



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### **Are we ready to go outdoors now? The prospects for outdoor education during a period of curriculum renewal in Scotland**

**Citation for published version:**

Thorburn, M & Allison, P 2010, 'Are we ready to go outdoors now? The prospects for outdoor education during a period of curriculum renewal in Scotland', *The Curriculum Journal*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170903560824>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1080/09585170903560824](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170903560824)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

The Curriculum Journal

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in the Curriculum Journal, 2010. Copyright Taylor & Francis, available online at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09585170903560824>  
Thorburn, M., & Allison, P. (2010). Are we ready to go outdoors now? The prospects for outdoor education during a period of curriculum renewal in Scotland. Curriculum Journal, 21(1), 97-108

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Are we ready to go outdoors now?  
The prospects for outdoor education  
during a period of curriculum renewal in Scotland.**

**Abstract**

New devolutionary powers for education have been enthusiastically seized on by politicians and policy makers alike to promote a more integrated and holistic form of education in Scotland. This period of curriculum renewal offers the prospect of increased levels of outdoor education however to date there is a lack of a clearly agreed rationale for learning and clarity about how curriculum will be experienced by students. Consequently, we analyse pertinent conceptual questions about the matters through reviewing articles and policy announcements prior to advancing, in preliminary fashion, a rationale for outdoor education which conceives of outdoor learning primarily as a moral endeavour. In developing the proposed rationale as the organising framework for learning, the paper critically considers the multifarious challenges of connecting policy intentions with the authentic learning experiences of students. In so doing the paper discusses many of the most apparent curriculum and pedagogical barriers to learning, which have led in recent years to fragmented provision and the under-realization of increased levels of deeply embedded and connected outdoor learning experiences.

**Keywords:** outdoor education; policy; curriculum; learning; pedagogy.

## **Introduction**

Currently, education in Scotland is in the process of major change. One of the outcomes of the National Debate on Education in 2002 was a commitment to completely review existing curriculum. This review culminated in the publication of a 'Curriculum for Excellence' (CfE) (Scottish Executive, 2004) which sets out the values, purposes and principles for education through the creation of a single, coherent curriculum from ages 3 to 18 with space for young people to achieve and teachers to teach. Four overarching capacities define how young people are intended to develop through becoming: successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors to society and responsible citizens. These policy aspirations have been enthusiastically endorsed by the new Scottish legislature. The Minister for Education and Young People identified CfE as having 'profound implications for what is learnt, how it is taught and what is assessed' (Scottish Executive, 2004, p. 3). Notably for advocates of outdoor education, these include commitments to 'greater cross-subject activity [and] more space for sport, music, dance, drama, art, learning about health, sustainable development and enterprise, and other activities that broaden the life experiences-and life chances-of young people' (Scottish Executive, 2004, p. 4). In a curriculum dominated by 'indoor' learning there is a policy opportunity for increased learning to occur in outdoor environments as increased political interest and investment in education has been matched by returning autonomy and curriculum decision-making to teachers to exercise their professional judgement in trying to realise the generically framed CfE aims.

In progressing towards a more rounded understanding of the Scottish context it is worthwhile registering that no major structural changes are planned with school education continuing to be dominated by two large sectors; primary schooling for pupils between 5-12 years and secondary schooling, which lasts for all students until 16 years old, with three-fifths of students currently opting to stay in secondary schools until 18 years old (Scottish Government, 2008). Over

95% of primary and secondary schools are in the public sector and governed by thirty-two locally elected unitary authorities. Such a steady and continuous model of schooling is very much ‘the Scottish way’ (McCrone, 2003, p. 248) as it promotes a vision where every school aims for excellence.

