

# Australian outdoor (and) environmental education research: senses of 'place' in two constituencies

Noel Gough

La Trobe University, Australia

## Abstract

The Outdoor Council of Australia's renaming of *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education (AJOE)* as *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education (JOEE)* follows deliberations among Australian and international stakeholders in outdoor education about the future of publishing in the field and raises a question about the relationships of outdoor and environmental education that Andrew Brookes (1989) voiced more than a decade ago: is outdoor education *environmental education re-invented*, or *environmental education reconceived*? In crafting this essay my initial intention was to review the histories (and possible future trajectories) of changing relationships between outdoor and environmental education research in Australia by appraising manifestations of these relationships within two key (albeit overlapping) constituencies broadly represented by contributions to two Australian journals: *AJOE* and the *Australian Journal of Environmental Education (AJEE)*. Brookes (1989) argued that the distinctiveness of outdoor education as a form of environmental education is derived from its physical and conceptual isolation from schooling. In the course of examining evidence for his proposition in research literature drawn from these two constituencies, I encountered an allegation that a 'sense of place' seemed to be missing from Australian environmental education research. I dispute this allegation and argue that outdoor education's physical and conceptual isolation from schooling is precisely what enables the cultivation of a 'sense of place' in ways that distinguish it from other forms of environmental education. I conclude by reflecting on the implications of *AJOE*'s namechange for cultivating this distinctive approach.

## Introduction

In an editorial introducing the first issue of *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education (AJOE)* under its new name, *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education (JOEA)*, John Quay (2016, p. 1) notes that the 'change acknowledges engagement with the international community of academics and others for whom the discourses of outdoor and environmental education are central'. He adds:

Outdoor education, as theorised and practised in Australia, is well known for its concern with environmental issues. However, while it could be argued that Australians were amongst the earliest to press this point, the scope of this interest has never been Australian alone. The change in name signals this fact, but it doesn't mean a major change in direction for the journal. There is no hard line drawn between various expressions of outdoor education, which is a broad church. In all of its guises, the influence of the 'environment' in outdoor education is tangible, no matter how this term may be defined (nature, ecosystem, biosphere, wilderness, habitat, world, context, milieu, situation, location, etc.).

The deliberations about the future of publishing in outdoor education that led to the change of title, raise a question about the relationships of outdoor and environmental education clearly articulated by Andrew Brookes (1989) in *AJEE* more than a decade ago: is outdoor education ‘environmental education re-invented, or environmental education reconceived?’ Brookes (1989, p. 15) elaborates: ‘Outdoor education has been distinguished from physical education by its focus on environmental education... But is the environmental education which occurs in outdoor education distinguished by anything other than an association with adventure activities? After all, field trips are not a new idea’. I initially addressed Brookes’ question by reviewing histories of the changing relationships between outdoor and environmental education research in Australia and speculating on their possible future trajectories. I began by appraising selected manifestations of these relationships produced by contributors to two key journals: *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* and *Australian Journal of Environmental Education (AJEE)*. In 2014, *AJEE* celebrated 30 years of publication (see Cutter-Mackenzie, A. Gough, N. Gough, & Whitehouse, 2014). Although *AJOE* has a shorter history (1995-2016), they share a tendency towards an increasing emphasis on research as they have matured (see N. Gough, 2014; Thomas, Potter, & Allison, 2009). Brookes (1989, p. 15) argues that ‘the distinctiveness of outdoor education as a form of environmental education is derived from its physical and conceptual isolation from schooling’ and my starting point for examining his proposition was to appraise examples of research literature drawn from the two overlapping constituencies these journals represent, with particular reference to research that attends to the curricular, extra-curricular and school-isolated manifestations of outdoor and environmental education. I do not restrict my appraisal to research literature published only in these two journals, because many of the authors whose works appear in them have also published elsewhere.

### **Environmental education: indoors and/or outdoors?**

In the Foreword to a recent edited collection of essays on experiencing the outdoors, Pete Hay (2015, p. vii; italics, capitals and punctuation in original), writes:

#### *Outdoors. Not, Therefore, Indoors*

Here is one of the great binaries of lived experience, and it is a binary replete with portent. Step outside and you cross one of the great divides of daily existence...

Phenomenologically speaking – experientially – the contrast between the being of outdoors and the being of indoors could hardly be more pronounced... This being so, it is puzzling why the multi-faceted nature of the ‘outdoors’ should have been so little explicated in the literature extant.

