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Abstract

Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies and existing literatures on personal and social development (PSD) through outdoor adventure education (OAE) offer several different but overlapping explanations of the process young people undergo to enhance their social skills, promote personal wellbeing, and successfully engage in wider society. Teachers’ beliefs literature, although providing scientific rigour and well-researched empirical constructs relating to beliefs, offer limited insights into teachers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. Nor do they provide a thorough explanation of how teachers’/practitioners’ beliefs, actions and intentions may be affected by dynamic contextual factors. Sail training literature—which is a part of OAE—offers a dynamic context typically used to promote young people’s PSD. As such, three gaps were identified in existing literatures: lack of skippers’ voices within sail training literature; the need to understand teachers’ and OAE practitioners’ beliefs about PSD; and lack of sound philosophical underpinnings of practitioners’ beliefs. This thesis goes beyond sail training and OAE literatures to develop a theoretical framework so that later comparisons with sail training skippers’ perspectives can be made.

Therefore, following a social constructivist ontological position supported by interpretivist epistemological assumptions, these four gaps were addressed using semi-structured interviews with 16 sail training skippers working for UK sail training organisations. A reflective diary and fact sheets were also used to develop further understanding and record ongoing conceptualisations of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. Four elements key to young people’s PSD emerged during inductive thematic analysis: environmental factors and social systems; social behaviours; attainable challenge; and essential sailing skills. Deductive analysis contrasting skippers’ beliefs against Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisation of growth was also conducted. A combination of inductive and deductive analyses revealed skippers’ underlying beliefs to be focused on physical and social environments, and further shaped by contextual factors (e.g., weather conditions) to create a meaningful community-based context in which learning could occur. This point was also emphasised by both Dewey and Hahn. Skippers, however, provided new insights into Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations and their applications into OAE contexts leading to subtle refinements of Dewey and Hahn’s theoretical conceptualisations (e.g., diversity consists of diversity in socio-economic background, age, core beliefs and broader experiences).
The findings contribute to our current understanding of the mechanisms underpinning beliefs about PSD in light of contextual factors. They also provide practitioners with the applied research-informed frameworks for engaging with young people’s PSD, in order to maximise its benefits, bridging the gap between theory and practice, and supporting practitioners’ continuous professional development.
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Chapter 1. Introduction of Thesis, Aims and Relevant Literatures

1.1 Introduction

In a world of social media, online interactions and continually evolving technology, it is more important than ever that we provide opportunities for young people to interact with others offline, develop their social skills and keep them physically and psychologically fit and healthy (World Health Organization [WHO], 2018). Personal and social development (PSD) addresses young people’s strengths and potential to help them develop their social skills and interests, and promotes overall health and wellbeing through a range of activities and in a variety of contexts such as afterschool activities or residential camps and expeditions (e.g., Fenech, Fenech, & Birt, 2013; Hansen, Larson, & Dworkin, 2003; Sultana, 2008). Personal and social development through sail training – one of the outdoor adventure education (OAE) activities providing a context for PSD – has received growing attention in recent years. In the interests of establishing programme credibility and justifying their cost (Goudas, 2010), researchers have focused primarily on measuring the outcomes young people develop (e.g., self-confidence or teamwork skills). Now that a deeper understanding has been achieved of what the outcomes are, it would seem that the next useful development is to understand more about the processes of PSD, so that Ewert’s (1982) “educational black box” (p. 122) can be further unpacked (Allison & Von Wald, 2013; Sibthorp, Paisley, & Gookin, 2007).

One of the contexts in which an understanding of PSD processes can be developed is in the light of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies, which are based on the idea of young people’s growth (Dewey, 1913/1969) and wholesome education (Hahn, 1936; 1947). These educational philosophies offer valuable insights and explanations of the conditions, practices and activities that may influence young people’s PSD – a point which Biesta (2006) echoed in his modern-day educational philosophy. Biesta (2006) suggests that the focus needs to be shifted to “the conditions under which [democratic] action is possible in schools and society” (p. 11) – the conditions on which Dewey and Hahn provided their thorough thoughts. Both Dewey and Hahn also offer a basis for more in-depth thinking on how the process of PSD may occur within the context of broader OAE programme outcomes and practitioners’ beliefs. Wojcikiewicz and Mural (2010) and later Ewert and Sibthorp (2014) noted the influence of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts on the overall philosophy of OAE, which supports the inclusion of Dewey and Hahn’s work as key philosophies for PSD.
As noted above, in addition to understanding the broad context and philosophy behind OAE and its links with PSD, it is also important to develop a better understanding of how practitioners in charge of facilitating the processes of PSD make sense of their own beliefs, young people’s development, and their own roles in facilitating the process. As noted by Pratt and Associates (1998/2005), practitioners’ intentions, actions and beliefs are key to guiding their practices and choosing learning strategies that are associated with the outcomes current research has been primarily concerned with. In essence, the outcomes are only the “tip of the iceberg” (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005, p. 10) whereas the ‘rest of the iceberg’ symbolically illustrates the philosophical underpinnings of practitioners’ beliefs and the complex mechanisms underlining the process of PSD. This thesis, therefore, aims at using the sail training environment, which targets young people’s PSD through the sea (Miner, 1995), as a context to address its overarching aim: to develop a better understanding of practitioners’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and their underpinning philosophies in relation to Dewey and Hahn’s perspectives.

1.2 Brief Overview of Key Literatures

As evident in the previous section, this thesis is positioned within three key literatures: teacher’s beliefs; Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies; and sail training and broader OAE literatures. Each of these literatures is briefly reviewed in the sub-sections which follow, offering some insight into key concepts that are essential for further development of this thesis. Each sub-section also highlights the gaps that emerged after critically reviewing relevant literature.

1.2.1 Teachers’ beliefs literature: A need to investigate beliefs about PSD.

The teachers’ beliefs literature provides fruitful opportunities to better understand the concept of beliefs. In comparisons to OAE literature, it also offers more rigorous theoretical frameworks and underpinning mechanisms explaining the multifaceted relationships between beliefs, actions and intentions which are key to this thesis (see Pratt & Associates, 1998/2003). These relationships are affected by a number of dynamic factors such as beliefs about students’ backgrounds and abilities, expectations of their behaviour and achievements, or self-efficacy beliefs about teachers’ ability to implement a particular technique (Buehl & Fives, 2009; Day
Current teachers’ beliefs literature is centred around the empirical investigations of beliefs about the subject content and practices, with some studies also examining self-efficacy beliefs (i.e., perceived confidence in one’s skills and abilities to perform an action or to achieve a specific goal; Bandura, 1997; e.g., Lumpe, Czerniak, Haney, & Beltyukova, 2012). Both Day and Gu (2010) and B. B. Levin (2015) noted that ‘other’ beliefs are equally important and may further influence the relationships between beliefs about content matters and appropriate pedagogies (e.g., beliefs about accepted behaviours or societal norms). In fact, other beliefs are particularly important when considering existing expectations to promote young people’s PSD either as part of a national curriculum within formal settings (e.g., Florian & Rouse, 2009; MacDonald Grieve, 2009) or as a targeted outcome of extracurricular activities and OAE programmes (e.g., Allison & Von Wald, 2010; Gould & Carson, 2008; 2010; Whitley, Wright, & Gould, 2016). In this case, understanding teachers’ perceptions becomes vital, so that their beliefs, actions and intentions can be further investigated as a means to better understand the process of PSD.

Taking into account the above points, this thesis will investigate the nature of beliefs about young people’s PSD outside formal schooling context. Another viewpoint can also be gained through the literature on educational philosophy which offers an additional dimension to purely empirical and deductive studies that most of teachers’ beliefs literature is based on.

1.2.2 Educational philosophy underpinning teachers’ beliefs: A need to apply Dewey’s thoughts into practice and to conceptualise Hahn’s practices.

As teachers’ beliefs literature has also been critiqued for its failure to consider broader educational philosophies to gain insights into how teachers’ beliefs, practices and perceived roles enhance the purpose of education (Baş, 2015; Fenstermacher, 1978), it is worth considering educational philosophy to address this issue. Pring (2004/2006) explained that educational philosophy offers insights into “the meaning of what is stated, of the truth of what is claimed, of the verification of conclusion reached, of the conceptualization of a problem and its solution, of the objectivity of enquiry and the knowability of reality” (p. 6). Even though the thorough review of educational philosophies is beyond the scope of this thesis, current research is
situated within the educational philosophies of John Dewey (1859-1952) and Kurt Hahn (1886-1974).

Dewey and Hahn's educational thoughts are centred around the idea of young people’s growth and wholesome education—or PSD (Dewey, 1913/1969; Fesmire, 2015; Knoll, 2001). While Dewey provides numerous conceptualisations and insights into conditions needed for PSD, Hahn offers a number of practices aimed at promoting young people’s PSD (Hahn, 1947; Hind, 2016). For instance, Dewey promoted educators’ flexibility and ability to adapt to different environments and learners (Peters, 1977; Thorburn, 2018). Hahn, in turn, is known for using expeditions and fitness training as a means to build “strength of character” (Hahn, 1960, p. 5).

Both Ord and Leather (2011) and Quay (2013) noted that OAE programmes are underpinned by Dewey and Hahn’s ideas and practices which are often either assumed or not well understood. In fact, few studies have made an effort to establish stronger links between OAE programmes and their underpinning educational philosophy, most of which focused on Dewey-informed perspective (e.g., Ord & Leather, 2011; Thorburn, 2018; Thorburn & Marshall, 2011; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010). These studies, however, are theoretical and continue “to review the conceptual ideas of thinkers (such as Dewey) whose theorizing continues to influence outdoor educators” (Thorburn, 2018, p. 27). On the other hand, Marshall’s (2016) thesis empirically investigates the role sail training programme had as a catalyst to Aristotelian practical wisdom although Aristotelian philosophy is beyond the interested of this thesis.

In addition, most studies have made simplistic connections between Hahn’s educational vision and OAE programmes, where OAE programme elements such as novelty and challenge are often linked with Hahn’s use of the same elements (e.g., Hattie, Marsh, Neill, & Richards, 1997; McKenzie, 2003; Veevers & Allison, 2011). Although it may be the case, there is a lack of empirical investigations exploring Hahn’s ideas in greater depth and making broader and deeper links between Hahn’s educational thoughts and OAE and sail training practices and processes. This criticism should be viewed in light of the fact that Hahn never provided thorough conceptualisations of his practices – a point later discussed in Chapter 3.

In order to establish a sound philosophical foundation of beliefs about young people’s PSD, this thesis provides a critical review of Dewey and Hahn’s thoughts relative to this study. Both the practical applications of Dewey’s thoughts into a specific OAE context and further conceptualisations of the processes underpinning
Hahn’s practices are considered. Outdoor adventure education and sail training literatures as a context of this thesis are discussed next.

### 1.2.3 OAE and sail training literatures: A need for practitioners’ perspectives.

Outdoor adventure education and sail training programmes provide a context in which the gaps identified in the previous sections can be explored (i.e., limited understanding of teachers’ and practitioners’ beliefs about PSD and lack of sound philosophical underpinnings to beliefs about PSD). That is, OAE and sail training experiences are conducted within dynamic settings where unfamiliar environment, small group dynamics and challenges have been shown to positively affect young people’s PSD (e.g., Stott, Allison, Von Wald, & Fakunle, 2016).

The traditional focus of OAE and sail training literatures has been on measuring the outcomes of the programmes and “whether programs ‘work’” (Allison & Pomeroy, 2000, p. 91), although it has recently shifted to better understanding young people’s perspectives and experiences. Ewert (1982), Sibthorp et al. (2007) and later Allison and Von Wald (2013) encouraged researchers to focus on the process of OAE to gain further understanding of how and why programme outcomes may be achieved. Although some efforts have been made to better understand programme elements (e.g., Beames, 2004a; Bobilya, McAvoy, & Kalisch, 2005; White, Abraham, Smith, White, & Staiger, 2016), these studies heavily focused on reporting young people’s views often using self-report measures. In essence, a significant amount of current knowledge within OAE is based on young people’s perspectives. Both Brookes (2003c) and Sibthorp (2003) highlighted that the field of OAE is lacking practitioners’—or skippers’ in the context of sail training—perspectives and deeper insights into “what kind of situations help which learners in what ways” (Brookes, 2003c, p. 22).

This thesis, therefore, investigates skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD as a means to introduce a more balanced approach to sail training literature allowing us to better understand the intentions behind skippers’ actions and philosophical underpinnings of skippers’ beliefs.
1.2.4 Investigating skippers’ beliefs and their philosophical underpinnings: A qualitative multi-literature enquiry.

Taking into account the gaps described, the idea of implementing a multi-literature enquiry and a qualitative research study is a logical solution. Indeed, teachers’ beliefs literature provides rigorous theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence on teachers’ beliefs, actions and intentions and the relationships between these three components. Yet, it neglects to expand existing knowledge of teachers’ other beliefs in light of contextual factors or to provide sound philosophical underpinnings for these concepts (Baş, 2015; Buehl & Alexander, 2001; Day & Gu, 2010). Deweyan and Hahnian educational thoughts help to address the latter point. Nevertheless, Dewey has been criticised for his failure to identify criteria against which growth can be measured or to provide an applied framework for educators to use (Thorburn & McAllister, 2013). Meanwhile, Hahn did not provide any thorough theoretical frameworks for his educational establishments and practices (Sutcliffe, 2012). The sail training literature offers a dynamic environment in which developing young people’s PSD is a primary goal of the sail training voyage. However, both OAE and sail training literatures fail to: provide a more balanced view based on both young people’s and practitioners’ perspectives; offer deeper insights into OAE practitioners’ beliefs; and explain the process of PSD through establishing rigorous theoretical and empirical justifications (Houge Mackenzie, Son, & Hollenhorst, 2014; Sibthorp et al., 2007).

Echoing Sibthorp’s (2010) encouragement to look beyond OAE context to better understand the underlying mechanisms of PSD so that current OAE programmes could be further improved, this thesis seeks well-established and rigorous theoretical and methodological frameworks within teachers’ beliefs literature as a starting point to the multi-literature enquiry (see Chapter 2). The focus is then shifted to key ideas of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies relevant to this thesis as a means to establish an initial foundation to provide some insights into educational philosophy potentially underpinning skippers’ beliefs (see Chapter 3). Finally, sail training literature is used not only to identify emerging gaps and further position this thesis within the specific context of OAE, but also to provide better insights into contextual factors present within sail training experience (see Chapter 4). Each body of literature helps to advance a theoretical framework used for developing this thesis and conducting data analysis in later chapters. Such approach
allows for situating this thesis within the “wider practical and scholarly tradition” (Seaman, Brown, & Quay, 2017, p. 1) of implementing a multi-literature enquiry. The danger here, however, is that the multi-literature approach adds complexity to the research process as a number of gaps and connections across literatures have to be identified, expressed and addressed. Each discipline, or even different contexts within the same discipline, have developed different technical language which often refers to the same phenomenon (von Ruschkowski, 2003). For instance, OAE commonly uses PSD to refer to positive youth development (PYD) although according to Gould and Carson (2008), these are often used interchangeably to address the same phenomenon. Overall, ill-defined terms and failure to use consistent definitions across studies prevent transferability and generalisability of findings beyond the context of investigation and endorses the problem of generalisability (Danish, Taylor, Hodge, & Heke, 2004; Fives & Buehl, 2012). This, of course, is a common issue with a multi-literature approach which cannot be avoided but is rather addressed in the following section.

1.2.5 Section summary.

It is evident throughout this section that there is an emerging need to voice practitioners’ views to better understand the intentions and beliefs guiding their actions, so that a broader picture of how the OAE programmes work can be created. Practitioners witness and facilitate the process of PSD on an almost daily basis allowing them to identify the commonality of the process, establish patterns, and better understand the interaction between the programme elements identified by McKenzie (2000) and later by Sibthorp and Jostad (2014). Both Brookes (2003a) and Goudas (2010) also noted that adding a different perspective would provide a valuable source for future programme improvement as more insights could be gained into the intended outcomes, processes, and potentially developed positive outcomes making the results more generalisable. Likewise, comparing skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD with Dewey and Hahn’s perspectives provides further insights into the practical applications of well-conceptualised Dewey’s thoughts. It also helps to develop theoretical conceptualisation of Hahn’s educational practices OAE and sail training programmes claim to follow.
1.3 Defining Key Concepts

After identifying the gaps in existing relevant literatures, and briefly presenting the approach undertaken to address these gaps, it is now important to clarify terminology used throughout this thesis. In doing so, confusion and vagueness due to ill-defined concepts can be avoided (Danish et al., 2004; Gould & Carson; 2008; P. Wright, personal communication, September 21, 2016; R. Cox., personal communication, March 15th, 2017). This section explains the following areas: young people’s PSD; residential nature of OAE; and teacher-practitioner-educator continuum. The section concludes with key terminology used throughout this thesis.

1.3.1 Young people’s PSD.

Personal and social development (PSD) is part of the broader concept of positive youth development (PYD), although these terms are often used interchangeably (Gould & Carson, 2010). Positive youth development focuses on the promotion of young people’s strengths and potential rather than focusing on existing deficits (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010). It has been widely researched within a range of different contexts, initiatives and interventions, including such diverse areas as social competence training during pre-school and early primary school education (e.g., Fuller, 2001); after-school community programmes (e.g., Jenson, Alter, Nicotera, Anthony, & Forrest-Bank, 2013); or life skills development through sport (e.g., Chinkov & Holt, 2016). Personal and social development, though, is a term more commonly used within OAE literature, even though there is no one universal definition (Scrutton & Beames, 2015). For instance, Allison and Won Wald (2010) defined PSD as “developing confidence, cooperation, trust and teamwork….Self-esteem is also regularly identified as central to PSD in outdoor education” (p. 223-224), while R. Gray and Lockhart-Smith (2015) referred to PSD as “the acquisition of skills and knowledge, and the development of behaviours, attributes, and values, that increase an individual’s personal effectiveness” (p. 14).

Positive youth development targets the following key areas: physical, intellectual, psychological/emotional and social (The National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2002). In comparison, PSD typically comprises two components – personal and social – even though Scrutton and Beames (2015) argued that “PSD describes a process that is arguably much broader and more sensitive to the needs of individuals and society in general” (p. 9).
This thesis assumes that PYD is an umbrella term and captures broader development than PSD. Therefore, PSD consists of personal (i.e., intrapersonal) and social (i.e., interpersonal) skills which are tailored to meet individual needs throughout the OAE programmes (also see Section 1.3.4). It is with this distinction in mind, that the term PSD is used throughout this thesis. This provides a multi-dimensional way of thinking where PSD competencies include both individual-orientated (e.g., emotional regulation, self-awareness, self-esteem) and group-orientated outcomes (e.g., negotiation in a group, teamwork or tolerance and respect towards others). Personal and social development is concerned with developing people able to participate successfully in community and social situations, implying that PSD can also be understood as individually tailored social development (Capurso & Borsi, 2013; Jirásek, Roberson & Jirásková, 2017; Sammet, 2005; Stott, Allison, Felter, & Beames, 2015).

1.3.2 Residential nature of OAE programmes.

OAE programmes are designed to help people uncover inner potential and to encourage PSD in a novel, adventure-centred environment (e.g., expeditions, mountaineering or sailing) through adaptation, building trust with other team members, diminishing hierarchical structures and developing effective teamwork (Irvine & Wilson, 1994). Ewert and Sibthorp (2014) defined OAE as follows:

A variety of teaching and learning activities and experiences usually involving a close interaction with an outdoor natural setting and containing elements of real or perceived danger or risk in which the outcome, although uncertain, can be influenced by the actions of the participants and circumstances. (p. 5)

Outdoor adventure education programmes are often residential and involve participants living within accommodation provided for them for the length of the programme (e.g., campsite, outdoor centre, a vessel, etc.). Although there is no mutual agreement in terms of how long a programme should last to achieve maximum potential benefits, an OAE programme can last anywhere from a weekend to a month-long expedition (e.g., Ang, Farihah, & Lau, 2014; Hattie et al., 1997; Neill, 2008; Stott, Allison, & Von Wald, 2013). Therefore, young people – the participants on the programme – are often exposed to novelty in terms of activity and the environment. But they are also taken away from their home environment and home comforts where they engage in communal living with people they often have not met before the OAE experience.
Considering the above, and because OAE activities often require teamwork and co-operation, small group dynamics is a common feature of OAE programmes which is used for participants’ learning in a group-based outdoor context (Bell, 1993; McKenzie, 2000; 2003; J. W. Roberts, 2008; Sibthorp & Jostard, 2014). Overall, OAE programmes require dealing with a number of risky and uncomfortable situations such as home sickness, establishing relationships with peers and teachers in close proximity and within a more dynamic setting, working and living with others on a day-to-day basis, and potential emergency situations (Brown & Fraser, 2009; Sammet, 2010; Stott et al., 2016).

These features are key to understanding the difference between the formal schooling environment and OAE environments, and the various contextual factors which are present in one but not in the other. For instance, formal schooling is often classroom-based, and learners are able to leave on a daily basis and ‘check out’ from the physical and social environments until the next school period. In contrast, participants taking part in an OAE programme do not have an immediate exit, work and live with the same people on a 24/7 basis and cannot find support and comfort in, for example, significant others because they are simply not there. Outdoor adventure education programmes are also subject to other environmental variables which can be out of anyone’s control, including weather conditions or terrain. Therefore, OAE practitioners need to take into consideration not only exaggerated interpersonal and intrapersonal factors but also dynamic environmental conditions which are rarely present within a formal school setting.

**1.3.3 Teacher versus practitioner versus skipper versus educator.**

There is a general agreement that the term *educator* refers to the many different professionals who are involved with instruction and teaching, and hence educator is an umbrella term encompassing teachers, coaches, practitioners and others (Oxford Dictionary, 2015). Nevertheless, for the purposes of this thesis, it is important to distinguish between the terms *teacher*, *practitioner* and *skipper*.

According to the *Oxford Dictionary* (2015), the term *teacher* is often used to describe an educator within the formal school setting. Therefore, this term is used in this thesis to refer to teachers’ beliefs literature and empirical evidence which comes from pre-service, in-service or veteran teachers involved with teaching a national curriculum within a formal school setting. A *practitioner*, on the other hand, is the term used to refer to teachers, coaches, instructors and other professionals usually
working outside formal schooling environments who are concerned with providing some sort of teaching and instruction. For instance, “leaders on expeditions are generally given the responsibility for ‘teaching' young people in some way” (Allison & Von Wald, 2010, p. 229) and hence, instructors working within the OAE environment are referred to as OAE practitioners throughout this thesis. The term skipper is used to refer specifically to fully-qualified instructors working on a sail training vessel (also see Section 1.3.4 and Chapter 4) as a way to clarify the literature from which the empirical evidence is drawn. Using the terminology in these ways not only aids in recognising the differences between teachers’ beliefs, OAE and sail training literatures, but also helps to highlight links between them.