Nevertheless CfE policy making has recognised the limited ways in which cross curriculum initiatives have permeated curriculum in recent years. Consequently, the current period is one where there has often been the retention of learning ‘in’ specific subjects rather than ‘through’ more integrated approaches with an emphasis on experiential learning and problem-solving. This has led to certain difficulties. For example, when reviewing the implementing of a new programme of citizenship education, Cowan & McMurty (2009) reported on the difficulties of making learning adequately active and personalised for students. This occurred due to teachers either presenting knowledge through the safe heaven of single subjects or through adopting cursory and minimalist integration approaches. However, policy makers are now alert to these difficulties and are trying to increase curriculum flexibility and to empower teachers to make full use of the current policy opportunities which exist for reviewing practice and designing and implementing high quality teaching interventions which can inspire learners.

In this light, the current context is one which is favourable for outdoor education, as the political endorsement of outdoor learning ‘is ‘increasingly favourable’ (Higgins, et. al., 2006, p. 4); as evidenced by the creation of a national based ‘Outdoor Connections’ initiative (Learning & Teaching Scotland, 2005) with a remit for development officer and steering group support to advise on how current barriers to outdoor learning in schools can be overtaken. The intention is that ‘Learning and Teaching Scotland’ (LTS) as the Scottish Governments’ curriculum agency can provide adequate support in exemplifying some of the ways in which experiential learning can be meaningfully enacted within the new curriculum structure. In broad terms, the focus within

‘Outdoor Connections’ is ‘about’ the knowledge and understanding associated with outdoor education with learning occurring as a result of engagement ‘in’ outdoor activities and ‘through’ emphasising the personal or moral nature and benefits of learning.

However, despite this initial promise, on reviewing the literature in this area it becomes clear that considerable conceptual confusion is evident. For example, outdoor education appears to have morphed to become outdoor learning with the two terms used synonymously. Similarly, while the proposition that experiential learning can occur in outdoor environments has received some attention (Allison & Wurdinger, 2005) there is a lack of clarity and an over used rhetoric to support this as a rationale for taking students outdoors. This confusion is sometimes passed off as merely semantics but these are important issues that reveal underpinning values and assumptions which are worthy of further attention (Biesta, 2005). Given such conceptual confusion it is to be expected that there is limited recognition of outdoor education in curriculum discussions and that when it does emerge it is typically associated with a week long multi activity residential programme at a local education authority centre.

Deploying the nomenclature of learning ‘in’, ‘through’ and ‘about’ is not a new device in curriculum planning. The approach is informed by the writings of Arnold (1979; 1984) who reviewed ways in which practical learning could be effectively integrated with various areas of knowledge and understanding. Specifically, this approach has been used within Senior Level Physical Education awards in Queensland, Australia where engagement ‘in’ different sporting activities, ‘through’ emphasising a broad understanding of performance and its influences is designed to improve students knowledge and understanding ‘about’ physiology, biomechanics, sociology and the like. Crucially, during the implementation of the Senior Level award, Penney & Kirk (1998) indicate that it was the concept of integration itself which proved most problematic. In some content areas, teachers described connections as natural and obvious and in other areas this

was less apparent resulting in the experiential benefits of integrated teaching and learning being enacted in contrived practical settings or explored within separate theory and practice environments.

We perceive the same risks to exist within the current Scottish context if there is insufficient attention paid to the overarching context for learning. We are not surprised therefore that Nicol et. al., (2007) found that young people had difficulty in expressing their emotions surrounding the relationship between nature and the environment. We appreciate these concerns and while recognizing the connective benefits of linking outdoor education with learning ‘in’ activities and ‘about’ environmental education and sustainable development, for example, we posit in this paper that a relative over emphasis on these areas combined with the associated problems of simply ‘being outdoors’ Nicol et. al., (2007) are limiting the contribution of an experiential focus as the basis for outlining how personal and moral endeavour could be the most effective way for organising learning. This over emphasis is illustrated in the 2007 report ‘Outdoor Education in Scotland: A summary of recent research’ (commissioned by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and conducted by Nicol, Higgins, Ross and Mannion). Examining the literature included in the review it is striking that of the seven publications included five of them are by the authors of the summary and four of them are funded by SNH. It is of little wonder therefore, that the impression created is one of outdoor education and environmental education being one and the same thing. We view this narrowing of conceptual understanding of the role, purpose and philosophies of outdoor education as unnecessary, unhelpful and historically inaccurate.

