast to Zink & Boyes’s (2007) findings, the teachers in this study clearly placed high emphasis and importance on sociocultural outcomes and socio-ecological perspectives. It is evident that an ongoing, professional challenge for the wider outdoor education and HPE community is continued advocacy for outdoor education so that it can develop and maintain its place in the curriculum, especially through the eyes of teachers in different subject disciplines.

It is noteworthy that the three teachers who had been challenged by students about the inclusion of *Te Ao Māori* and *mātauranga Māori* found that once a new culture of learning was established in their programmes, these issues largely became obsolete. Once teachers successfully transitioned through their period of changing pedagogy, students were positive and welcoming of the changes. Similar conclusions about students’ responses were found by Taylor (2014) and Brown (2011), with students in the latter study suggesting the place responsive journey “...did not “suck”, nor was it described as boring or a waste of time” (p. 118).

Many teachers in this study demonstrated a strong commitment to forging bonds between Māori and Pākehā worlds. Glynn (2015) believes that a logical way forward is for both non-Māori and Māori to reposition themselves as ‘treaty partners,’ and in doing so, “these new relationships will provide us with opportunities to engage with the histories, values, and practices of the

indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand” (p. 178). It is apparent that some teachers in this study are successfully advocating for new pedagogies in outdoor education, and in doing so, they have set a precedent for other subject areas. A key challenge lies ahead for outdoor educators, as the findings of this study clearly indicate that many outdoor education programmes in schools are leading the way in becoming culturally responsive, however, the low status of outdoor education in schools is limiting recognition of such transformations.

The holistic development of students and nurturing of culture

Schools play an important role in providing students with meaningful learning experiences and opportunities as opposed to preparing them for a life to be lived later (A. Macfarlane et al., 2008). Place responsive pedagogies support this view in that they emphasise the importance of being present in and with places (Wattchow & Brown, 2011). By facilitating outdoor education courses that were driven by a central concern for places and the students they teach, teachers in this study were noticing that their programmes or units were benefiting students in unique ways. Notably, a focus on ‘place’ allowed students a chance to unpack and share knowledge that had significant meaning for them and enabled students to move from what Gruenewald (2003) terms a “school-centric curriculum” (p. 646), to one that has much more significance to their own lives. In particular, Māori students had increased opportunities to legitimise knowledge, practices, and customs that were unique to their culture. Such opportunities begin to address key issues in mainstream schooling where curriculum context is argued to be largely irrelevant to Māori students (Penetito, 2010), and the concern that outdoor education practices are based upon outdated theories that are not responsive to learners in Aotearoa New Zealand and the places in which they learn (Townsend, 2011).

All teachers in this study shared a deep concern for the holistic development of their students and valued the importance of creating culturally safe environments. Personal and social development outcomes were widely reported throughout interviews, although they were not seen to be the chief

outcomes sought. As the nature of place responsive learning environments puts less weighting on personal and social development outcomes that are pre-determined, teachers expressed excitement about the various and often unexpected ways they had seen their students benefit from outdoor education. Through developing connections to places fostering environments where 'culture counts' (Bishop & Glynn, 1999), many observed a number of outcomes that were not necessarily achievable through their traditional programmes. This included students developing a sense of connection to their school and the wider community, and in some cases, students developing a greater sense of citizenship within their communities. These findings share critical similarities with Taylor's (2014) study which found that "students engaged and connected with local places in a meaningful way which increased motivation, personal and social development, and positive agency within the community of those on the trip" (p. 2) during a place responsive camp.

Education meant much more to teachers in this study than students simply attaining NCEA grades. For example, Sarah identified how she has observed students develop a strong sense of cultural identity, while Emma's *Marae* (complex of buildings where formal meetings take place) based camp "welcomed contributions for from all cultures" and she has noticed that her Māori students are more confident in a *Marae* based context. The explicit approaches to developing cultural identity identified by many teachers in this study, somewhat alleviates A. Macfarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh & Bateman's (2007) concern that many students from non-dominant cultures are not free to be themselves in a mainstream school environment. Considering that all six teachers were health and physical education specialists, the influence of Dr. Mason Durie's '*whare tapawhā*' model of well-being (one of the four underlying concepts in the HPE curriculum) (Ministry of Education, 1999) on their concern for the holistic development of students is an area that is worth pursuing further. The attention these teachers gave students' holistic well-being does suggest nevertheless, the essence of the HPE curriculum can be a useful guide for

place and culturally responsive pedagogies, even when the curriculum content may be drawn on from areas outside of HPE.

Bishop and Glynn (2000) emphasise the need for learning and teaching relationships between Māori and non-Māori not only to hold the premise that 'culture counts', but also to allow learners to initiate learning interactions, exercise self-determination in respect of the learning process and become co-inquirers in engagements with their teachers and classmates. By adopting a place-conscious approach, many teachers reported that students had opportunities for greater input into learning contexts, and students were encouraged to draw on their cultural toolkit (Bruner, 1996). This was reinforced by Emma who explained that by locating themselves at a local *Marae*, her Māori students became the experts, and were relied upon to share knowledge with their peers. Ben also emphasised how his students are fully involved in the planning and facilitation of their outdoor camp. These approaches mirror Brown's (2008b) call for a pedagogy in outdoor education which "acknowledges our relationships with place(s) as a way to understand who we are, how we connect to others and how we both give and take meanings from the places in which we live and learn" (p. 7). The above practices align closely to the *Kia Eke Panuku* initiative, which strongly encourages teachers to draw on students 'cultural capital', which includes cultural experiences and the knowledge and attitudes that students bring with them to the classroom (Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success, n.d.).

The consideration of learners' needs as a key pedagogical consideration was evident for many teachers in this study. As the teachers themselves rather than external providers were planning and facilitating outdoor education experiences, they were able to customise the learning experiences and take into account the specific needs of the students they teach. Beames and Brown (2016) contend that "one particular strength that school teachers and teachers-in-training can bring to discussions about outdoor learning, is a comprehension of the primacy of the learner in programme design" (p. 78). Sarah's concern

that an increasing number of students she teachers suffer from anxiety and her efforts to ensure students feel physically and emotionally safe while participating in outdoor education exemplifies how teachers can plan learning experiences based on their students' needs. Ben also noted that many of his students are 'socially different,' so his place responsive programme deals much more with students' emotions and their personal development than his traditional programme. Such actions also exemplify *Manaakitanga*, which emphasises an ethic of care and respect for people, and is one of the five teacher cultural competencies of Māori learners (Ministry of Education, 2011).

Increased opportunities to align the 'front' end of the curriculum

As discussed in chapter two, a major concern within our education system is that educational policies and practices have favoured Pākehā language and knowledge, which has been detrimental to Māori (A. Macfarlane et al., 2007). A key success for many teachers in this study was that their programmes of learning increased their ability to meet the NZC's expectation that all students will have the opportunity to acquire knowledge of *te reo Māori* (Māori language) and *tikanga Māori* (Māori customs) (Ministry of Education, 2007). The nature of place responsive pedagogy invited multiple and diverse perspectives about places. As Emma noted, this is inseparable from culturally responsive pedagogy as Māori define who they are through *whakapapa* (genealogy), which ultimately connects to *whenua* (land).

For many teachers in this study, the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) provided the overall guidance in their outdoor education programmes and units of work, which for some meant a shift away from outdoor industry based outcomes. In support of this, Cosgriff and Thevenard (2012) contend that the NZC's vision for young New Zealanders to be "confident, connected, actively involved, and lifelong learners" (p. 8) helps to guide outdoor education philosophies as it "specifies connectedness to the land, environment, and communities as well as contribution to the environmental well-being of Aotearoa New Zealand as integral aspects of this" (p. 69). Almost all teachers viewed the new curriculum

(Ministry of Education, 2007) as a powerful tool in advocating for outdoor education as a legitimate subject. The views of these teachers resonate with Cosgriff, Thevenard, and Campbell-Price (2012) who contend that placement of outdoor education within the HPE learning area has opened the door for new opportunities for new pedagogies and increased the potential for a close alignment with the NZC vision.