Lastly, Davies and Gibson (1967) defined the concept of social educator as any adult who forms a relationship with a young person. They explained that:

[It matters little whether they [educators] undertake extra-curricular and non-syllabus work in schools or colleges, or whether they are available one night a week or two weeks a year, or every day of their working life; it is of no account whether they wear distinctive clothing or not; it makes no difference whether they receive payment or lose heavily from their personal pocket – for the adolescent they have the same role to play. For through their practice the young person will experience situations which foster his [sic] developing personality, elicit responses to a whole range of relationships and introduce interests and concerns which will give substance and breadth to his [sic] life. (p. 12)

Therefore, all adults are social educators “as practitioners of human relationships” (Davies & Gibson, 1967, p. 197), no matter how the individual terms discussed above are being defined.

1.3.4 Key terminology.

In addition to the educator terms discussed above, there are a number of other main terms used throughout this thesis. These are defined below to aid clarity and avoid potential misunderstandings.

Beliefs – complex, multifaceted and dynamic constructs which have no one consistent definition within the literature. Beliefs help one to construct knowledge, reflect upon experience and guide human actions, and are particularly resistant to rapid change because they are often implicit (i.e., individuals are not conscious of them; Fives & Buehl, 2008; 2012; Pajares, 1992). A system of beliefs consists of a
variety of beliefs about a range of topics, all of which have complex overlapping relationships with one's actions.

**Personal and Social Development (PSD)** – PSD is a part of positive youth development and consists of two key components – person-orientated and group-orientated skills. Personal and social development includes a range of skills (e.g., coping skills, emotional regulation, negotiation, consideration for others, compromising, teamwork, etc.) and aims at developing an individual who can successfully and effectively take part in a society through achieving personal effectiveness and potential (R. Gray & Lockhart-Smith, 2015).

**Outdoor Adventure Education (OAE)** – OAE programmes are typically residential experiences taking part in a novel physical and social setting for a fixed period of time. The purpose of OAE programmes is to promote young people’s PSD where the activity is used as a vehicle to achieve PSD-related outcomes (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; B. Martin, Cashel, Wagstaff, & Breunig, 2006). Outdoor adventure education programmes are typically centred around a group experience where programme outcomes and young people’s PSD are targeted through risk-taking, novelty, adaptation, building successful interpersonal relationships with other team members and developing effective teamwork (Irvine & Wilson, 1994; Sibthorp & Jostad, 2014; Stott et al., 2016). Due to a number of contextual variables present within the OAE environment (i.e., people, weather conditions and outdoor activities), it is often referred to as *hyperdynamic* environment (Collins & Collins, 2015b). Outdoor adventure education programmes are based on ideas of experiential learning/education and these terms are often used interchangeably. However, OAE includes adventure as one of its elements whereas experiential learning can be conducted in classroom-based settings (e.g., laboratory work) and does not necessary include adventure.

**Sail Training** – one type of residential OAE programme that uses working aboard a vessel and the sea as a context for PSD. Although sail training experience involves working and living on board for a period of time, teaching sailing skills is not the primary aim of the programme but rather a means to promote PSD (McCulloch, 2004; 2007; Rowe, Dadswell, Mudie, & Rauworth, 2014).
Teacher – an educator primarily working within the formal schooling environment and often teaching national curriculum (Oxford Dictionary of English, 2015).

Practitioner – an educator working within a non-formal environment and often teaching skills from extra- or alternative-curriculum.

Skipper – the highest ranked person (i.e., first in command) on a sail training vessel who has appropriate professional qualifications needed to take charge of the boat.

Young people – those people aged between 15 and 24 years of age (The United Nations, n.d.).

Trainees – young people who come on board to take part in a sail training experience and form a crew.

1.3.5 Section summary.

Many terms used throughout the literatures reviewed for this thesis are vague and ill-defined, reducing generalisability of key findings and their transferability into different contexts (Danish et al., 2004; Fives & Buehl, 2012). The definitions provided above and explained in this section are used to describe key concepts and allow for consistency and mutual understanding of the key arguments. These arguments will be developed throughout the next chapters.

1.4 Purpose of this Thesis

Taking into account the theoretical, philosophical and applied needs identified in the preceding sections of this chapter, the main aim, objectives and research questions of this thesis are:

Aim:

To develop a better understanding of skippers' beliefs about young people's PSD and their philosophical underpinnings.
Objectives:
1. critically review relevant literatures;
2. develop an understanding of Dewey and Hahn’s theoretical contributions to young people’s PSD;
3. develop theoretical frameworks based on relevant literatures;
4. understand the demands and contextual factors present during the sail training experience;
5. explore appropriate methodologies to evaluate skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD;
6. empirically investigate skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD;
7. compare and contrast skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD with Dewey and Hahn’s perspectives;
8. and then to provide an applied framework helping practitioners to better understand the process of PSD and guide its facilitation.

Research questions:
Research Question 1 (RQ1): What is the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience?
   a. What process do young people undergo for their PSD?
   b. How do skippers develop their beliefs about young people’s PSD over time?
   c. How do skippers perceive their roles and practices facilitating the process of young people’s PSD?
   d. To what extent and how do contextual factors affect skippers’ perceptions on their roles and beliefs within the process of young people’s PSD?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What are Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to an understanding of young people’s PSD during sail training experience in relation to literature and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience?
   a. What are the theoretical contributions of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts on young people’s PSD?
   b. To what extent do Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies underpin skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD?
1.5 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis offers a multi-literature enquiry to address the identified gaps within the relevant literatures and to fulfil its aims. This section, therefore, offers a succinct overview of each chapter to follow. It also explains the use of first- and third-person pronouns throughout this thesis.

1.5.1 Structural outline.

This thesis comprises eight chapters, two of which contain empirical findings that are used to form and illustrate later arguments. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on teachers’ beliefs, their formation and role. This literature is key to investigating skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. The chapter provides explanations of the key concepts underpinning teachers’ beliefs and practices, and the relationship between the two. Links with OAE practitioners and the overall setting of OAE, including the sail training, are made throughout the chapter. Chapter 2 concludes with the development of the first part of a theoretical framework. It explains the relationships between practitioners, learners and the curriculum adapted to the sail training environment and as guided by practitioner’s beliefs, actions and intentions (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005).

Chapter 3 reviews Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts and highlights those which are relevant to this thesis. In doing so, the chapter introduces and explains the central components of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies and summarises their expectations of educators. This chapter also makes links with OAE and sail training literatures in light of the philosophical assumptions underpinning these programmes. Further connections between specific OAE programme elements and central components of Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies are made. The chapter concludes with the second part of the theoretical model which summarises conditions, activities and practices that are needed for young people’s growth as advocated by Dewey and Hahn (and therefore in terms of this thesis, needed for PSD).

The focus of Chapter 4 shifts towards introducing the specific context of sail training. The chapter begins with a detailed description of a typical sail training environment before reporting on a systematic review of the sail training literature. The systematic sail training literature review allows for the development of a better understanding of existing trends within the literature and results in the provision of a summary table on young people’s views on why or how sail training experience
‘works’. Broader OAE literature is briefly reviewed to provide a deeper understanding of key features of OAE programmes relevant to this thesis. Building on the understanding developed in Chapter 2, the third part of the theoretical framework is then presented. This part of the framework explains the complex relationship between skippers’ beliefs and their practices in light of the dynamic contextual factors existing within the sail training environment.

Chapter 5 moves on to explain the ontological and epistemological assumptions which underpin this thesis. Methodological assumptions are then clarified before research ethics, sampling procedures and the key characteristics of the sample are presented and discussed. The chosen research methods are then explained and justified in light of research aims and questions, and the ontological and epistemological positions adopted. Data collection and step-by-step data analysis approaches and procedures are explained. The coherence of these factors contributes to ensuring the rigour and trustworthiness of the research study.

Chapters 6 and 7 present the main empirical findings of this study. The chapters are thematically organised in relation to RQ1 and RQ2, respectively. Both chapters follow the same structure where the results are presented first, followed by further analysis and discussion. Both chapters use all relevant bodies of literature reviewed in the preceding chapters to make links with emerging findings and develop the arguments of the thesis. While Chapter 6 uses inductive data analysis and Chapter 7 uses deductive data analysis, these approaches supplement one other in analysing empirical results and allow better conceptualisation of what the empirical data reveals (see Chapter 5; Blackstone, 2012; Patton, 2002).

This thesis is brought to a conclusion in Chapter 8, which provides an overview of the whole research process. Recommendations for future research and practice are made, and final conclusions complete the chapter.

1.5.2 First- versus third-person perspective.

Although there is an existing debate within the academic community on the use of first- versus third-person perspective, there are pros and cons for both sides of the argument. In recent years, the first-person perspective has become the more widely used tradition within the social sciences (Kirsch, 1994). The reason for this is mainly the acknowledgement of researcher’s interpretations on the topic providing more subjective conclusions underpinned by one’s perceptions and explanations (Webb, 1992). Webb (1992) noted that use of the third-person “obliterates the social
elements of the research process” (p. 747) which are paramount for an interpretivist ontological position, a social constructivist epistemology and the qualitative research paradigm. On the other hand, natural sciences researchers following a positivist ontological assumption often conform to more ‘traditional’ academic expectations using the third-person perspective. The third-person perspective eliminates personal bias, constructs objective arguments and “turn[s] opinions into truths” (Kirsch, 1994, p. 382) where writer’s/scholar’s identity and voices become of little significance (Chalmers, 2013; Danielewicz, 2008; Gorelick, 1991).

Bearing in mind the nature of this thesis and the pros and cons of using the first- or third-person perspective as outlined above, it is appropriate for different parts of this thesis to use different traditions. That is, the first-person perspective is employed to indicate the researcher’s specific ideas and empirical work and the conceptualisations grasped throughout the research process. The third-person perspective is employed mostly to conform to the expectations of academic writing when presenting objective ideas, making strongly supported points and constructing logical arguments. The third-person perspective is also used to indicate other scholars’ ownership and to review critically “a subject in the light of the available evidence” (Webb, 1992, p. 748; e.g., literature review chapters). At times, a reference to an academic community is made by using the pronoun ‘we’. Although ‘we’ creates feelings of belonging to the community and implies membership and inclusion, it also allows for dynamic processes to occur promoting dialectic discussion within the community and drawing one’s attention to the need for collaborative efforts to advance existing knowledge (Wiesenfeld, 1996). The use of ‘we’ also helps to make a more coherent transition from employing one perspective to another one as the thesis progresses.

1.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an introduction to this thesis and explained the rationale behind conducting this research. It also introduced the literatures in which this thesis is positioned (i.e., teachers’ beliefs, Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts, sail training and limited OAE literatures) and identified the main gaps in current knowledge. These gaps were: lack of understanding of teachers’ and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and the effect of contextual factors; the need to understand skippers’ perspectives within sail training literature; lack of sound philosophical underpinnings of teachers’ beliefs literature; and the need to provide
further insights into practical applications of Dewey's educational thoughts within a specific OAE context while aiming to further conceptualise Hahn's educational practices often assumed to underpin OAE and sail training practice. The chapter also identified and defined key concepts and terminology used throughout the thesis, focusing on and explaining subtle but important differences between, for example, teachers and practitioners. The chapter culminated in the presentation of the aims and research questions of this thesis and concluded with an overview of the overall structure. The benefits of employing both first- and third-person perspectives throughout this thesis were also explained.
Chapter 2. Educators’ Beliefs: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews teachers’ beliefs literature and its relevance to this thesis. It provides a pivotal overview and introduction to key ideas and principles relevant to skippers’ beliefs. The chapter presents a succinct picture of what beliefs are, how they develop, what factors affect beliefs and the overall function of beliefs. It also reviews OAE literature in light of aims and research questions of this thesis. As a result of this overview, the initial foundation is laid from which the first part of the theoretical framework of this thesis is developed and concludes this chapter.

There are three unique challenges in this chapter. The first challenge is to make clear why an understanding of teachers’ beliefs literature is essential given the aims and research questions of this thesis (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). This thesis is using sail training skippers as a specific population and context through which to develop a better understanding of teachers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. Since such beliefs have not been investigated for skippers, sail training and OAE to the same extent as with other populations, little could be understood if only OAE and sail training literatures were taken into consideration (Sibthorp, 2010). Therefore, this thesis goes beyond sail training and OAE literatures because teachers’ beliefs literature offers useful insights into conceptualisations, development and function of beliefs. These areas are essential to grasp to address the aims of this thesis. In addition, teachers’ beliefs literature offers scientific rigour and well-researched empirical constructs of beliefs which have not yet been developed within OAE literature (Taylor & Caldarelli, 2004).

The second challenge for this chapter is to continually bring OAE practitioners and the OAE context into focus. It is important to highlight the similarities and differences between teachers and OAE practitioners to develop a deeper understanding of how teachers’ beliefs literature informs this thesis. The identified similarities and differences may affect beliefs in unique ways and, therefore, it is also important to turn back to the limited literature exploring the beliefs of practitioners who work outside the formal schooling setting (e.g., Taylor, 2006; 2011). As explained in Chapter 1, terms teacher and practitioner are used in parallel to represent teachers working within the formal schooling environment, and educators working outside the formal schooling setting (e.g., sail training skippers, climbing instructors, environmental educators, etc.) respectively. As such, this chapter reviews teachers’ beliefs literature first before it moves on to provide an essential review of key relevant
OAE literature (systematic sail training literature review is reported in Chapter 4). Combined, better understanding of educators’ beliefs, their functions and formation over time can be develop which is crucial for the aims and research questions of this thesis.

The third and final challenge for this chapter, is to establish key concepts relevant to this thesis before they can be further explored within the OAE context and in light of Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives in later chapters.

In order to deal with the identified challenges more effectively, it is important to provide a thorough explanation on how the literature review reported in this chapter was conducted. Three literature search strategies were used: search strategies; a set of key articles, snowballing and forward snowballing; and inclusion criteria (Hart, 2001; Wohlin, 2014). Prior to any of the literature search strategies could be carried out, it was important to define and narrow the topic of interest and its limits (Harts, 2001). As such, the following sub-topics were identified as inclusion criteria:

- Types and functions of beliefs
- The relationship between beliefs and practices
- Formation of beliefs
- Beliefs about personal and social development OR other beliefs

The following criteria were also used to further guide teacher’s beliefs (reported in Section 2.2) and OAE (reported in Section 2.3) literature searches:

- the study report was available in English;
- a full study report or a draft manuscript was available;
- the study report followed a recognisable referencing system;
- the study report was published or produced between 2000 and 2018 unless it was seminal work (e.g., Pajares, 1992);
- The study was conducted with Physical Education teachers OR OAE practitioners in any OAE setting (for initial searchers only);
- books and grey literature were considered if the above criteria were met.

The literature search started from searching for relevant studies conducted in a context of OAE and/or investigated beliefs of Physical Education teachers. Google Scholar was used as an initial search engine to familiarise myself with existing
literature. Keywords included “personal philosophy”, “teachers’ beliefs”, “teachers’ values”, “values and beliefs”, “personal development”, “physical education”, “outdoor education”, “instructors”, etc. Various combinations of keywords were also used. For instance, “values and beliefs” AND “outdoor education”.

Next, specific academic journals were searched using same searching strategies. These included *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, *Journal of Experiential Learning*, *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, and *Environmental Education Research*. Combined, literature search resulted in a set of 38 key studies (see Reference list) which were then used for snowballing and forward snowballing search technique (Wohlin, 2014). Snowballing technique allowed me to identify seminal works (e.g., Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005) while forward snowballing helped me to find newer studies conducted within the area interested (e.g., Collins, Collins, & Grecic, 2015).

Even though there is a significant amount of educators’ beliefs literature available, only 11 empirical studies investigating OAE practitioners’ beliefs were identified (see Reference list). As such, this chapter explains key mechanisms underpinning educators’ beliefs in light of teachers' beliefs literature first. The chapter then offers an overview of OAE literature to provide more insight into specific factors common across many OAE programmes, such as use of the outdoors as a context for developing young people’s PSD or for small group dynamics (e.g., Jostad et al., 2015; Sibthorp, 2010; Sibthorp & Morgan, 2011). It also reviews the six studies that investigated OAE practitioners’ beliefs. Combined, both literatures allow us to further explore educators’ roles, beliefs and expectations in relation to aims and research questions of this thesis.

### 2.2 Key Aspects of Beliefs: What They Are, How They Form and Function

It is hard to define accurately what a belief is, partially because people generally lack awareness of their own beliefs which are often implicit and not clearly conceptualised (Fang, 1996). In addition, teachers’ beliefs literature consists of thousands of empirical studies, most of them based on somewhat different definitions, which reduces consistency and makes it more difficult to conceptualise what a belief means (Fives & Buehl, 2012). This section, therefore, aims to provide essential information on what beliefs are, how they can be classified, how beliefs develop and what functions beliefs have.
2.2.1 Conceptualisation of beliefs.

As noted by Taylor and Caldarelli (2004), there are several definitions and conceptualisations within existing literature describing what a belief is. Pajares (1992) defined beliefs as “an individual’s judgement of the truth or falsity of a proposition” (p. 316) whereas Thompson (1992) referred to beliefs as dynamic systems which are “permeable mental structures, susceptible to change in light of experience…. The relationship between beliefs and practice is a dialectic, not a simple cause-and-effect relationship” (p. 140). Whether beliefs are defined as dynamic systems or individual constructs, emerging common features suggest that beliefs are complex and multifaceted constructs which guide one’s behaviours, provide a framework for assessing actions, and help one to construct knowledge and reflect upon experience (Fives & Buehl, 2008; 2012; Taylor & Caldarelli, 2004). There is no one right or wrong way to define beliefs, but failing to understand the underlying complexity and interconnectedness of different beliefs mitigates against fully conceptualising and comprehending their significance on one’s actions.

In the context of teaching, beliefs are often referred to as “the most stable and least flexible aspect of a person’s perspective on teaching” (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005, p. 21) implying that beliefs are resistant to rapid change (Lim & Chan, 2007). Based on their systematic literature review, Fives and Buehl (2012) argued that stability of beliefs should be viewed on a continuum where core and well-integrated beliefs are the most stable at one end, and not clearly defined, new and isolated beliefs are the least stable at the other end. Some beliefs are more easily changed and adapted by ongoing experiences or interventions, whereas other beliefs may take longer, or require more prominent personal experiences to change. The point here is that beliefs are not unconditionally fixed and steady; ongoing adjustments to one’s beliefs should be viewed as a normal process of personal and professional development which is not time defined.

Another key point is that beliefs can be general or specific (i.e., context-independent or context-dependent respectively). That is, some beliefs are broader and cover more general personal philosophy or ideals across different areas. Other beliefs, however, are activated by unique circumstances in the presence of certain factors (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Activated beliefs become dominant only under these specific conditions. For instance, beliefs can be inactive and masked by other predominant beliefs under different circumstances (Verjovsky & Waldegg, 2005). Muis, Bendixen and Haerle (2006) noted that context-dependent beliefs “are socially
constructed and context bound; the context is the instructional environment, which is also embedded in the academic context and the sociocultural context” (p. 31). In line with Muis et al. (2006), Fives and Buehl (2012) explained that the unique features of different contexts or learners may activate very specific beliefs which are not otherwise present. For example, teachers may allow more unstructured activities within a classroom setting as it provides a safe space for less supervised exploration. In comparison, teacher might engage with a more directive and authoritarian approach when taking the same group of students into outdoor setting which presents more risks and direct danger to the learners. Context as one of the factors influencing beliefs is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

2.2.2 Types of beliefs.

Teachers’ beliefs have been categorised in many different ways within teachers’ beliefs literature over the years (e.g., B. B. Levin, 2015; Richardson, 1996). Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) identified three main types of beliefs: epistemic, which are essential to individual perspectives on teaching, justifying where knowledge comes from, why it is important and how one knows whether learning occurred; procedural, that is what actions, when and how should be applied and adjusted including justifications for those actions; and normative, which include teachers’ perspectives on their own roles, responsibilities, relationships and social norms.

In contrast, B. B. Levin (2015) identified at least seven types of beliefs: beliefs about knowledge (i.e., where knowledge comes from or epistemic beliefs); beliefs about students (e.g., skill level, cultural or socio-economic background); beliefs about self (e.g., self-efficacy beliefs); beliefs about subject matter or content; beliefs about pedagogy (e.g., how to teach); beliefs about moral and ethical dilemmas (e.g., concerning specific groups of learners or current affairs); and beliefs about societal issues (e.g., political views or issues of poverty).

Irrespective of which classification one decides to follow, it is clear that some beliefs are more explicit than others, and some have a more direct effect on teaching than others (e.g., beliefs about student ability vs. beliefs about working relationships). It appears that when faced with different challenges, teachers are influenced by several additional factors which affect their beliefs and shape their ‘acceptance’ of actions and intentions (see Section 2.2.3). The point here is that all types of beliefs are applicable to many different disciplines and teaching environments, even though the teachers’ beliefs literature tends to focus on pedagogical or procedural beliefs,
content or subject beliefs and epistemic beliefs about a school subject within a formal school setting (e.g., Lumpe et al., 2012; Sahin, Bullock, & Stables, 2002). Nonetheless, there are a few exceptions in the literature where epistemic and pedagogical beliefs were investigated with adult practitioners outside the formal school setting, for example in local parks, museums, or outdoors (e.g., Collins et al., 2015; Hill, 2010; Taylor, 2006; 2011). These studies provide further insights into practitioners’ beliefs not only within non-formal settings but also how environmental and contextual factors influence beliefs and approaches when delivering more risky activities compared with formal classroom settings (also see Section 2.3 and Chapter 4). Likewise, in Fives and Buehl’s (2012) summary table reported in their literature review article, 12 out of 73 studies examined teachers’ beliefs about self and the rest investigated pedagogical beliefs.

B. B. Levin (2015) noted in her review chapter that current teachers’ beliefs literature has overlooked the importance of other beliefs such as self-efficacy beliefs about teachers’ own ability to teach, or beliefs about students’ socio-economic background and their abilities. Despite this claim, there is a growing body of teachers’ beliefs literature which examines self-efficacy beliefs within both formal and OAE settings (e.g., Fives, Hamman, & Olivarez, 2007; Day & Gu, 2010; Schumann, Sibthorp, & Hacker, 2014; Schumann & Sibthorp, 2016). These studies, however, are mainly focused on perceived technical competencies, implementation of pedagogies or work conducted with more challenging learners. Very few studies have investigated teachers’—or practitioners’—beliefs about ethical, moral, societal or political dilemmas or beliefs about PSD especially when PSD is the key aim of the educational programmes. Indeed, Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) use the example of a mechanic for whom teaching women how to repair their car is “just as much about changing society” (p. 50) and raising questions about gender stereotypes and discrimination. Thus, some teachers and practitioners have clearly defined and well-conceptualised beliefs about a range of issues which are the true intention of their practice.