Accordingly, it would be mistaken to accelerate towards delivering on these (‘in’ and ‘about’) components of outdoor education, for example, by completing a pre-defined study on sustainable development, when a more complete engagement with an experiential philosophy of learning ‘through’ requires students to identify issues, topics, problems and challenges which they are interested in and use these as the context for trying solutions, reflecting on their success and

progressively engaging in an upward spiral of engaged learning (Dewey, 1916; Wurdinger, 2005). Conceived of in this way, we consider outdoor education as being beneficial in helping students explore their own values, preferences, histories and to make decisions about how they want to live their lives. This seems to fit comfortably with the four capacities of CfE, and additionally, in a lifelong learning context, of helping students to identify the types of outdoor activities they might wish to pursue and the attitudes and behaviours they might adopt individually and collectively with regard to the way in which they want to live their lives. This conception of education is consistent with recent research in to values and character formation in the twenty-first century where ‘residential trips, the Duke of Edinburgh scheme and students organising their own clubs, societies and discussion groups are instrumental in developing character, virtue and values’ (Arthur et. al., 2006, p. 113).

However, even though current policy aspirations present advocates of outdoor learning with a challenging and potentially empowering opportunity for curriculum renewal, Raffe et. al., (2007) reminds us that reform agendas can be adversely affected by a mix of political, institutional and epistemological barriers. Consequently, given the pertinence of this analysis, referring as it does to the recent Scottish policy context, later discussion will review the curriculum and pedagogical barriers to change which might exist within schools as well reviewing the increased learning opportunities which exist. In taking forward our critique within outdoor education we have identified two key questions which we consider to merit critical investigation at this time. These are:

- how can conceptual discussions inform the development of a coherent rationale for outdoor education?
- how can the curriculum and pedagogical challenges in outdoor education be addressed in future years?

In analysing these questions it is important to recognise that the notion of high quality outdoor education experiences being discussed here is one where opportunities are available and free or relatively affordable for the vast majority of young people in mainstream primary and secondary schools. Many forms of outdoor education are now a thriving part of a mixed economy and while expensive gap year expeditions and the like might be part of the overall education of some, generally these types of experiences remain out of reach for many young people. As such, future discussions do not dwell on these types of opportunity; instead we focus on school-based provision within mainstream schools.

### **Developing a coherent rationale for outdoor education**

Scotland was one of the first countries to widely introduce outdoor education in schools and as such many people can relate to and recall a week of activities at an outdoor centre. Traditionally this involved a technical focus requiring mastery of the skills necessary for kayaking, abseiling, canoeing, rock climbing and so forth. Higgins & Sharp (2003) advise that the 1970s were the highpoint of this form of provision and in recent years the situation has changed markedly (mainly for financial rather than philosophical or ideological reasons) with many local authority centres now being run as independent charitable trusts where any remaining links with local authorities are likely only to exist for some students on a pay-as-you-go basis (Higgins, et. al, 2006). Additionally, within these arrangements there remains a distinct absence of agreement on the ideals of outdoor education and whether it ought to be a subject and be treated as such (a discussion we return to later) or whether it ought to be an approach that benefits from cross-disciplinary teaching interventions.

In any event, there are various reasons why this form of provision does not articulate adequately enough with new curriculum aims. Firstly, the traditional context of learning ‘in’ practical activities is likely to lead to pedagogical approaches which contain a bias towards skill

acquisition rather than personal development. This is to be expected given the requirements for safe practice in a society which is increasingly becoming risk-averse (Furedi, 1997; Gill, 2007) and where there is recognition that a basic familiarity with a range of technical skills is a precursor for deriving personal satisfaction in practical activities. Consequently, a continuance of this form of activity sampling appears ill-suited to the current curriculum context, where the requirement for emphasising personal learning capacities suggests the need for staffing continuity if experiences are to be meaningfully integrated and connected with school-based learning, rather than included as a tagged on addition to the school curriculum. Accordingly, a version of outdoor education which involves travelling to outdoor centres to experience the specialist skill sets of unfamiliar teachers or instructors appears disassociated from current school-based learning contexts and lacking in transferable value. In future discussion we refer to this form of provision as being ‘high in risk and low in transfer value’.