Place and culturally responsive pedagogies often called for knowledge from a wide range of sources that crossed multiple learning areas. As students were usually given opportunities to take an active role in the process of knowledge making, the knowledge being utilised was diverse and reflected both Pākehā and Māori ways of knowing and being. Ben, Sarah, Dave and Emma all gave examples of how their learning contexts have become cross-curricular, which was widely achieved by stimulating learning in, through and about places. Although cross-curricular learning fits well with the NZC's principle of 'coherence' across the curriculum, a key barrier for teachers in this study in delivering cross-curricula learning was aligning programmes of learning effectively to assessment. Hipkins and Spiller (2012) also note that although the NZC promotes coherence, NCEA does not do so yet. This presented a key challenge for teachers, as limiting their assessment options directly impacted on curriculum design and pedagogical considerations.

Hipkins and Spiller (2012) encourage teachers to think critically about course structures "because learning that challenges students to wrestle with real-world issues will seldom stay within the bounds of one discipline area" (p. 6). However, tensions between the outcomes of place responsive pedagogy and barriers to incorporating learning from outside of the HPE curriculum appeared to be a major concern for some teachers in this study. In particular, Ben felt that his senior outdoor education programme should be counted as a university approved course, but this was not currently possible as he uses achievement standards from a range of subject domains. Hipkins and Spiller (2012) also point out that university regulations are presenting implications for teachers

who wish to explore cross-discipline boundaries and encourage further thinking and development in this area.

Ben explained how linking his place responsive outdoor education programmes closely aligned to the 'front end' of the NZC (2007), which provided a strong case for the development of his new courses. In the future, he envisages an entire school that is fully place responsive, which would effectively challenge a number of traditional secondary school practices and ideologies including the popular view that teachers are primarily 'teachers of subjects'. A softening of the barriers between subject areas is also evident in the literature with for example, Townsend (2014) seeing the potential of creating a full cross-curricular course whereby "students can study units from history, English, geography, education for sustainability and biology based around our significant places" (p. 110). This vision reminds us that place responsive pedagogies are not unique to outdoor education but should encompass learning across the curriculum, just as many teachers in this study have attempted to do. Further, approaches to senior courses that do not silo learning have the potential to move closer to traditional Māori teaching and learning practices, where "Māori pedagogies, and by association, assessment practices are characterised by inter-relationships between various curricula" (Hemara, 2000, p. 32). For many of the teachers in this study, learning in outdoor spanned across a range of subject areas in the curriculum and they embraced multiple perspectives on knowledge. It appears that these teachers are leading the way in addressing a key issue towards integrated curriculum, which is concerned with how teachers work between learning areas while maintaining the integrity of each (Hipkins & Spiller, 2012).

Thinking creatively about assessment

Hills (2011) argues that "the choice of assessment will have an effect on an outdoor education course as a whole" (p. 61). For the teachers in this study this appeared to be the case. Many had used achievement standards outside of their subject area so that they were able to validate learning related to the

places that they facilitated outdoor education in, although there were a number of challenges in achieving this. Others studied the HPE achievement standards carefully and modified assessment contexts and tasks to complement their outdoor education teaching and learning outcomes. As previously discussed, not all teachers viewed formal assessment in a favourable light. Their general concern about formalised assessment in outdoor education mirrors Hill's (2010b) assertion that schools are under increasing pressure to link measurable assessment tools to their outdoor education programmes. Nevertheless, teachers acknowledged the importance of effective assessment practices for students' academic success and for helping to maintain the status of outdoor education in the curriculum.

Assessment practices undoubtedly affect the quality of learning, and a number of teachers in this study believed that a culture within schools of high stakes formal assessment contradicted the underpinning philosophies of their outdoor education programmes. For example, using place responsive pedagogies had heightened Emma's concern about an assessment culture in schools that favours 'a right and wrong answer'. The tension teachers identified, is similar to previous research identifying conflicts between teachers' beliefs about outdoor education and the constraints of assessment and curriculum pressures in secondary schools (Hill, 2010b), and also resonate with Straker's (2014) research with outdoor educators which identified a "feeling caught between a system" (p. 245) that on one hand promotes pre-determined assessment outcomes but on the other hand the NZC (2007) "endorses the value of engaging students in learning that directly relates to them" (p. 245). Ben and Dave both reported that they would prefer to have no assessment at all because it gets in the way of quality learning. The attitudes of these teachers could in part be attributed to the contrast in outcomes of traditional skills-based outdoor education and the use of standard-based assessment for so-called measurable aspects (Hills, 2011), compared to place responsive outdoor education focusing on interactions and developing a sense of connection to places (Wattchow & Brown, 2011). However ongoing tensions between

assessment practice and what is seen to be appropriate pedagogical practice remain.

There was a distinct preference by almost all teachers in this study to utilise achievement standards over unit standards as they allowed a greater flexibility and enabled teachers to modify assessment contexts, content and have more flexibility as to how they collect evidence. In support of teachers' decisions to incorporate achievement standards, Hills (2011) contends that they provide pathways to authenticate learning experiences in outdoor education beyond the context of outdoor pursuits, they are less activity focused, and are less prescriptive than unit standards. Dave shared concerns that outdoor education used to be more focused on 'places', but there has been a shift away from this as schools have increased their 'quest for data.' However, he has managed to maintain his place conscious approach to outdoor education primarily through adapting HPE achievement standards to fit his context. Sarah's example of adapting a safety management achievement standard to fit her place responsive approach by emphasising the importance of 'cultural safety' is a further example of how some teachers in this study have carefully planned assessments to complement their learning contexts.

Cosgriff and Gillespie (2011) remind us that "in complex cyclical and reciprocal ways, curriculum decision-making shapes and enables/constrains pedagogical decision-making and practice, which in turn shapes and enables/constrains assessment practices and vice versa" (p. 10). All teachers in this study recognised this interrelationship and how crucial effective assessment practices were to legitimising their outdoor education programmes. Although many teachers in this study felt that assessment got in the way of good quality learning, they ensured that assessment practices were well planned, well thought through, and were meeting the needs of their students. Teachers spoke with intricate detail about how had they crafted outdoor education programmes and units of work that aligned to their personal philosophies and preferred pedagogical approaches in outdoor education. In doing so, they had

carefully selected and modified assessment tasks to best fit the learning outcomes of their outdoor education programmes or units of work. The literature supports teachers' views that assessment must be well thought through so that it compliments curriculum and pedagogy.

Cosgriff and Gillespie (2011) view assessment as a catalyst for change in senior outdoor education, noting five key catalysts. There is evidence throughout the findings of teachers' consideration and application of all five catalysts. The "alignment process" (Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011, p. 15) undertaken by NZQA and NCEA resulted in a number of new standards on offer giving a scope of assessment possibilities, which many teachers in this study had incorporated into their programmes of learning. As Hokowhitu (2004) notes, the exclusion of *whenua* as part of the *Hauora* (health) model for well-being in the HPE curriculum potentially results in the notion of *whenua* being largely overlooked. However, many teachers in this study demonstrated a desire to include *whenua* as the basis for their entire curriculum delivery, which was achieved through a place-based or place responsive approach, the utilisation of local places and co-construction of a localised and contextually relevant curriculum. By "viewing achievement standards with fresh eyes" (Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011, p. 17) a number of teachers were able to adapt contexts and modes for assessment that fitted with their outdoor education programmes or units of work. In addition, Ben, Sarah, Emma and Dave all gave examples of students co-constructing knowledge and at times assessment tasks, which effectively meant students were also able to assist in shaping assessment contexts. All teachers demonstrated a high ability to "write programme specific materials" (Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011, p. 19) which aligned to their personal philosophies in outdoor education. Although Cosgriff and Gillespie (2011) identified time as a potential barrier to teachers formulating their own assessment tasks, not one participant identified time as a barrier, which indicates that teachers in this study simply made the time to attend to assessment related tasks. Finally, there was strong evidence that teachers were engaged in "reflective practice" (Cosgriff & Gillespie, 2011, p. 19) and

made well considered decisions that took into account the intricate connections between curriculum, assessment, and pedagogy. This was achieved in spite of many believing NCEA assessment did not fit their outdoor education philosophy and programmes, and could be described as a double-edged sword; formal assessment generally hindered high quality learning, however, getting it right was crucial to validate student success and legitimise their outdoor education practices.

