

ISSN 2206-3301

Volume 19, Number 2, October 2016



JOEE

Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education

Special issue

Looking back while looking forward



www.outdoorcouncil.asn.au

Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education

The journal of the Outdoor Council of Australia (OCA)

EDITOR

Dr John Quay – *The University of Melbourne*
jqay@unimelb.edu.au

ADVISORY EDITOR

Dr Andrew Brookes – *La Trobe University*
a.brookes@latrobe.edu.au

MANAGING EDITOR

Ms Pam Firth
pam@detaildevil.net.au

REVIEWS EDITOR

Dr Glyn Thomas – *University of the Sunshine Coast*
gthomas2@usc.edu.au

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Dr Mike Brown – *The University of Waikato*
Dr Janet Dymont – *University of Tasmania*
Associate Professor Tonia Gray – *Western Sydney University*
Dr Marcus Morse – *La Trobe University*
Dr Alistair Stewart – *La Trobe University*
Dr Brian Wattchow – *Federation University*

REGIONAL EDITORS

Associate Professor Soren Andkjaer – *University of Southern Denmark*
Associate Professor Morten Asfeldt – *University of Alberta, Canada*
Dr Simon Beames – *The University of Edinburgh, UK*
Professor Pete Higgins – *The University of Edinburgh, UK*
Dr Susanna Ho – *Ministry of Education, Singapore*
Professor Denise Mitten – *Prescott College, USA*
Professor Kirsti Pedersen-Gurholt – *Norwegian School of Sport Sciences*
Associate Professor Tom Potter – *Lakehead University, Canada*
Associate Professor Jay Roberts – *Earlham College, USA*
Professor Takako Takano – *Waseda University, Japan*
Associate Professor Sue Waite – *Plymouth University, UK*

Permission to reproduce material from the Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education for personal or classroom use is granted by the Outdoor Council of Australia. Apart from such purposes, materials may not be reproduced or reprinted without written permission from and with acknowledgement to the Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education and the individual author(s) concerned.

Views expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the Outdoor Council of Australia.

ISSN 2206-3301. Printed on recycled paper.

Subscriptions are available through state-based outdoor education and outdoor recreation bodies in Australia. For these subscribers, membership enquiries, payments, or change of address information should be directed to the respective state association. If you would like to subscribe directly, please contact the subscriptions manager at Queensland Outdoor Recreation Federation, Sports House, 150 Caxton St, Milton, Queensland, 4064, Australia, phone: 61 7 3369 9455, email: journal@outdoorcouncil.asn.au.

CONTENTS

Volume 19, Number 2, 2016

Editorial John Quay	1
REFEREED ARTICLES	
Australian outdoor (and) environmental education research: Senses of “place” in two constituencies Noel Gough	2
What do citation patterns reveal about the outdoor education field? A snapshot 2000–2013 Andrew Brookes and Alistair Stewart	12
The “F” word: Feminism in outdoor education Tonia Gray	25
Outdoor education and school curriculum distinctiveness: More than content, more than process John Quay	42
Postparadigmatic materialisms: A “new movement of thought” for outdoor environmental education research? Noel Gough	51
BOOK REVIEW	
<i>Mountaineering Tourism</i> Philip M. Mullins	66
MISCELLANEOUS	
Journal of Experiential Education Table of contents	71
Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning Table of contents	72
Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership Table of contents	73
8th International Adventure Therapy Conference Sydney, Australia, 29 Aug–2 Sep 2018	74

To subscribe to JOEE please contact the subscriptions manager at journal@outdoorcouncil.asn.au

Editorial

John Quay

Welcome to volume 19, issue 2, of the *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*. With this issue, development of the journal continues via an expanded Editorial Board that encompasses a group of highly respected Regional Editors who will support the journal from their places — in Asia, Europe, North America, and the United Kingdom — complementing the work of the Associate Editors in Australia and New Zealand. A further critical addition is Glyn Thomas in the role of Reviews Editor, overseeing the journal's contribution to commentary in connection with recent publications.

This is a Special Issue of the journal as all papers were invited, then processed as normal through double blind peer review, with Andrew Brookes and me as co-editors. The aim is to provide perspectives on past and future that speak across the change in name from the *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* to the *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*. In more colloquial terms, the papers in this issue attempt a version of "looking back while looking forward." Notably, all the authors are Australian: a deliberate decision in the attempt to capture these perspectives.