**2.2.3 Factors influencing formation of beliefs.**

As noted in the previous section, teachers’ beliefs are influenced by a number of factors such as the context in which they work, previous experiences and their own and learners’ abilities (e.g., MacDonald Grieve, 2009; Hodge, Ammah, Casebolt, Lamaster, & O’Sullivan, 2004). Buehl and Fives (2009) identified six main sources of
beliefs: formal preparation (e.g., lectures or education); formal bodies of information (e.g., articles or the Internet); observational and vicarious experience (e.g., observing other teachers teaching); interactive and collaborative experiences with others (e.g., discussions or sharing experiences with other teachers); enactive experiences (e.g., personal life experiences or critical moments), and self-reflection. Day and Gu (2010) discuss four critical influences on teachers’ commitment and resilience which, in turn, affect their beliefs: personal influences (e.g., family support, personal relationships or health); pupils (e.g., learners’ attitudes or motivation to learn); practice settings (e.g., support from other staff or embedded contextual factors); and policy (e.g., school agenda or national curriculum). The context in which teachers teach is crucial to understanding embedded environmental influences on the development of beliefs which may lead to the identification of context-dependent and independent beliefs (see Section 2.2.1). According to B. B. Levin (2015), beliefs and actions cannot be separated from the context in which they occur. Therefore, as the context of this thesis, sail training is discussed in some detail in Chapter 4.

For the purposes of this thesis, it is worth reviewing two key factors influencing beliefs: context and experience (personal and teaching). The importance of these factors becomes more prominent throughout the subsequent chapters of this thesis and thus, a good foundation of each factor is worth while at this stage.

Context. Scholars may refer to “factors embedded in teachers’ workplace” (Day & Gu, 2010, p. 52) or allude to the idea that teachers’ beliefs are affected by the broader context of schools’ policies and national curriculum (e.g., Horrell & Mulhdland, 2017) as well as the cultural context of the society (e.g., Hill, 2010; Hermans, van Braak, & Van Keer, 2008). Taylor and Caldarelli (2004) and later Taylor (2011) noted that non-formal environments such as parks, museums or zoos present the practitioners with a number of contextual challenges which vary from risk to participants present within nature (e.g., watching birds at night) to one-off voluntary participation of learners of mixed ages, abilities and interests in the subject. Confirming these observations, Tschannen-Morgan, Salloum and Goddard (2015) noted that teachers’ “beliefs are shaped by interactions with others in the environment in which they work” (p. 301). Differences among environments become especially clear if one investigates and compares different teaching settings, for example classrooms versus outdoors. Other contextual factors include: physical features of environment (e.g., available equipment or capacity; Brush, Glazewski, & Foon Hew,
background and ability of learners (e.g., additional special needs or socio-economic background; Swain, Nordness, & Leader-Janssen, 2012); and naturally occurring circumstances (e.g., weather conditions; Taylor, 2011). Undoubtedly, some of these factors are more important when working outdoors or taking a technical, competency-based course where some danger to learners will always be present due to the nature of the environment and the activity itself. Scholars within OAE noted that contextual factors alter the role of the OAE practitioner, as within seconds they may change the environment from facilitating an educational experience to managing a risky situation (see Section 2.4; Brown, 2002; Brown & Fraser, 2009; Collins & Collins, 2012). Hence, compared with the steadier and less dynamic nature of a classroom environment, the dynamic change and nature of environmental features affect OAE practitioners’ situation-specific beliefs which further prioritise their actions and practices (also see Sections 2.2.1 and Chapter 4). This does not mean, however, that OAE practitioners’ beliefs change. Instead, a specific belief is activated by a certain feature which becomes more important in that moment in time but does not challenge a core belief (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005). As an example, consider performing a technically complicated manoeuvre under poor weather conditions during sail training. Since successful completion of the skill becomes more important, this may activate a belief about the need to focus on technical aspects of the skill. This, in turn, results in skippers engaging with an authoritarian style and taking direct charge rather than addressing the need to communicate well or supervising a young person to perform a task. Indeed, crashing a boat has profound consequences on the overall sail training experience. This specific belief, therefore, would be predominant only under certain conditions even though generally it is part of a set of beliefs held by a skipper. Therefore, it is crucial to recognise the environment of OAE and sail training as a means to develop a deeper understanding about OAE practitioners’ beliefs. Key elements of OAE experience creating the contextual factors affecting beliefs, actions and practices are discussed in Section 2.3 while the context of sail training is explained in Chapter 4.

**Experience (personal and teaching).** The final area to cover in this section is the importance of personal life experiences, teaching practice and accumulated teaching experience. Richardson (1996) and later Kang (2008) noted that practice and beliefs influence each other, while Wilkins (2008) claimed that beliefs influence practice. According to Buehl and Beck (2015), the general agreement is that beliefs
influence what is being done in practice but equally, practice influences beliefs. For example, success—or lack of success—in implementing certain teaching strategies, alters teachers’ beliefs about those strategies (Swain et al., 2012). Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) noted that “more experienced teachers tend to have a well-developed repertoire of activities and adjust their tactical knowledge to evolving circumstances” (p. 212). However, this is not necessarily true if accumulated teaching experience is not reflected upon. Indeed, Bolton (2010) explained that there is a “difference between 20 years of experience and one year of experience repeated 20 times” (p. 8).

There are many studies investigating teachers’ personal life experiences throughout their lives and the effect of those experiences on teachers’ beliefs. For instance, Butt, Raymond, McCue and Yamagishi (1992) reported an in-depth case study of a teacher who developed his beliefs about students’ PSD through his own experience of self-discipline and taking responsibility for and care of nine siblings; experiencing cultural and socio-economic deprivation when growing up; and adopting teaching techniques that helped him to overcome language struggles at school. In line with Butt et al. (1992), Morgan and Hansen (2008) found that physical education (PE) teachers’ memories and personal experience of their own PE classes at school influenced their current PE practices. While in-depth narrative analysis of individual’s life experience is beyond the scope of this thesis, Chapter 6 touches upon this topic as one of the factors influencing formation and change of skippers’ beliefs over time.

Factors influencing beliefs go far beyond immediately present aspects of teachers’ lives or environments and can be related to critical events which took place many years ago. Butt et al. (1992) noted that “to understand the knowledge that teachers possess it is imperative that we know it in the way that the individual teacher does” (p. 57). Indeed, such knowledge allows for better understanding of the effect of beliefs about issues within and beyond the teachers’ profession. These beliefs, in turn, influence educational practice and overall personal philosophies as these are constructed through social contexts and in light of personal and teaching experience (Day & Gu; 2010; Muis et al., 2006; Pajares, 1992).

2.2.4 Function of beliefs.

As noted earlier in this chapter, beliefs are often understood as guides to one’s actions and behaviours. Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) explained that beliefs are one of three aspects of commitment (actions, intentions and beliefs), often expressed
as rationale or justification for actions being taken (e.g., the way one teaches) and intentions/objectives of those actions. To better understand the above conceptualisation, three functions of beliefs identified by Fives and Buehl (2012) become useful. These are: beliefs as filters for interpretation; beliefs as frames for addressing problems; and beliefs as guides for teachers’ actions.

**Beliefs as filters for interpretation.** Pajares (1992) argued that beliefs influence how an individual characterises each phenomenon and makes sense of it. Beliefs can help teachers to filter out what is important through ‘collecting data’ and interpreting it against previous experience and available information (e.g., Butt et al., 1992; Priestley, Biesta, & Robinson, 2015; Taylor, 2006). Beliefs as filters for interpretation also allow teachers to make sense of new information and experiences, and to decide which information is relevant and should be presented to the learners (Taylor, 2006; 2011; Priestley et al., 2015).

**Beliefs as frames for addressing problems.** Once received information and experience is filtered, beliefs then provide a framework against which the situation or the problem can be conceptualised and potentially resolved. According to D. M. Levin, Hammer and Coffey (2009), framing allows people to make sense of “what is going on” (p. 146). Likewise, Lau (2010) explained that framing helps the teacher to better understand what the student is saying by using their own beliefs as frames to achieve mutual understanding.

**Beliefs as guides for teacher’s actions.** The final function of teachers’ beliefs is argued to be the most important for assessing the quality of teachers’ practice and implementation. This is because beliefs help us to decide what actions should be taken within different situations and why (Fives & Buehl, 2012).

It is important to highlight the overlapping and complex functions of types of beliefs. That is, belief X is needed to filter out what information is relevant and how it should be interpreted; belief Y helps to frame and conceptualise the problem based on the filtered information, and belief Z is guiding actions being taken to resolve the situation. Different types of beliefs may have different functions to fulfil, and all three functions complement each other and are not mutually exclusive (Fives & Buehl, 2012). For example, epistemic beliefs may be used as filters for interpretation, normative beliefs – as frames to define and further contextualise the problem, and
procedural beliefs – as guides to actions. The way in which these three types of belief functions interact to inform actions is captured in Figure 2.1.

![Diagram of beliefs functions and types]

**Figure 2.1.** The complex relationship between functions and types of beliefs. Adapted from Fives and Buehl’s (2012) systematic literature review and works by Pratt and Associates (1998/2005).

It is worth noting that it is complicated to delineate functions, types of beliefs and aspects of commitment, as all three areas are pivotal parts of the “interconnected web of key beliefs structures” (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005, p. 213). That is, each function of beliefs is underpinned by aspects of commitment visually illustrated in Figure 2.2.
2.2.5 Section summary.

Teachers’ and practitioners’ beliefs are complex and multifaceted phenomena which have been addressed from numerous perspectives: issues of definition and conceptualisation of the term; investigating context-dependent and independent beliefs; exploring factors affecting development of beliefs; and focusing on specific types of beliefs. It is challenging to separate all these aspects from each other, as beliefs are not mutually exclusive but rather interconnected and influencing each other’s meaning and function. The key aspects of beliefs discussed in this section lay the foundation for this thesis. The section also highlighted some existing gaps within teachers’ beliefs literature which included the fact that investigating epistemic, pedagogical and self-efficacy beliefs has primarily been done in low-risk classroom environments rather than in OAE. This thesis is set within the sail training environment which provides a more challenging educational setting within which contextual factors and other types of beliefs are being investigated.

2.3 Key literature and features of OAE.

As noted earlier in this chapter, OAE programmes provide more dynamic context which is likely to influence the formation and implementation of beliefs into practices (see Section 2.2.3). In order to develop a better understanding of how certain aspects of OAE experience may affect OAE practitioners’ beliefs, actions and intentions, this section offers a succinct review of OAE literature in light of the key mechanisms underpinning beliefs reviewed earlier in this chapter and aims and research questions of this thesis. The following three themes will be reviewed in more depth: key elements of the OAE programmes; small group dynamics; and OAE practitioners. The identified themes allow to maintain focus of this section as OAE
literature consists of numerous studies that have addresses different topics and investigated a number of phenomena varying from: measuring programme outcomes (e.g., Pike & Beames, 2007); conducting thematic literature review to synthesise the developed PSD outcomes (e.g., Stott et al., 2015); to identifying key elements of OAE experiences (e.g., McKenzie, 2000); and investigating OAE practitioners’ conflicting roles (e.g., T. Thomas, 2010).

Outdoor adventure education literature was conducted in two stages. The first stage aimed at introducing and explaining key aspects of OAE programmes (e.g., programme outcomes, key elements, dominating views and methodological decisions). The literature search started with an initial set of articles (see Reference list) which was then used for implementing snowballing and forward snowballing techniques (Hart, 2001; Wohlin, 2014; also see Section 2.1). Criteria outlined in Section 2.1 were combined with the following sub-themes:

- the study offered a critical synthesis of existing OAE literature;
- the study was identified as seminal work (e.g., Ewert, 1986);
- the study investigated programme outcomes, underpinning mechanisms and/or theoretical explanation of the overall OAE experience;
- the study reported OAE practitioners’ views or identified the OAE practitioners as one of key elements reported by young people.

The second stage centred around identifying current literature investigating OAE practitioners’ beliefs. As noted in the introduction to this chapter (see Section 2.1), OAE literature is limited in investigating OAE practitioners’ beliefs. After conducting the literature search, 11 relevant studies were identified. These studies met criteria listed in Section 2.1 as well as additional criteria:

- The study was conducted with qualified OAE practitioners or student-practitioners in any OAE setting (including adventure sports coaches qualified in OAE activities such as mountaineering or kayaking);
- The study context met the definition of OAE provided in Chapter 1.3.

There also were exclusion criteria to further align the identified literature with both aims and context of this thesis:
targeted participants of the OAE programmes were young children (e.g., kindergarten);
the study context was outdoor play or field trips;
the outdoor was used by formal schooling teachers to teach their main subjects (e.g., maths).

Empirical studies that met the above criteria are summarised in Section 2.3.3.

2.3.1 Key elements of the OAE programmes.
McKenzie (2000) noted that there are six key features of OAE programmes: the physical environment; activities; processing; the group; instructors; and the participants. These factors are not mutually exclusive across OAE programmes and influence each other as well as the overall experience. That is, OAE programmes take place in an environment in which a group of participants and their leader (i.e., OAE practitioner) interact with each other while taking part in an activity or completing a task (e.g., setting a sail, pitching a tent or preparing a meal). These factors are likely to influence OAE practitioners' beliefs as reported by Taylor (2006; 2011) and later by Collins and Collins (2012; 2016) due to much more salient OAE environment compared with formal schooling environment (see Section 2.2.3). Therefore, both key elements of the OAE experience and the underpinning mechanisms are crucial in unpicking the contextual factors affecting the development of OAE practitioners' beliefs, intentions and actions.

Although we know that the key elements of OAE experience interact with each other, it is not clear how they interact with each other and what effect such interaction has on the overall experience (McKenzie, 2000). This problem arises partially as a result of the fact that the majority of research within OAE settings has focused on identification of the programme-specific outcomes, which is in line with the sail training literature discussed in the Chapter 4 (Sibthorp et al., 2007). Allison and Pomeroy (2000) noted that OAE research has traditionally focused on measuring the outcomes of the programmes as a justification for “whether programs ‘work’” (p. 91). Therefore, there are numerous reports measuring young people’s confidence, self-esteem, leadership and teamwork skills prior and post an OAE programme (e.g., A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005; Shellman & Ewert, 2010). However, in line with both Allison and Pomeroy (2000) and McKenzie (2000), Sibthorp et al. (2007) highlighted the need to focus on the underlying mechanics of change, and Allison and Von Wald (2013) noted
that “with the outcomes in mind, we can focus on the process and thus help youth development operators achieve better results from their engagement with young people” (p. 28). A better understanding of the underlying processes and how such processes are affected by different combinations of key features (e.g., to what extent and how different practitioners affect the underlying processes; see McKenzie, 2000) facilitates recognition and promotion of potential outcomes of the OAE experience.

Few researchers in the literature reviewed made an attempt to describe the process of the OAE experience, with Walsh and Golins’s (1976) efforts being the most detailed. In this context, their study is the one most frequently referred to although Sibthorp (2003) described Walsh and Golins’s (1976) model as simplistic, descriptive and atheoretical, and the study is now rather outdated. It is, nevertheless, widely used because the model relates to OAE practitioners. A further example is Deane and Harré’s (2014) model which built on both review of the empirical OAE literature and the work of Walsh and Golins (1976). Other scholars have also identified various factors based on a single case-study approach which highlighted the significance of diverse groups, novelty of the environment, isolation, social relationships and small group dynamics (e.g., Beames, 2004a; Stott et al., 2016; Takano, 2010). Overall, there is a consensus across the literature that the novelty of the environment and activity, lack of familiarity with other participants, relationships built with each other including OAE practitioners, and small group dynamics are pivotal elements of the OAE experience (see Deane & Harré, 2014; Sibthorp & Jostad, 2014; Stott et al., 2016). These points further illustrate the need to develop a better understanding of educators’ beliefs within more dynamic settings and educators’ other beliefs (see Section 2.2; Day & Gu, 2010; Taylor, 2011).

2.3.2 Small group dynamics.

“The intense social experience” (Deane & Harré, 2014, p. 7) created during OAE programmes allows young people to undertake different roles within the group, explore novel behaviours, gain feedback on those behaviours, and observe consequences of one’s actions (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993). Group dynamics is mostly determined by young people and OAE practitioners, as these people bring their own personalities, attributes and agendas to the OAE (Shooter, Paisley, & Sibthorp, 2012; Vernon & Seaman, 2012). Nevertheless, Sibthorp and Jostad (2014) highlighted the complexity of small group dynamics and developed an eight-component model – based on OAE literature review – to address its complicated nature within OAE:
macro context, students, instructors, goals, group factors, group outcomes, group-dependent individual outcomes, and length of the programme. According to Sibthorp and Jostad (2014), students, instructors and goals form group factors—including working relationships and group norms—which then influence the development and achievement of group outcomes (e.g., teamwork or sense of community) and group-dependent individual outcomes (e.g., communication skills or understanding of others). In contrast to small group dynamics developed in the classroom-based teaching, OAE programmes vary in length (e.g., 7-day journeys vs. 10-week expeditions vs. a semester-long experience; Beames, 2004b; Fraser et al., 2016; Sammet, 2005).

Therefore, each group results in a unique mixture of characters and social interactions as one can never be sure what strengths and weaknesses each group member will possess on weekly basis. Nor can one be sure about what individual outcomes may be developed through small group dynamics and group functioning from group to group. These points further echo the need to go beyond investigating OAE programme outcomes discussed in previous section. They also confirm Day and Gu’s (2010) and later B. B. Levin’s (2015) points that teachers’ beliefs literature has overlooked the importance of other beliefs such as beliefs about students’ socio-economic background, their abilities or social norms. Indeed, small group dynamics is also present in the classroom-based learning which influences how educators’ approach different pupils and/or certain situations (e.g., inappropriate behaviour, misconduct or pupils with learning disabilities; MacDonald Grieve, 2009).

### 2.3.3 OAE practitioners.

The final point to discuss is the perspectives dominating the empirical OAE literature. Similarly to sail training literature (see Chapter 4), OAE literature fails to represent the perspectives of OAE practitioners which would provide a more balanced view on the phenomenon-in-question. For instance, Sibthorp et al. (2007) found that the rapport built between the young people and OAE practitioners predicted the development of communication skills as perceived by young people. Likewise, Mirkin and Middleton (2014) reported that young people perceived OAE practitioners to be role models, facilitators and “social engineer[s]” (p. 280) and valued their support over control. In line with Mirkin and Middleton (2014), Stott et al. (2016) reported group leaders to be one of five key factors affecting young people’s learning as perceived by young people. These few examples illustrate the need to investigate OAE
practitioners' perspectives to better understand the role they think they play in meeting programme outcomes and developing young people personally and socially.

Although a vast majority of OAE literature is focused around perspectives of young people, a handful of studies investigated the perceptions of OAE practitioners. For instance, Vernon and Seaman (2012) conducted a phenomenological study investigated OAE practitioners' lived experiences and perspectives regarding co-instruction (i.e., working with another instructor during an OAE programme). The authors interviewed five OAE practitioners with at least eight years of experience. Vernon and Seaman (2012) found that co-instruction was perceived to be as an integration of work and home life which had three options: isolating (i.e., failure to integrate both lives which has a negative effect on both OAE practitioners); lacklustre (i.e., only partial integration is achieved which does not interfere with satisfaction and ability to co-instruct); or fulfilling (i.e., full integration is achieved baring positive outcomes of co-instruction). The authors noted that co-instruction relationship is based on social dynamics and may affect overall staffing as well as staff and leadership training. However, co-instruction relationship may also affect the overall OAE experience and outcomes of the programmes which Vernon and Seaman (2012) failed to investigate. There is some evidence to suggest that not only relationships with OAE staff members but also relationships between OAE staff members affect young people's learning and the overall OAE experience (see Fraser et al., 2016; Sammat, 2005). Additionally, social dynamics between staff members may also affect OAE practitioners' roles in meeting programme outcomes, developing young people's PSD, and overall group dynamics. These limitations further highlight the issue of failing to understand how different programme elements interact with each other and affect practitioners' beliefs, actions and intentions.

Other studies that looked at OAE practitioners' viewpoints focused on issues around safety and risk management (e.g., Aadland, Vikene, Varley, & Fusche Moe, 2017; Trotter, Salmon, & Lenne, 2013) or a value of risk for educative purposes (Bell, 2017; Brown & Beames, 2017). The hyperdynamic and highly risky OAE environment clearly supports the need to better understand OAE practitioners' actions and decision making with respect to safety. However, there is an equal need to understand those perceptions in light of educative outcomes OAE programmes claim to achieve (e.g., teamwork or coping skills; Allison, Martindale, Stott, Gray, Nash, Fraser, & Wang, 2018). This point was also supported by Collins and colleagues' works (i.e., Collins & Collins, 2012; 2015; 2016a; 2016b; Collins et al., 2015).
Combined, these studies showed that adventure sports coaches are continually faced with a need to prioritise between performance (or technical skill) and learner’s personal development (or educational outcomes). According to Collins and Collins (2016b), the learners need to be ‘safe enough’ so that some degree of risk could be further used as an educational tool guiding pedagogical practices and decision making.