Hay’s assertion reminds me that the multi-faceted nature of the *indoors* has been explicated exhaustively in the research literature on *classroom* environments, much of which has been led by my Australian colleague Barry Fraser (1998). Hay also reminds me that *outdoors* is a much less ambiguous term than *environment*, a point to which Quay (2016, p. 1) also alludes when he writes: ‘In all of its guises, the influence of the “environment” in outdoor education is tangible, no matter how this term may be defined’. I doubt if anyone would disagree with this assertion, but I cannot say that the influence of the outdoors in environmental education has equivalent status. As N.Gough and A.Gough (2010, p. 340) observe, Arthur Lucas’s (1979) ‘model for environmental education as being education in, about, and for the environment...has become a mantra for the field’ and has indeed been a persistent focal point for deliberations and debates about how the field is, and should be, conceptualised. For

example, in the first issue of *AJEE*, Ian Robottom (1984, p. 11; italics in original) quotes the coordinator of the Australian Curriculum Development Centre's Environmental Education Project as endorsing the view that 'the essence of environmental education lies in its education *for* the environment dimension':

We can talk about education *in* the environment, education *about* the environment, education *from* the environment and education *for* the environment, but only the last can be called environmental education (Annette Greenall, 1981, p. 4; italics in original).

In the same issue, John Henry (1984, p. 14; italics in original) seeks to identify the 'presuppositions about teaching and curriculum [that] are embedded in the developed conception of environmental education as education *for* the environment'. However, also in the same issue, Max Walsh (1984, p. 14) pointedly disagrees with Greenall's (and, by implication, Robottom's and Henry's) positions:

Such statements give little encouragement to the teacher who is genuinely concerned about the deteriorating world environmental situation and is striving to do his/her own thing about it, albeit through an education about and in the environment approach. The implication is... that such approaches are inadequate, and insufficient recognition is given to the possibility that education for the environment may need to be preceded by an education about the environment component.

Walsh's comments indicate that a number of environmental educators are likely to agree that environmental education might at least partly (and perhaps quite substantially) be constituted by an emphasis on education *about* and *for* the environment without venturing out of the classroom (or laboratory) very often. However, I am confident that most outdoor educators would agree with Brookes' (1989, p. 15) position that outdoor education is distinguished from other educational pursuits, including environmental education, by 'its physical and conceptual isolation from schooling. Conceptual isolation provides the opportunity to construct powerfully affective forms of de-schooled environmental education'. Brookes (1989, p. 15) reasons that 'conceptual isolation can provide different situational constraints from those existing in schools or other institutions', but also warns that 'a technocratic rationalisation of the field associated with its increasing institutionalisation threatens to negate that potential'. Quay (1984, p. 22) takes advantage of this physical and conceptual isolation in recent research that seeks 'to better understand life in school as experienced by the young people who live it'. He probes beyond what Philip Jackson (2015, p. 1) calls 'the ubiquity of classroom phenomena in both time and space' by juxtaposing young people's experiences of life in academic classrooms with their experiences in outdoor education, specifically their participation in an eight-day school camp. Quay (2015, pp. 1-2) writes:

Life in school is ordinary, so ordinary in fact that students (and teachers) become oblivious to much of the routine. The subtitle I have given this book – *From academic classroom to outdoor education* – points to a juxtaposition aimed at addressing this difficulty. To raise this ordinariness to awareness, one must see it against a somewhat contrasting background. For much of academic life in school, outdoor education offers such a background, and vice versa, academic classroom life offers a contrast to life in outdoor education, enabling nuances to be perceived.

This is not the place to discuss Quay's research in further detail, other than to affirm that it supports Jackson's comments about the ubiquity of *classroom* phenomena, and confirms the

merits of a comparative research design, but I am a little surprised by his endorsement of another generalisation: ‘there is some truth to the notion to that “school is school, no matter where it happens” (Jackson, 1990, p. xxi)’ (Quay, 2015, p, 1). I interpret Quay’s research as providing further evidence that *academic classrooms are academic classrooms*, no matter where they are, but I doubt that any outdoor educator would suggest that *a school camp is a school camp, no matter where it is located*. To some extent, I am stating the obvious, but the significance of *place* (or rather, of *particular places*) has not always been taken for granted in the research literatures of outdoor and environmental education. For example, Thomas, Potter, and Allison’s (2009) comparative study of papers published in *AJOE*, the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning (JAEOL)* and the *Journal of Experiential Education (JExpEd)* between 1998 and 2007 does not code papers by reference to categories that readily indicate the extent to which they foreground the specificities of place, a point to which I return in a later section of this essay.