The first paper, "Australian Outdoor (and) Environmental Education Research: Senses of 'Place' in Two Constituencies" by Noel Gough, immediately confronts an issue at the heart of the new journal title by questioning the meaning of the "and": should it be "outdoor and environmental education" or "outdoor environmental education"? This difference is a significant one, re-emphasizing questions about the level of association between outdoor education and environmental education raised by Andrew Brookes more than a decade ago. Gough argues that the distinction between outdoor and indoor forms of education feeds into the specific contribution outdoor education makes in environmental education, highlighting the importance of attending to senses of place in these deliberations.

The paper by Andrew Brookes and Alistair Stewart "What Do Citation Patterns Reveal About the Outdoor Education Field? A Snapshot 2000–2013" looks back and forward through a bibliometric lens, searching for citation patterns that may inform our understanding of publishing in outdoor education. Their analysis is timely considering the many changes that are occurring in the publishing world and the ways in which bibliometric measurements are being used to characterize the contributions of academics. Interestingly, the importance of theses in the citing works suggests that outdoor education is a field still in the earlier phases of its maturation, generating significant momentum through the engagement of master's and doctoral candidates.

Tonia Gray's paper "The 'F' Word: Feminism in Outdoor Education" is deliberately provocative, looking back and forward in questioning the status of women working in outdoor education, through a feminist lens. As we aim to proactively achieve gender equality in all spheres of life, it is timely to gain a sense of how this applies in outdoor education. Of key concern are what Gray generously calls "blind spots" in the outdoor education profession. These are instances where the distinctive contributions of women are not deliberately considered in decision-making processes. Merit does not excuse these blind spots as it is often interpreted narrowly, without due consideration of the importance of gender in constructing our field.

The paper from John Quay "Outdoor Education and School Curriculum Distinctiveness: More Than Content, More Than Process" looks back and forward by exploring deliberations about outdoor education and school curriculum. These discussions commonly attempt to define outdoor education such that it may be considered to possess a distinct (amongst other subjects) body of knowledge, thereby cementing its place in a content-based curriculum. Quay argues that because there is more to curriculum than knowledge and skills, ways of being provide a possible alternative which positions outdoor education differently, thereby undercutting previous debates.

Noel Gough bookends the papers in this issue with an important contribution "Postparadigmatic Materialisms: A 'New Movement of Thought' for Outdoor Environmental Education Research?" that looks forward by looking back at how we contend methodologically with the issue (expressed perhaps too simply in much outdoor education discourse) of human-nature (environment) relationships. Gough argues that the methodological discussions raging in various fields must be engaged with in order to inform how we consider this relation — be it as inter-action or "intra-action."

A further valuable asset in this issue is an extended book review penned by Phil Mullins of "*Mountaineering Tourism*" by Musa, Higham, and Thompson-Carr.

I hope you enjoy this Special Issue of the journal. Thank you very much to all involved in making it happen: my co-editor for this issue Andrew Brookes, the authors, the editorial team, and of course the highly valued reviewers.

John Quay, Ph.D
Editor

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 name change for cultivating this distinctive approach.

Keywords: sense of place, outdoor education, environmental education

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 (JOEE)*, 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.). (Quay, 2016, p. 1)

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

What do citation patterns reveal about the outdoor education field? A snapshot 2000–2013

Andrew Brookes and Alistair Stewart

La Trobe University, Australia

Abstract

This study considered what insights into outdoor education (OE) research and scholarship could be gleaned from citation indices and patterns. Citation *indices* have long been used as ranking tools in the physical sciences, and more recently have been used in humanities and social sciences. High citation measures indicate high research impact, although the converse is not necessarily true because research can have impact unrelated to citations, especially in a small practical field such as OE, and citation indices cannot be used for cross-discipline comparisons without considering variations in citation patterns between fields or disciplines. Citation data can also be used for purposes other than ranking. One aim of this article is to consider what OE citation *patterns* indicate about the distinctiveness of OE as a field. We wanted to use citation data to inform our understanding, as researchers, of the nature and structure of OE discourse. In particular, we made use of citation tools to look at not only which OE work had been cited but also where citation impact occurred. The study examined the most-cited OE research and scholarship published from 2000 to 2013. We attempted to answer the following questions: (1) What do citation patterns indicate about OE research impact outside the field? (2) Does where OE research is published predict where its citation impact, if any, will be? (3) Do citation patterns point to the existence of a single OE literature, or several? (4) Do citation impacts provide insight into how, if at all, the OE field progresses? Using Google Scholar data, Publish or Perish software, and searches for “outdoor education,” we obtained 1,446 articles or other sources. Using Zotero software, we reviewed and analysed these articles and works. We found strong support for an argument that OE discourse constituted a distinct research community clustered around the *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* (now the *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*), the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, and the *Journal of Experiential Education*. Most published OE work is never cited, and a small number of well-cited works form patterns of citation. We were surprised by the number of theses in the citing works, and found that with the exception of a few articles any impact of OE research and scholarship outside of the OE journals, theses, or OE conferences, is highly diffuse.