While offering some insights into OAE practitioners’ perspective, only 11 studies examining OAE practitioners’ beliefs were identified, eight of which were unique empirical investigations (see Sections 2.1 and 2.3 for the implemented inclusion and exclusion criteria). Table 2.1 summarises all identified studies which were retrieved and thematically analyses for this section. Multiple reports of the same study are marked with an asterisk. Table 2.1 was last updated on 1st April 2019.
Table 2.1

Summary Table of the OAE Literature Investigating OAE Practitioners’ Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Types of Beliefs</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker, 2011</td>
<td>Investigate the arousal response, self-efficacy beliefs and emotions, and the relationships between these constructs in OAE practitioners-in-training. Assess the effectiveness of self-efficacy intervention to enhance learning (i.e., attribution re-training intervention).</td>
<td>Unpublished PhD Thesis</td>
<td>40 OAE practitioners-in-training (white water kayak for this study but part of their overall OAE training; 28 M and 12 F)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Experimental design: intervention and normal instruction (i.e., controls)</td>
<td>Weak or moderate self-efficacy beliefs at pre-measure showed the largest subsequent cortisol arousal response; females have greater association between arousal and self-efficacy beliefs in low arousal conditions while males have the same association in high arousal conditions (i.e., low self-efficacy beliefs cause to approach the task with more arousal and anxiety).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention: same as controls but includes reflective practice, suggestions for arousal responses and finding out an alternative coping strategy (i.e., attribution re-training intervention).</td>
<td>Post self-efficacy beliefs were a stronger predictor on skill outcome; the change in self-efficacy beliefs correlated moderately with specific skill outcomes; statistically significant correlations between post skill and: pre-performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not validated self-efficacy beliefs in kayaking (4 antecedents of self-efficacy: vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, physiological state, and performance accomplishments) and somatic arousal. Pre- and post-training measures.</td>
<td>Repeated physiological measures (HR with HR monitors; cortisol level in saliva; critical flicker-fusion threshold with CFF meter): before leaving accommodation, at the training venue, on the first major rapid in the water, immediately after the biggest rapid, immediately after the</td>
<td>A statistically significant increase in self-efficacy beliefs for attributional re-training intervention group and not statistically significant increase for controls; small positive effect of attribution re-training intervention on self-efficacy beliefs and learning; intervention group increased in more aspects of self-efficacy compared with controls; performance accomplishments was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyes &amp; O'Hare, 2003</td>
<td>Empirically investigate the adventure decision-making model when making decision in over- or under-challenging situations (Boyes, 1999)</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>10 (4F and 6M OAE practitioners; 25-54 years of age; average 25 years of experience)</td>
<td>Pedagogical, situation-awareness and student abilities</td>
<td>Retrospective process-tracing methodology (i.e., interviews)</td>
<td>Using situational assessment and cues available to develop a better understanding; importance of situational awareness; interaction between groups of individuals and the physical environment; change of goals in response to personal competence and environmental demands; anticipation of possible crisis as part of decision-making; importance of social context in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

last rapid, and after 1 hr lunch break.  
Kayaking skill tests.  
A 3-day kayaking course.  

stronger predictor; intervention had the most effect on resilience to negative vicarious experiences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Types of Beliefs</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins &amp; Collins, 2015</td>
<td>Investigate how professional judgement and decision-making is incorporated into physical sessions with respect to creating space for on-action and in-action reflective practice and optimising opportunities.</td>
<td>Empirical (part of bigger investigation)</td>
<td>5 high-level adventure sports coaches (mean age = 50.3, SD = 9.1). All were active qualified in multiple OA sports.</td>
<td>Pedagogical; Overall personal philosophy</td>
<td>Longitudinal – a series of interviews (pre-project; pre-session and post-session interviews) combined with video footage of 2 coaching session (i.e., stimulated recall)</td>
<td>Main objective of personal philosophy – develop a skilful, independent individual student/performer; actions (or pedagogic strategies) reflected personal philosophies; careful selection of physical environment which was key for control management; coach-student interactions to manage control, develop independent and robust performance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins &amp; Collins, 2016a</td>
<td>Better understand how adventure sports coaches make a decision by manipulating environmental features and using interactions between procedural and educational factors.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>7 high-level adventure sports coaches (mean age = 50.3, SD = 9.1). All were active qualified in multiple OA sports.</td>
<td>Pedagogic, about environment, learners, interaction between the two</td>
<td>Longitudinal repeated-measures (pre-session interview, observation and video if the session, post-session interview all repeated twice).</td>
<td>Coaching environment perceived as physical and pedagogic context; interaction between the two and manipulation of constraints was identified; value of interaction between knowledge and its implementation into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins &amp; Collins, 2016b</td>
<td>Investigate what elements the adventure sports</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>5 high-level adventure sports</td>
<td>Pedagogic, about learners, environment</td>
<td>Longitudinal repeated-measures (pre-session interview, observation</td>
<td>PJDM reflects changes in environment, task and/or individual; prioritise risk vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coach focuses on; which ones are critical to decision-making and how gained knowledge is prioritise and used.</td>
<td>coaches (mean age = 50.3, SD = 9.1). All were active qualified in multiple OA sports.</td>
<td>and the interaction between the two.</td>
<td>and video if the session, post-session interview all repeated twice).</td>
<td>benefits; individualisation of coaching process (individualised mental model based on data); info on technical and tactical performance and abilities of each individual. Safety is a priority but the ‘safe enough’ so that risk could be used for educational purposes; decisions driven by the interaction with the environment rather than tools within that environment; value of observation and questioning; reflective act (i.e., practice) is lined with professional philosophy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Collins et al., 2015   | Investigate epistemological chain of adventure sports coaches (i.e., professional philosophies). | Empirical study | 7 high-level adventure sports coaches in paddle sport (mean age = 50.3, SD = 9.1; experience in other OAE activities such as rock climbing and mountaineering) | Personal philosophies; Pedagogic beliefs              | Semi-structured interviews (28 mins on average) following interpretative phenomenological analysis | Views of risk, challenge and adventure as part of pedagogic process formed throughout one's life; impact of role models on development of their personal philosophies; interaction with the environment (i.e., risk and challenge) which leads to contextual learning that reflects complexity of the adventure environment; beliefs about students being independent; learner-centered philosophy and pedagogy; importance of in-action and on-action reflections; parallel focus on technical performance and psychological aspects (e.g., decision-making); a challenge to work with other coaches but it also was a source of knowledge and development; flexibility to adapt to situational needs; interaction of environment, individual and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Types of Beliefs</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schumann, 2013</td>
<td>Review OAE practitioners' self-efficacy beliefs in light of empirical literature (study 1)</td>
<td>PhD Thesis (a literature review-based theoretical study followed by 3 empirical studies)</td>
<td>Study 1: n/a</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>OAE research almost completely neglects the importance of self-efficacy beliefs and their accuracy in OAE practitioners and presents a view of enhancing self-efficacy beliefs through participation in OAE (not OAE practitioners though); 4 key sources for inaccurate beliefs: provision of success (i.e., skewed balance between successful experiences &amp; failure leading practitioners to conduct more successful tasks which are key components; these components create a variety of possible decisions (optimise environment first and then respond to learner's reaction); epistemological chain (or personal philosophy) provides fundamentals that underpin PJDM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop (study 2) and validate (study 3) an OAE self-efficacy beliefs scale (TOE-SES).</td>
<td>Investigate the effectiveness of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metacognitive monitoring intervention on accuracy of OAE educators-in-training teaching self-efficacy beliefs (study 4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experiences), isolated learning and inability to transfer from the course to real OSE context; processing experience (i.e., reflection and self-assessment). Self-assessment is the most influential; strategies to minimise inaccuracy: balanced opportunities for success and failure; training conditions more accurately representing real OAE settings and their complexity; metacognitive monitoring interventions (i.e., reflection, self-assessment and processing of experiences).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2: 303 OAE practitioners-in-training (32% F; mean age = 23 years, SD = 4.57; average</td>
<td>Study 2: 49-item scales was reduced to 23-item scale made of 5 subscales: student engagement, instructional planning and assessment, and instructional strategies were combined and</td>
<td>Self-efficacy in 5 domains (7 in study 1): technical skill; interpersonal skills; classroom management; pedagogy</td>
<td>Study 2: Bandura’s (2006) self-efficacy recommendations &amp; DeVille’s (2003) guidelines for scale development used as an initial point; OAE expert panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAE experience = 12 weeks).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(including planning, assessment &amp; implementation); student engagement; environment and sustainability. Student ability was part of at least 3 constructs.</td>
<td>(researchers, field staff and curriculum directors) reviewed to adjust it to OAE context;</td>
<td>renamed to Instruction and Assessment because proficiency in one domain affected proficiency in the others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: 200 OAE practitioners-in-training (44% F; mean age = 24.8 years, SD = 6.43; average OAE experience = 12.79 weeks, SD 28.8).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 3: fill in the developed 5 component scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4: OAE practitioners-in-training across 16 courses (n = 22 in treatment group; n = 18 controls).</td>
<td>Self-efficacy beliefs with respect to teaching and pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 4: Experimental design: Intervention group and controls Pre- and post-intervention using TOE-SES (Schumann &amp; Sibthorp, 2014) completed by</td>
<td>Study 4: Treatment group had more accurate self-efficacy beliefs in relation to instructor’s assessment; significant interaction effect; Practitioner-in-training scores on sub-scales were generally higher in controls while instructors’ scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann et al., 2012</td>
<td>Investigate the retention of wilderness first aid knowledge, self-efficacy beliefs and skills over time.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>72 wilderness first aid course participants (e.g., guides, outdoor recreationists, physicians, etc.; 45%</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Repeated measures Wilderness first aid and self-efficacy beliefs – a survey after the course and 4, 8 or 12 months later Skills – scenario 4,8 or 12 months later</td>
<td>Knowledge, self-efficacy beliefs and skills decreased as time interval increased; statistically significant difference between 8-months and 12-months in knowledge and self-efficacy beliefs; self-efficacy beliefs were higher for treatment group which indicates more inaccuracy; Treatment group was more competent (although no statistical significance). The intervention improved the accuracy of teaching self-efficacy beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Schumann &amp; Sibthorp, 2014</td>
<td>Develop and validate an OAE self-efficacy beliefs scale (TOE-SES)</td>
<td>Empirical study (2-part) Based on a PhD thesis</td>
<td>Study 1: 303 OAE practitioners-in-training (32% F; mean age = 23 years, SD = 4.57; average OAE experience = 12 weeks). Study 2: 200 OAE practitioners-in-training (44% F; mean age = 24.8 years, SD = 6.43; average OAE experience = 12.79 weeks, SD 28.8).</td>
<td>Self-efficacy in 5 domains (7 in study 1): technical skill; interpersonal skills; classroom management; pedagogy (including planning, assessment &amp; implementation); student engagement; environment and sustainability. Student ability was part of at least 3 constructs.</td>
<td>Study 1: Bandura’s (2006) self-efficacy recommendations &amp; DeVille’s (2003) guidelines for scale development used as an initial point; OAE expert panel (researchers, field staff and curriculum directors) reviewed to adjust it to OAE context; Study 2: fill in the developed 5 component scale.</td>
<td>did not correlate with an actual skill performance. Study 1: 49-item scales was reduced to 23-item scale made of 5 subscales: student engagement, instructional planning and assessment, and instructional strategies were combined and renamed to Instruction and Assessment because proficiency in one domain affected proficiency in the others. Study 2: 1 item removed from interpersonal skills subscale; strong technical skills are essential to effectively manage a classroom but ability to demonstrate technical skills is NOT the same as the ability manage a classroom; measurement of self-efficacy beliefs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Schumann &amp; Sibthorp, 2016</td>
<td>Investigate the effectiveness of a metacognitive monitoring intervention on accuracy of OAE educators-in-training teaching self-efficacy beliefs</td>
<td>Empirical study based on a PhD thesis</td>
<td>OAE practitioners-in-training across 6 courses (n = 22 in treatment group; n = 18 controls).</td>
<td>Self-efficacy with respect to teaching and pedagogy</td>
<td>Experimental design: Intervention group and controls Pre- and post-intervention using TOE-SES (Schumann &amp; Sibthorp, 2014) completed by educators-in-training; course instructors completed TOE-SES instructor version on each educator-in-training (post-intervention measure only). Intervention: monitoring intervention worksheet prior and self-assessment after each teaching activity followed by an evaluation from the instructor (the comparisons served an accuracy measure</td>
<td>Treatment group had more accurate self-efficacy beliefs in relation to instructor’s assessment; significant interaction effect; Practitioner-in-training scores on sub-scales were generally higher in controls while instructors’ scores were higher for treatment group which indicates more inaccuracy; Treatment group was more competent (although no statistical significance). The intervention improved the accuracy of teaching self-efficacy beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Schumann et al., 2014</td>
<td>Review OAE practitioners’ self-efficacy beliefs in light of empirical literature</td>
<td>Theoretical study</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>OAE research almost completely neglects the importance of self-efficacy beliefs and their accuracy in OAE practitioners and presents a view of enhancing self-efficacy beliefs through participation in OAE (not OAE practitioners though); 4 key sources for inaccurate beliefs: provision of success (i.e., skewed balance between successful experiences &amp; failure leading practitioners to conduct more successful experiences), isolated learning and inability to transfer from the course to real OSE context; processing experience (i.e., reflection and self-assessment). Self-assessment is the most influential; strategies to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Types of Beliefs</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimise inaccuracy: balanced opportunities for success and failure; training conditions more accurately representing real OAE settings and their complexity; metacognitive monitoring interventions (i.e., reflection, self-assessment and processing of experiences).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * Identify multiple reports of the same study.
The synthesised OAE literature on OAE practitioners’ and/or OAE practitioners’-in-training beliefs provides a succinct and critical summary of existing tendencies and gaps within OAE literature. Three key shortcomings were identified: qualitative studies employed small sample sizes (i.e., \( n \leq 10 \)) which are not necessary representative of a larger population nor provide an in-depth understanding (e.g., Collins & Collins interviewed 5 coaches where interviews lasted 20 minutes on average; \( n = 5 \)); tendency to focus on pedagogical or self-efficacy beliefs (\( n = 8 \)); and investigating pedagogical beliefs and personal philosophies as part of professional judgement and decision making process (\( n = 4 \)).

Although both quantitative and qualitative methods were equally used, all three studies that investigated self-efficacy beliefs (i.e., Barker, 2011; Schumann, 2013; and Schumann, Schimelpfenig, Sibthorp, & Collins, 2012) did so by employing quantitative methods and relying on self-reported measures (e.g., TOE-SES; Schumann & Sibthorp, 2014). This approach does not allow to investigate the antecedents to self-efficacy beliefs in sufficient depth. Nor does it provide any insights into development of beliefs as surveys and questionnaires relay on pre-determined items rather than allow information to emerge inductively. Barker’s (2011) study is still subject to these limitations, even though the developed scale included four key antecedents to self-efficacy based on Bandura’s work (see Bandura 1997). This approach fails to take into consideration other factors potentially influencing development of beliefs. Besides, weak correlations may be affected by small sample sizes.

This issue was partially addressed by the five studies that used qualitative approaches as their main data collection method (i.e., Boyes & O’Hare, 2003; Collins & Collins, 2015; 2016a; 2016b; Collins et al., 2015). These studies—intentionally or unintentionally—offered some insights into formation of beliefs (e.g., community of practice or role models; Collins et al., 2015), importance of situational factors and awareness (e.g., student ability; Boyes & O’Hare, 2003), and functions of beliefs (e.g., beliefs as filters for interpretation; Collins & Collins, 2016b). It is worth noting that only Collins and Collins (2015) and Collins et al. (2015) examined coaches’ personal philosophy as an underpinning mechanism to professional judgement and decision making. Collins et al. (2015) concluded that personal philosophy and a relationship between beliefs, practices and intentions
does exist in adventure sports coaching, as in other domains (cf. Buehl & Fives, 2009; Hofer, 2002; Kang, 2008; Thorburn & Collins, 2003), and provides the ‘scaffolding’ that underpins the PJDM [professional judgement and decision making] process which synergizes the ASC’s [adventure sports coaches] practice. (pp. 234-235)

This point further illustrates the complex relationship between beliefs, practices and intentions discussed earlier in this Chapter. It also supports the idea of the need to better understand environmental factors and their effects on this relationship. As such, OAE practitioners’ beliefs should be investigated first as a means to develop a deeper understanding of their decision making and the overall process of OAE experience.

Certainly, there is a lack of representation of OAE practitioners’ beliefs and overall perspectives. Outdoor adventure education practitioners have ample experience with diverse groups and people undertaking or working for OAE programmes. Therefore, their perspectives may allow us to develop a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanisms underpinning the process of young people’s PSD. Such perspectives also allow for producing cumulative knowledge, building on existing theory and practice, and conceptualising more generalisable models compared with over-reliance on young people’s voices which dominate existing OAE literature. Obtaining in-depth OAE practitioners’ perspectives also enables us to further investigate one of the key OAE programme elements— instructors (see McKenzie, 2000)—and to look at small group dynamics from a different perspective.

2.3.4 Section summary.

Outdoor adventure education literature provides not only useful insights into key programme features affecting young people’s PSD and overall OAE experience (e.g., physical environment, instructors or small group dynamics), but also highlights three key issues. First, OAE literature is heavily focused on investigating programme outcomes rather than providing thorough empirical explanations of underpinning mechanisms. This also implies a lack of understanding on how key programme elements interact creating different educational experiences (McKenzie, 2000). Second, OAE literature is built on young people’s views and almost completely neglects practitioners’ perspectives. A handful of studies offering the views of OAE practitioners provide useful insights into how the key elements of OAE experience
may interact (e.g., Vernon & Seaman, 2012). This is due to the fact that OAE practitioners oversee numerous programmes and have experience working with different young people which allow them to anecdotally observe emerging patterns and commonalities. These insights get lost by failing to offer a more balanced view. This point also leads into the final issue highlighted in this section. That is, there is little understanding about OAE practitioners’ beliefs which influence practitioners’ actions and intentions as noted earlier in this chapter. Besides, the hyperdynamic OAE environment further highlights the importance of investigating the contextual factors, their effects on educators’ beliefs and the beliefs being activated or deactivated by specific contextual factors. Such factors become especially prominent within the OAE environment as explained in this section.

2.4 Educators’ Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations

As discussed previously, educators simultaneously hold a number of beliefs which affect their own practice and perceived role within the process of education. Paradoxically, educators have beliefs about their own roles in the educational setting, their relationship with learners, approach to teaching and learning, personal philosophies and the perceived ideals—or key messages—they are trying to communicate through their teaching (Pajares, 1992; Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005; Zheng, 2009). As only few studies investigated OAE educators’ roles, responsibilities and expectations, this section is twofold. First part introduces key ideas behind teachers’ roles, responsibilities and perceived expectations of their own practice as a way to better understand underpinning mechanism and empirical theory. The second part of this section reviews the limited literature on OAE practitioners’ roles, responsibilities and expectations.

2.4.1 Teachers’ beliefs literature.

According to both Zheng (2009) and Domović, Vidović Vlasta and Bouillet (2017), teachers undertake a variety of roles within the educative process which are influenced by various factors, including their underpinning beliefs, personal philosophies and ongoing formative training. Przybylska (2011) noted a changed general perception of the teacher’s role over the years: “The teacher was expected to control, instruct, guide, help and discipline. He/she [sic] had responsibility for, and authority over pupils. Nowadays it is replaced with cooperation of professionals who
support students’ personal growth and manage the learning process departing from the rigid 45-minute pattern” (p. 85). This change arises not only from personal philosophies but also from various external circumstances. Kugel (1993) noted a change in the perceived role of university professors over time and with experience. Kugel (1993) explained that when lecturers start teaching, they go through five stages with time, experience and reflection. These stages are: focusing on oneself and own role in the classroom; own understanding of the subject matter as it is being transmitted to a learner; learners’ ability to receive the transmitted knowledge; helping students to learn to use the transmitted knowledge; and helping students to learn on their own. More recently, Domović et al. (2017) reported a changed perception in the role of pre-service teachers from transmitting knowledge to mainstream students to being a protector of students with additional needs after conducting a mixed-methods study and implementing a metaphor technique to data analysis.

2.4.2 OAE literature.

In addition to the changing understanding and perception of the teachers’ role, there is the issue within OAE that practitioners may have to hold conflicting roles at the same time. For instance, Priest and Gass (2005) noted that OAE practitioners should possess and develop technical, safety and risk management, environmental, communication and facilitation skills along with a range of other skills. The outlined skills give an indication of the number of roles the OAE practitioner has to be able and prepared to undertake, including facilitating productive group dynamics and PSD, practising and encouraging environmental awareness, ensuring welfare and safety of the participants, and teaching, instructing and overseeing the technical competencies required for the activity. In agreement with Priest and Gass (2005), Ewert and Sibthorp (2014) explained that OAE practitioners are expected to deal with various levels of participant motivation to take part, and fear and anxiety towards activities and on-going situations. Therefore, OAE practitioners may need to provide psychological support and encouragement while managing risk and safety of the participants without losing the educational value of the experience. It should be noted, however, that this is not always the case. A more passive role of OAE practitioners in promoting participants’ PSD is also encountered. For instance, it is not unusual for some OAE practitioners to advocate a “mountains speak for themselves” (James, 1980, para 1) philosophy, where PSD outcomes are perceived as by-products of
risky, challenging and unfamiliar environments rather than the result of a practitioner-facilitator’s role in promoting these outcomes (also see Chapter 3).

Collins and Collins (2012) conceptualised a role of adventure sports coach where three key functions were identified depending on the nature of the clientele: coach for performer development; guide for personal experience; and teacher for personal development. According to Collins and Collins (2012), all three functions are underpinned by the coaches’ ability in that activity as well as a sound understanding of welfare and safety. Therefore, the OAE practitioners are likely to adopt roles to accommodate for immediately present needs and contextual factors — which can drastically change from providing space for reflection and facilitating PSD to managing risk and addressing safety issues — over educational goals (e.g., Brown, 2002; Collins et al., 2015; B. Martin et al., 2006). Some of these roles and situations specific to sail training experience are described in more detail in Chapter 4.

2.4.3 Section summary.

There is a clear difference between teachers’ and OAE practitioners’ roles during the educative process not only as a result of the broader expectations presented by changing society but also because of the complexities of the tasks. Evidently, OAE practitioners often have multiple roles which they quickly switch—consciously or unconsciously—to meet individual’s needs and environmental demands (see Section 2.2.3). It is in this context that this thesis explores skippers’ perceived roles within the process of young people’s PSD. In doing so, the aims and intentions of skippers’ practice and the underlying beliefs can be better explored. This then allows us to explore skippers’ educative practice for young people’s PSD which is “partly defined in terms of the intentions, beliefs, and values of the teacher…and the social context within which the teachers perceive their task” (Pring, 2004/2006, p. 128).

2.5 Beliefs and OAE: Connecting the Dots

As noted earlier in this chapter, teachers’ beliefs literature offers rigorous theoretical frameworks and mechanisms underpinning the multifaceted concepts of beliefs and the relationships between beliefs, actions and intentions. Teachers’ beliefs literature is driven by empirical research mostly investigating pedagogical and content beliefs within formal schooling settings (Taylor & Caldarelli, 2004).
Nevertheless, Day and Gu (2010) noted the importance of other beliefs—such as beliefs about students or societal norms—on teachers’ practice and overall teaching philosophy. Outdoor adventure education literature offers valuable insights into contextual factors and key elements which create a fast-changing hyper-dynamic environment. Such environment provides a unique context in which educators’ other beliefs could be investigated. However, previous section highlighted the need to investigate OAE practitioners’ beliefs as this topic has been scarcely investigated within the OAE literature to date. As such, teachers’ beliefs and OAE literatures have two underlying themes in common: expectations to deliver PSD-related curriculum and effects of contextual factors on educators’ beliefs, practices and intentions.