## **Senses of place in Australian outdoor and environmental education**

In a recent overview of Australian environmental education research, Robert Stevenson (2011) examines the question of whether a sense of place, or attachment to the Australian biophysical or cultural landscape, has shaped Australian environmental education research in distinctive ways. Stevenson analyses articles by Australian authors published in *AJEE* in the period 1990-2000, a period that, as he reminds us, precedes the relatively recent (re)emergence of attention to place-based education in wider academic discourses (see, for example, Gruenewald, 2003a, 2003b; Gruenewald & Smith, 2008; Somerville, 2010; Somerville, Power & de Carteret, 2009). Stevenson (2011, pp. 46-7) begins by problematising any expectation of place-based distinctiveness:

The fact that there are many unique features of Australian landscapes, including its fauna and flora, obviously does not necessarily mean that its citizens in general or its environmental education researchers in particular have a unique perspective on or relationship with those landscapes or researching that relationship.

Stevenson (2011, p. 47) cites Richard Stedman’s (2003) argument for ‘the significance of the attributes of landscape which are associated with characteristic experiences, with meanings in turn being constructed from these experiences’, which he sees as resonating with many Australian environmental educators, including himself, ‘who were motivated to enter the field by a concern for the loss of places to which they feel a strong sense of attachment and belonging’. Noting also that many environmental educators advocate connecting student learning to the local and the personal, Stevenson (2011, p. 47) asks:

Do Australian environmental education scholars in general similarly connect their research and writing to the local and the personal? This issue of personal connections and identity with or sense of place in the Australian environment suggests one approach to exploring the question of the distinctiveness of Australian environmental education research.

Noting that the concept of place can be found in numerous disciplines – architecture, philosophy, literary theory, environmental science, environmental psychology, health, geography, history, human ecology, cultural studies and education – Stevenson reviews a selection from the extensive literature on place and place identity, with particular reference to studies in environmental psychology literature that seem to offer some potential for explaining how a sense of place might be manifested in an individual’s environmental work

and identity. Following this overview, Stevenson (2011, pp. 48-9) formulates the following questions that he explores in his paper:

Is there a sense of place or connection to the Australian cultural or biophysical environments or landscapes evident in Australian environmental education research?  
...To what extent do Australian environmental education scholars see themselves as an integral part of their Australian environment? If so, what aspects or dimensions of the local and place are important influences on Australian environmental education scholars?

Stevenson identifies 67 articles written by Australian or Australian-based authors published in *AJEE* during the 11-year period from 1990-2000. Forty-four articles (approximately two-thirds) involved a specifically Australian context. Stevenson then analyses the 44 articles addressing or set in an Australian context to determine if they address a unique characteristic of the Australian biophysical or cultural environment. I quote the results of his analysis in full below (omitting citation details for the articles that meet his criteria):

Nine were concerned with a cultural aspect of the Australian landscape (e.g., indigenous perspectives or cultural/historical heritage) and just two focused on education in relation to a unique biophysical feature of Australia's landscape, fauna or flora. The final and most important analysis for [my] purpose... focused on whether or not people's sense of place or the relationship between Australians and their environment was addressed in any way. The principle guiding this last analysis of the stories told in *AJEE* was actually articulated in an article published during this period and that was one of seven principles of school-level curriculum identified by John Fien (1991): 'developing a sense of place and identity in the Australian environment'. Only four articles captured this principle and explicitly addressed sense of place or identity... In a fifth article, the author refers to place commitment as outcome in arguing that 'the process of enabling people to extend their knowledge of natural systems and processes can also enhance their relationships with and commitment to these places'. However, this was an isolated reference to sense of place and therefore not included in this group of articles (Stevenson, 2011, p. 49).

These results lead Stevenson (2011, p. 50) to ask: 'Where's place [in Australian environmental education research]? Missing or displaced?' He acknowledges that his findings 'initially seemed surprising and generated a search for explanations of why a sense of place generally seemed to be missing from Australian environmental education research, at least as reflected in this 11 year snapshot of this research'. He then asks:

What does the lack of attention to sense of place in environmental education research suggest? Are the concerns of Australian environmental education researchers displaced from the Australian environment? Is this merely a reflection of other research priorities in environmental education (or what is considered important in environmental education research)?