What do the findings mean for the future of outdoor education in a culturally diverse society?

The findings uncovered in this study present a range of implications for outdoor education as it transitions into the 21st century in schools. Well over a decade ago, Lugg (1999) suggested that “it is time for outdoor education to 'mature' beyond individualistic objectives to tackle more ecological concepts of community and interdependence” (p. 31). Contemporary outdoor education literature would certainly suggest that outdoor education is responding to such calls. However, as Cosgriff, Legge, et al. (2012) point out, “it is only relatively recently that Māori voice(s) have been heard in policy and curriculum documents that give weight to authentic opportunities for engagement to achieve educational success” (p. 230). As many of the teachers in this study adapted their outdoor education practices based upon culturally responsive initiatives in schools, the belief which Liam eluded to that ‘what benefits Māori students, benefits all students’ became apparent.

In this section, I critically discuss what the findings in this study might mean for the future of outdoor education in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand and the opportunities that outdoor education offers teachers and schools in respect to place and culturally responsive practices. Four implications are highlighted in this section. The first reiterates the *strong alignment between place and culturally responsive pedagogies* that teachers in this study expressed, and the significant potential there is for schools to utilise place responsive approaches to compliment culturally responsive pedagogies and

vice versa. The second relates to the critical importance of *professional support for outdoor education teachers* in the adoption of new pedagogies and highlights that many teachers may intend to adopt new outdoor education practices but a lack of support limits the development of theory being transferred into practice. The third implication highlights how the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies by teachers in this study has provided more *authentic outdoor education experiences* that are relevant to the diverse range of learners in Aotearoa New Zealand. The final implication addresses how new pedagogies in outdoor education can better *reflect bicultural partnerships* in our education system.

The alignment between place and culturally responsive pedagogies

Scherff and Spector (2010) argue:

“CRP [culturally responsive pedagogy] strives to use learners’ cultural ways of knowing and being as a vehicle for instruction as well as a source of content, while placed-based learning takes as its starting point the varying contexts from which learners come” (p. 141).

Townsend (2014) also notes a direct correlation with her adoption of a place responsive approach that was grounded in culturally responsive pedagogy and the success of her Māori students. This study’s findings support these ideas and suggest that place and culturally responsive pedagogies share critical similarities with one another. Given this, I propose place responsive pedagogy naturally compliments a culturally responsive and relational approach to teaching and learning and could be well positioned to contribute to the growing call by policy makers and academics to rethink our educational practices in secondary schools.

A number of teachers in this study indicated that the nature of place responsive education meant consideration of a wide range of knowledge drawn from both Pākehā and Māori worldviews because both parties have a story to tell. This has the potential to address issues related to the problematic nature of a westernised curriculum for Māori (A. Macfarlane, 2004), as the blending of

western and Māori knowledge that was evident in the pedagogies most teachers in this study used, meant “one worldview is not prioritised at the expense of the other” (S. Macfarlane et al., 2015, p. 65), therefore, both Māori and non-Māori benefit. The adoption of place-based or place responsive practices can also be seen to satisfy a number of indicators of culturally responsive programmes in schools (e.g. the *Kia Eke Panuku* initiative) including the emphasis on learning contexts that draw on students’ prior knowledge and cultural experiences as a means of building new learning connections (Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success, n.d.).

Place responsive and culturally responsive theories require particular consideration of the places in which learning occurs and who the learners are. While the discussion has specifically focused on Māori and Western approaches to education, there are numerous other cultural and ethnic groups in Aotearoa New Zealand who bring diverse perspectives to education which the potential to re-shape outdoor education practices in schools. As A. Macfarlane et al. (2007) contend, “all students benefit from being in a culturally-inclusive classroom” (p. 65). The actions of teachers in this study clearly show that they pedagogically support diversity in their learning environments and in doing so, model new approaches in education that respond to the needs of all learners.

A further implication is the proposition that outdoor education teachers and researchers would benefit from paying more attention to the literature and initiatives focused on culturally responsive pedagogies in schools. There is a notable absence of discussion about culturally responsive initiatives in schools within academic and professional outdoor education literature, yet many teachers reported that it was their involvement in such programmes that helped to spark a shift in mind-set which led to the adoption of new pedagogies in their outdoor education programmes or units of work.

Professional support for outdoor educators is critical

As highlighted by many teachers in this study, a key barrier to adopting new pedagogies in outdoor education was that the teachers themselves had to seek out and learn new skills and knowledge. This finding emphasises how important the availability of professional support to outdoor educators is, especially when practitioners are re-thinking their practice. The nature of culturally responsive pedagogy encourages teachers to draw on knowledge from learners, however, Hynds et al. (2016) contend that “there can also be limits to the cultural knowledge that teachers can learn solely through reciprocal learning and teaching relationships with their students” (p. 245). The teachers in this study acknowledged professional support and ideas from peers and other educators were critical to them being able to sustain change. Although generic prescription concerning place responsive education is not possible (Wattchow & Brown, 2011), the creation of support materials such as case studies or snapshots of contemporary outdoor education practices and creative assessment ideas would be useful aids to support teachers in understanding how place and culturally responsive theories might actually transform into practice. In relation to resource development, Martindale (2011) notes that such resources “need to be well collated and readily accessible for teachers because of their high workloads” (p. 91).

Research introduced earlier suggests that outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand is responding to calls for a more bicultural approach, however, the extent of this response remains open to question. Townsend’s (2014) experience of “causing offence” when she explained why she no longer used or taught “... ‘de-contextualised’ outdoor education that originated from colonial roots” (p. 112) and the lack of enthusiasm for her offer to run workshops about implementing a place responsive approach highlights continued resistance from some educators to engage in alternative pedagogies in outdoor education. As highlighted by the primary teachers in Cosgriff’s (2015a) research, a fear of ‘letting go of control’ in outdoor education contexts could well be limiting teachers in re-thinking their outdoor education delivery. As the findings of this

study indicate, attendance at professional learning opportunities or engagement in school based initiatives can be an essential stimulus for teachers to critically reflect on their own practice.

Sarah noted the importance of surrounding herself with like-minded teachers in her school, which mirrors Hipkins's (2015) findings that teachers are more likely to do demanding professional thinking when they are "highly engaged peers in a collaborative way" (p. xii). This point not only emphasises the importance of collaboration within the outdoor education community but the need to target a specific pedagogy focus when collaborating. Given the spread of outdoor education teachers nationwide, making use of online communication and collaboration is one way teachers could ask for support and guidance from other like-minded teachers.

Almost all teachers in this study navigated through numerous internal and external barriers while adopting alternative pedagogies in outdoor education. Many teachers forged important links between theory and practice which had not previously been done before in their schools and while they are leaders of educational change in their schools, apart from involvement in culturally responsive initiatives, they were often on their own when undertaking changes. Hipkins and Spiller (2012) note that change is complex and "requires leadership support for the innovators who are showing the way" (p.39). There is a notable absence of support for those teachers wishing to make changes in their outdoor education programmes. Just as culturally responsive pedagogy calls for teachers and students to restore power imbalances, I also propose that leaders in outdoor education including policy makers, researchers, academics could adopt a similar approach. One example of this in practice would be a formal mentoring programme in which teachers could submit questions or ideas to 'experts' the outdoor education field, and receive critical feedback/feedforward and guidance to help inform practice.

Authentic outdoor education for all students

School-based outdoor education has been influenced by theories and practices that are arguably outdated in the world we live in today. The teachers in this study demonstrated a willingness to question assumptions and search for new pathways in their outdoor education practices. This included placing students at the forefront of decisions around pedagogy, which was strengthened for many by involvement in culturally responsive school based initiatives. Examples teachers gave of their outdoor education practices signified that *adventure* in outdoor education can move beyond a fixation on physical skills, towards learning experiences that strengthen students' connections with the places that they live in by engaging in a contextually relevant and localised curriculum (Beames & Brown, 2016).