A second limitation in building a coherent programme of mainstream provision in outdoor education has been the lack of curriculum statements prescribing the need for local authorities to provide such provision. Prescription has rarely been the norm in Scottish education, and while previous 5-14 school curriculum arrangements noted the benefits of outdoor education, the lack of specific rather than generalised endorsement resulted in a relatively modest curriculum presence. Similarly inclined cross-curricular initiatives e.g. health education (Forrest, 2008) have suffered the same fate in a predominantly subject based curriculum. The lack of specific curriculum advice is set to continue under CfE, and represents something of a strength and a weakness in the current policy context: a strength in that entirely feasible links can be developed between, for example, ‘sustainable living’ and being a ‘responsible citizen’ (Higgins & Nicol, 2008) yet a weakness in that teachers, can within the generally autonomous teaching arrangements which exist, continue to decide whether teaching will be almost exclusively indoors or not. In this respect, it appears that

teachers' historically high level of 'continuity and personal relationship within the policy community' (Menter et. al., 2004, p. 197) might be something of a mixed blessing in achieving curriculum outcomes through outdoor learning.

Therefore, institutionally what appears missing is a school-based approach to outdoor education which we define as being 'low in risk and high in transfer value'. By low risk we are referring to learning experiences which are modest in technical difficulty, based around the normal school day, free or low in cost for students and generally deliverable by the vast majority of interested teachers. The more these factors could be explicitly addressed the greater the potential there is that learning experiences could connect to learning during and beyond the school day as they would be imbued with the spirit of individualised and personalized learning which underpins CfE. Recent reporting on outdoor education in England (Office for Standards in Education, 2004) reflects similar concerns in acknowledging that valuable experiences out of school need to link to further experiences in school so that wider learning connections are revealed to students.

Nevertheless, politically the contested nature of what constitutes an outdoor education remains a live issue at present. In May 2008, the Scottish Conservative party proposed that secondary school age students should be given the right to a one-week residential based outdoor education based on traditional activities with funding coming from a mix of the Scottish Government and private donors (British Broadcasting Corporation, 2008). This proposal has benefited from a degree of cross-party political support and was recently the subject of further parliamentary questions. However, even if a one year funding programme was agreed we consider that this initiative would lack the longer term perspective required on the value and role of outdoor education in schools in the decades ahead. Accordingly, while we see the merit of a mixed pattern of provision with learning at school articulating with learning in residential outdoor centres, only

having the later raises concerns again about the fragmented nature of learning. We believe that provision will remain confused and political support mixed until the focus changes to a more principled position and a concern with a longer term vision of 'Outdoor Education in Scotland' in future years. Furthermore, as Higgins & Nicol (2008, p. 544) note 'despite considerable effort over the past twenty years, there is still no formal teaching qualification in outdoor education in Scotland' and student teachers are offered very little training in this area of provision as part of their teacher education programmes. As such, for the type of proposal under current consideration it is likely to be bought in staff delivering programmes, and their professional background is likely to be predominantly informed by single sport national governing body awards (technical skills) rather than education training and skills. Clearly, in this set up there is the possibility that the proposal in question could become little more than an update on the 'high in risk and low in transfer value' programmes of which we were critical earlier unless these programmes are supported by school based programmes which are essentially 'low in risk and high in transfer value'.