Stevenson (2011, p. 50) offers one explanation, namely, 'that in the decade of the 1990s sense of place was not commonly connected or associated with environmental education and research on sense of place was published elsewhere in other fields, such as in environmental psychology, human geography, and architecture and planning. Attention to the idea and value of place based education and pedagogy has only (re)emerged in recent years'. He adds that 'if this was the case, it still suggests that place attachments or identities in relation to the

Australian landscape were not treated as central to their work by environmental education scholars in this country - at least prior to place-based education becoming a popular topic'.

I offer another explanation, based partly on recognising that Australian environmental education research is not coterminous with research published in *AJEE* during the decade of the 1990s. When Brookes (1989) raised the question of the relationships of outdoor and environmental education in *AJEE*, there were few opportunities for publishing outdoor education research elsewhere: *AJOE* did not begin to publish refereed research papers until 1998, and I suspect that it took some time for it to become accepted as an equivalent to established international journals, which by that time included not only the long established *Journal of Environmental Education (JEE)* and *Journal of Experiential Education (JExpEd)*, but also the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning (JAEOL)*, the *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, *Environmental Education Research (EER)* and the *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education (SAJEE)*. Brookes' (1989) approach to reconceptualising the relationships between outdoor and environmental education is predicated in large part on recognising and understanding the differences in situational constraints between institutional environmental education and the possibilities offered by experiences of education in environments that are usually less altered by humans and typically for an extended period (such as the eight-day school camp on which Quay, 2015, focuses). It is unfortunate that Brookes' (1989) contribution to *AJEE* precedes the period that Stevenson (2011) samples in his search for a sense of place in Australian environmental education research (as reported in *AJEE*), because Brookes makes a very clear and compelling case for the necessity of outdoor educators thoroughly understanding the *particular* qualities of *specific* places as a requisite for developing a unique form of environmental education. Indeed, Brookes (1989, p. 16) insists that understanding situational constraints is key to its legitimisation: 'outdoor education is by no means intrinsically defensible as a form of environmental education. The possibilities it offers have to be recognised and deliberately nurtured'. Brookes (2006, p. viii) subsequently fleshes out these possibilities in doctoral research that he describes as 'a study of outdoor education, in the deliberative tradition of curriculum inquiry. It examines the intentional generation and distribution of knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes through organised outdoor activities, both as a research interest, and as a critical perspective on outdoor education discourse'. His research encompasses eight separate but interrelated research projects, initially published in 11 refereed journal articles, which develop and defend his thesis statement:

The problem of determining what, if any, forms of outdoor experience should be educational priorities, and how those experiences should be distributed in communities and geographically – that is who goes where and does what – is inherently situational. The persistence of a universalist outdoor education discourse that fails to acknowledge or adequately account for social and geographic circumstances points to serious flaws in outdoor education research and theory, and impedes the development of more defensible outdoor education practices.

Brookes (2000, 2002a, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e, 2004) elaborates on this thesis in contributions to journals that represent work undertaken by members of both of the constituencies on which this essay focuses and has also been assiduous in advocating this position in other relevant constituencies, including physical education (Brookes, 1994), tourism recreation research (Brookes, 2001) and curriculum studies writ large (Brookes, 2002b). Of course, these works also fall outside of the sample of publications that Stevenson

(2011, p. 50) analyses in his search for an answer to the question: ‘Where’s place [in Australian environmental education research]?’ The existence of these works alone suggest that Stevenson could not have concluded that ‘a sense of place generally seemed to be missing from Australian environmental education research’ if he had looked outside the decade of the 1990s and at Australian environmental education research published in journals other than *AJEE*. It is also important to note than Brookes is not the only Australian researcher demonstrating and documenting the qualities and merits of developing placeresponsive outdoor environmental education, with particularly notable examples including the work of Alistair Stewart (2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2006, 2008, 2011; see also Stewart & Müller, 2009), Marcus Morse (2014, 2015) and Brian Wattchow (2007, 2008, 2015) .