Keywords: outdoor education literature, literature reviews, bibliometrics, experiential education

Introduction

The expanding reach and availability of citation data, particularly due to Google Scholar (GS), have made citation metrics — and patterns — more accessible in the social sciences and humanities and more meaningful, provided differences between disciplines or fields are understood (Harzing, 2013). Citation measurement, long established in the physical sciences, has only recently become mainstream in the social sciences and humanities, in part due to the advent of GS. In some fields and in some institutions citation measures are used to infer the impact of a particular journal or individual academic (LSE Public Policy Group, 2011), but citation data can also serve other purposes. Whether or not citation metrics are important to academic careers in OE, citation data can also be used to help understand the nature of academic discourse in the field, which is the aim of this article.

There is considerable literature on citation metrics. We have relied on Harzing’s (2013) work, which has a particular focus on the use of GS data in smaller or marginal fields of study. GS is important because in a field like OE it picks up any and every citation it can find, as distinct from indexing citations only in a specific set of journals. We refer

readers interested in the more arcane aspects of citation metrics to Harzing (2013) and the literature she cites.

While we expect this article will have some relevance for those interested in the application of citation metrics in ranking exercises, our primary aim was to use citation data and tools to better understand the OE literature. In trying to understand the ebb and flow of ideas in the OE field, citation patterns do not reveal which ideas are most significant — that requires a review of both the cited works and the citations in context — but they do indicate where the most influential ideas might be found.

To the best of our knowledge, there has been no previous research on citation patterns in OE journals or publications. There have been previous reviews of OE research (see, for example, McKenzie, 2000 or Rickinson et al., 2004), and Thomas, Potter, and Allison (2009) have published a broad overview of the content of the *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* (AJOE),¹ the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning* (JAEOL), and the *Journal of Experiential Education* (JEE).

The most basic citation measure is a count of the number of times a publication (article, paper, book, or thesis) has been cited in the scholarly or

The “F” word: Feminism in outdoor education

Tonia Gray

Western Sydney University, Australia

Abstract

Women have embarked on outdoor careers believing the profession to be a level playing field and one that offers occupational alternatives to traditional sporting activities and educational opportunities. This paper seeks to provide a critical analysis of the pockets of bias associated with the status of women in outdoor education (OE), particularly in Australia. In spite of being an integral part of the OE profession for many decades, women remain dramatically underrepresented in terms of career prestige, academic footprint, leadership roles, and appreciation of their distinctive contributions to the discipline. Because of barriers to achievement, many talented women prematurely exit the field or wind up in positions for which they are overqualified or lack influence proportional to their capacity. Although many practitioners suffer from feminist fatigue — the reluctance to, yet again, bring up entrenched problems — there is a need for a position statement about how women are being erased, perhaps unintentionally, by gender laundering associated with cultural and social inequalities in OE. These obstacles include structural problems and blind spots that prevent women from being noticed, acknowledged, and celebrated. The paper concludes by showcasing nine key reasons for gender asymmetries and suggests ways that women, men, and the profession as a collective, can become more open, democratic, and equitable — so that we can all enjoy the same opportunities and recognition.

Keywords: outdoor education, outdoor leadership, women, careers, gender asymmetry, inequity, feminism

Introduction: The gendered outdoor education landscape

When I first entered the outdoor education (OE) profession in the mid '80s, gender disparity was overwhelmingly apparent. The work environment was highly gendered and homogeneous in a range of ways: white, middle class, and able bodied. Attending the first New South Wales state conference in the early '90s, I could almost cut the testosterone in the air with a knife. I was one of two lonely women; we made up a tiny minority of the workforce due to extreme gender imbalance.