Despite concerns such as these remaining unresolved, there continues to be a politically supported policy enthusiasm for outdoor education, as indicated earlier when describing how the Outdoor Connections programme aimed to provide a national point of reference for raising awareness. Yet while the Chair of the Advisory Group declared that 'as a group, we are convinced that outdoor learning offers unique opportunities to extend the potential of our children and young people' (Learning & Teaching Scotland, 2007, p. 1) the reporting style which follows contains few practical implementation strategies, with the 20 page report instead comprising full page photographs, snapshot quotes and details of Advisory Group members. Accordingly, it is unsurprising that even by the reports admission 'work still needs to be done at a variety of levels to ensure equal opportunity for all' (LTS, 2007, p. 1). Consequently, it appears noteworthy that given the increased prospects for curriculum renewal which exist that no ongoing monitoring group has

been formed to encourage and where necessary maintain the standards of outdoor education. Of similar concern is noting that the two year development officer post with Learning and Teaching Scotland, which was created with the announcement of the Outdoor Connections programme was not continued between mid 2007 and January 2009 when the post was finally re-advertised for a 6 month contract with the primary task of organising a conference in April 2009 with a funding commitment beyond June 2009 remaining unconfirmed. Where provision exists it will be monitored by government inspectors of education, but this approach misses the fundamental problem which is lack of provision rather than the quality of provision. In the summer of 2008 the Scottish Government set up the Outdoor Learning Strategic Advisory Group (OLSAG) to 'provide clear strategic advice and leadership on learning beyond the classroom, in all its forms, which is consistent with the experiences and outcomes for the 3-18 curricular'. The rationale for membership of the group is unclear and some aspects of current provision and sectors of society are conspicuous in their absence. For example, no member of the group represents a private business within outdoor education and no one represents people with disabilities. The rationale for group membership may be characterised as confused and not representative of the outdoor sector in Scotland.

In this respect, it is debateable whether the consensual model of policy making used within the Outdoor Connections programme was helpful or not and we expect the same will apply to OLSAG. The main criticism of this model is that as only personnel with a senior professional role tend to gain membership of such groups there is often a high degree of agreement with policy aims and a relative lack of contestation when discussing conceptual matters. As such, a relatively uncritical perspective is often adopted with policy making groups making the most of the 'narrative privilege' possibilities which exist within official policy reporting (Humes, 2008, p. 71). By way of example, the summary details about what the Outdoor Connections Advisory Group report has achieved notes that the research informing the policy overview is underpinned by 'the most

comprehensive national study anywhere in the world' (LTS, 2007, p. 13). However, further scrutiny of the commissioned research (Higgins, et. al., 2006) indicates that the basis for the research was a desk based review of literature supported by field research in only two of Scotland's thirty-two local authorities. This comprised of 211 questionnaires to schools (less than half of which were returned [46%]) and interviews with 20 respondents. In addition to these criteria it should be noted that the only teachers who received questionnaires were principal teachers in biology and geography. This seems indicative of the earlier point we made regarding the emphasis on conceptualizing outdoor education as an environmental rather than a moral endeavour. Further research (Allison, 2009) has highlighted the limitations of such a conception (and offered a significantly different analysis as a result of gathering views of teachers, parents and students in six schools) and is supported by recent work by Haydon (2005) on the value of personal, social and health education. Additionally, other studies worldwide which are much more 'comprehensive' (e.g. Hattie et. al., 2007) clearly match the scope of the ambitions we have attempted to describe for Scotland. We also note the relative underreporting of interventions internationally which might have revealed interesting insights about how some curriculum programmes have become more deeply embedded in school life, for example in Norway (Henderson & Vikander, 2007) and the Charter Schools and Coalition for Essential Schools programmes in the United States of America (Levine, 2002; Thomas et. al., 2005).

Overall, critics of the consensual form of policy making so popular in Scotland might consider that little has been achieved to date other than generally raising the profile of outdoor learning and reaffirming its contributory benefits to a holistically informed curriculum. In this respect, it could be argued that the Outdoor Connections report (LTS, 2007) was not bold or radical enough in making the case for increasing levels of outdoor education, relying instead on a familiar rhetorical narrative about the potential of outdoor learning which failed to offer sustained leadership

and curriculum and pedagogical insight about how a change agenda could be enacted. This sense of missed opportunity is heightened by recognising that politically during this period (2002-2006) Peter Peacock, the Minister for Education and Young People (who initiated the review of outdoor education which led to the Outdoor Connections report) was generally seen as a stabilising and authoritative influence whose 'sure-footed and inclusive style brought some calmness to the educational world and [who] also ensured that the changes which were introduced came with broad support and acceptance' (Gillies, 2008). As such, the current situation is one where national governments can gain plaudits from the announcement of policy, but where on the ground improvements in schools and local communities remain much more difficult to detect; sadly something of an acknowledged problem in implementing education policies (Whitty, 2006).