As noted earlier, PSD is part of curriculum educators are expected to teach and follow. For instance, Scottish Curriculum for Excellence aims to developing “successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens [and] effective contributors” (Education Scotland, 2019, para 2) while Personal, Social and Health Education [PSHE] is part of national curriculum in England and Wales (PSHE Association, 2019). Similar to national curricula in schools, OAE programmes are centered around developing personal and social skills of young people as key programme outcomes (e.g., The Outward Bound Schools; Outward Bound International, 2019). Therefore, teachers and practitioners are expected to incorporate these learning outcomes within their daily practice. One should note that beliefs about, for example what leadership skills consist of, are likely to affect educators’ practices in a similar way in which subject and pedagogical beliefs affect what teachers teach and how (see Section 2.2). However, OAE literature fails not only to investigate practitioners’ beliefs about PSD but also provides a very limited body of literature investigating practitioners’ beliefs about, for example, pedagogy, content or self-efficacy (Schumann et al., 2014; Taylor, 2006). Teachers’ beliefs literature also provides a limited understanding of other beliefs as empirical literature is heavily focused on beliefs about pedagogy or the subject content (see Section 2.2.2; B. B. Levin, 2015). Keeping in mind these points and the importance of beliefs about ones’ actions as discussed throughout this chapter, the need to investigate educators’ beliefs about PSD becomes prominent within both OAE and teachers’ beliefs literatures. Therefore, this thesis aims at addressing this gap by developing an in-depth understanding of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience.
The second point connecting teachers’ beliefs and OAE literatures is research setting and broader context both literatures are located at. As noted throughout this chapter, teachers’ beliefs literature is heavily focused on the formal schooling setting which is by and large an easily controlled, low-risk setting. Such a setting allows teachers to meet their targets more easily and implement their own beliefs into classroom practices. In contrast, OAE programmes are often conducted within high-risk, hyperdynamic environments which provide additional barriers in implementing one’s beliefs due to physical risk to learners, unforeseen circumstances or factors outside ones’ control (also see Chapters 3 and 4; B. Martin et al., 2006; Priest & Grass, 2005). As noted in Section 2.2, contextual factors have many effects on beliefs ranging from activating situation-specific events to shaping beliefs over time to meet contextual demands. However, OAE literature is heavily focused on understanding beliefs about risk management and safety issues rather than better understanding how different beliefs may affect educational value of the experience (e.g., Boyes & O’Hare, 2003; Brown & Fraser, 2009). Such activities are one of the key features of OAE programmes which, in turn, alter what is and is not possible within these environments compared with a safe classroom setting. Clearly, a hyperdynamic environment would also activate some of the situation-specific beliefs which may not be present under different circumstances (see Section 2.2; Fives & Buehl, 2012); a point which has not been investigated in sufficient detail within the OAE context to date.

This discussion emphasises the fact that contextual factors should not be ignored but rather embraced as providing an opportunity to further investigate various aspects of beliefs. Equally, hyperdynamic and risky nature of OAE programme setting should not be the only focus of OAE research. For instance, Brown and Fraser (2009) argued that risk should be viewed as moving beyond what one knows (i.e., learning) rather than merely physical risk. Such view should be an alternative educational approach within OAE setting offering additional pedagogical tools to the OAE practitioners. On the other hand, studies conducted outside the formal schooling environment add valuable information on how contextual factors influence practitioners’ beliefs (e.g., Christian, Berry, & Kearney, 2017; Taylor, 2006; 2011). Taylor and Caldarelli (2004) noted that environmental park practitioners have to adjust their practices to voluntary one-off participation where learners can join and leave at any time compared to more rigid and compulsory participation within a more
formal setting. In line with Taylor and Caldarelli (2004), Collins et al. (2015) reported inconsistencies between practice and perceived beliefs of adventure sport coaches where authors highlighted that “responses to the environment and direct safety concerns...override any philosophical position. The perceived benefit does not override the potential for injury or death” (p. 235). Collins et al.’s (2015) comment also highlights the complex role of OAE practitioners (see Section 2.3) which is less salient within steadier classroom environments.

It is evident that there is a lack of understanding on how contextual factors salient outside the formal schooling setting influence teachers’ beliefs about PSD even though teachers’ beliefs literature provides much needed methodological rigor and scrutiny. While OAE literature can offer valuable insights into such factors due to its nature and complexity (e.g., small group dynamics), it fails to investigate OAE practitioners’ beliefs and broader perspectives (also see Section 2.3). Essentially, there is a lack of understanding about what beliefs teachers and OAE practitioners hold about young people’s PSD, how beliefs evolve over time and how they influence practice in light of contextual factors such as working relationships developed among young people and between educators and young people. Combined, OAE literature provides an opportunity to investigate the effect of contextual factors on educators’ beliefs while developing a better understanding about educators’ beliefs about PSD—a gap identified and explained in previous subsection. It is within this broad context in mind that the research reported here examines sail training skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training.

2.6 Theoretical Framework of Current Study: Part One

For the purpose of this thesis, Pratt and Associates’ (1998/2005) conceptualisation of beliefs, general model of teaching and aspects of commitment were adapted as guides to investigating skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. To recap, Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) defined beliefs as “complex and interrelated clusters...that give meaning to each other and to the nature of one’s commitment in teaching” (p. 205). Although Pratt and Associates (1998/2005) exclusively focused on teaching beliefs of teachers and practitioners working with adults, their research does offer a valuable general model of teaching which illustrates commonalities while accommodating learners’ diversity (see Figure 2.3). That is, teachers (or practitioners) define their own role and responsibilities; they have a
variety of learners who bring unique characteristics to the teaching environment; teachers decide what content they will teach and how they will adapt it for different learners; teachers have some ideals, beliefs and values which influence and guide their teaching (i.e., true intentions of teaching); teachers decide how they will engage with their learners (i.e., relationship X), with the content (i.e., relationship Y) and how they will engage learners with the content (i.e., relationship Z). All elements are located within a specific teaching environment or context. One should note that ideals consist of a mixture of beliefs and are influenced by personal philosophy (as discussed throughout this chapter). The significance of the represented relationships varies among practitioners depending on beliefs they hold (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005).

For the purposes of the theoretical framework which underpins this thesis, the general model of teaching (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005) has been adapted for the specific context of sail training and is presented in Figure 2.3.
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*Figure 2.3. Part one of the theoretical framework used in this thesis. Adapted from Pratt and Associates (1998/2005).*

Each element and relationship presented in Figure 2.3 is guided by the aspects of commitment and functions of beliefs discussed in Section 2.2.4 and presented in Figure 2.2. Some elements and relationships will be more significant than other elements depending on skippers’ beliefs. For instance, Skipper A may highlight their relationship with the trainees (relationship X) over skipper’s A
relationship with PSD (relationship Y). Skipper B, however, may have weak relationships with both trainees and PSD (relationships X and Y respectively) but emphasise trainees’ relationship with PSD (relationship Z). Nevertheless, actions, intentions and beliefs are what drives each element. As illustrated in Figure 2.4, if one imagined the general model of teaching to be a ‘top layer’, actions, intentions and beliefs would form its foundation. For the purposes of this thesis and to further reflect the context of this study, Pratt and Associate’s (1998/2005) specification of commitment (i.e., beliefs, intentions and actions) is used interchangeably with skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices respectively. Factors specific to the sail training context are discussed further in Chapter 4 and visually presented in Figure 4.4 as a final contextual piece of the theoretical framework used for this thesis.
Figure 2.4. Visual illustration of the layer structure of the relationship between the general model of teaching and aspects of commitment.

2.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed key concepts within teachers' beliefs literature that are necessary as the foundation for a better understanding of approaches taken in this thesis. Clear links and differences between teachers and OAE practitioners were highlighted which mainly consist of significantly different teaching environments and
educational settings. The literature on teachers’ beliefs provides the rigorous methodological scrutiny needed to empirically investigate beliefs, although a number of gaps within teachers' beliefs literature became apparent. These included a lack of understanding of beliefs about young people’s PSD and contextual factors constantly shaping the beliefs. Similar gaps were also highlighted within OAE literature. As such, OAE literature fails to provide a coherent understanding of practitioners’ beliefs beyond their perceived technical competency. Despite the highlighted gaps, this chapter led to the development of the first part of the theoretical framework which is used to investigate skippers' beliefs, their development and effect on perceived practice.

The next chapter provides more detail on Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts which provide a lens through which to view skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD. This scrutiny leads to the identification of areas in Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies which allow the construction of a second layer of the theoretical framework used for this thesis, adding depth to this research.
Chapter 3. Deweyan and Hahnian Educational Philosophies: Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces and provides some observations on the educational philosophies of John Dewey (1859-1952) and Kurt Hahn (1886-1974) as relevant to this thesis. These schools of thought lay essential foundations to this thesis in light of its aims and research questions. The focus is then shifted towards providing a pivotal overview to philosophical underpinnings of OAE and sail training literatures in relation to Dewey and Hahn’s contributions. The chapter concludes with the second part of the theoretical framework developed for this thesis.

There are three key points that should be addressed before Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts can be meaningfully reviewed. These points are: the benefits offered by philosophy of education in relation to research aims and questions; the reasons for positioning this thesis within Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts; and the challenges one is faced with when reviewing the philosophies of both John Dewey and Kurt Hahn. As explained in Chapter 1, philosophy of education provides an alternative way of thinking about a phenomenon and challenges its underpinning framework (Pring, 2004/2006; Pritchard, 2016). In essence, the philosophy of education offers deeper insights into the purposes of education while a philosophical nature of educators’ beliefs provides a better understanding of what and why an educator is trying to achieve within their practice (Baş, 2015; Fyall, 2012; Pring, 2004/2006). Therefore, a sound underpinning philosophy is essential to the successful implementation of beliefs which can be viewed as putting personal philosophies into practice through actions (Fyall, 2012; Richardson, 1996). Despite this, both teachers’ beliefs and OAE literatures are based on purely empirical and deductive research studies implementing pre-determined measurements such as standardised questionnaires and self-reported measures (see Fang, 1996; Bailey, Johann, & Kang, 2017; B. B. Levin, 2015; B. B. Levin et al., 2013). Although these methods allow data to be collected from bigger sample groups to determine patterns, they present two key issues. First, these measures provide a list of skills, characteristics and features that can be adapted, either to training or practice without providing underpinning thinking of how they enhance the purpose of education (Fenstermacher, 1978; Pring, 2004/2006). In addition, participants may not necessarily relate to them or interpret them in the same way as the researchers did. This may also lead to social desirability response bias as questionnaires are often
designed around assumed programme outcomes and responders may feel pressured to respond positively regardless of their true beliefs (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

The second issue lies within the fact that even open-ended questions analysed qualitatively (e.g., Paisley et al., 2008) do not provide an in-depth understanding, as there are no opportunities to ask follow-up questions or obtain a better understating of responders’ experiences (Walliman, 2017). Nor do they inform us on how educators’ beliefs can be viewed in terms of the broader curriculum, values and philosophy advocated by fellow colleagues, workplace and the national curriculum. Indeed, there have been only a few attempts to take the philosophical underpinnings into consideration when exploring teachers’ beliefs (e.g., Baş, 2015; Buehl & Alexander, 2001; Kang, 2008). On the other hand, OAE literature claims to follow Deweyan and/or Hahnian educational philosophies but such claims are often either assumed or based on theoretical reviews rather than empirical evidence (e.g., Hattie et al., 1997; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010; also see Section 3.5). Therefore, it is worth turning to the philosophy of education as it provides conceptualised theory against which beliefs can be assessed and further developed, bearing in mind broader purposes of curriculum and education (Demirel, 2012 as cited in Baş, 2015).

Broadly speaking, the philosophy of education has been extensively addressed throughout the works of key educational philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Lev Vygotsky, Gert Biesta and others. These writers provide deeper insights and conceptualisations of the meaning and aims of education which are beyond the scope of this thesis (see Plato’s Republic, Aristotle’s Politics, the major completion of Vygotsky’s works Mind in Society and Biesta’s The Rethinking of Education). Nevertheless, this thesis is positioned within the key works of John Dewey and Kurt Hahn as they provide pivotal understanding of young people’s PSD—or growth—as key concepts of their educational philosophies. As discussed earlier in this thesis, such growth is a main goal of OAE programmes (e.g., Beames, Humberstone, & Allin, 2017; Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; all see Chapters 1 and 2). Moreover, OAE programmes often claim to be rooted within both Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts due to the use of experiential learning which related to both Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively). Briefly speaking, Dewey’s educational philosophy is based around the concept of community, continuity (i.e., positive contribution to the future learning), growth of practical knowledge (e.g., project-based learning; Roberts, 2005) and quality of experience (i.e., educative vs. miseducative vs. non-educative experiences;
also see Section 3.5; Simpson, 2011). Indeed, sharp focus on experience as an educational tool is probably why Dewey is taught to be ‘a farther’ of modern experiential education (Priest & Gass, 2004; Roberts, 2004). As noted by Roberts (2004), the definition of experiential learning illustrates the connection between the two:

Experiential education is a teaching philosophy that informs many methodologies in which educators purposefully engage with learners in direct experience and focused reflection in order to increase knowledge, develop skills, clarify values, and develop people’s capacity to contribute to their communities. (Association for Experiential Educators, n.d., para 1)

As Hahn believed that profound experiences and hardship experiences lead to growth, wholesome education and character development (also see Section 3.3; Hogan, 1968), the above definition also relates to Hahn’s practices and methodology (e.g., The Outward Bound; also see Section 3.3; Veevers & Allison, 2011). Indeed, Hahn’s educational programmes were based around four core elements (i.e., fitness training, expeditions, projects and rescue service; also see Section 3.3; Hahn, 1960) which demonstrate the idea of experience. These points also illustrate Robert’s (2004) claims that experiential learning “emerged from the writings and work of Kurt Hahn” (p. 12) as unfamiliar environment and challenging physical tasks are almost pre-requisites to OAE programmes (e.g., Deane & Harré, 2014). As such, a link between Hahnian educational philosophy and OAE programmes is often made based on educational tools rather than deeper thought and underpinning philosophy (e.g., A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005; also see Section 3.5). Despite this critique, both Hahnian and Deweyan educational thoughts may provide useful insights and conceptualisations when striving to achieve a better understanding of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD through sail training—the key aim of this thesis (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4).

Both Dewey and Hahn provide some unique challenges that should be addressed to do justice to their educational thoughts and this thesis. For instance, Dewey’s legacy consists of numerous writings reflecting his thoughts and educational ideas (i.e., over 50 books, countless essays and speeches; Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). As it is almost impossible to consider all of his output, this thesis draws heavily on Dewey’s My pedagogic creed (1987/1926), Interest and Effort in Education (1913/1969), Democracy and Education (1916), How We Think (1933), Logic: The theory of Inquiry (1938) and Experience and Education (1938/1998) as the most
influential of Dewey’s work and as the most relevant to this thesis (Pring, 2007; Peters, 1977; Popp, 2015). In contrast, Hahn wrote very little but established several educational programmes (e.g., Gordostoun school in Scotland, Outward Bound and The Duke of Edinburgh Award) which are expressions of his educational philosophy. Despite Hahn openly speaking about lack of originality in his educational thought which was “stolen from everywhere, from the Boy Scouts, from Plato, from Goethe and from the public schools” (Hahn, 1960, p. 3), Stewart and McCann (1968) emphasised Hahn’s interpretations and presentation of these combined philosophies as being unique to Hahn and his educational thought. The point here is that Dewey wrote from a philosophical viewpoint, whereas Hahn was a practitioner and not a philosopher (Quay & Seaman, 2013; Sutcliffe, 2012). This means that the two schools of thought supplement one other because working with Dewey involves the challenge of implementing his conceptualisations in practice and working with Hahn presents the challenge of conceptualising the practices he espoused. Therefore, positioning this thesis within both educational philosophies allows it to overcome the outlined challenges as Hahn’s works offer clearly defined pedagogical tools and practices while Dewey’s writings provide thorough conceptualisations to such methods. This approach also provides a useful conceptual framework for making comparisons between skippers’ beliefs about young people PSD and Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts (see Section 3.6 and Chapter 7). Indeed, the philosophical-empirical nature of this thesis is only strengthened by implementing Dewey and Hahn’s ideas side-by-side in order to offer deeper insights into philosophical underpinnings of OAE programmes, practical applications of Dewey’s ideas into sail training experience, and conceptualisations of Hahn’s practices based on skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD.

All these points are further discussed in this chapter.

3.2 John Dewey: Community-Based Education and Learner’s Growth

Deweyan educational philosophy is based on the idea of community-based learning where learners should be taught “to work with each other because people in a community must work together” (Simpson, 2011, p. 107). Overall, Dewey emphasised education for growth—or PSD—throughout his writings. For example, in Interest and Effort in Education, Dewey noted that “interest is normal and reliance upon it [is] educationally legitimate in the degree in which the activity in question involves growth or development [emphasis added]” (1913/1969, p. 41). Similarly,
Dewey's *Democracy and Education* presents his theory of growth – a concept relevant to “teaching and the development of educational programmes” (Popp, 2015, p. 45) which is similar to the notions of PSD. For instance, Dewey continually emphasised skills such as co-operation, communication and shared experiences throughout his work. According to Peters (1977), “Dewey’s main concern was with growth in practical knowledge, in the development of critical intelligence as described in his earlier book *How We Think*” (p. 105). Dewey perceived education to be important for a democratic society as each child grows into an adult and will take part in society; therefore, education should aim at preparing children to be valuable and democratic members of society later in life. Consequently, Deweyan educational philosophy is concerned with society, community or a group in general, each of which plays a social function and is key for democratic education.

According to Quay and Seaman (2013), Dewey “characterizes learning as a socially organized activity and not only a psychological process” (p. 74). If Deweyan philosophy is concerned with community-based education developing future adults capable of taking part in a democratic society, such goals involve a social element too, as learning does not occur in a vacuum but rather in a group or community-like environment. The main focus here is the word *organised* which implies systematically arranged and co-ordinated, rather than unstructured social activities. Nevertheless, Peters (1977) critiqued Deweyan educational philosophy for neglecting interpersonal relationships and emotions. Fishman and McCarthy (1998) also noted Dewey’s neglect of the difficulties one encounters in developing both groups and overall interpersonal relationships – difficulties which often lead to positive realisations about oneself and one’s abilities.

It is not clear, however, how much of this critique captures the true essence of Deweyan educational philosophy as Dewey’s thought was purposefully vague to avoid prescribed practices (Hollis, 1977; Peters, 1997). Peters (1977) also referred to Dewey’s ideal of growth as “much more [emphasis added] that of a group of dedicated, problem solving scientists, who were united by their shared concerns and willingness to communicate their findings to each other” (Peters, 1977, p. 105). Even on a basic level, some sort of interpersonal relationship would be developed and would cause emotions when communicating with each other. Fishman and McCarthy (1998) echoed Dewey’s twofold educational aims, one of which was the “development of moral traits of character, especially those sustaining intelligent, cooperative thinking” (p. 53). If moral traits of character are at the heart of Deweyan educational
philosophy, co-operation, for example, is a personal trait demonstrated when successfully dealing with other people, handling interpersonal relationships and emotions.

It is important to mention that Dewey emphasised collectivism over individualism as, in his opinion, individualism had “shrunk just to the desire of profit” (Peters, 1977, p. 118). However, Peters (1977) critiqued this view, pointing out that “autonomy, integrity, and authenticity…still [are] potent individualistic ideals both in life and in education” (p. 118). Indeed, both autonomy and integrity are individual skills a person portrays and demonstrates in a group situation or in a community setting. In such circumstances, the community performs not only a social function, but also creates an environment for personal growth. This is in line with Flew’s (1977) observations of the common misconception Dewey fell into: “The private is necessarily anti-social, in the sense of damaging to others; and that the social, in either sense, is necessarily collectivist” (p. 94). Actually, privacy is needed to take successful part in social or collectivist circumstances.

Another problem here is that Dewey failed to conceptualise growth and define it clearly. Nor did he provide measurable and observable criteria against which growth—or PSD—could be evaluated (Thorburn & McAllister, 2013). Such criteria are needed not to standardise or prescribe learning and growth, which are against Deweyan principles, but to distinguish between “desirable and undesirable forms of growth” (Peters, 1977, p. 104). Dewey thought of growth as an open-ended process which was not clearly marked and varied across different individuals. Nevertheless, Fishman and McCarthy (1998) criticised such vagueness as the process is open for interpretation which results in considerable difficulties in capturing the true principles of Deweyan educational philosophy. Dewey’s philosophy also fails clearly to define, identify and measure the process and outcomes of growth so that the overall process can be further facilitated as a part of socially structured activities.

Despite the failure to conceptualise growth, Dewey identified conditions needed for growth to occur. As noted earlier, Dewey emphasised communication, co-operation and community-based education, and valued the importance of a social group in which these qualities are developed. In Dewey’s view, the group allows the introduction of “problem-solving…together with the close link between learning and living and the sense of contributing to a social whole permeated by sharing experiences” (Peters, 1977, p. 102). A community, or a social group, is a dominant feature in Dewey’s writings. He saw the group as an educative tool. For instance,
Dewey thought of a society as an organic whole in which members contribute to the shared goals (Pring, 2007). However, a society consists of many groups and therefore, open-minded and creative thinking should be emphasised and striven for, so that social diversity with respect to social classes and interaction among groups can be encouraged (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). Social diversity and interaction among groups, according to Dewey, would allow learners to have “an opportunity to escape from the limitations of the social group in which he was born, and to come into contact with a broader environment” (1916, p. 24).

In summary, Dewey emphasised the value of community as a social function in one’s development and recognised the effects environmental factors can have during PSD. The importance of such relationships is emphasised throughout Dewey’s writings and is key to the context of this thesis where PSD within group-based activities is stressed. Certainly, such activities and conditions promote interpersonal relationships and a degree of individual emotions (as well as the ability to cope with them) which were arguably neglected by Dewey. With this contextual background, this thesis aims to conceptualise the process of PSD within sail training environments so that comparisons with Dewey’s theory of growth can be established. Conceptualising the process of PSD during sail training will lead to insights into the conditions that facilitate learning. This will then allow critical evaluation of Dewey’s ideas within OAE contexts.

3.3 Kurt Hahn: Development of Character and an Overall Philosophy

Hahnian educational philosophy is based on the idea of wholesome education, education for life and development of character which is emphasised over academic achievement. Overall, Hahn stressed moral development throughout his work in which he advocated community service, and he often referred to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Knoll, 2001; Stewart & McCann, 1968). Hahn specifically targeted adolescents at the age of puberty (Stewart & McCann, 1968). He thought that adolescents were exposed to poisonous passions which have to be controlled and directed into a “grande passion” (Hahn, 1930 as cited in Knoll, 2001, para 23) to avoid transformation into “skeptics, cynics, listless persons, or even lawbreakers” (Knoll, 2001, para 22). In general, Hahn believed that society at that time faced five declines of modern youth, an idea which essentially lies at the foundation of his philosophy and educational thought (Smith, Knapp, Seaman, & Pace, 2011). Hahn often referred to these declines as “social diseases” (Hahn, n.d.; 1940; 1960):
There is the decline in fitness due to the modern methods of locomotion, the decline in initiative, due to the widespread disease of spectatoritis [watching and not taking part], the decline in care and skill, due to the weakened tradition of craftsmanship, the decline in self-discipline, due to the ever-present availability of tranquilizers and stimulants, the decline of compassion. (Hahn, 1960, p. 7)

The sixth decline is reported to be the “decline in memory and imagination due to the confused restlessness of modern life” (Richards, 1990, p. 69). Even though scholars refer to Hahn’s *The Six Declines of Modern Youth* (e.g., Brand, Kruczek, Shan, Haraf, & Simmons, 2012; Richards, 1990; van Oord, 2010), Hahn referred to five declines which can be found within his speeches and addresses, for example, the speech given at the Forty-Eighth Annual Dinner of Old Centralians in 1958 (Hahn, 1958). It is not clear when, where and how the sixth decline was recorded and to what extent Hahn can be associated with the decline in memory and imagination.