A similar scene was playing out in the United States in the '80s as illustrated by OE pioneer and founder of Woodswomen, Inc (WI), Denise Mitten (in press), who has traced the history of women adventuring outdoors within a patriarchal field. She recounts:

Over thirty years ago, at the 1983 *Association for Experiential Education (AEE) International Conference* in Lake Geneva, WI, women made a move to unite using the time-tested communication method of posting a note on the bathroom mirror asking women to “meet at midnight at the picnic table.” In the US the AEE was in a challenged state because in a previous year the leadership refused to move the conference from Missouri, a state that did not ratify the equal rights amendment (ERA) for women. Women were understandably angry at the lack

of political awareness of male leaders. Women were concerned about lesbian baiting that is so often used to silence women. Meeting at midnight in practice and symbolically provided a space and place to talk about women in AEE. (Mitten, in press)

Thankfully, change came rapidly in the middle of the 1990s, with the number of women increasing exponentially (Gray, Allen-Craig, & Carpenter, 2016; Miranda & Yerkes, 1996). The field welcomed a groundswell of talented and competent women who aspired to lead the sector and to teach in the outdoor profession (Mitten & Woodruff, 2010). Yet, whilst the overall number of women in OE has risen steadily since the 1990s, growth in our academic recognition and professional influence has stalled (Christie, in press; Gray, Mitten, Loeffler, Allen-Craig, & Carpenter, 2016). Currently, we lag behind in professional status and are disproportionately underrepresented in leadership positions, in spite of the influx of gifted women. The issue has become more acute over the past decade as a number of authors have noted (Bell, Cosgriff, Lynch & Zink, in press; Blades, in press; Christie, in press; Gray, in press; Gray & Mitten, in press; Martin, 2013).

By nature, I would like to consider myself an optimistic and constructive contributor, but how to approach this issue is, nonetheless, a thorny problem. In fact, women's gains in the field have been remarkable, as evidenced by entry-level classes in the tertiary sector full of bright, vibrant, industrious young women and with many of the successful women having benefitted from mentors of both sexes. However, the entrenched

Outdoor education and school curriculum distinctiveness: More than content, more than process

John Quay

The University of Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

For many years now, those of us engaged with outdoor education curriculum work in Australia have been debating questions which orbit around the issue of defining outdoor education. We claim to be doing so in order to clarify what we are pursuing educationally, our purpose, not only for ourselves but for others, so that we can legitimately stake out our position, our own little piece of educational turf, amongst the other subjects in the school curriculum. However, this debate has never been easy and any attempts to bring it to a resolution inevitably, it seems, settle some issues while heightening tensions in other areas. In this paper I explore two of the more recent approaches to the question of outdoor education's positioning in the school curriculum: the question of distinctiveness and the question of indispensability. Then, through an historical excursion involving Australian and US curriculum history, I highlight some of the difficulties created by shifts in language use. Finally I argue, using definitions of outdoor education that emerged in the United States in the 1950s, that the distinctiveness of outdoor education lies in neither a body of knowledge (content) nor skills and practices (process) but in a deeper level of educational understanding which emphasizes ways of being.

Key words: outdoor education, curriculum, history, subject, Australia, United States, definition

Outdoor education in the curriculum (or not)

Two major questions have been raised over the last 20 years which attempt to draw outdoor education discourse into a broader discussion of curriculum, not just outdoor education curriculum but curriculum per se, as this informs how schooling is organized. One of these questions raises the issue of how outdoor education may be distinctive in this broader curriculum discourse, and how it may be different from the subjects that are currently in the curriculum (Gray & Martin, 2012; Lugg, 1999; Lugg & Martin, 2001; Martin, 2008; Martin, 2010). The other question tackles the same problem from a different angle, asking after the indispensability of outdoor education or why, if it is in the curriculum, it should be (Brookes, 2004). One question searches for outdoor education's universal distinctiveness; the other challenges the universality of this distinctiveness while maintaining the need to find some way of considering outdoor education in curricular terms. In the first part of this paper I revisit both of these questions with the aim of finding a way to move the discussion forward so that any distinctive contribution of outdoor education can be perceived.

A school curriculum question: Is outdoor education distinctive?

Prominent amongst the questions asked of outdoor education in curricular terms are those seeking a definition. "What do we mean by the term "outdoor education"? Is there a common understanding and vision for this area of the curriculum? To what extent is outdoor education a subject in its own right with distinctive content and processes?" (Lugg, 1999, p.