### **Curriculum and pedagogical challenges in outdoor education**

As outdoor education is not included as a subject in the Scottish curriculum one option is to try to become one. However, this is a problematic option due to the absence of subject teachers and a specialist teaching qualification. Furthermore, if outdoor education is claiming to be of cross disciplinary value then pursuing single subject status might not be a desirable approach, not least because it could constrain teachers from making greater use of outdoors learning environments locally available. We view cross disciplinary curriculum and teaching as making greater sense as it has the capacity to provide an organising framework for learning outdoors which encourages teachers to make more use of the flexible course programming arrangements and for students to review what is of value to them and how to gain control over their lives. If this approach was successful, we consider that outdoor education could become of central rather than peripheral curriculum importance. Therefore, viable exemplification of how experiential learning in the outdoors can feasibly occur is necessary both in terms of articulation with curriculum arrangements and pedagogically in terms of how the learning process can be enacted. Without support at these

levels two contrasting policy problems might develop. Firstly, for teachers whose beliefs are inclined toward learning outdoors there is a risk that a lack of support will erode relationships between teachers and policy makers (Hayward, 2007). Alternately, there is the problem that teachers' whose beliefs are not inclined toward learning outdoors might use the continuing lack of support on curriculum and pedagogical matters as a justification to continue learning predominantly indoors.

Disappointingly, we note that due to the fragmented nature of leadership and support available to teachers, to date, (e.g. through the gap in development officer provision between the middle of 2007 and January 2009) that it is often left to other interested public bodies to try and provide curriculum support materials rather than being coordinated from the centre by Learning and Teaching Scotland. Recently, SNH (2007) produced as part of its promotion of the Scottish Outdoor Access Code, a bright and engaging set of school curriculum support materials on rights and responsibilities for lower secondary age students. However, understandably the learning connections between the support materials and CfE remain undeveloped and consist of a few simple statements. For greater learning benefits to occur, we advise that a more complete form of assistance is required through exemplifying how the curriculum support materials provided convey messages about the process of learning which are intended and of how these can feasibly be interpreted and understood in relation to the learning outcomes proposed for 'health and well-being', for example. We recognise that in terms of the degree of curriculum exemplification and support required there is a balance to be struck between constructive assistance and an unhelpful form of over assistance, which can lead to the risk of rote adoption of materials. Nevertheless, in addressing the current national situation we consider that there is likely to be further policy slippage unless the added momentum created by raising awareness of outdoor education is supported by the development of more informative support materials. In a recent case study commissioned by SNH,

Allison (2009) found that teachers in schools were keen to have access to support materials to enable them to take students outside. This study also suggested the development of a web page which offers a 'one stop shop' for teachers to access information, risk assessment templates, curriculum linking materials, names of local contacts and other relevant information is merited. This type of initiative we would argue has a far greater capacity for pedagogical interventions to become deeply embedded in school practice in the longer term relative to funding occasional residential experiences for which there is no evidence of an underpinning philosophical rationale.