Smith et al. (2011) noted that Hahn started developing educational programmes that would address the identified declines in modern society and would focus on moral, physical and intellectual development. According to van Oord (2010), Hahn was not interested in developing artists or academic scholars. Instead, education for life, moral responsibility and political leadership were “a fundamental part of this process” (p. 260). Indeed, four elements—or four educational antidotes (van Oord, 2010)—are a common feature among Hahnian philosophy-based programmes as a means to address the six declines. These elements are fitness training, expeditions, projects and rescue service (Hahn, 1960). Morning exercise, mountaineering and sailing expeditions, carpentry projects and coastguard duty are examples of how the four educational antidotes were operationalised by Hahn.

Hahn’s educational philosophy may come across as a deficit-based approach (i.e., young people fail due to cognitive, social and motivational limitations; Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2012; He, 2009; Valencia, 1997) due to his strong views about the six declines of modern youth. According to Outward Bound Finland (2017), Hahn thought that the society is not able to offer support for young people’s positive development and therefore, it was Hahn’s aim to provide such support. Hahn’s philosophy is reflected in the idea that “there is something good in every person and focusing and developing on that good, individual’s personal growth will take place” (Outward Bound Finland, 2017, para 1). Hahn’s views can also be summarised in the following quote: “There is more in us than we know. If we can be made to see it, we will be unwilling to settle for less” (Hahn
as cited in The Kurt Hahn School Expeditionary Learning School, n.d.). These points suggest that Hahn’s approach was based on developing young people’s strengths rather than focusing on their deficits. In fact, Hahn thought it was the society which failed the child and thus, a different approach to education was needed. But no thorough conclusions can be drawn due to few primary sources written by Hahn (also see Section 3.1).

In contrast to Dewey, Hahn promoted emotional rather than cognitive aspects of learning. This is argued to be the key difference between Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies (Knoll, 2001). Hahn is known for using German terms *Erlebnis* and *Erlebnistherapie* which translate as *experience* and *adventure therapy* respectively. When talking about experience and the concept of Erlebnistherapie, Hahn believed that students had to be placed into unfamiliar natural contexts to experience real adventure and hardship, and to face “conflict with the natural environment” (Hogan, 1968, p. 68). This helps to test personality, develop self-esteem and develop an understanding of the consequences of decisions being made (Brand et al., 2012; Hogan, 1968). Indeed, feelings and emotions arising from profound experiences and through Hahn’s four educational antidotes are likely to cause change: “The fact of helping and saving…released feelings and emotions which are so basic that they even helped to change opinions, habits, and prejudice” (Knoll, 2001, para 26). Therefore, Hahn often referred to the parable of the Good Samaritan as it epitomises the “unselfish helper and saver” (Knoll, 2001, para 26). One should note that Hahn never implied that there was a direct effect between the experience and positive change. Instead, he thought that such change can happen but will not necessarily happen, so the better question to ask was how often the change may happen (Hahn, 1965).

Hahn’s ideas on how to address the six declines of the society were successfully put into practice within his educational establishments and award schemes. As noted earlier in this chapter, Hahn is better known for practical achievements rather than an explicitly defined educational philosophy (van Oord, 2010). It is, therefore, worth outlining Hahn’s educational programmes which are often used to illuminate Hahnian philosophy, its key principles and the practical implementations of Hahn’s educational thought. This will also help to further illustrate points outlined earlier in this section.
3.3.1 Salem School.

After the First World War, Hahn was instrumental in establishing the Salem School in Germany where he worked as a headmaster (Sutcliffe, 2012). With support from Prince Max of Baden, Hahn was able to put his educational vision and thoughts into practice. The Salem School is still based on the Seven Laws of Salem (Schule Schloss Salem, n.d.):

2. Make the children meet with triumph and defeat.
3. Give the children the opportunity of self-effacement in the common sense.
4. Provide periods of silence.
5. Train the imagination.
6. Make games important but not predominant.
7. Free the sons [sic] of the wealthy and powerful from the enervating sense of privilege.

Salem’s education targeted the development of character; the idea was argued to be partially influenced by German’s loss in WWI. According to Veevers and Allison (2011), Prince Max thought that the “German people had been let down by politicians who were ‘wise’ but did not ‘possess toughness in pursuit’” (p. 6). Therefore, Salem aimed at holistic education combining both academic pursuits and development of character (e.g., pupils were encouraged to speak out or stand for their own beliefs when faced with discomfort; Veevers & Allison, 2011). Hahn (1936) explained that “The Salem system tried to preserve a child’s strength intact through the difficult, the loutish years, and to hand it to the man as a life-long source of strength” (para 11). According to Veevers and Allison (2011) and Sutcliffe (2012), Salem’s curriculum consisted of a number of activities and exercises such as walking tours, military sports or sailing as well as working in the surrounding fields, learning from the local craftsmen and engaging in social work. These activities clearly illustrate Hahn’s passion for a well-rounded education as well as addressing the previously noted “social diseases.”

3.3.2 Gordonstoun School.

Due to the political situation in Germany before the Second World War, Hahn had to relocate to the UK and implement his educational thoughts again from the
beginning (Seaman & Pace, 2009; Stewart, 1972). There are many interesting, subtle nuances to Hahn’s biography—for instance, his imprisonment in Germany and relocation to the U.K. indicates the power of his political connections (e.g., the successful efforts of British politicians and intellectuals to release Hahn from prison and relocate to Britain; Allison, 2016; Mann, 1970; Veevers & Allison, 2011). This, as well as a difficult financial situation, lack of initial credibility in Britain and varying accounts on what the true intentions were behind social diversity at Hahn’s schools, are beyond the scope and interest of this thesis (see Stewart & McCann, 1968; Sutcliffe 2012; Veevers & Allison, 2011). The main point though, is that in 1934 in Scotland, Hahn, with the help and support of his friends, colleagues and followers, established Gordonstoun School which was based on Salem’s principles (Stewart & McCann, 1968; Sutcliffe, 2012). Gordonstoun’s motto reflects Hahnian philosophy, targeting wholesome development rather than purely academic merit: “Plus est en vous, which roughly translates as ‘there is more in you’” (van Oord, 2010, p. 257).

Further developed thought—partially due to political context and personal experiences (see Allison, 2016; McLachlan, 1970)—and opportunities available to Hahn in Britain led to the introduction of a wider range of activities in Gordonstoun than had been the case in Salem. For instance, Hahn placed greater emphasis on sailing and its educational value: “Training under sail becomes the main character training activity” (Hahn, 1948 as cited in Veevers & Allison, 2011, p. 31). According to Allison (2016), first students at Gordonstoun were asked to build boats—an example of project-based learning—which were later used for sailing and community services. This example also illustrates the way in which Hahn’s thoughts about and conceptualisation and utilisation of the previously mentioned four educational antidotes (i.e., expeditions, physical conditioning, project work and service) and educative goals were continuously evolving. Each key element had its own purpose, for example, service emphasised community service, taught responsibility and created the feelings of being needed. Indeed, Knoll (2001) noted that by continually expanding his educational tools, Hahn “had created an educational system which went beyond the usual methods and aims of school reform [and was called] ‘experiential therapy’ (Erlebnistherapie)” (p. 7). Continuing to follow Salem’s principles in the new establishment of Gordonstoun allowed Hahn to develop and implement his progressive thoughts further, and still stay committed to the core idea of his educational philosophy – the development of character and the need for the wholesome education.
3.3.3 Outward Bound and the Duke of Edinburgh Award.

Another legacy left by Hahn is Outward Bound Schools, first established as The Aberdovey Sailing School (or Sea School at Aberdovey) in Wales in 1941 which later became Outward Bound Sea School (Hogan, 1968; Veevers & Allison, 2011). The school was established with the initial support of Lawrence Holt and his company The Blue Funnel Line who provided financial aid, the captains and some men to run the sailing programme (Hahn, 1960; Hogan, 1968; 1970). In general, the aim of Outward Bound is to prepare young people for service and build strength of character (e.g., the ability to rely on themselves or overcome adversity and fear; Hahn, 1960; 1965; Hogan, 1968) following its motto “to serve, to strive and not to yield” (Neill, 1996). Indeed, Hahn is known to quote Holt who claimed that training at Outward Bound (or the Sea School) “was less for the sea than a training through the sea, and so benefit all walks of life” (Miner, 1990, p. 59). Hogan (1970) also noted that Hahn had the long-term vision to establish a training centre which would demonstrate the effectiveness of his methods.

It is important to point out that Outward Bound was based on Hahn’s badge schemes, such as that in use at Gordonstoun or the Moray Badge (Hogan, 1968; Miner, 1990; Veevers & Allison, 2011). The original purpose of badge schemes was to introduce not only school pupils but also young men from the surrounding areas to training (Veevers & Allison, 2011). According to Hogan (1970), Hahn secretly hoped that his approach and the badge schemes would be adopted throughout Britain and the Commonwealth countries. Badge schemes were, in turn, antecedents to The Duke of Edinburgh (DofE) Award established in 1956 (Sutcliffe, 2012; Veevers & Allison, 2011).

Both Outward Bound and the DofE award followed Hahn’s educational thought and established principles. Hahn (1960) noted: “These four elements – fitness training, expeditions, projects, rescue service are familiar to all who have experienced or witnessed Outward Bound in action” (p. 7). Indeed, Outward Bound had elements of rescue services, both sea and land-based expeditions, athletic training and map and compass training (Hogan, 1968; Miner, 1990). Likewise, the DofE award currently targets four areas: skill, physical recreation, service and the adventurous journey, all of which clearly have their roots in Hahn’s educational antidotes (i.e., projects, fitness training, service and expeditions respectively; the Duke of Edinburgh International Award, 2015). Certainly, these elements follow the same principles as Salem and Gordonstoun did, and further illustrate the key features of Hahnian educational
philosophy which aims at a “vigorous and active individual’ with humanitarian convictions who felt responsible for the welfare and progress of society” (Knoll, 2001, para 18). Outward Bound currently operates in 33 countries, and the DofE award is currently available in more than 140 countries (Outward Bound International, 2017; The Duke of Edinburgh International Award, 2015).

Veevers and Allison (2011) look at Outward Bound in light of interconnected contexts, one of which is Hogan’s (1970b as cited in Veevers & Allison, 2011) claim that Outward Bound aimed at “proving” the effectiveness of the badge schemes curriculum, thus hoping to create a new type of educational system. This is in line with Hahn’s previously mentioned vision to establish a training centre for the practical demonstration of his educational methods and effectiveness of the badge schemes as well as to spread his educational agenda across the country. Indeed, the inclusion of pupils from outside Gordonstoun meant expansion of Hahn’s educational system and its availability to a wider community for people from socially diverse backgrounds. According to Veevers and Allison (2011) and later Allison (2016), inclusions, expansion and creation of new educational approaches available to all were items from a broader Hahn’s agenda.

3.3.4 Section summary.

Von Oord (2010) summarised Hahnian philosophy as consisting of “the six declines of modern youth, the four educational antidotes and the three ways to capture the student mind” (p. 259). Nevertheless, there are another three features underpinning Hahnian educational philosophy which are distinct and relevant to this thesis. These are: social diversity and education for elites to promote social compassion; the role of emotions; and the importance of community service (or the Parable of the Good Samaritan). Certainly, these factors have a profound influence on young people’s PSD as people (both as individuals and as part of a group) is a recurring theme within Hahnian philosophy. That is, the rescue cannot be performed unless there is someone to be rescued. Likewise, social diversity and leadership cannot be taught unless there is a group consisting of people from different socio-economic backgrounds where leadership skills and compassion can be demonstrated. With this in mind, this thesis aims to conceptualise the process of young people’s PSD during sail training and to identify the conditions needed for facilitation of PSD. This will then allow for making comparisons with the conditions
needed for Hahn’s Erlebnistherapie (i.e., removal from familiar environment, conflict with environment and exposure to a real challenge; Brand et al., 2012; Hogan, 1968).

3.4 Dewey and Hahn’s Expectations of Educators

Dewey advocated strong principles for the practices needed to achieve his educational goals. On the other hand, Hahn and his followers executed a number of progressive (at that time) practices aimed at achieving his educational vision (e.g., explaining the rationale behind an educator’s decision or discussing everyday problems; Hahn, 1965, Hogan, 1968). As this thesis focuses on sail training skippers who are educators (see Chapter 1 Section 1.3), it is worth reviewing what Dewey and Hahn expected of educators, and how the two approaches complement one other. Therefore, this section focuses on four key aspects: guidance, mentoring and educator’s control; direct and indirect teaching; flexibility and adaptability to meet individual learner’s needs; and the interpersonal relationship between the educator and the learner.

3.4.1 Guidance, mentoring and educator’s control.

According to Simpson (2011), Dewey emphasised the benefits of a teacher’s guidance and mentoring in maintaining the purpose and meaning of learning. The rationale behind teacher’s guidance and mentoring was the perception that “students left to their own devices have experiences that are impulsive and non-sequential” (Simpson, 2011, p. 11). Therefore, Dewey perceived the importance of an educator’s guidance to be in making experiences educative which is in line with Dewey’s emphasis on socially structured activities mentioned in the previous section. In Dewey’s (1916) Democracy and Education, he stated:

The other side of an educative experience is an added power of subsequent direction or control…A genuinely educative experience, then, one in which instruction is conveyed and ability increased, is contradistinguished from a routine activity on one hand, and a capricious activity on the other. (p. 90)

It follows from this that the educator is expected to facilitate experience rather than to dictate or control it externally. Indeed, Dewey noted that the “teacher loses the position of external boss or dictator but takes on that of leader of group activities” (1938/1998, p. 66). Seaman and Pace (2009) describe a two-phased educator’s role, citing Dewey’s My Pedagogical Creed (1897/1929) and Tanner’s (1997) work. First, the educator has to build content and contextualise it in light of experience, so that it
can grow over time. Second, the educator is a ‘social translator’ where children’s “powers, interest, and habits…[are] translated into terms of their social equivalents—into terms of what they are capable of in the way of social service” (Dewey, 1897/1929, p. 76). Overall, Dewey thought of the educators as more experienced persons with wider horizons and hence, their suggestions—or giving directions—may be “at least as valid as a suggestion arising from some more or less accidental source” (Dewey, 1938/1998, p. 84-85).

In a similar way to Dewey, Hahn indirectly advocated the importance of educator’s guidance and support to young people by, for example, comparing educators to shepherd: “The young of today are as sheep not having a shepherd: they are groping for guidance” (Hahn, n.d., p. 2). As the role of the shepherd includes guidance and directing, this metaphor indicates Hahn’s expectations of the educator: guide and direct young people who may be lost in current society. Direct teaching, supervision and mentoring are also evident in Hogan’s (1968) comment on how sailing worked at the Outward Bound School in Aberdovey:

The object was to give initial training to complete watches in the cutters – under oars and sail – and then as soon as possible and conditions permitted to get the boys away in the dinghies and half-deckers without officers so that they could learn from their own mistakes. (pp. 58-59)

Although this comment is in line with Dewey’s idea of trial and error (i.e., immediate reflection; Quay & Seaman, 2013), one should note the importance of initial training given to the learners which may imply educator’s control. This, indeed, is contradictory to Deweyan philosophy but a key difference between Dewey and Hahn’s environments should be kept in mind. That is, Dewey worked in classrooms, laboratories or with low-risk activities such as gardening whereas Hahn used sailing and mountaineering as a part of training for young people’s character. As noted by Price (1970), there is a danger to life in the latter environments and hence, safety precautions should be taken. Therefore, more thorough direction and initial educator control to prepare technically competent and physically fit learners is expected within a Hahnian approach as a result of the higher risk environment.

Finally, Dewey highlighted the need to be a role model for the learner. He argued that educators should show how to take part in a democratic society rather than talk about democratic society, so that connections between ideas, principles and actions could be developed: “[Educators] need to show that…[they] are personally aware of problems in the community and they need to show students that educators, as members of the community, are personally involved in the solution” (Simpson,
2011, p. 106). Indeed, being able to take part in a democratic society is an overall aim of Deweyan educational philosophy and hence, educators themselves should be able to actively undertake such roles as society demands of them. Hahn, however, was less explicit about this point. For him, young people were role models to each other, but it is not clear to what extent he expected educators to be role models for the young and in what areas.

3.4.2 Direct and indirect teaching.

Another principle strongly postulated by Dewey was the idea of direct and indirect teaching (or explicit and implicit teaching respectively). As noted by Fishman and McCarthy (1998), Dewey envisaged indirect teaching where classes are structured “so that they [educators] and their pupils identify genuine problems, use the curriculum to investigate and discover solutions to these problems, and, as a result, establish connections with course subject matter” (p. 20). In Interest and Education, Dewey talks about setting the conditions in which students would start using their curriculum indirectly. This would result in expanded interests and growth. For instance, making a learner more “conscious of the end and purpose of his actions” (1913/1969, p. 53). As such, setting the appropriate conditions for the curriculum (or subject content) to be used, is an example of indirect teaching compared with explicit transfer of the subject-matter from the educator to the learner.

Similar to Dewey, Hahn advocated direct and indirect teaching methods. For instance, Hahn believed that young people had to be exposed to challenge and adversity to build coping skills: “Make the children meet with triumph and defeat, at first building carefully on their gifts and potentialities to ensure success, but later teaching them to overcome defeat in harder enterprises” (Stewart & McCann, 1968, p. 192). The key here is not only exposing young people to various situations so that they can develop coping skills (i.e., indirect teaching), but teaching them to use those skills when exposed to more challenging situations (i.e., direct teaching). Analogous idea can be derived from Hogan and Oldhams’s (1941) comment: “The majority of boys will face one or two tests with the feeling that they can never master them. They need to be shown how [emphasis added] to defeat their defeatism” (as cited in Veevers & Allison, 2011, p. 69). Nevertheless, one has to be careful when interpreting Hahn’s educational principles and expectations of educators because of the lack of written legacy and theoretical conceptualisations of Hahn’s—and his followers’—educative methods.
One should note that regardless of which approach is being advocated, whether that of Dewey or Hahn, the key is an ability to use both direct and indirect teaching. According to Simpson (2011), the question is not which approach is more effective. Instead, it is a matter of joining the two together and making direct and explicit connections between direct teaching (i.e., learning subject content) and indirect teaching (i.e., the use of content).

3.4.3 Flexibility and adaptability to meet individual learner’s needs.

Both Dewey and Hahn were explicit about the need to adapt their teaching methods and practices to each learner so that individual needs could be addressed. Although Dewey’s ideas and writings seem somewhat vague on practices, he wanted to avoid prescription, and allow the educator to adapt them on a case-by-case basis (Hollis, 1977; Peters, 1977). Essentially, the practices had to be adjusted and adapted according to the needs of the individual learner to “build on individual student interests and their unique dispositions” (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998, p. 24) which is fundamental to effective education. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey recognised that educators may apply his principles and theories in their own way and hence, “the required beliefs cannot be hammered in; the needed attitudes cannot be plastered on” (1916, p. 13). Therefore, educators are expected to maintain a flexible approach and adapt to different situations to meet individual learner’s needs while working with a whole group. In *How We Think*, Dewey (1933) stated:

> [The educator] must make special preparation for particular lessons. Otherwise the only alternatives will be either aimless drift or else sticking literally to the text. Flexibility, ability to take advantage of unexpected incidents and questions, depends upon the teacher’s coming to the subject with freshness and fullness of interest and knowledge. (p. 276)

Similar ideas were also expressed by Hahn. Hahn advocated the need to address learner’s individual needs to enhance their individual progress and help to find their *grande passion*, and to adjust the level of adversity and challenge needed for successful character-building (Hogan, 1968; Knoll, 2001). This is particularly well illustrated by Hogan’s (1968) subtle comment: “A conflict with the natural environment and yet it must be *adjustable, so as not to overtax adolescence* [emphasis added]” (p. 68). As this discussion shows, both Dewey and Hahn postulated the need to contextualise their ideas and approaches to suit individual learner’s needs. For Hahn, this meant to adjust the level of hardship so that it would be effective and reasonable
for each learner. In this way, each learner can experience success before adversity is encountered and negative feelings are created for educative purposes. Dewey, on the other hand, did not provide clear prescribed practices but kept them purposefully vague for the educators to adapt them as needed.

3.4.4 Interpersonal relationships between the educator and the learner.

Hahn emphasised the emotional aspects of learning, whereas Dewey focused on cognitive aspects. For Hahn, learning occurred through emotions and hence he advocated the importance of building rapport between the educator and the learner. In order to build such rapport, Hahn noted personal qualities the headmaster—or the educator—should possess. He was looking for a headmaster who would be trusted by the pupils and would treat them with respect and dignity (Sutcliffe, 2012):

[Hahn] also knew what he looked for in headmasters, expressing himself in the following words in 1953: “Respect is not enough; affection is not necessary and comes by Grace. What is wanted is trust; trust that a boy be heard in patience by an unoccupied man, that he will be understood if he does not say much, that nothing he says will be misused”. (p. 146)

Another important quality mentioned in the above quote is patience. Indeed, patience was reported by Hahn as one of two “human qualities” the educator should possess: “Victorious patience and the devoted interest in the progress of the individual boy” (Hahn, 1960, p. 4). Essentially human interaction and the interpersonal relationship developed between the learner and educator is at the heart of Hahnian philosophy. This is in line with Röhrs’s (1970) remark that “a strong mutual respect between teacher and pupil is necessary” (p. 126) to nurture effectively the four elements previously discussed which address the six declines of modern youth (see Section 3.3).

The final and perhaps the most prominent expectation Hahn had of his educators, was the ability to approach the learner. According to Hahn (1960), the key was not to demand or persuade, but to make learners feel needed and important:

There are three ways of trying to win the young. There is persuasion, there is compulsion and there is attraction. You can preach at them, that is a hook without a worm; you can say “You must volunteer,” that is of the devil; and you can tell them, “You are needed.” That appeal hardly ever fails. (p. 6)
Hahn expressed similar themes in his *Two Sermons* (n.d.) speech where he emphasised the need to provide appealing opportunity rather than compulsory service:

The young need not be *compelled* to serve; they will never fail to respond provided they are given the opportunity for relevant service. There is no need to say to them, “You must”; it is enough to say, “You may”. (p. 10)

Certainly, the above quotes may look contradictory to Hahn’s educational philosophy (see Section 3.3) because rescue service, for example, was compulsory. The key here, perhaps, should be viewed in terms of *how* this compulsory service was presented to learners rather than that it was compulsory per se. This meant that the educator was expected to create the feeling of the learner being needed by the community and to benefit others, rather than the rescue services being needed by the learner for their own development (Hahn, 1960).