As previously noted, Thomas, Potter and Allison’s (2009) comparative analysis of the refereed articles published in *AJEE*, *JAEO* and *JExpEd* between 1998 and 2007 does not code papers by reference to categories that readily indicate the extent to which they foreground the specificities of place. They code what they call the ‘primary and secondary foci’ of each article using the following categories:

- Safety management
- Risk management
- Curriculum issues
- Teaching and teacher issues
- Theoretical foundations
- Gender, race, social justice issues
- Special needs
- Adventure
- Program design/facilitation
- Profession/professional issues
- Outcomes/effects/participant experiences
- Environmental/ecological/spiritual/sustainability
- Relationships with nature/self/others
- Research processes (Thomas, Potter & Allison, 2009, p. 19)

I am a little puzzled that articles with titles such as ‘Reinvigorating our love of our home range: exploring the connections between sense of place and outdoor education’ (Stewart, 2003) , ‘Decolonising encounters with the Murray River: building place responsive outdoor education’ (Stewart, 2004b), ‘Playing with an unstoppable force: paddling, river-places and outdoor education’ (Wattchow, 2007), and ‘Moving on an effortless journey: paddling, riverplaces and outdoor education’ (Wattchow, 2008), all of which were published in *AJOE*, did not signal the need for a code that indicated their foci on particular places. I presume they were coded in the more generic categories of environmental/ecological/ spiritual/sustainability or, perhaps, relationships with nature/self/others.

I can readily understand that an article such as Brookes’ (2007a) ‘Preventing death and serious injury from falling trees and branches’ is most likely to have been coded primarily as safety management, as would the three articles on outdoor education fatalities that constituted part of his doctoral research (Brookes, 2003a, 2003d, 2003e) and their subsequent updates (Brookes, 2007b, 2011). But I would be more inclined to code it, together with Stewart’s and Wattchow’s papers, as ‘place-based’ or ‘place-responsive’, if such a category had been available. This is because Brookes also insists that his research on fatalities supports his

rejection of universalist outdoor education discourse and his advocacy for situationist approaches that acknowledge and adequately account for the particular social and geographic circumstances in which any given outdoor education activity occurs. Thus, one of the conclusions to his article on preventing death and serious injury from falling trees and branches is:

Although I have described a ‘protocol’ for assessing trees, this should be taken as a guide for expertise that must be gained experientially – that is by practising – and that should be considered as local knowledge more than expertise in a generic procedure. Although assessment of campsites (and resting places) is crucial, as is awareness of severe weather conditions, I contend that safety around trees, like vigilance for loose rock or the possibility of snake-bite, is more a matter of constant awareness than a procedural or technical matter (Brookes, 2007a, p. 58).

In discussing the then contemporary moves to formalise outdoor education as a legitimate part of the curriculum rather than a peripheral or extra-curricular activity, Brookes (1989, p. 16) notes that, ‘as outdoor education has become institutionalised its advocates have distanced it from physical education by emphasising its environmental content’. This was particularly noticeable in the deliberations that led to the senior secondary subject *Outdoor Education*, introduced in the Victorian Certificate of Education in 1982, being replaced by *Outdoor and Environmental Studies* in 2006 (for more comprehensive accounts of this transformation see A. Gough, 2004, 2007). Brookes (1989, p. 16) draws attention to the similarities between Lucas’s (1979) ‘model for environmental education as being education in, about, and for the environment’ (as quoted above) and the definition of outdoor education used in Bendigo College of Advanced Education’s B.A. (Outdoor Education) program as ‘in the outdoors, about the outdoors, and for the use, understanding and appreciation of the outdoors’ and notes that the Victorian Office of School Administration’s *Curriculum Frameworks* document (1988) also describes the environmental education component of outdoor education using an environmental education curriculum model. Brookes cautions that both the College’s definition and the Ministry’s description could be applied to many environmental education courses:

Outdoor education involves field trips, but that is a part of good environmental education in many situations. What, then, distinguishes outdoor education from other forms of environmental education? Not much, it seems. At least, not when a cleaned and tidied outdoor education is brought inside for inspection in the normative light of curriculum specifications. But that is not how outdoor education ought to be viewed. Outdoor education has arisen, not from a curriculum specification, but from a persistent practice. Outdoor education involves taking groups of children out of the school to a new environment... Stevenson (and others) have argued that environmental education demands ‘a new definition of the role of the teacher and demands changes in the organisational conditions under which teachers generally work’ (Robert B. Stevenson, 1987, p. 79). The separation of outdoor education from schools and schooling allows those demands to be met (Brookes 1989, p. 16).