The situation we have sketched so far exists because with CfE it is expected that individual schools can design pedagogical as well as curriculum solutions to the holistic learning challenges posed. Therefore, implicit in any analysis of change are questions about whether teachers can adopt the type of pedagogical practices which could lead towards meaningful gains in how students explore their own values and make coherent and informed decisions about their lives. Accordingly, in a future paper we will consider some of the most apparent professional development issues for teachers in training and for experienced teachers in post. However, for the present we focus specifically on some of the system wide mechanisms which might exist for exemplifying best practice and which move beyond leaving it to individually motivated teachers to experiment and make appropriate learning connections. Recently, in Scotland, various national initiatives (e.g. Health Promoting Schools and the Active Schools programmes) have been advanced through staff (generally a teacher) being deployed with a coordinating remit aimed at increasing learning opportunities and participation experiences for students. Evidence from some programmes has not been particularly encouraging, for example, the first stage review of the Active Schools programme indicated that improvements in physical activity levels remain modest (Scottish Executive, 2007). Furthermore, evidence from an earlier national evaluation of a similar programme indicated that

taking on a school coordination remit was not particularly desired by teachers or considered helpful as a contributor towards career development (Coalter & Thorburn, 2003).

However, there are very often specific issues associated with different coordination remits which might impact upon implementation. For example, the Active Schools programme has had to recognise the potential limitations of ever more precisely described teacher employment agreements (Scottish Executive, 2001) and ‘a heavily unionized workforce’ (Ozga, 2005, p. 216) when trying to improve in-school and out-of-school active participation levels through building partnerships with sports development personnel in local communities. We anticipate that, in part, these types of difficulties would be less apparent if a form of outdoor education coordinator post was to be rolled out nationally. This is due to the inter-disciplinary nature of the teacher interventions proposed with their rationale for becoming an embedded presence within practice rather than being considered as an occasional and additional professional request.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has sought to review the major conceptual, policy, curriculum and pedagogical challenges which currently influence outdoor education in Scotland. The paper highlights that the current policy context is one which offers outdoor education the best opportunity in many years to have a deeply embedded presence within the education of young people. However, political aspirations can change quickly and the potential of the moment requires to be grasped so that the full potential of learning ‘through’ outdoor education can be realised. In this respect, we note with some enthusiasm that a new development officer post in outdoor education was created at national level for the first six months of 2009.

The paper also offers a re-conceptualization of outdoor education, which when framed by associated discussions of holistic learning, we believe contains the capacity to outline how an

experiential teaching and learning approach could articulate with the educational aims underpinning CfE. However, for progress to be sustained in the longer term leadership and direction will be required, for as Raffe et. al., (2007) discovered in their analysis of the last period of major curriculum change in Scotland during the 1990s, the lack of a shared vision adversely affected the levels of change expected. Therefore, while there is clear need for more forthright national leadership (Higgins & Nicol, 2008) there is also a need at an individual school level for teachers to continually explore and systematically review the potential of curriculum experiences and pedagogical interventions in outdoor education to meet the changing lives and lifestyles of young people in Scotland for many years to come.

## References

- Allison, P. & Wurdinger, S. 2005. Understanding the power, promise and peril of the Experiential Learning Process. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 18(4), 386-399.
- Allison, P. 2009. Engagement with Scotland's National Parks and National Nature Reserves. Available online at:  
<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/outdoorlearning/keyinformation/research/index.asp>
- Arthur, J., Deakin-Crick, R., Samuel, E., Wilson, K. & McGettrick, B. 2006. Character education: The formation of virtues and dispositions in 16-19 year olds with particular reference to the religious and spiritual. Pennsylvania: The Templeton Foundation.
- Arnold, P. 1979. Meaning in movement, sport and physical education. London: Heinemann.
- Arnold, P. 1984. Sport, Moral Education and the Development of Character. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 18, no. 2: 275-281.
- Biesta, G. 2005. Against Learning. *Nordisk Pedagogik* 25, 54-66.
- British Broadcasting Corporation. 2008. Tories make outdoor activity calls. Available online at:  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/7412214.stm>
- Coalter, F. and Thorburn, M. 2003. An Evaluation of the School Sport Co-ordinator Programme in Scotland. Research Report no. 87. Edinburgh: Sport Scotland.
- Cowan, E.M. and McMurty, D.C. 2009. The implementation of 'Education for Citizenship' in schools in Scotland: a research report. *The Curriculum Journal* 20, no. 1: 61-72.
- Dewey, J. 1916. *Democracy and Education. An introduction to the philosophy of education* (1966 edn.), New York: Free Press.
- Forrest, J. 2008. Health Promotion. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 490-495. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Furedi, F. 1997. *Culture of fear*. London: Cassell.
- Gill, T. 2007. *No fear: Growing up in a risk averse society*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Gillies, D. 2008. The Politics of Scottish Education. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 80-89. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Hattie, J.A., Marsh, H.W., Neill, J.T. & Richards, G.E. 1997. Adventure Education and Outward Bound: Out-of-class experiences that have a lasting effect. *Review of Educational Research*, 67, 43-87.
- Haydon, G. 2005. Impact No. 10. The importance of PSHE: A philosophical and policy perspective on personal, social and health education. *Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*.