25). These are questions that Alison Lugg asked in this journal close to 20 years ago, at a time when the school curriculum in Victoria, Australia (from preparatory to year 10) was undergoing review. While foregrounded within the context of the curriculum review, these questions were premised on a long-standing awareness of "the lack of clarity about the purpose and content of school outdoor education, even amongst outdoor educators" (p. 25). Lugg went on to argue that as a consequence, "we need to be able to clarify what it is that makes outdoor education distinctive. That is, what makes it significantly different to other subjects" (p. 25). Clarity in this regard is about positioning within a curriculum as a subject, requiring determination of a distinctive body of knowledge, which makes up the subject matter of *this* subject, outdoor education, and no other. If this could be achieved, Lugg believed it would provide capacity to develop legitimate arguments for compelling schools and education institutions "to include outdoor education in the curriculum of the 21st century" (p. 25) — expressly as a standalone subject in the middle school years, to supplement the already existing range of cognate subjects offered at the senior school levels in most Australian states (see Martin, 2008).

Standing in the way of clarifying this distinctiveness is anything that draws attention away from articulation of subject content. Indeed, "if the school community does not see outdoor education as having distinctive content," then "it may be more difficult to justify as an essential component of what is often perceived as a 'crowded' curriculum" (Lugg & Martin, 2001, p. 44). By way of a survey of Victorian schools in relation to outdoor education, Lugg and Martin (2001) concluded that it was perhaps

Postparadigmatic materialisms: A “new movement of thought” for outdoor environmental education research?

Noel Gough

La Trobe University, Australia

Abstract

Since at least the beginning of this century, the literatures of research methodology in the social sciences have increasingly focused on what are now being called “new empiricisms” and “new materialisms.” My purpose in this essay is to appraise the potential of these approaches for outdoor environmental education research. I begin by reviewing some of the ways in which outdoor and environmental education research has been conceptualised in the recent past, with particular reference to the practice of representing research in terms of paradigmatic distinctions. I argue that poststructuralist theorising, with which the new empiricisms and new materialisms have strong continuities, has never been accommodated by Kuhnian paradigmatic categories, and that these new movements are more usefully understood as arising from “postparadigmatic” thinking. I then provide a brief (and far from comprehensive) overview of some key characteristics of new materialist research approaches with particular reference to the utility of deploying Barad’s concept of “intra-action” and Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of “assemblage” in conceptualising research methodology and methods, and offer a selection of examples of how such approaches might inform outdoor and environmental education research, with particular reference to challenging anthropocentrism in these fields.

Keywords: new empiricism, new materialism, ontology, empiricism, materialism, Karen Barad,, machinic assemblage, Deleuze and Guattari

Introduction

My motivation for writing this essay arises, in large part, from my interest in pursuing a very similar question to one that Phillip Payne (2016) poses in the title of his capstone article for a recent special issue of the *Journal of Environmental Education*, namely, “What next? Post-critical materialisms in environmental education.”¹ I was both pleased and intrigued to note that Payne’s response to the “what next?” question converges in many respects with recent advocacy for modes of thinking described in terms of “new empiricisms” and “new materialisms” (see, for example, St. Pierre, Jackson, & Mazzei, 2016) that have also captured my interest. Payne writes:

This new *movement of thought* concerns itself with ontology, and the status of the real and, subsequently, the epistemologies flowing from a “new” material vitalism about the way the world *is*, and how we are *in* it. In its various guises, this movement may well reveal the historical complicity of “old” Western Cartesian inert “thought” about what it thought truly and rationally *mattered*, its presumptions, logics, and methods of reason (for example, Barad, 2007; Coole & Frost, 2010; Connolly, 2013; Latour, 2013; Shaviro, 2014). (Payne, 2016, p. 169; italics and quotation marks in original)

I share Payne’s interest in “what next?” for environmental education, and more specifically for *outdoor* environmental education research, but I do not

want to constrain my speculations by representing them in terms of familiar paradigmatic categories (such as critical or post-critical). To appraise possibilities for “what next?” requires consideration of past and present movements of thought, so in this essay I will briefly review some of the ways that outdoor environmental education researchers have thought about their practice, and the cultural materials on which they have drawn in so doing, before considering the possibilities for deploying new empiricist and materialist perspectives in this field.