In contrast, Dewey’s views on the role of emotions and interpersonal relationships built between the educator and the learner are less explicit. He was often critiqued for neglecting interpersonal relationships and ignoring the benefits such relationships can bring to individual’s growth so that their best potential could be realised (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998; Peters, 1977). Consequently, Dewey’s expectations of educators’ personal qualities and his approach to the idea of building rapport with the learner are somewhat unclear.

### 3.4.5 Section summary.

Dewey and Hahn offered similar and yet distinct expectations of educators within their educational philosophies. Dewey highlighted the need for educators’ mentoring and guidance to make the experience educative. He also avoided prescribed learning so that the educators could contextualise their methods to meet individual learners’ needs. Hahn had very similar expectations which need to be viewed within a more challenging and dynamic environment compared with Dewey’s teaching environment (i.e., mountains vs. classroom respectively). As such, Hahn may come across as a supporter of external control; nevertheless, such ‘control’ is actually encompassed in the initial technical training needed to achieve educational goals later on. This point is particularly important within many OAE settings where learners change on a weekly basis, and weather conditions and unexpected situations can never be predicted and fully prepared for. The need to provide enough initial training, supervision and guidance, and to ensure a safe educative experience...
while targeting individual goals is fundamental to sail training experiences because these educative goals are being fulfilled within a high-risk environment (see Chapter 4). Bearing this foundation in mind, this thesis aims to better understand Deweyan and Hahnian expectations of practitioners when applied to sail training contexts, particularly focusing on what Dewey and Hahn referred to as the promotion of growth or character training respectively. It is important to deepen our current understanding of such matters, so that the process of PSD and overall learning can be further enhanced, and appropriate expectations of the practitioners’ role, skills and activities could be further developed.

3.5 Deweyan and Hahnian Educational Philosophies within the OAE Context

There are clear links between OAE programmes and key points noted in Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies. To recap, OAE programmes are often residential experiences set up to use group activities as learning experiences, usually within novel and challenging environments (see Chapter 1). As noted by Sibthorp and Jostad (2014), the OAE group setting helps to create a feeling of community of which the young people are members. Even though the created community is temporary and lasts only for the period of the OAE programme, a general OAE setting and idea nonetheless fulfils reasonably well the environment Dewey envisioned for community and community’s role as a social function. It is important to acknowledge that Dewey thought of education for community on a bigger scale and for a prolonged period of time compared with the short and temporary OAE environment. That is, community created within an OAE environment has no clear continuation into a longer-term and more established community after the OAE experience is over (e.g., Brown, 2010). This point is often lost when interpreting Dewey’s thoughts in the OAE context and hence, it is crucial to clarify the essentially different scales Dewey and OAE programmes work with. In contrast, there are more straightforward links between Hahn’s educational thought and OAE. Indeed, Hahn established the Outward Bound school which is often linked to the modern OAE movement (see Section 3.3.3; Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014). Despite this, neither Hahn’s philosophical thought nor philosophical underpinnings of OAE are explicit and well-conceptualised. This, in turn, presents a challenge when trying to connect and contrast Hahn’s and OAE underlying philosophies compared with the links and insights to Dewey’s educational philosophy noted above. Bearing these challenges in mind, the section which follows focuses on how key features of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies discussed
throughout this chapter thus far relate to OAE contexts as relevant to this thesis. Specifically, this section addresses three key notions of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies and how they connect with the OAE movement: the philosophical underpinnings of OAE; community-based education and groups as a social function within OAE; and Dewey and Hahn’s expectations of educators applied in the OAE context.

3.5.1 The philosophical underpinnings of OAE.

Dewey’s concept of growth, including co-operation and communication, goes together with OAE programmes which aim primarily at developing young people’s PSD. Indeed, Dewey often referred to his own ideas as progressive education (e.g., Dewey, 1916) which is commonly linked to both OAE and OAE educators (e.g., Simpson, 2011; Quay & Seaman, 2010). Similarly to Dewey, Hahn’s use of adventure, wholesome education and emphasis on character training, all of which are fundamental to OAE, are clearly evident throughout this chapter. One should note that the concept of character-building within OAE and Hahn’s influence on OAE development are subject to occasional criticism (see Brookes, 2003a; 2003b; Freeman, 2011). Despite this, both Dewey’s ideas and Hahn’s practices have a significant influence on OAE and the sail training movement in which PSD, holistic approaches and growth through unique challenges are often highlighted as key to the underlying philosophy (e.g., Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Priest & Gass, 2005).

Nevertheless, Ord and Leather (2011) and later Quay (2013) critiqued OAE programmes for positioning themselves within Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts and practices without developing an in-depth understanding of these schools of thought. In fact, there have been few attempts to make theoretical and philosophical connections between Dewey’s ideas and OAE (e.g., Isaak, 2014; Ord & Leather, 2011; Thorburn, 2018). For instance, Wojcikiewicz and Mural (2010) provided theoretical comparisons between Deweyan educational philosophy and how sail training practices, as perceived by sail training practitioners and sailing instructors (both authors are sailing practitioners), fit within the framework. It is worth mentioning that Wojcikiewicz and Mural (2010) focused on practical aspects of experience and notions of teaching sailing by placing learners in a boat, providing initial training and theoretical knowledge, and then giving opportunities to practice sailing skills aboard. However, the authors failed to mention that the main purpose of most sail training
programmes is PSD and hence, it is not clear how the Deweyan framework presented by Wojcikiewicz and Mural (2010) relates to PSD and growth.

Thorburn (2018) provides another example of making an effort to establish theoretical connections between Dewey’s ideas, OAE experience and moral deliberation. Thorburn (2018) heavily relies on extensive writings of Dewey and relevant OAE literature as a means to make theoretical connections and highlight the need for OAE practitioners to construct “outdoor learning experiences which help learners to continuously review their actions and the impact they may have on the environment” (p. 34). It is evident that Thorburn (2018) engaged with Dewey’s writings at much deeper more conceptual level compared with criticism offered by both Ord and Leather (2011) and Quay (2013). Nonetheless, the point here is simple – the gap between theory and practice is still evident. In particular, the average practitioner has little familiarity with Dewey and his ideas as most literature is produced either by scholars or scholars-practitioners who share “enthusiasm for working with Dewey’s writings” (Thorburn, 2018, p. 28). These, however, fail to recognise that the average OAE practitioner is most likely to be much less familiar with Dewey’s original ideas implying limited applications of the developed guidance and suggestions for practice.

In terms of OAE programmes being in line with Hahn’s educational practices (e.g., Hattie et al., 1997; Priest & Gass, 2005), there is, in fact, little empirical evidence to confidently confirm these claims. As noted in Chapter 1, most of published literature on Hahn reflects his biography (e.g., Seaman & Pace, 2009), reviews Hahn’s educational legacy and dominating themes (e.g., Allison, 2016) or makes one-dimensional simplistic links between Hahn’s educational thoughts and current OAE practices (e.g., A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005). The most common link and comparison between Hahn’s educational principles and OAE experience is the use of unfamiliar natural environment and a challenging activity which almost are the prerequisite for OAE experience (see Deane & Harré, 2014). Hahn, however, failed to provide more in-depth detail on the overall process of how unfamiliar environments help to build one’s character and promote PSD, as the environment is always there. This is evident in the following explanation provided by Brand et al. (2012):

Hahn believed that if students are taken out of their familiar contexts to new terrain, such as on a rock wall, and are given the opportunity to have real experiences and challenges, they will develop self-esteem and a realization of how powerful the effects of their decisions could be to themselves and others. (p. 105)
In essence, this is in line with previously noted passive role of OAE practitioners in promoting PSD (see Chapter 2). That is, simply being in the unfamiliar natural environment is the key to young people’s PSD. This, however, relies entirely on the environment itself to achieve PSD outcomes, rather than purposeful teaching within that environment.

Following these ideas, one might assume that a novel and challenging environment is the ultimate condition needed for PSD without giving any further thought to how it works or how it can be influenced by practitioners (also see Chapter 4). A simplistic check-list between Hahn’s and OAE practitioners’ practices does not justify the claims of OAE experiences being underpinned by Hahn’s educational thought. Nor does it provide a thorough theorising of Hahn’s ideas to influence OAE practitioners. To provide a better foundation, we need to include Dewey’s conceptualisation of the relationship between the learner and the physical and social environments, and the idea that dynamic and active interactions between the learner and the environments is key to promoting PSD. This example, therefore, further illustrates the need to bridge theory (i.e., Dewey’s conceptualisations) with practice (i.e., Hahn’s practices) as “understanding the link between educational theory and practice is important because sound theory provides the basis for valid practice” (Smith et al., 2011, p. 2). In fact, it also highlights the supplementing nature of these two schools of thoughts as a means to conduct more in-depth analysis and understanding of the philosophies OAE practitioners use to guide their actions.

3.5.2 Community-based education and the group as a social function within OAE.

As noted in Section 3.2, Deweyan philosophy is based on the idea of community-based education where learning is aimed at the society and promoted within an organised community. Dewey highlighted the idea that society works as a social function due to it being “an intentionally designed social environment” (Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010, p. 108). Skills such as co-operation, communication and leadership are developed through a group setting which is one of the key features of many OAE programmes (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; McKenzie, 2000; Priest & Gass, 2005). Equally, one of the four core educational antidotes used by Hahn was expedition (see Section 3.3) where J. W. Roberts (2012) noted that the “very idea of an ‘expedition’ which is formed one of the nascent, core values of the field…suggests the social and interactive nature of experience within this variation. Expeditions are
completed by groups, typically, and not by individuals” (p. 64). Despite similar use of group activities and group settings to achieve their goals, there are two clear differences between OAE programmes and Dewey and Hahn’s views. These are: further utilisation of a group setting during OAE programmes; and significance—or lack of—of interpersonal relationships and rapport built between educator and learner.

First, OAE programmes are based around the idea of using a group setting for PSD (also see Chapter 4; Jostad, Sibthorp, Pohja, & Gookin, 2015; Sibthorp & Jostad, 2014). According to Sibthorp, Furman, Paisley, Gookin and Schumann (2011), through using group settings, OAE programmes help to develop teamwork, communication and decision-making skills as well as developing the ability to cope with adversity and challenge one’s own beliefs (also see Chapter 4). In contrast, Dewey’s philosophy is grounded in community-based education where collectivism was valued over individualism (see Section 3.2; Pring, 2007). Peters (1977) critiqued Dewey’s over-simplistic view of individualism: “But he [Dewey] was mistaken in thinking that the ideals of individualism have shrunk just to the desire of profit. There are also autonomy, integrity, and authenticity which are still potent individualistic ideals both in life and in education” (p. 118). As such, group settings create environment for personal growth with opportunities to develop not only co-operation and communication skills (i.e., interpersonal) but also more individual, moral habits such as intelligent co-operative thinking, integrity and autonomy (i.e., intrapersonal skills; Flew, 1977; Peters, 1977). Paradoxically, while Dewey saw the significance and importance of habits (see Dewey, 1916; Fesmire, 2015), he continued to critique individualism which is closely related to the moral habits mentioned above. On the other hand, Hahn used group activities and group settings extensively as an educational tool combined with individualistic settings (see the 4th and 6th Laws of Salem in Section 3.2.1; Hogan, 1968; Schule Schloss, n.d.).

Another key point is that group settings not only create opportunities to develop various PSD-related skills, but also allow individuals to challenge beliefs and address the habits and perceptions formed by one’s everyday environment. As noted in Section 3.2, Dewey advocated for diversity and interaction across different social groups which form a society, as this allows young people to look beyond their own social group and daily interactions with their environment (Dewey, 1916). Similarly to Dewey, Hahn often spoke about education for elites (Bueb, 2002 as cited in Sutcliffe, 2012; Van Oord, 2010) and compassion for the less fortunate was taught during
Hahn’s programmes. Dewey and Hahn both promoted social diversity, although in slightly distinct ways (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively). They both highlighted the benefit it brings including overcoming limitations presented by one’s own social group and exposure to the broader environment and different worldviews (Dewey, 1916; Stewart & McCann, 1968). Much like Dewey and Hahn, OAE promotes understanding towards others and frequently mentions the benefits one gains from being a part of a socially diverse group (e.g., Beames, 2004a; 2004b; Takano, 2010). Nonetheless, OAE programmes often assume that such benefits will arise simply by being a part of a socially diverse group and do not explore this phenomenon in a more rigorous way (e.g., Beard & Wilson; 2006; Deane & Harré, 2014; Takano, 2010).

The second difference between Dewey and OAE programmes is the emphasis on interpersonal relationships and the rapport developed between the instructor and the participants. McKenzie (2000) identified six key OAE programme elements which included participants, the instructor and the group. A number of studies have found the perceived benefits of the relationships built between young people and their instructors during OAE programmes as reported by the young people themselves (e.g., Stott et al., 2016; Paisley, Jostad, Sibthorp, Pohja, Gookin, & Rajagopal-Durbin, 2014). For instance, White et al. (2016) noted the importance of crew and authority figures as perceived by participants of a sail training voyage. Participants felt that the relationships developed between them and the crew members helped them to “contain potential fears and anxieties… [and] provided role models” (p. 360) and social support. Indeed, OAE literature has repeatedly reported the importance of interpersonal relationships between the instructors and participants to ensure the success of OAE programmes (e.g., Jostad, Sibthorp, & Paisley, 2013; McKenzie, 2003). This point is in line with Hahn’s thoughts on the need to build trusting and respectful interpersonal relationships between the educator and the learner discussed earlier in this chapter (see Section 3.3; Sutcliffe, 2012).

Dewey recognised but perhaps did not clearly emphasise the significance of successful interpersonal relationships (see Fishman & McCarthy, 1998; Peters, 1977). Difficulties experienced within the group setting when interacting and dealing with other group members affects working interpersonal relationships which in turn, can influence the development of one’s interpersonal skills (Peters, 1977). Dewey did not explicitly emphasise the benefits of interpersonal relationships to promote growth, and yet there is an obvious link between Dewey and results reported by White et al. (2016) – the educators being role models for the participants. The key difference
between role models as advocated by Dewey and those reported by White et al. (2016) is as follows. Dewey thought that educators act as an example of how to take part in a democratic society (see section 3.2; Simpson, 2011) whereas in White et al.'s (2016) study, educators were role models in terms of how to behave, interact or cope with demanding situations. Such role modelling is discussed and endorsed by numerous other researchers within OAE, who argue that OAE practitioners play a vital role in modelling positive and desirable behaviours during the programmes and promote PSD partly through leading by example (e.g., Mirkin & Middleton, 2014; Sibthorp et al., 2011).

Thus, not only group activities, but also meaningful interpersonal relationships between educators and learners, meaningful exposure to socially diverse groups, and trustworthy educators being role models are key to community-based education fully utilising group-based activities and experiences, and promoting one’s PSD, growth or character training during OAE and sail training programmes (also see Chapter 4; Beames, 2004b; Mirkin & Middleton, 2014; Sibthorp et al., 2007; Takano, 2010).

3.5.3 Dewey and Hahn’s expectations of educators as applied to OAE context.

As we have seen in the discussion above, OAE practitioners are key in facilitating participants’ learning which demonstrates underlying philosophy in practice. To recap, Dewey’s ‘progressive educators’ are often associated with outdoor educators (e.g., Simpson, 2011) or OAE practitioners. While this may be true in the positive sense, it also means that some of Dewey’s critique towards progressive educators can also be applied to OAE practitioners. Simpson (2011) noted Dewey’s critique: “Some progressive educators simply placed students in interesting setting and turned them loose to explore, but that did not make it quality education” (p. 162). This is in line with previous criticism that novel environment is assumed to be a pre-requisite for OAE experience simplistically following Hahn’s educational practices, failing to make purposeful use of both physical and social environments and letting the environments ‘do the teaching’ (e.g., Jirásek et al., 2017). Learning can become directionless which contradicts Dewey and Hahn’s principles and their expectations of educators (i.e., the educators are expected to guide and mentor the learners to facilitate their learning; Dewey, 1916; 1938/1998; Hahn, n.d.; Hogan, 1968). As such, the learners are “left to their own devices” (Simpson, 2011, p 11), risking turning the experience from educative to aimless (i.e., experience with no educative purpose) or
miseducative (i.e., experience which prevents future learning). It also neglects the need for the socially structured activities which characterise learning being linked with the experience of the learner (Pring, 2007; Quay & Seaman, 2013). This idea of the link between the experience of the learner and the educative experience is also known as Dewey’s principle of continuity (Fesmire, 2015; Priest & Gass, 2005). As the OAE experience is often residential, consisting of numerous naturally occurring situations and social interactions among young people and staff, Dewey’s principle of continuity is sometimes taken for granted.

Even though Dewey was in favour of students’ exploration and encouraged educators to avoid external authority and let students do what they wanted, he recognised the dualism presented between this approach and providing guidance and mentoring (Pring, 2007). Rather than favouring one or the other approach, Dewey tried to find the middle ground by emphasising the overall learning process (i.e., growth). Following this logic, OAE practitioners do not necessarily let the learners ‘loose’ as experiences are usually structured (see A. Martin, Franc, & Zounkova, 2004; Paisley, Furman, Sibthorp, & Gookin, 2008). Outdoor adventure education practitioners are often perceived to be not only instructors of the technical skills (e.g., sailing a boat or pitching a tent) but also mentors and facilitators of the overall process. Hogan (1968) noted that educators at the Aberdovey Sailing School aimed at providing initial training first, so that learners could develop some essential competencies before the instructor reduced external control and encouraged individual exploration, continuously minimising guidance. Hogan’s (1968) comment is still accurate within the sail training environment, as these exact points were also made by Wojcikiewicz and Mural (2010). As mentioned earlier, the key here is a dynamic and technically challenging environment. Therefore, the instruction–facilitation dualism within OAE may seem more extreme as a result of its highly demanding environment (also see Chapter 4) compared with the less dynamic and safer environment in which Dewey typically operated.

On the other hand, OAE is focused on PSD, and the question here is to what extent the above methods are useful for addressing PSD. One may notice that OAE and especially sail training literature is heavily based on using self-reported measures to represent young people’s views (see Chapter 4; Schijf, Allison, & Von Wald, 2017). Even though young people repeatedly report the value of teamwork, living and working in close proximity or feeling that they are a valued group member, it is not clear to what extent these PSD outcomes are achieved due to the environment itself
(i.e., relying on physical and social environments to ‘produce’ desired outcomes without systematic and purposeful intervention from a practitioner) compared with purposeful and conscious intervention. The reported outcomes are in line with Hahn’s advocated methods in capturing learners’ attention (i.e., make learners feel needed; Hahn, 1960) and with Dewey’s view that each team member has to contribute “to make a joint endeavour successful” (Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010, p. 109). This demonstrates the significance, as perceived by young people, of individual contributions and individual roles in furthering the good of the whole community.

Both Dewey and Hahn advocated direct (i.e., explicit) and indirect (i.e., implicit) teaching approaches (see Section 3.4). The implementation and use of these approaches are not very clear within the OAE context because of a lack of understanding of practitioners’ beliefs and intentions, and the rationale behind their practice (also see Chapter 2). As noted in Section 3.4, Hahn thought that young people need to be taught coping skills or shown how to overcome their own limitations, suggesting a requirement for direct teaching of PSD (Stewart & McCann, 1968; Veevers & Allison, 2011). In contrast, Dewey noted the need to teach indirectly, but he did not imply the indirect teaching to be equivalent to by-products of the environment or leisure activities (i.e., a result of a group living and working together on the boat). Following James’s (1980) comments that some OAE practitioners follow a “mountains speak for themselves” philosophy—which anecdotally is still true almost 40 years later—OAE practitioners may have been over-relying on socially organised activities at times where PSD, including communication and co-operation, are too implicitly taught (if taught at all). Certainly, these are only observations and speculations because, as we have noted previously, there is a gap in understanding OAE practitioners’ views within empirical OAE and sail training literatures (see Chapter 2). I will return to this issue in Chapter 4.

### 3.5.4 Section summary.

From the discussion above, it can be seen that while Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies, and the key ideas and assumptions found within OAE programmes are complimentary, they are not necessarily fully aligned. Physical and social environments and social interactions offered by the group or community are clearly the dominating features within both Deweyan and Hahnian philosophies and OAE programmes. However, how these features are being utilised by OAE practitioners to promote PSD is less clear as a result of: purely theoretical links made
between Dewey’s ideas and OAE practice; the lack of a well-defined and conceptualised philosophical underpinning of both OAE and Hahn’s practices; and the over-reliance on learners’ self-reporting. It is difficult to draw in-depth comparisons between Deweyan and Hahnian philosophies and OAE elements because the intentions of OAE practitioners when using these elements and practices are not clear. Within the bounds of these difficulties, this section nonetheless identified some key categories within Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts which can be used to analyse a variety of OAE practices. Keeping in mind the purposes of this thesis, the emphasis was placed on purposeful teaching of social skills (i.e., direct teaching) and conscious creation of the conditions in which one would actively use and further engage with their social skills (i.e., indirect teaching) versus reliance on the physical and social environments and socially structured activities to achieve these outcomes with no conscious effort and contributions.

Further framing this thesis within a more specific sail training context allows for a better understanding of skippers’ views and further insights into the aims and intentions behind their practice, so that one can critically evaluate to what extent “intelligently directed development of the possibilities inherent in ordinary experiences” (Dewey, 1938/1998, p. 114) is being utilised by skippers. There certainly is the need to further bridge theory and practice to achieve a philosophically—and theoretically—grounded practice (Smith et al., 2011). This thesis aims at providing more insight into what meanings skippers have made of Dewey’s educational thoughts applied within the sail training context while gaining better conceptualisation of Hahn’s practices commonly used within OAE experiences.

3.6 Theoretical Framework: Part Two

It is clear that both Hahn and Dewey provide similar and yet distinct ideas about education both of which inform the current study. As noted throughout this chapter, Dewey took a philosophical perspective on education, whereas Hahn was more focused on practice (Knoll, 2001). Combined, Dewey and Hahn’s thoughts are categorised into three sections: activity, educators and practices, and broader conditions (see Figure 3.1). As captured in Figure 3.1, activities and practices influence each other and are further shaped by the conditions present at any given situation.
Figure 3.1. Part two of the theoretical framework based on Dewey and Hahn’s key ideas relevant to this thesis. Each point is labelled with which school of thought it comes from – Dewey (D), Hahn (H) or both (D & H).