Brookes (1989, pp. 20-21) offers a number of ‘signposts’ to outdoor education as a reconceived form of environmental education. These include:

- *The role of adventure* (‘real-life adventure motivates in a way which is rarely, or never, attained in the classroom’)

- *The role of group learning* (working with ‘small groups in isolated settings... the teacher can foster the development of a group ethic of awareness and concern about the natural environment’)
- *The holistic nature of outdoor education* (‘in everyday life students are separated in space and time from the environmental consequences of their lifestyles. Outdoor education can make obvious the connections between human needs and wants, local environmental impacts, and long term changes to the environment’)
- *Engagement and ownership* (‘investing time and effort into travelling to wild places seems to give travellers a sense of ownership and a disposition to care about natural areas. This effect is enhanced when students feel they have been given sufficient free choice in the way the activity is conducted’)
- *Identification and competence* (‘Natural environments can appear hostile and threatening until students are competent to live safely and comfortably in the outdoors. Teachers need to be aware of the hidden messages they transmit when teaching outdoor living skills; hostility towards nature (the conquering ethic), or feeling comfortable with nature’)
- *The impact of natural scenery* (‘The effectiveness of a trip can be enhanced by the careful choice of campsites, routes, and resting places’)
- *Understanding learning* (‘Different ways of learning and ways of knowing are legitimised and reinforced by open discussion. The problematic nature of knowledge and the learning process should be shared with students’)
- *Content* (‘Teaching detailed understanding of ecosystems or environmental problems is the province of schooling. Teaching about the environment in outdoor education seems best to be guided by a sense of the power of outdoor experiences to change perspectives; outdoor education can give students a sense of place, of time, of relationships in nature, and of changes brought about by humans. These are things which can be learned in school or College, but through outdoor education students learn to care; knowledge about the environment becomes personal knowledge rather than school knowledge’)
- *Time*. (‘The impact of outdoor education seems to be more profound on longer trips. This is not equivalent to giving longer lectures, but has more to do with allowing time for students to tune out of College and tune in to the natural environment. The teacher is free to wait for the “teachable moment” before intervening in the learning process. Sufficient time needs to be allowed for students to progress from concerns about personal safety and acceptance by the group to concern for life on earth’)
- *Affective education and the role of the teacher*. (‘Institutionalised education can give students the impression that environmental problems are none of their business because they are not experts. Outdoor education aims to demonstrate that environmental literacy is accessible to everyone, and that environmental problems are everyone's business. The role of the teacher is part of that message...in contrast with the impersonal, formal, and distant approach often adopted, the shared living of extended outdoor education experience almost inevitably breaks down the academic pretensions which are a barrier to affective learning’)

Brookes (1989, pp. 21-22) concludes that ‘outdoor education provides an opportunity to change our perceptions of environmental education. It is not contingent on the prior achievement of educational reform; on the contrary, it can allow the development through practice of the powerful ideas which such reform requires’. However, he adds, the ‘uncritical institutionalisation of outdoor education threatens that potential’, signs of which he sees in the teaching of cross-country skiing, which is increasingly dominated by technical accreditation

standards and uncritically assisted by National Parks and Education authorities. Accreditation standards for ski teachers are based on models of education centred on training and instruction, concerned almost exclusively with skiing skills, group management, and safety.

Increasing numbers of schools are contracting their cross-country skiing to commercial operators offering discount 'outdoor education'. There is little evidence that such operators employ staff on the basis of their critical approach to environmental education. Their low cost is based on paying staff far less than teaching rates... the purchase by schools of packaged educational solutions implies a technical view of outdoor education (Brookes, 1989, p. 22).

## **Conclusion: what's in a journal title?**

I began this essay by reference to the rebranding of *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* (AJOE) as *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education* (JOEE), and I return to it here, because I fear that although something has been gained by adding 'environmental education', something has been lost by deleting 'Australian' as a marker of place-consciousness (having a national title in a journal has never discouraged international contributors or readers, as is evident from the constituencies that contribute to *AJEE*, *CJEE* and *SAJEE*). Perhaps paradoxically, something might also have been lost by adding that little word 'and'. If, as Quay (2016) asserts in his editorial, the change of name 'doesn't mean a major change in direction for the journal', I hope that contributors to *JOEE* will ignore 'and', and interpret it as a journal of *outdoor environmental education*, that is, as a site hospitable to publishing a distinctive mode of environmental education scholarship, as characterised by Hay's (2015), cryptic assertion (quoted above): 'Outdoors. Not, therefore, indoors'. All of the scholarly journals cited in this essay are themselves examples of the institutionalisation of outdoor and/or environmental education and we must therefore be vigilant in avoiding what Brookes (1989, p. 22) calls 'uncritical institutionalisation'. I agree with both the positive and negative implications of Brookes' (1989, p. 22) conclusion:

Outdoor education can be used to provide uniquely affective and effective forms of environmental education. However, unless [outdoor educators] develop a critical understanding of the ways in which conceptions of learning can be and must be reformulated in this relatively unconstrained learning environment, outdoor education will be at best an unnecessary duplication of existing environmental education, at worst another exploitative use of dwindling natural areas.