By adopting place-based or place responsive pedagogies, teachers in this study reported that learning contexts had a greater significance to the lives of their students. This is one of the hallmarks of what Beames and Brown (2016) propose as “authentic learning...” that is learning in and for the “here and now” (p. 7). Just as culturally responsive pedagogy pays attention to the cultural toolkit that students inherently bring to the classroom (Bruner, 1996), place responsive pedagogy calls for educators to provide learners with opportunities to respond to, and empathise with places and recognise that they are rich in local meaning and significance (Wattchow & Brown, 2011).

Authentic education requires students to learn in real world contexts where they can make links between what they are learning and their own experiences (Beames & Brown, 2016). Many teachers in this study facilitated outdoor education experiences where students were active participants in the process of knowledge construction and in doing so, enabled students to select and apply knowledge that had meaning for them. For example, a number of outdoor education camps discussed in this study involved staying at local *Marae*, which provided an authentic local context rich in culture as a basis for learning. Unlike decontextualised outdoor education experiences, there were many strong

examples in this study of how paying attention to 'places' provided accessible and authentic contexts for students to learn in. The example Sarah gave about an ex-student who was inspired to study law at university after listening to a *kaumātua* speak about the struggles his *iwi* had faced in retaining their land exemplifies the power of learning through real life contexts.

Using the outdoor environments students were in as the "text book" (Cosgriff, Thevenard, et al., 2012, p. 80) provided totally different outdoor experiences to those based upon generalised outdoor education learning resources, which have been called into question for their failure to comprehend curriculum questions (Brookes, 2004). Many teachers in this study promoted learner inquiry into places, which aligns with Wattchow and Brown's (2011) signposts for place responsive pedagogy, as learners uncovered the stories that places had to tell and then represented them in various ways. Teachers reported that by allowing places to guide curriculum delivery, many students developed a strong connection to places. The supporting of place attachment effectively softened the walls between schooling and the real world in which we live in (Gruenewald, 2003) and allowed students to participate as active citizens within their community.

Opportunities to reflect bicultural partnerships

Offering a counterpoint to academic critique of outdoor education practice for its lack of relevance to the everyday lives of students and reliance on outdated theories, the learning environments that many teachers in this study described were culturally located and contextually relevant to the places in which learning occurred. The actions of these teachers can be seen to address at least partially, Cosgriff, Legge et al.'s (2012) calls for outdoor educators' to achieve a high level of cultural awareness, good understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and to take a genuine interest in others worldviews. Like Legge (2008), many of the teachers in this study felt that it was important for all students to develop an appreciation for both Māori and Pākehā worldviews through participation in real world experiences. Although it has been suggested

becoming bi-cultural is problematic (Ritchie, 1992), none of the teachers reported personal challenges in navigating between Māori and Pākehā worlds. Instead, it was the influence of others attitudes and perceptions that often proved to be a barrier. This finding again emphasises that with support and guidance and “surrounding yourself with like-minded people”, teachers of all backgrounds have the potential to facilitate rich bicultural approaches in outdoor education, especially when adopting pedagogies that shared teaching and learning responsibilities between teachers, students, and the wider community.

There is an ongoing recognition of the importance of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi of partnership, protection, and participation in educational settings (Glynn, 2015). Many teachers in this study demonstrated a high commitment to acknowledging the bicultural foundation of Aotearoa New Zealand and provided students with opportunities to learn about *Te Ao Māori* and *mātauranga Māori* through their outdoor education programmes and units of work. Central to a Māori worldview is an abiding concern for human relationships (A. Macfarlane et al., 2007), and this was evident in many outdoor education practices teachers adopted, as they shifted away from technical skills and decontextualized outcomes. It is evident that many of the teachers in this study are successfully meeting the expectations of the NZC in respect to a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi through the development and facilitation of outdoor education programmes that welcome contribution from both Pākehā and Māori.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed how the findings in this study relate to the literature and has given rise to a number of considerations for the future of outdoor education in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. It has become evident that outdoor education in schools is highly influenced by a range of complex factors, which can impact on what is actually delivered in schools. However, as teachers in this study have demonstrated, shifts in outdoor

education practices are highly achievable with the right support and guidance. The adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies in outdoor education has provided teachers in this study with exciting new pathways, which has highlighted the potential for outdoor education compliment learning across the curriculum. It is clear that the adoption of these pedagogies in outdoor education considers and supports Māori preferred ways of learning and is positively impacting on Māori students' educational experiences in mainstream schooling, which in turn, benefits all learners.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The findings in this study give rise to several considerations for the future of outdoor education in schools in the 21st century. This study has found that outdoor education is taking shape in new and exciting ways in secondary schools. The contested nature of outdoor education was evident with teachers and aligns with literature discussed earlier that outdoor education takes form in a variety of ways and is subjective in meaning. Although this could be expected, it does present challenges when outdoor education teachers attempt to legitimise their practices within schools as many colleagues hold the belief that outdoor education is primarily about having fun or engaging in outdoor pursuits. Importantly, teachers in this study have presented a case that outdoor education can evolve and adapt to suit the specific needs of learners and effectively break free from traditional practices that generally deny socio-ecological perspectives and the places in which learning happens.

The examples of practice and views of some teachers in this study signify that place responsive pedagogies and culturally responsive pedagogies share several critical similarities, and outdoor educators would be well placed to continue to explore how the two approaches might align more closely together. Although the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies presented new opportunities in schools, teachers in this study also faced many challenges that impact on the delivery of outdoor education. Targeted and professional support for outdoor educators appears to be a critical component to the success of the adoption of new pedagogies in outdoor education. Therefore, conversations in the outdoor education community around *pedagogy* should be further supported and encouraged.

Teachers in this study have demonstrated that outdoor education which engages students in real world issues has further allowed students to participate in authentic learning experiences that have significance to their own lives. The customisation of outdoor education curriculum, assessment, and pedagogical approaches has enabled students to learn in the real world that

they live in, while also providing students with a greater level of agency over their learning. Finally, this study has paid attention to our obligations as educators to meet the expectations of nation's founding document, The Treaty of Waitangi. Many of the outdoor education programmes of learning and units of work that teachers described in this study exemplify a strong commitment to ensuring Māori students can succeed as Māori in mainstream schools. Although this might seem an ambitious challenge by some, many of the teachers in this study had found the adoption of new pedagogies in outdoor education made a significant contribution to addressing the disparities between Māori and non-Māori achievement in their classes and programmes. These findings and implications point to outdoor education practices that rely less on outdated theories and practices from other countries and more on socio-ecological perspectives and practices of Aotearoa New Zealand, which includes a consideration of the real and important issues students face within their lives and the communities they live in.

Limitations to the study

Qualitative interviews enabled a brief insight into the lives of the teachers in this study which uncovered information about their experience teaching outdoor education. However, the responses were indicative of their experiences at that time, which could well be different to now. If time was not a constraint, maybe alternative methodology could explore in more depth how teachers go about adopting new pedagogies in outdoor education. Potentially an action-research based project would have been useful to understand how teachers' attitudes and perceptions change when undertaking change in their outdoor education practices.

Another limitation was the number of teachers interviewed, and the fact that they were all generally supportive of place and culturally responsive pedagogies in outdoor education. If time had permitted, an additional research question may have been useful that further explored why many teachers are resistant to change in outdoor education practices. It would have been

beneficial to hear from teachers who prefer to prescribe to traditional outdoor education practices and theories and to learn more about why they have not engaged in contemporary pedagogies. Maybe they have tried adopting new pedagogies, but have experienced limited in success or found that they were falling short of meeting students' needs and their school's expectations. Understanding these attitudes and perceptions would have provided an insight into what could be done to support effective change in outdoor education practices.

Direction for future research

The teachers in this study generally forged strong links between the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) and outdoor education practices, and appear to be leading the way in the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies in their schools and the wider outdoor education community. However, the continued low status of outdoor education in schools' despite the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies, and the ongoing challenges surrounding formalised assessment that appear to limit curriculum innovation warrant future research attention.