- Hayward, L. 2007. Curriculum, pedagogies and assessment in Scotland: the quest for social justice 'Ah kent yir faither', *Assessment in Education* 14, no. 2. 251-268.
- Henderson, B. & Vikander, N. 2007. *Nature First: Outdoor life the Friluftsliv way*. Toronto: Natural Heritage Books.
- Higgins, P. and Sharp, R. 2003. Outdoor Education. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 580-587. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Higgins, P., Nicol, R. and Ross, H. 2006. Teachers' approaches and attitudes to engaging with the natural heritage through the curriculum, Commissioned Report No. 161. Inverness: Scottish Natural Heritage.
- Higgins, P. and Nicol, R. 2008. Outdoor Education. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 540-545. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Humes, W. 2008. Policy Making in Scottish Education. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 69-79. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Learning and Teaching Scotland. 2005. Available online at:  
<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/outdoorlearning/keyinformation/outdoorconnections/issue1.asp>
- Learning and Teaching Scotland. 2007. *Taking Learning Outdoors: Partnership for Excellence*. Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.
- Levine, E. 2002. *One kid at a time*. London: Teachers College Press.
- McCrone, D. 2003. Culture, Nationalism and Scottish Education: Homogeneity and Diversity. In *Scottish Education*, ed. T.G.K. Bryce and W.H. Humes., 239-249. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Menter, I., Mahoney, P. and Hextall, I. 2004. Never the Twain shall meet? Modernising the teaching profession in Scotland and England, *Journal of Education Policy* 19, no. 2: 179-195.
- Nicol, R., Higgins, P., Ross, H. and Mannion, G. 2007. *Outdoor education in Scotland: A summary of recent research*. Perth: Scottish Natural Heritage.
- Office for Standards in Education (2004) *Outdoor Education: Aspects of good practice HMI 2151*. London: Ofsted.
- Ozga, J. 2005. Modernizing the education workforce: a perspective from Scotland, *Educational Review*, 57 no. 2: 207-219.
- Penney, D. and Kirk, D. 1998. *Evaluation of the Pilot Senior Syllabus in Physical Education: Final Report*. Brisbane, Queensland: Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.
- Raffe, D., Howieson, C. and Tinklin, T. 2007. *The impact of a unified curriculum and qualifications*

system: the Higher Still reform of post-16 education in Scotland. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 no. 4: 479-508.

Scottish Executive. 2001. *A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Professional Conditions of Service for Teachers (The McCrone Report)*, Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Scottish Executive. 2004. *A curriculum for excellence: The Curriculum Review Group*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive. 2007. *Reaching Higher: Building on the success of Sport 21*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Government (2008) *Statistical Bulletin Education Series: Teachers in Scotland 2007*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/91982/0058105.pdf>

Scottish Natural Heritage. 2007. *Know the Code before you go! Rights and responsibilities for 12-14 years old*. Inverness: Scottish Natural Heritage.

Thomas, D., Enloe, W. & Newell, R. 2005. *The coolest school in America*. Oxford: Scarecrow Education.

Whitty, G. 2006. Education(al) research and education policy making: is conflict inevitable?, *British Educational Research Journal* 32 no. 2: 159-176.

Wurdinger, S.D. 2005. *Using experiential learning in the classroom: practical ideas for all educators*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.