## **References**

(NB. In regard to the use of full names in this reference list, I depart from the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* to facilitate reading the gender politics of my sources. I also believe that it is discourteous to authors to arbitrarily truncate the ways in which they prefer to identify themselves.)

- Brookes, Andrew. (1989). Outdoor education: environmental education re- invented, or environmental education reconceived? *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 5, 15-23.
- Brookes, Andrew. (1994). Reading between the Lines—outdoor experience as environmental text. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 65(8), 28-39.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2000). Nature-based tourism as education for sustainability: possibilities, limitations, contradictions. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 15/16, 25-32.

- Brookes, Andrew. (2001). Doing the Franklin. Wilderness tourism and the construction of nature. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 26(1), 11-18.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2002a). Gilbert White never came this far South. Naturalist knowledge and the limits of universalist environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 7(2), 73-87.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2002b). Lost in the Australian bush: outdoor education as curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34(4), 405-425.
- Brookes, Andrew. (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, Andrew. (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, Andrew. (2003c). Outdoor education fatalities in Australia 1960-2002. Part 1. Summary of incidents and introduction to fatality analysis. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(1), 20-35.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2003d). Outdoor education fatalities in Australia 1960-2002. Part 2. Contributing circumstances: supervision, first aid, and rescue. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(2), 34-42.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2003e). Outdoor education fatalities in Australia 1960-2002. Part 3. Environmental circumstances. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(1), 44-56.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2004). Astride a long-dead horse. Mainstream outdoor education theory and the central curriculum problem. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(2), 122-133.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2006). *Situationist outdoor education in the country of lost children*. (PhD thesis), Deakin University, Melbourne. Retrieved from <http://www.deakin.edu.au/dro/view/DU:30023275>
- Brookes, Andrew. (2007a). Preventing death and serious injury from falling trees and branches. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(2), 50-59.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2007b). Research update: Outdoor education fatalities in Australia. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(1), 3-9.
- Brookes, Andrew. (2011). Research update 2010. Outdoor education fatalities in Australia. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 15(1), 37-57.
- Cutter-Mackenzie, Amy, Gough, Annette, Gough, Noel, & Whitehouse, Hilary. (2014). Opening to the Australian Journal of Environmental Education Special 30-Year Anniversary Issue. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 30(Special Issue 01), v-vi.
- Fien, John. (1991). Toward a school-level curriculum inquiry in environmental education. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 7, 17-29.
- Fraser, Barry J. (1998). Science learning environments: assessment, effects and determinants. In Barry J Fraser & Kenneth J Tobin (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Science Education* (pp. 527-564). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Gough, Annette. (2004). *Making outdoor education more academic: a case from the Victorian Certificate of Education (or is it scenes from Ned and Stacey?)*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Outdoor Education Research Conference: *Connections and Disconnections: Examining the reality and rhetoric*. *International perspectives on outdoor education theory and practice*, La Trobe University, Bendigo, 6-9 July. [http://www.latrobe.edu.au/education/downloads/2004\\_conference\\_gough.pdf](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/education/downloads/2004_conference_gough.pdf)
- Gough, Annette. (2007). Outdoor and Environmental Studies: more challenges to its place in the curriculum. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(2), 19-28.