At the time of writing, funding and resourcing for the *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success* initiative was effectively being replaced in secondary schools by *Communities of Learning: Kāhui Ako*, which involves a group of schools who set "shared goals, or achievement challenges based on the particular needs of its learners" (Ministry of Education, 2017). The nature of place responsive pedagogy, which calls for narratives, stories, and representations of places (Wattchow & Brown, 2011) offers a chance to keep culturally responsive and relational pedagogies further in the spotlight. Outdoor education in schools has exciting potential to contribute to this new initiative, and the adoption of place and culturally responsive pedagogies would naturally fit well with an across-school approach. For example, a local mountain within the community could become the place for and of study and learning, which could span right throughout students' years in formal learning. The funding and resourcing

enabled by *Communities of Learning: Kāhui Ako* would effectively allow collaboration across schools for such a project to take place. For many outdoor educators who are leading change in their schools, this initiative could provide a platform to consider learning in outdoor education that spans across multiple layers of the community. This may better enable educators to use authentic and real life local outdoor contexts as the basis for their outdoor education, and influence curriculum delivery that is based on real world issues that need to be solved.

As the shape and form of secondary education in mainstream schooling evolves, there will be new opportunities for outdoor education as a senior school subject and a key area of learning in the HPE curriculum. New pedagogies are challenging the educational landscape of secondary schools, which is reflected in the way that some schools are breaking free from learning disciplines existing in isolation from one another. As some of the teachers in this study have suggested, outdoor education has real potential to assist in cross-curricular learning and enhance the relevance of learning between learning areas. It would be beneficial to investigate further the role that outdoor education might play in facilitating learning experiences that incorporate a cross-curricular curriculum.

Lastly, there is a clear need for greater representation of Māori students' experiences in mainstream outdoor education settings. As the majority of Māori students attend mainstream schooling, this presents an important consideration for the ways in which Māori students can engage in authentic outdoor education experiences that are based on Māori ways of knowing, thinking, feeling and being. Bicultural approaches to outdoor education have the potential to further connect Māori students with places, which the literature has identified as being fundamental to being Māori. The rise of culturally responsive practices in schools will no doubt cause teachers to greater reflection as to what constitutes culturally responsive outdoor education practices and warrants further investigation.

Glossary of Māori Terms

<i>Term</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<i>ako</i>	<i>Māori pedagogy</i> , to learn, study, instruct, teach, advise
<i>awa</i>	river
<i>haerenga</i>	journey
<i>hangi</i>	earth oven
<i>hapū</i>	subtribe
<i>hauora</i>	health
<i>hīkoi</i>	walk
<i>horua</i>	tobogganing
<i>iwi</i>	extended kinship group
<i>karakia</i>	prayer, grace
<i>kaukau</i>	swimming
<i>kaupapa Māori</i>	knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society
<i>korero tawhito</i>	history
<i>koru</i>	symbol of the double spiral
<i>kura</i>	<i>Māori school</i>
<i>marae</i>	complex of buildings where formal meetings take place

<i>moana</i>	sea
<i>mātauranga Māori</i>	Māori knowledge
<i>manaakitanga</i>	hospitality, kindness, generosity, support - the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others
<i>Māoritanga</i>	Māori practices, beliefs, culture
<i>noa</i>	to be free from the extensions of <i>tapu</i>
<i>pounamu</i>	greenstone
<i>tapu</i>	sacred
<i>tangata whenua</i>	indigenous people born of the land
<i>Te Ao Māori</i>	the Māori world
<i>te reo Māori</i>	Māori language
<i>Te Ao o Takaroa</i>	god of the ocean
<i>tikanga Māori</i>	Māori customs
<i>turangawaewae</i>	standing place, where one has the right to stand
<i>waiata</i>	song/poetry
<i>waka</i>	canoe
<i>whānau</i>	family
<i>whaikōrero</i>	speech making
<i>whakaheke ngaru</i>	surf riding
<i>whakapapa</i>	geneology

whakatauākī

proverbs

whenua

land, placenta

Definitions of terms retrieved from ***Te Aka Online Māori Dictionary*** (Moorefield, 2017), unless otherwise cited in-text.

References

- Alcorn, N., & Thrupp, M. (2012). Uncovering meanings: The discourses of New Zealand secondary teachers in context. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(1), 107-121.
- Barnes, M., Clarke, D., & Stephens, M. (2000). Assessment: The engine of systemic curricular reform? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(5), 623-650.
- Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: Practical strategies*: Sage.
- Beames, S., & Brown, M. (2014). Enough of Ronald and Mickey: focusing on learning in outdoor education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 14(2), 118-131.
- Beames, S., & Brown, M. (2016). *Adventurous Learning : A Pedagogy for a Changing World*. Florence, US: Routledge.
- Beames, S., & Ross, H. (2010). Journeys outside the classroom. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 10(2), 95-109.
- Beedie, P., & Bourne, G. (2005). Media constructions of risk: a case study of the Stainforth Beck incident. *Journal of Risk Research*, 8(4), 331-339.
- Berryman, M., & Bishop, R. (2015). The Te Kotahitanga Observation Tool: Development, use, reliability and validity. doi:10.15663/wje.v16i3.37
- Best, E. (1925). *Games and pastimes of the Maori*. Wellington, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Bishop, R. (1997). Interviewing as collaborative storying. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 24(1), 28-47.
- Bishop, R. (Ed.) (2011). *Freeing ourselves* (Vol. 66). Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2010). Te Kotahitanga: culturally responsive professional development for teachers. *Teacher Development*, 14(2), 173-187.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 734-742.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Wearmouth, J., Peter, M., & Clapham, S. (2012). Professional development, changes in teacher practice and improvements in Indigenous students' educational performance: A case study from New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(5), 694-705.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: changing power relations in education*. South Melbourne, Vic: Cengage Learning.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (2000). Kaupapa Maori messages for the mainstream. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 1, 4-7.
- Bishop, R., Ladwig, J., & Berryman, M. (2014). The Centrality of Relationships for Pedagogy: The Whanaungatanga Thesis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(1), 184-214.
- Bolstad, R., Gilbert, J., McDowall, S., Bull, A., Boyd, S., & Hipkins, R. (2012). *Supporting future-oriented learning and teaching*. Retrieved from
- Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. (2007). Genres of empirical research in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 3-11.
- Boyes, M. (2000). The place of outdoor education in the health and physical education curriculum. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 33(2), 75.

- Boyes, M. (2012). *Historical and contemporary trends in outdoor education* (D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill Eds. Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand: a new vision for the twenty first century ed.). Christchurch: N.Z.: CPIT.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brookes, A. (2003a). A critique of neo-Hahnian outdoor education theory. Part one: Challenges to the concept of “character building”. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 3(1), 49-62.
- Brookes, A. (2003b). A critique of neo-Hahnian outdoor education theory. Part two: “The fundamental attribution error” in contemporary outdoor education discourse. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 3(2), 119-132.
- Brookes, A. (2004). Astride a long-dead horse : mainstream outdoor education theory and the central curriculum problem. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(2), 22-33.
- Brookes, A. (2011). Preventing fatal incidents in outdoor education. Lessons learnt from the Mangatepopo tragedy. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(6), 7-32.
- Brookes, A., Smith, M., & Corkill QC, B. (2009). *Report to trustees of the Sir Edmund Hillary Outdoor Pursuit Centre of New Zealand: Mangatepopo Gorge Incident, 15 April 2008*. Retrieved from
- Brown, M. (2008a). Comfort zone: Model or metaphor? : Australian Outdoor Education Council.
- Brown, M. (2008b). Outdoor education: Opportunities provided by a place based approach. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(3), 7-25.
- Brown, M. (2010). Transfer : outdoor adventure education's Achilles heel? Changing participation as a viable option. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 14(1), 13-22.
- Brown, M. (2011). A changing landscape: Place-responsive pedagogy. In D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Christchurch: NZ: CPIT.
- Brown, M. (2012a). Freeing ourselves from narrow thinking about risk in adventure programming. In B. Martin & M. Wagstaff (Eds.), *Controversial issues in adventure programming*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Brown, M. (2012b). Student perspectives of a place-responsive outdoor education programme. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 3(1), 64-89.
- Brown, M. (2013). Teacher perspectives on place-responsive outdoor education. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 2, 3-10.
- Brown, M., & Fraser, D. (2009). Re-evaluating risk and exploring educational alternatives. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 9(1), 61-77.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (Fifth edition.. ed.): Oxford : Oxford University Press.