I regret that Payne does not disaggregate the five sources he cites as examples of the “various guises” taken by the “new movement of thought” to which he refers. This “sandbag” approach to citing sources (in which multiple sources are packed into parentheses at the end of a sentence) is commonplace in academic writing, but is not particularly informative because it invites readers to interpret what might be disparate sources as having a degree of homogeneity. Of the five sources cited, only William Connolly’s (2013) work is further elaborated in Payne’s (2016, p. 170) assertion that the collective thought of the contributors to the special issue “about ‘what next?’ converges loosely on the need for new intellectual resources, vocabularies and grammars”:

William Connolly (2013) captures the broader mood well in his “ecology of late capitalism,” where the processes of “planetary politics” and, in particular “role experimentations” in “democratic

Mountaineering Tourism

Reviewed by Philip M. Mullins

Musa, G., Higham, J., & Thomson-Carr, A. (2015). *Mountaineering Tourism*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

ISBN: 978-1-138-78237-2

Musa, Higham, and Thompson-Carr have edited a volume intended to provide “a critical treatment of the possibilities and pitfalls of mountaineering tourism” (p. xxii). The book contains 17 chapters and nine case studies divided into three sections. The book’s structure follows Weed and Bull’s (2004) conceptualization of sports tourism as interplay of activity, people, and place. In the opening chapter, the editors explain clearly the purpose, basic concepts, and structure of the book. That the book takes on a theoretical approach is highly commendable; doing so provides a structure through which the reader can gain more insight from the volume as a whole, and more clearly see connections among diverse papers. The approach, however, also raises problems and possibilities that the editors no doubt had to contend with, and which arose in my reading. The editors acknowledge the potentially uneasy fit of a sports tourism approach, and they make a good case for using it. I believe it can function well.

The editors explain the concepts of activity, people, and place (p. 9), but the framework would facilitate greater insight, I think, if these conceptions responded more to a paradigm of mobilities and globalization. Globalization, according to Urry (2000), has exposed as untenable the notion of the natural world and society as separate. As I have stated elsewhere, “this context challenges outdoor adventure — traditionally practiced and theorized around distinctions between nature and civilization — to rethink and reframe its socio-environmental role” (Mullins, 2014a, p. 131).

While the editors employ the notion of place as “space that is infused with meanings” (p. 9), alternative conceptualizations that give primacy to place, rather than space, challenge the dominant Western worldview of nature and society as separate, and could position mountaineering tourists as participating socio-ecologically in making, remaking, and challenging places and their various contested meanings within a globalized world of mobility (McCarthy, 2002; Mullins, 2014a, 2014b). McCarthy’s (2002) insight regarding mountaineering and place is worth revisiting:

Climbers’ stories are evidence that people can experience the world as place instead of space, and that while certain

mountaineering literature emphasizes egotism and reinforces the subject/object divide, another current of mountaineering literature documents transcending a narrow, egocentric, conception of individuality, and replacing it — if only fleetingly — with a recognition of interconnection between human being and natural setting. (McCarthy, 2002, p. 181)

And so the book as a whole would benefit from clearer conceptualization and identification of the social and biophysical interrelations of persons and places that occur through and are potentially fundamental to meaningful experiences of mountaineering tourism as an activity (Mullins, 2014a, 2014b). I have elsewhere used a hermeneutic phenomenological circle to highlight these interrelations (Mullins, 2015). Nevertheless, readers should approach the book sections as overlapping and evocative of a larger whole, rather than discrete descriptive units.

Having read the work front to back, I will provide some thoughts on what readers might anticipate in the book sections, where readers might look for additional material, and how the editors might make a good thing even better for future editions. It is easier to be the observer/critic than the climber/author, and so I offer my review and suggestions humbly with respect for those who wrote and assembled this volume.

The group of 33 contributing authors (including the editors, who wrote the first and last chapters) is well-balanced in terms of international representation and between men (19) and women (14) — an important consideration for an activity that is historically masculine and tied to imperialism, and for a book intending to provide critique. The volume does have a Kiwi flavour, but clearly and purposefully presents an international context.

On activity, Part One comprises five chapters and three case studies. It opens with Lew and Han’s sweeping overview of the world’s mountain trekking destinations — a nice reminder that mountaineering tourism, as an activity, is not all about advanced technique, high altitude, and high risk. The chapter also touches on physical geography, history, and motivations of mountain trekking. Beedie admirably establishes a history of mountaineering tourism