- Gough, Noel. (2014). Research methodologies represented (or not) in the *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 30(1), 30.
- Gough, Noel, & Gough, Annette. (2010). Environmental education. In Craig Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 339-343). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Greenall, Annette. (1981). An introduction to environmental education. In Curriculum Development Centre; Environmental Education Project (Ed.), *Environmental Education: A Sourcebook for Secondary Education* (pp. 4-7). Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Gruenewald, David A. (2003a). The best of both worlds: a critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, 32(4), 3-12.
- Gruenewald, David A. (2003b). Foundations of place: a multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 619-654.
- Gruenewald, David A., & Smith, Gregory A. (Eds.). (2008). *Place-Based Education in the Global Age: Local Diversity*. New York & London: Psychology Press.
- Hay, Pete. (2015). Foreword: Outdoors. Not, therefore, indoors. In Margaret Robertson, Ruth Lawrence & Greg Heath (Eds.), *Experiencing the Outdoors: Enhancing Strategies for Wellbeing* (pp. vii-ix). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Henry, John. (1984). Towards education for the environment. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 1(1), 14-15.
- Jackson, Philip W. (1990). Introduction *Life in Classrooms* (reissued with a new introduction ed., pp. iix-xx). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lucas, Arthur M. (1979). *Environment and Environmental Education: Conceptual Issues and Curriculum Implications*. Melbourne: Australian International Press and Publications.
- Morse, Marcus. (2014). A quality of interrelating: describing a form of meaningful experience on a wilderness river journey. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 14(1), 42-55.
- Morse, Marcus. (2015). Being alive to the present: perceiving meaning on a wilderness river journey. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 15(2), 168-180.
- Office of School Administration Victoria. (1988). *The Personal Development Framework, P10: Deciding and Acting in Everyday Life*. Melbourne: Office of Schools Administration, Ministry of Education.
- Quay, John. (2015). *Understanding Life in School: From Academic Classroom to Outdoor Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Quay, John. (2016). Editorial. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, 19(1), 1.
- Robottom, Ian. (1984). Why not education for the environment? *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 1(1), 11-13.
- Somerville, Margaret J. (2010). A place pedagogy for 'global contemporaneity'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(3), 326-344.
- Somerville, Margaret, Power, Kerith, & de Carteret, Phoenix (Eds.). (2009). *Landscapes and Learning: Place Studies for a Global World*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Stedman, Richard C. (2003). Is it really just a social construction? The contribution of the physical environment to sense of place. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(8), 671-685.
- Stevenson, Robert B. (1987). Schooling and environmental education: contradictions in purpose and practice. In Ian Robottom (Ed.), *Environmental Education: Practice and Possibility* (pp. 69-82). Geelong: Deakin University.
- Stevenson, Robert B. (2011). Sense of place in Australian environmental education research: distinctive, missing or displaced? *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 27(01), 46-55.

- Stewart, Alistair. (2003). Reinvigorating our love of our home range: exploring the connections between sense of place and outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(2), 17-24.
- Stewart, Alistair. (2004a). Canoeing the Murray River (Australia) as environmental education: a tale of two rivers. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 9, 136-147.
- Stewart, Alistair. (2004b). Decolonising encounters with the Murray River: building place responsive outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(2), 46-55.
- Stewart, Alistair. (2006). Seeing the trees and the forest: attending to Australian natural history as if it mattered. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 22(2), 85-97.
- Stewart, Alistair. (2008). Whose place, whose history? Outdoor environmental education pedagogy as 'reading' the landscape. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 8(2), 79-98.
- Stewart, Alistair. (2011). Becoming-Speckled Warbler: re/creating Australian natural history pedagogy. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 27(1), 68-80.
- Stewart, Alistair, & Müller, Gregg. (2009). Toward a pedagogy for Australian natural history: learning to read and learning content. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 25(1), 105-115.
- Thomas, Glyn, Potter, Tom G., & Allison, Pete. (2009). A tale of three journals : a study of papers published in AJOE, JAEOL and JEE between 1998 and 2007. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 13(1), 16-29.
- Walsh, Max. (1984). Environmental education: a decade of failure but some hope for the future. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 1(1), 21-24.
- Wattchow, Brian. (2007). Playing with an unstoppable force: paddling, river-places and outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 11(1), 10-20.
- Wattchow, Brian. (2008). Moving on an effortless journey: paddling, river-places and outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 12(2), 12-23.
- Wattchow, Brian. (2015). Standing then floating: searching for a sense of sea-place on the south coast of Australia. In Mike Brown & Barbara Humberstone (Eds.), *Seascapes: Sensual Geographies of the Sea* (pp. 125-139). London: Ashgate.

## Author

**Noel Gough** is adjunct professor in the School of Education at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, following his retirement from the position of Foundation Professor of Outdoor and Environmental Education (2006-14). He previously held senior appointments at the University of Canberra and Deakin University and has been a visiting professor at universities in Canada, China, the United Kingdom and South Africa. His research interests include curriculum inquiry and research methodology, with particular reference to environmental and science education. In 1997 he received the inaugural Australian Museum Eureka Prize for environmental education research, and is founding editor of *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*. He is a past president (2008) of the Australian Association for Research in Education. Email: [n.gough@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:n.gough@latrobe.edu.au)