- Campbell-Price, M. (2010). Is what is assessed in senior outdoor education all the students learn? *Out and About*, 24, 10-15.
- Campbell-Price, M. (2012). School curriculum and outdoor education: Part 2: Secondary School. In D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand: a new vision for the twenty first century* (pp. 84-103). Christchurch: N.Z.: CPIT.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Interactions between Maori children and Pakeha teachers : observations of an American visitor* (2nd ed. ed.). Auckland, NZ: Auckland Reading Association.
- Cloke, P., & Perkins, H. (2002). Commodification and Adventure in New Zealand Tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 5(6), 521-549.
- Codd, J. (2005). Education policy and the challenges of globalisation: Commercialisation or citizenship? In J. Codd & K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Victoria: Australia: Thomson/Dunmore Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (Vol. 7). New York: Routledge.
- Cooley, S., Cumming, J., Holland, M., & Burns, V. (2015). Developing the Model for Optimal Learning and Transfer (MOLT) following an evaluation of outdoor groupwork skills programmes. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(2), 104-121.
- Corrigan, P. (1990). *Social Forms/Human Capacities: Essays in Authority and Difference by Philip Corrigan*. London: UK: Routledge.
- Cosgriff, M. (2008). What's the story? Outdoor education in New Zealand in the 21st century. *New Zealand Physical Educator*, 41(3), 14-25.
- Cosgriff, M. (2015a). The reconceptualisation of outdoor education in the primary school classroom in Aotearoa New Zealand: How might we do it? *Education*, 44(3), 339-313.
- Cosgriff, M. (2015b). Snapshots from the field: Transforming outdoor education in the primary school. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*(2), 26-35.
- Cosgriff, M., & Gillespie, L. (2011). Assessment in senior outdoor education: A catalyst for change? *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education*, 2(5), 7-22.
- Cosgriff, M., Legge, M., Brown, M., Boyes, M., Zink, R., & Irwin, D. (2012). Outdoor learning in Aotearoa New Zealand: voices past, present, and future. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 12(3), 221-235.
- Cosgriff, M., & Thevenard, L. (2012). School curriculum and outdoor education: Part 1: Early childhood and primary school. In D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand: a new vision for the twenty first century* (pp. 84-103). Christchurch: N.Z.: CPIT.
- Cosgriff, M., Thevenard, L., & Campbell-Price, M. (2012). School curriculum and outdoor education. In D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand: a new vision for the twenty first century* (pp. 84-103). Christchurch: N.Z.: CPIT.
- Cotton, D. (2006). Implementing curriculum guidance on environmental education: the importance of teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(1), 67-83.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: meaning and perspective in the research process*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 4th). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40*(4), 314-321.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Maōri health development*. Auckland, N.Z: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenhart, M. (2006). Representing qualitative data. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, P. B. Elmore, & A. American Educational Research (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 567-581). Washington, D.C.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Estrellas, A. (1996). The Eustress Paradigm: A Strategy for Decreasing Stress in Wilderness Adventure Programming. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's Voices in Experiential Education* (pp. 32-44). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65.
- Ferguson, C., Little, S., & McClelland, M. (2000). *Developing teamwork through experiential learning*. Paper presented at the Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges.
- Ferrier-Kerr, J., Keown, P., & Hume, A. (2008/2009). The role of professional development and learning in the early adoption of the New Zealand curriculum by schools. *Waikato Journal of Education, 14*, 123-137.
- Finch, B. (2005). Considering pedagogies for consent in research with children. *Waikato Journal of Education, 11*, 61-71.
- Freeth, W., de Oliveira Andreotti, V., & Quinlivan, K. (2014). Reconceptualizing leadership in the implementation of the New Zealand Curriculum: implications for school leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 17*(1), 83-102.
- Gass, M., & Priest, S. (2006). The Effectiveness of Metaphoric Facilitation Styles in Corporate Adventure Training Programs. *Journal of Experiential Education, 29*(1), 78-94.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic.
- Glynn, T. (2015). Positioning ourselves as treaty partners. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: exploring new horizons* (pp. 169-180). Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Gray, T., & Martin, P. (2012). The role and place of outdoor education in the Australian National Curriculum. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education, 16*(1), 39-50.
- Gruenewald, D. (2003). Foundations of Place: A Multidisciplinary Framework for Place-Conscious Education. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 619-654.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research* (Vol. 2).
- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and “Ethically Important Moments” in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(2), 261-280.
- Haddock, C. (2007). *Education Outside the Classroom (EOTC) Secondary Schools Survey*. Retrieved from Ministry of Education:

- Hall, C. (2005). The national certificate of educational achievement (NCEA): Is there a third way. In J. Codd & K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 235-265).
- Harcourt, M. (2015). Towards a culturally responsive and place-conscious theory of history teaching. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 2, 36-44.
- Harvey-Jordan, S., & Long, S. (2001). The process and the pitfalls of semi-structured interviews. *Community Practitioner*, 74(6), 219-221.
- Haskell, E. (2001). *Transfer of Learning: Cognition, Instruction, and Reasoning*. Portland, Ringold: Academic Press.
- Hattie, J., Marsh, H., Neill, J., & Richards, G. (1997). Adventure Education and Outward Bound: Out-of-Class Experiences That Make a Lasting Difference. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 43-87.
- Hayes, R., & Matusov, E. (2005). Designing for Dialogue in Place of Teacher Talk and Student Silence. *Culture & Psychology*, 11(3), 339-357.
- Heke, I. (2014). *Atua Matua Maori Health Framework*.
- Hemara, W. (2000). *Māori pedagogies: a view from the literature*. Wellington, N.Z: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Hill, A. (2010a). Connection to Place as a Central Theme for Sustainable Outdoor Education. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(4), 26-46.
- Hill, A. (2010b). Reflections on beliefs and practices from New Zealand outdoor educators : consistencies and conflicts. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 14(1), 30-40.
- Hill, A. (2012). Developing approaches to outdoor education that promote sustainability education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 16(1), 15-27.
- Hills, C. (2011). Opportunities for using achievement standards for assessment in outdoor education within New Zealand secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(5), 51-65.
- Hipkins, R. (2015). *Learning to learn in secondary classrooms*. Retrieved from Wellington, NZ:
- Hipkins, R., & Spiller, L. (2012). *NCEA and Curriculum Innovation*. Retrieved from Wellington, NZ:
- Hodgson, C., & Bailie, M. (2011). Risk management. In C. Hodgson & M. Berry (Eds.), (Adventure Education: an Introduction ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Challenges to state physical education: Tikanga Maori, physical education curricula, historical deconstruction, inclusivism and decolonisation. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 10, 71-84.
- Hollins, E. (1996). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning*: Routledge.
- Hunn, J. (1960). *Report on Department of Māori Affairs*. Wellington, NZ.: Department of Māori Affairs.
- Hynds, A., Hindle, R., Savage, C., Meyer, L., Penetito, W., & Sleeter, C. (2016). The Impact of Teacher Professional Development to Reposition Pedagogy for Indigenous Students in Mainstream Schools. *The Teacher Educator*, 51(3), 230-249.

- Irwin, D. (2008). Weaving the Threads: Exploring Identity through Bicultural Outdoor Education Experiences. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(4), 66-86.
- Irwin, D., & Straker, J. (2014). Tenuous Affair: Environmental and Outdoor Education in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 30(2), 151-166.
- Irwin, D., Straker, J., & Hill, A. (2011). Charting Future Directions for Outdoor Education in the 21st Century. In D. Irwin, J. Straker, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Christchurch: NZ: CPIT.
- Irwin, D., Straker, J., & Hill, A. (2012). *Outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand: a new vision for the twenty first century*. Christchurch: N.Z.: CPIT.
- Jackson, A., Hauteruruku ki Puketeraki, Mita, N., Kerr, H., Jackson, S., & Phillips, C. (2016). One day a waka for every marae: A southern approach to Maori water safety. *New Zealand Physical Educator*, 49(1), 26-28.
- Kane, M., & Tucker, H. (2007). Sustaining Adventure in New Zealand Outdoor Education: Perspectives from Renowned New Zealand Outdoor Adventurers on the Contested Cultural Understanding of Adventure. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(2), 29-40.
- Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success. (n.d.). Culturally Responsive and Relational Pedagogy. Retrieved from <http://kep.org.nz/dimensions/culturally-responsive-and-relational-pedagogy>
- Krauss, S. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(4), 758-770.
- Ladwig, J. (2012). *Analytical Note: Initial results of estimating the effect of Te Kotahitanga's model of pedagogy*. The University of Newcastle: James Ladwig.
- Leather, M. (2013). 'It's good for their self-esteem': the substance beneath the label. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning*, 13(2), 158-179.
- Leather, M., & Nicholls, F. (2014). More than activities: using a 'sense of place' to enrich student experience in adventure sport. *Sport, Education and Society*, 21(3), 443-464.
- Legge, M. (2006). *Maori culture in physical education: Narrative inquiry of lived experience*. (Unpublished PhD thesis), Deakin University, Melbourne.
- Legge, M. (2008). A Snapshot of Place Based Learning in a Marae Context: An Autoethnographic Account. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(4), 87-102.
- Loynes, C. (1998). Adventure in a Bun. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 21(1), 35-39.
- Lugg, A. (1999). Directions in outdoor education curriculum. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 4(1), 25-32.
- Lugg, A. (2004). Outdoor adventure in Australian outdoor education : is it a case of roast for Christmas dinner? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(1), 4-11.
- Lugg, A., & Martin, P. (2001). The nature and scope of outdoor education in Victorian schools. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 5(2), 42-48.
- Lynch, P. (1998b). *A romp through the past - One hundred and fifty years of New Zealand outdoor education*. Paper presented at the Ara Maturanga: Pathway

- to learning. Third national outdoor education conference., Auckland College of Education, Epsom, Auckland.
- Lynch, P. (2006). *Camping and the Curriculum*. Canterbury, NZ: PML Publications.
- Lynch, P. (2012). Outdoor recreation-related outdoor education - Scope of the research (1995-2010). Part two. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 3(1), 42-63.
- Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra: listen to culture : Māori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, N.Z: NZCER press.
- Macfarlane, A. (2015). Sociocultural foundations. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: exploring new horizons* (pp. 19-31). Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Cavanagh, T., & Bateman, S. (2007). Creating Culturally-safe Schools for Maori Students. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, The*, 36, 65-75.
- Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Grace, W., Penetito, W., & Bateman, S. (2008). Indigenous epistemology in a national curriculum framework? *Ethnicities*, 8(1), 102-126.
- Macfarlane, S. (2009). Te Pikinga ki Runga: rising possibilities. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*(2), 42-50.
- Macfarlane, S. (2015). Sociocultural contexts as enablers of diversity: Considerations for the primary years. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: exploring new horizons* (pp. 100-116). Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Macfarlane, S., Macfarlane, A., & Gillon, G. (2015). Sharing the baskets of knowledge: Creating space for a blending of streams. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: exploring new horizons*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Mackenzie, N., & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas : paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(2), 193-205.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *Mai Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- Manning, R. (2011). A critical pedagogy of place?: Te Atiawa (Maori) and Pakeha (Non-Maori) history teachers' perspectives on the teaching of local, Maori and New Zealand histories. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 40, 102-111.
- Mannion, G., Fenwick, A., & Lynch, J. (2013). Place-responsive pedagogy: learning from teachers' experiences of excursions in nature. *Environmental Education Research*, 19(6), 792-809.
- Marsden, M. (2003). *The woven universe: selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden: Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden*.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (Vol. 6). Los Angeles, California: SAGE.
- Martindale, J. (2011). Teachers' perspectives of education outside the classroom. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(5), 81-93.
- Matthews, K., & Jenkins, K. (1999). Whose country is it anyway? The construction of a new identity through schooling for Maori in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *History of Education*, 28(3), 339-350.

- McCulloch, G. (2011). *The struggle for the history of education* (Vol. 1). New York: Routledge.
- McKenzie, M. D. (2000). How are adventure education program outcomes achieved? A review of the literature. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 5(1), 19-27.
- Menter, I., Elliot, D., Hulme, M., Lewin, J., & Lowden, K. (2011). *A guide to practitioner research in education* (Vol. 1st). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mertens, D. (2016). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (Vol. 3). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Metge, J. (1990). *Te Kohao o te Ngira: culture and learning: education for a multicultural society*. Wellington, N.Z: Learning Media, Ministry of Education.
- Mikaels, J., Backman, E., & Lundvall, S. (2015). In and out of place: exploring the discursive effects of teachers' talk about outdoor education in secondary schools in New Zealand. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 1-14.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage. (2012). Treaty of Waitangi. Retrieved from <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty-of-waitangi>
- Ministry of Education. (1992). *Anywhere, everywhere: EOTC curriculum guidelines for primary schools, secondary schools, and early childhood centres*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). *Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13*. (0790326140;9780790326146;). Wellington, N.Z: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *EOTC guidelines: bringing the curriculum alive*. Wellington, N.Z: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2011). *Tātaiako: cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners* (9780478386004;0478386001;). Retrieved from Wellington, N.Z.:
- Ministry of Education. (2013). Circular 2013/06: Payments by parents of students. Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/>
- Ministry of Education. (2015). *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success*. Unknown: Unknown.
- Ministry of Education. (2016). *EOTC Guidelines 2016: Bringing the Curriculum Alive*: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2017). Communities of Learning | Kāhui Ako. Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/col/>
- Ministry of Education. (n.d.-a). About Te Kotahitanga. Retrieved from <http://tekotahitanga.tki.org.nz/About>
- Ministry of Education. (n.d.-b). *Summary of Ka Hikatia: Accelerating Success 2013-2017*. Ministry of Education.
- Moorefield, J. (2017). Te Aka Online Māori Dictionary. <http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/>

- Murton, B. (2012). Being in the place world: toward a Māori “geographical self”. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 29(1), 87-104.
- New Zealand Association for Research in Education. (2010). NZARE Ethical Guidelines 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.nzare.org.nz/>
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority. (2016). *Understanding NCEA*: New Zealand Qualifications Authority.
- Nicol, R. (2002). Outdoor education: Research topic or universal value? Part Two. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 2(2), 85-99.
- Orr, D. (1994). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Paterson, R. (2014). *Complaint About The Decision Of A Board Of Trustees To Compulsorily Charge For Curriculum-Related Items*. (329013). NZ: Office of the Ombudsman.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Penetito, W. (2010). *Whats Maori about Maori education?* Wellington: NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Penetito, W. (2015). Chosing to be both provincial and cosmopolitan: Straddling two worlds. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: exploring new horizons* (pp. 36-51). Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.
- Penney, D., Brooker, R., Hay, P., & Gillespie, L. (2009). Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment: three message systems of schooling and dimensions of quality physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 14(4), 421-442.
- Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M., & Lee, J. (2004). A literature review on kaupapa Maori and Maori education pedagogy. *Prepared for ITP New Zealand by The International Research Institute for Maori and Indigenous Education (IRI)*.
- Polley, S., & Pickett, B. (2003). The nature and scope of outdoor education in South Australia : a summary of key findings. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(2), 11-18.
- Potter, T., & Dymont, J. (2016). Is outdoor education a discipline? Insights, gaps and future directions. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 16(2), 146-159.
- Priest, S. (1990). The semantics of adventure education.
- Priest, S., & Gass, M. (1997). *Effective leadership in adventure programming* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Priest, S., Gass, M., & Gillis, L. (2000). *The essential elements of facilitation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Ritchie, J. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*: Huia Publishers.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data* (Vol. 3rd). Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE.
- Scherff, L., & Spector, K. (2010). *Culturally relevant pedagogy: Clashes and confrontations*. Plymouth: Rowan & Littlefield Education.
- Sheard, M., & Golby, J. (2006). The Efficacy of an Outdoor Adventure Education Curriculum on Selected Aspects of Positive Psychological Development. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(2), 187-209.

- Smith, G. (2002). Place-Based Education: Learning to Be Where We Are. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(8), 584-594.
- Smith, G. (2007). Place-based education: breaking through the constraining regularities of public school. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(2), 189-207.
- Stothart, B. (2012). A Chronology of Outdoor Education In New Zealand 1840 to 2011. *New Zealand Physical Educator*, 45(1), 7-12.
- Straker, J. (2014). *Meanings of 'the outdoors': Shaping outdoor education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. University of Waikato.
- Sutherland, S., & Stroot, S. (2010). The impact of participation in an inclusive adventure education trip on group dynamics. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(1), 153-176.
- Tan, Y., & Atencio, M. (2016). Unpacking a place-based approach – “What lies beyond?” Insights drawn from teachers' perceptions of Outdoor Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 25-34.
- Taylor, C. (2014). *Place responsive education: student perspectives*. (Master of Sport and Leisure Studies), University of Waikato.
- Thomas, G. (2005). Traditional adventure activities in outdoor environmental education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 9(1), 31-39.
- Tooth, R., & Renshaw, P. (2009). Reflections on Pedagogy and Place: A Journey into Learning for Sustainability through Environmental Narrative and Deep Attentive Reflection. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 25, 95-104.
- Townsend, J. (2011). Challenges and opportunities in implementing a place-based outdoor education course in a New Zealand Secondary School. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, 2(5), 66-80.
- Townsend, J. (2014). *Ko au te whenua, te whenua ko au – I am the land, the land is me*. University of Waikato, University of Waikato. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10289/9005>
- Vygotsky, L. (1976). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. In J. Bruner, A. Jolly, & K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its role in development and evolution*: New York: Penguin.
- Wattchow, B. (2007). Playing with an unstoppable force : paddling, river-places and outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(1), 10-20.
- Wattchow, B. (2008). Moving on an effortless journey : paddling, river-places and outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 12(2), 12-23.
- Wattchow, B., & Brown, M. (2011). *A pedagogy of place: outdoor education for a changing world*. Vic, Australia: Monash University Publishing.
- Worksafe New Zealand. (2013). TOPEC sentenced for Paritutu rock deaths. Retrieved from <http://www.business.govt.nz/>
- Wylie, C., & Bonne, L. (2016). *Secondary schools in 2015: Findings from the NZCER national survey*. Retrieved from Wellington, NZ:
- Zink, R. (2003). Abseiling at 5, rafting at 10, what do we do with them when they are 15? Why pursuits might seem like an obvious choice for outdoor education. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education*, 1(2), 56-62.
- Zink, R., & Boyes, M. (2007). The nature and scope of outdoor education in New Zealand schools. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 10(1), 11-21.

Appendix A - Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form

Research project for a Master of Education

Researcher: Andrew Skipworth

/ / 2016

Dear,

You have received this letter because you have shown an interest in participating in a research project that I am conducting. The primary aim of the research is to learn more about place and culturally responsive outdoor education practices.

Your participation in the research will help to contribute to the field of outdoor education, and will help to guide schools in the future planning of effective outdoor education programs. Participation is entirely your choice, if you choose to withdraw from the research you may do so at any time. You may request your data be withdrawn up until the transcribing of the interview has begun. Please note that although all effort will be made to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed.

It is proposed that you will attend an interview lasting approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be in a semi-structured format. The interview will take place at your place of work, a mutually agreed venue, or through electronic means such as Skype. Following the interview, you will be supplied with a copy of the transcribed conversation. This allows you to confirm or clarify information obtained from the interview. The information gained from the interview will be kept confidential and pseudonyms will be used in reporting to protect your identity. The interview material will form the basis of my research thesis for a Master of Education. Ethics approval for this project has been granted from the University of Waikato Research Ethics Committee.

Once the research is complete, you will be sent a copy of the completed thesis (electronic format). Please read and sign the consent form on the following page and return it, along with your Principals consent, in the supplied envelope. Please feel free to contact me, or my research supervisor, if you require any further information or have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Skipworth

Research Supervisor
Dr. Mike Brown

Researcher
Andrew Skipworth

Research project for a Master of Education

Researcher: Andrew Skipworth

- I agree to be interviewed by Andrew Skipworth at an arranged time and place that is suitable.
- I understand that it is my free choice to participate, and I can withdraw at any time up until I have approved my interview transcript.
- I understand that the interview will be audio recorded but that the use of a pseudonym will protect my identity in any material gathered from this project.
- I understand that although all effort will be made to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed.
- I consent to the information obtained to be used as part of the requirements of the researcher's thesis and any subsequent publications and/or conference papers.

Name: _____

School: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B - Principal Information Sheet and Consent Form

Research project for a Master of Education

Researcher: Andrew Skipworth

/ / 2016

Dear

You have received this letter because _____ has agreed to consider participation in a research project. The primary aim of the research is to learn more about teachers' experiences related to place and/or culturally responsive outdoor education, and is being conducted as a requirement of a Master of Education at the University of Waikato.

Their participation in the research project will help to contribute to the field of outdoor education, and will help to guide schools in the future planning of effective outdoor education programs. Participation is entirely their choice, and they may withdraw at any time without question. Participants may request their data be withdrawn up until the transcribing of the interview has begun.

The use of a pseudonym will protect the participants of the research from being identified in any material. The College/School will not be named in the thesis or any subsequent publications. Please note, that although all effort will be made to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed. Ethics approval has been granted from the University of Waikato Research Ethics Committee.

If you are happy with this and give permission for me to interview _____, please sign the consent form on the next page and return it to _____. Thank you in advance for this and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me, or my research supervisor, Dr Mike Brown.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Skipworth

Research Supervisor

Dr. Mike Brown

Researcher

Andrew Skipworth

Principal Consent Form

Research project for a Master of Education

Researcher: Andrew Skipworth

- I give consent for _____ (staff member) to participate in the research project conducted by Andrew Skipworth as part of the requirement of a Master's thesis at the University of Waikato.
- I understand that all efforts will be made to protect the identity of the teacher and school within the research project and any resulting publications / conference papers
- I understand that although all effort will be made to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed.
- I understand that permission for the above staff member to participate in the research can be withdrawn at any time.

Name: _____

School: _____

Position: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix C – Interview Questions

Proposed Interview Objectives and Questions

<p><i>Preamble; focus of the research, why it is being conducted, findings will be anonymous etc.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To explore in detail teacher’s views about the relevance of place and/or culturally responsive practices in outdoor education
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Can you give me an overview of your involvement in outdoor education as a teacher? What is the current mind-set in your school around the purpose and value of outdoor education? What opportunities do students have in your school to participate in outdoor education as part of their curriculum subjects? Is your school involved in initiatives that aim to create culturally responsive learning environments? If so, how have these impacted on outdoor education delivery? What led you to focus more on place/or culturally responsive practices? Can you describe outdoor education units or programs of work in your school that you would classify as place/culturally responsive? <i>[Use these examples to frame next set of questions]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To gather insights from teachers on the opportunities provided by place and/or culturally responsive outdoor education in schools
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How are you involved in the delivery of ... <i>[units / programme of work]</i>? What are the benefits to students in participating in these? How well do you think <i>[units / programme of work]</i> aligns to outcomes in the New Zealand curriculum? How engaged are students in... <i>[units / programme of work]</i>? How do you go about assessing formal learning outcomes? Have you noticed any changes in formal assessment outcomes?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To gather insights from teachers on the challenges in achieving place and/or culturally responsive outdoor education in schools
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What challenges have you faced when implementing place and/or culturally responsive outdoor education? Why have faced these challenges? What support have you received in dealing with these challenges? In general, are there any other challenges you think teachers might face in implementing place and culturally responsive outdoor education in NZ schools? Why do you think they might face these? In your view, does the New Zealand curriculum support place and culturally responsive approaches to outdoor education?

- To gather teachers' **reflections** as to what the outcomes of place / culturally responsive outdoor education practices might mean for the future of outdoor education, and why these might be **important** for a **culturally diverse** population

1. How do you think the outcomes of place and/or culturally responsive outdoor education impact on students' overall education?
2. How might these outcomes meet the needs of students based on their ethnicity and culture?
3. How well do place and/or culturally responsive outcomes compliment your students' formal assessments e.g. NCEA?
4. What direction do you believe outdoor educators should take in schools? Why?