The above framework forms part of the deductive thematic analysis (see Chapters 5 and 7) which will allow for gaining further insights into skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and their philosophical underpinnings. This part of the theoretical framework also allows the second research question to be addressed. That is, to identify and outline Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to literature and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter offered a critical introduction to benefits of the philosophy of education and value it adds to the empirical investigation of beliefs. Philosophical foundations “may reveal additional aspects of beliefs” (Buehl & Alexander, 2001, p. 415) that are pivotal to meaningful educative practice within the sail training environment. The chapter also provided a critical review of Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies as relevant to the aims and research questions of this thesis (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). Clear links and discrepancies between these two schools of thought and connections with the underlying principles of OAE programmes were established and critically reviewed. Even though Dewey and Hahn’s philosophies are not without their challenges in the context of OAE, they complement each other by offering a combination of a well-conceptualised framework (Dewey’s achievement)
and well-established practices used during OAE programmes (Hahn’s achievement). Consequently, this chapter led to the development of the second part of the theoretical framework, which will allow more meaningful and substantial deductive thematic analysis of empirical data in Chapter 7.

The next chapter provides more detail on the context of this thesis. In essence, the following chapter helps to complete the theoretical framework of this thesis and better understand the complex nuances that shape the conceptualisation of skippers’ beliefs about young PSD.
Chapter 4. Context of Current Study: Introduction and Evaluation of Sail Training

4.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces and explains essential features of sail training experiences needed to further contextualise the aims and research questions of this thesis. It also provides more detail on the skippers’ roles aboard. This allows for additional links to be drawn between the teachers’ beliefs and OAE literature reviewed in Chapter 2 and Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies introduced in Chapter 3 as applied to the context of sail training. The chapter then offers a critical synthesis of empirical sail training literature which highlights gaps within the literature. The chapter concludes with the final part of the theoretical framework for this thesis, which is used to further contextualise the two parts of the theoretical framework already established in Chapters 2 and 3. The third part of the theoretical framework also aids better understanding of the unique contextual factors affecting skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and guides inductive analysis conducted and discussed in Chapter 6.

Before discussing the sail training experience in more detail and providing a systematic sail training literature review, it is important to expand on key terminology used within sail training communities and literature, some of which was introduced in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.3.4). These terms include (Hamilton, 1988; McCulloch, 2004; 2007; Miller, 2013; Ocean Youth Trust Scotland, 2017b):

*Skipper (master or first-in-command)* – appropriately qualified person who is in charge of the ship and the crew. The skipper makes final decisions.

*First mate (or second-in-command)* – appropriately qualified person who takes over from a skipper if the skipper cannot fulfil their duties and responsibilities. First mate is usually in charge of a crew to implement the skipper’s decisions and to run the ship.

*Crew* – everyone who participates in the handling of the boat.

*Staff crew* – either appropriately qualified and experienced people or those not qualified and with limited experience who assist with the handling of the boat and looking after trainees.
Trainees – young people aboard taking part in the sail training experience and forming part of a crew.

Watch – those trainees assigned to the group which is responsible for the safe operation of the boat (and other responsibilities) when on duty.

Watch leader – an experienced member of staff crew who is in charge of one or more watches. The watch leader explains, mentors and ensures instructions are followed, and makes sure that tasks are being completed safely and correctly. On some boats, a watch leader is one of the trainees who helps to manage the watch and communicate with the staff crew.

Teachers or youth workers – adults who come aboard with a group of trainees and are a part of the crew. These may include either trained youth workers or school teachers who are not necessarily trained youth workers.

Sail training organisation or operator – a company, usually a charity, providing sail training experiences to various clientele groups.

To recap, the concept of sail training refers to “sailing through the sea rather than for the sea” (Miner, 1990, p. 59) which is often translated as learning through the sea rather than about the sea (e.g., McCulloch, 2004; 2007; Rowe et al., 2014). Rowe et al. (2014) explained that sail training refers to “voyages for young people designed to use the sea experience as training for life rather than for a career at sea” (p. 31). Sail training is one of many activities classified as OAE which targets various aspects of young peoples’ PSD (McCulloch, 2016; Priest & Gass, 2005). A key point here is that both OAE and sail training programmes use an activity as a means to address young people’s PSD rather than focusing on the end result of achieving activity-related competencies.

4.2 Key Features of a Sail Training Voyage

Sail training can be conducted on various vessels varying in size, capacity and procedures aboard, and offering different lengths of voyage (see Sail Training International, 2018 for more technical specifications). Although there has been some debate in the literature regarding how long sail training voyages should last to achieve
positive results (see McCulloch, 2004; Neill, 2008), the voyages normally last seven-to-fourteen days (Rowe et al., 2014). It is a residential experience where most participants are strangers to each other at the beginning of the voyage, and yet they live and work on a vessel for a period of time. Lack of previous familiarity among the trainees prior to the sail training voyage is common and sometimes desired by staff crew (McCulloch, 2004). Such unfamiliarity allows for social diversity and the creation of socially unfamiliar situations, as well as exposing trainees to different socio-economic backgrounds without having a ‘safety net’ of previously established friendship (e.g., Takano 2010). Despite living with strangers often being one of the biggest challenges anticipated prior to a voyage, it has been shown to be one of the top factors influencing young people’s PSD and especially confidence (Allison, McCulloch, McLaughlin, Allison, Edwards & Tett, 2007; Hindle, 2014).

According to C. J. Rogers (2014), the key to sail training experience is the intensity of the experience which is created by the physical features of a vessel as it offers no immediate escape (see Figure 4.1). In general, all young people live in close proximity, have limited personal space, if any, and are not able to leave the boat as they please (see Figure 4.1; Capurso & Borsci, 2013; Sammet, 2005). As it will be explained later in this chapter, such proximity and environmental features have been shown to create feelings of forced dependence which influence the development of mutual trust, co-operation, teamwork and helping behaviours (Fraser, Richards, & Allison, 2016). According to Sibthorp (2003), Capurso and Borsci (2013) and later reported by Marshall (2016), environmental constraints force more intense social interactions and development (see Section 4.4.1).
Figure 4.1. A layout of *James Cook* – a small class C vessel with a capacity of 18 crew members in total. Adapted from Fraser et al. (2016).

Further, some sail training providers work with specific groups of young people (e.g., Ellen MacArthur Cancer Trust works with cancer survivors only; Ellen MacArthur Cancer Trust, 2014), whereas the majority of sail training providers offer their voyages to different groups which vary in terms of age (young adult or adult journeys) and background (e.g., school groups, criminal offenders or disabled young people; Ocean
Youth Trust Scotland, 2017a; The Jubilee Sailing Trust, 2017). There is no one standardised and detailed description which would fit all sail training experiences. To illustrate this point, let us consider two examples.

McCulloch (2002) identified five main sail training traditions in his thesis which are based on the size and type of the vessel, historic events, potential antecedents to the routines aboard and purpose. The identified traditions are: tall ship; leisure yachting; PSD; professional yachting; and historic vessel. Each vessel nonetheless is run by a different skipper who can decide to what extent a tradition should or should not be followed. The second example comes from Sail Training International. In order to provide sail training personnel with some sort of framework on how to assess and improve their practice, Sail Training International (2011) developed an evidence-based framework called the *Sail Training Self-Assessment Toolkit (2nd ed.*)* aimed at all types of sail training experiences conducted within any sail training tradition and on any type of vessel. The toolkit presented a model of sail training which had three key components: purposes of sail training; key practice areas; and youth development outcomes (or PSD outcomes). Within each area, further categories were identified which “help operators reflect on what is happening in their programmes compared to what they intend, and to identify where things need to change” (Sail Training International, 2011, p. 8). Within the context of this thesis, the second component—key practice areas—is the most relevant to this research. The key practice areas include: supportive interactions with others and modelling of good character and behaviour; meaningful opportunities for membership, community and participation in a group; challenging, engaging and genuine activities; and safety—physical and psychological—for learning (Sail Training International, 2011).

The above areas are discussed throughout this chapter as they reflect some of the key features of the sail training experience which help to further understand skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions. For now, the broader two factors of sail training experiences will be explained in more detail: hierarchy and group dynamics aboard; and the structure of the voyage. These factors are pivotal in helping us to understand the demands of sail training skippers as well as the practices identified within the Sail Training International (2011) toolkit as a means to contextualise skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD.

### 4.2.1 Hierarchy and dynamics on board.

Different sizes and capacities of vessels are used for sail training programmes (McCulloch, McLaughlin, Allison, Edwards, & Tett, 2010). The capacity and size of
each vessel might influence how the ship is run by a skipper, what other staff is on board, and how it may affect the overall dynamics (e.g., McCulloch, 2002; Sammet, 2005). For instance, the *James Cook* is a 21-meter-long and 5.48-meter-wide ketch with a capacity of only 12 trainees and five staff crew members (see Figure 4.1) compared with the *Tenacious* which is a 65-meter-long barque with eight permanent crew, a few assistants, a doctor (if possible), and up to 40 trainees (Jubilee Sailing Trust, 2017; Ocean Youth Trust North, n.d.; Rowe et al., 2014). Both examples require close proximity aboard, although the actual ‘distance’ and social interaction will vary from vessel to vessel as a result of its size, capacity and layout. It is worth noting that all tall ships are classified as class A, B, C and D based on their size and type of their rig and sails (i.e., class A is the largest and class D is the smallest tall ship; see Sail Training International, 2018).

The above examples also illustrate distinct staff crew structure and power relationships aboard. According to McCulloch (2004), trainees are not greatly involved in the decision-making on large vessels carrying big crews compared with smaller boats. Anecdotal evidence within sail training communities also claims that skippers on large vessels are less involved with the trainees compared with skippers on the smaller vessels. Likewise, trainees on smaller vessels experience more intense social interactions as there are less people aboard compared with bigger vessels. Nevertheless, Allison et al. (2007) conducted structured observations and obtained voyage summaries of 35 voyages on small, medium and large vessels in total, and conducted structured interviews with the trainees during and three months post-voyage. They concluded “that trainees’ views of the experience are broadly similar” (p. 35). This conclusion was based on achieved positive outcomes (e.g., social confidence) and lack of significant difference across the different sizes of the vessels. This conclusion implies the significance of the experience of going to sea rather than the size of the vessel (Allison et al., 2007).

Another point to make here is that staffing is not always fixed sometimes resulting in unfamiliarity among staff crew members as well as trainees. This may result in a skipper’s poor initial understanding and knowledge of their staff crew’s technical and social abilities and overall competencies (see McCulloch, 2002). It therefore follows that both trainees and staff crew members need to build working relationships with each other, learn about each other’s strengths and weaknesses, and adjust to different personalities while trying to achieve the overall outcomes of the sail training experience. Vernon and Seaman (2012) highlighted lack of
recognition within current literature that OAE practitioners may encounter interpersonal problems when co-instructing. McCulloch (2016) later pointed out that skippers and other staff crew members might be experiencing very similar feelings to inexperienced trainees aboard. This critique supports Hamilton’s (1988) comments that a skipper has to have “a strong personality and an excellent mastery of the art of leadership … [and] the ability to get the very best out of his [sic] crew” (p. 153).

4.2.2 Structure of a voyage.

Although each sail training operator and each skipper has certain preferences and routines with which they run their ship, there are some common features across sail training communities. For instance, because most trainees have never been on the ship before, some sort of safety and introductory briefing takes place at the beginning of each voyage. Trainees are usually expected to be involved in operating the ship which includes not only technical aspects but also undertaking domestic tasks such as cooking and cleaning (Fraser et al., 2016). Many ships have compulsory activities and certain expectations of trainees which help to promote discipline and establish routine (e.g., morning swims; Hindle, 2014; Marshall, 2016). Even though there is no one standardised description of sail training experience as mentioned earlier, there are three common themes across the UK sail training community. These are outlined and explained below: familiarity, watches, and introductions, briefings and debriefings.

**Familiarity.** As noted earlier, many trainees who take part in a sail training voyage have no prior familiarity with each other, although there are exceptions (e.g., a school group or youth project). Neither are trainees familiar with the sail training experience, technical skills and arrangements aboard (e.g., Finkelstein, 2005; Fraser et al., 2016). Therefore, it is not only other people but also the environment, the activity and the relevant technical language trainees need to familiarise themselves with. For instance, the front of the boat is called the *bow* and the right-hand side when looking at the bow is called *starboard* (Miller, 2013). Hence, trainees need to learn and get used to different language compared with what they use in their daily lives which further emphasises the novelty of the context (McCulloch, 2004; 2007).

Another point to make here is that regardless of staffing arrangements aboard (see previous section), a new group of trainees come on board almost weekly (depending on the length of the voyage). As such, staff crew members lack familiarity
with the trainees at the beginning of each voyage, affecting the overall dynamics and creating a need to assess the abilities and personality of each trainee quickly, anticipate challenges and adjust the voyage. Keeping in mind the possibility of lack of familiarity among staff crew members too, the skipper needs to assess the abilities and personalities of their staff crew, potentially affecting the skipper’s role and approach to the voyage.

**Watches.** All trainees are almost immediately divided into watches where each watch has a watch leader (see Section 4.1). Depending on the number of trainees and watches formed, watches normally operate on a shift-pattern. That is, while the on-duty watch is operating the boat (i.e., looking out for other ships, steering, etc.), other watches are resting. A watch system facilitates maintaining the operation of the boat 24/7 and creates a sense of dependency, reliance and teamwork, especially during night sails when the on-duty watch allows the off-duty watch to rest before they change over (Hamilton, 1988; McCulloch, 2007; Rowe et al., 2014). Such a system is also used for other domestic jobs (e.g., cooking or cleaning), as trainees are involved in all activities aboard—under supervision of staff crew members — which are needed to operate and live on the vessel. The watch system creates routine and structure each day, as there are set times for meals, tidying up, sailing or social activities (Hamilton, 1988; McCulloch, 2004). As noted by McCulloch (2007) and later by Fraser et al. (2016), watch keeping also provides an opportunity for trainees who are not familiar with each other to get to know their fellow trainees better.

**Introduction, briefings and debriefings.** Most voyages start from an introduction, safety briefings and logistical arrangements upon arrival (Fletcher & Prince, 2017; Grocott & Hunter, 2009). Trainees and staff crew members are introduced to each other first and the skipper often conducts a formal welcome before trainees are familiarised with the ship itself. Ground rules are normally established during formal introductions at the beginning of voyage to ensure safety and a smooth running of the voyage. Familiarisation with the ship, safety equipment and standard and emergency operating procedures often follow. According to Hamilton (1988) and McCulloch (2004), trainees need to get accustomed to their environment and daily tasks in the context of health and safety procedures and the equipment located aboard. It should be noted that all daily tasks are explained to the trainees—including walking down the steps, around the deck or using the toilet—due to the unique nature
of the equipment and the environment. Various briefings and debriefings are conducted throughout the voyage at various times. This may include explaining and deciding the sailing route, coming to mutual decisions on what activities the crew would like to do, or reflecting on the experience during dinner time or at the end of the voyage (Saunders, 2016, personal communication, April 1, 2016). Various feedback forms may be used at the end of each voyage to facilitate reflection, obtain feedback on the programme and/or provide sponsors with some evidence on achieved benefits (Hindle, 2014; Rowe et al., 2014; Sammet, 2005).

4.2.3 Section summary.

The sail training experience includes features and procedures which are common aboard different vessels (e.g., previous familiarity, limitations of space or no immediate exit). Nonetheless, as noted throughout this section, subtle differences and variations are common on a voyage-by-voyage basis as a result of the different mix of young people, their backgrounds and abilities, weather conditions, and available staff crew members and their skillsets. The main difference, however, remains how the identified elements consolidate on a per-voyage basis, affecting the overall learning and experience as well as shaping skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions (see Figure 4.2; also see Chapter 2). Keeping these points in mind, this thesis aims at better understanding skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD in light of the sail training features and dynamic contextual factors identified and explained in this section.
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Figure 4.2. Visual representation of the key features of the sail training experience affecting skippers’ beliefs, intentions and actions. Adapted from Buehl and Beck (2015).
4.3 Expectations and Role of Skippers

To recap, within OAE environments, researchers have identified a range of roles practitioners are expected to undertake, varying from teaching to facilitation of group processes (e.g., Wattchow & Brown, 2011). Collins and Collins (2012) highlighted that any role undertaken by the OAE practitioner is underpinned by a sound understanding of welfare and safety and technical ability related to the activity. Indeed, the vast majority of empirical research within an OAE setting reporting perceptions of OAE practitioners is focused on safety and risk management (e.g., Brown, 2002; see Chapter 2.3), although another trend within the literature is facilitation of small group behaviours (e.g., Smith, 2011; Smith & Penney, 2010).

Keeping in mind the expectations of educators explained in Chapter 2, Dewey and Hahn’s expectations of practitioners summarised in Chapter 3, and the sail training features detailed in Section 4.2, there are a number of roles and expectations skippers are faced with on a daily basis. As a result of the legal regulations arising from the nature of the activity, there are always demanding safety and risk management requirements. Consequently, skippers have to teach the essential skills needed to take part in sailing as well as being able to live aboard; provide ongoing supervision and mentoring to young people as well as staff crew members depending on their skillsets; often provide emotional support to young people who are struggling with the lack of familiarity with other crew members and the environment; promote young people’s PSD to achieve programme goals; and to lead and manage everyone aboard to ensure the smooth running of a vessel and an enjoyable experience. As noted earlier, young people and even staff crew members may be changing on almost a weekly basis. As such, there is the need to assess everyone’s strengths and weaknesses with each change, and to adjust the voyage to suit their abilities and needs. Essentially, skippers need to learn about their crew at the beginning of each voyage to make necessary changes and reasonable decisions depending on who is present, the route, weather conditions and broader programme goals.

Another role of the skipper is to build working interpersonal relationships with both unfamiliar staff crew members and young people, so that appropriate role behaviours can be modelled and looked up to by young people. Interpersonal relationships among staff crew members and between the staff crew members and young people influence overall group dynamics, the atmosphere aboard and the overall experience (e.g., Fraser et al., 2016; Vernon & Seaman, 2012). As an example, Sammet (2005) conducted a two-phase mixed-methods case study which
revealed that young people attributed negative experience of sail training to the personalities and perceived unreasonable actions of the staff crew members and teachers (e.g., snappy teachers). Later Cleland (2011) conducted a retrospective mixed-methods study with 278 sail training programme alumni. He reported that trainees who perceived significant positive changes in their development had better interactions with staff compared with trainees who did not report perceived positive changes. White et al. (2016) conducted pre- and post-voyage interviews in 11 adults in drug and alcohol rehabilitation programme. The participants reported the perceived positive influence of staff crew members who offered support and acted as role models throughout a voyage. These examples illustrate the importance of working interpersonal relationships aboard, suggesting yet another skippers’ role which goes beyond facilitation of group behaviours or conflict management (see Priest & Gass, 2005).

It is not clear to what extent the above speculations based on the existing empirical literature and conceptualisations of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts are in line with skippers’ perceptions. As it will be discussed in the following section, the sail training literature under-represents skippers’ and staff crew members’ voices as a result of the fact that most studies investigate young people’s perceptions. In addition, the exiting OAE literature appears to show a trend towards investigating risk management and safety, and the role of facilitator reported does not often fully represent the educational side of sail training programmes and the skipper’s role within such programmes. Nor does it recognise the interpersonal problems the skipper is likely to be faced with (see Vernon & Seaman, 2012). Hence, there is an emerging need to go beyond such assumptions and to better understand skippers’ perceptions and conceptualisations of their perceived roles aboard. Therefore, this thesis investigates the perceptions of skippers on their perceived roles aboard a sail training vessel. This focus allows for comparisons to be made with the existing literature and key educational theories presented in Chapters 2 and 3, and further insights to be gained into the influence of sail training contextual features on skippers’ beliefs.

4.4 Systematic Sail Training Literature Review

As previously discussed, in some respects, the sail training literature is limited in size and scope which provides an opportunity to thoroughly synthesise almost all available empirical sail training literature. Therefore, this section presents a thorough
review of the sail training literature which builds on Schijf et al.’s (2017) work and further adapts suggestions made by literature on Cochrane systematic and scoping reviews (e.g., Arksey & O’Malley, 2005; R. Armstrong, Hall, Doyle, & Waters, 2011; Levac, Colquhoun, & O’Brien, 2010).

Overall, this review resulted in 44 studies and study reports, 36 of which were unique studies (including one systematic review and one philosophical study; see Table 4.1). The following inclusion criteria were implemented, building on Schijf et al.’s (2017) sail training review:

- the study report was available in English;
- the study report was published or produced between 2000 and 2018; OR data was collected, or study was referenced after 2000 if there was no clear date of publication;
- a full study report or a draft manuscript was available;
- the study report followed a recognisable referencing system;
- the study was conducted within a sail training environment (sail training as defined in Chapter 1);
- the study did not include other activities unless a comparison between sail training and other activities was a purpose of the study;
- the study or study report conveyed new insights or findings.

Table 4.1 summarises all identified studies which were retrieved and thematically analysed for this chapter. Multiple reports of the same study are marked with corresponding symbols. Table 4.1 was last updated on 20th July 2018.
### Table 4.1

**Summary Table of the Sail Training Systematic Literature Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison et al., 2007*</td>
<td>Investigate value and effectiveness of sail training through examining purposes and beliefs about the benefits of participation in sail training.</td>
<td>Empirical study report</td>
<td>325 young people (173 for both interviews; 183 interviewees aged 14-17 years)</td>
<td>Trainees'</td>
<td>35 voyages by 17 operators on large, medium and small vessels.</td>
<td>Repeated measures mixed-methods: structured observations &amp; summaries; interviews (incl. a social confidence self-assessment scale) during and 3 months after a voyage.</td>
<td>Improvements in social confidence and ability to work with others are sustained over time but most effective when offered as a part of well-structured programme; positive value is not influenced by size of the vessel; perceived importance of good social experiences, learning skills and experiencing sailing life, working as a team, and doing something new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arahanga-Doyle et al., 2018</td>
<td>Assess changes in resilience, self-esteem and positive outlook as a result of the voyage and to determine</td>
<td>Unpublished pilot study</td>
<td>54 Maori and 37 New Zealand European young people; 91 (from 13-17 years of age). Young people from poor</td>
<td>Trainees'</td>
<td>Single-provider eight 7-day voyages on a medium/large vessel</td>
<td>Repeated measures (first day and last day of the voyage): questionnaires (social identity and support assessed only on the last day)</td>
<td>Both groups showed a statistically significant increase in resilience from pre- to post-voyage; Maori had lower levels of pre-test resilience; strong relationship between pre- and post-voyage resilience, post-voyage resilience and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the contribution of whanaungatanga (i.e., collective identity in Maori) to these outcomes.

socio-economic backgrounds by questionnaires.

social identity, social identity and social support, post-voyage resilience and social support (only Europeans). Pre-voyage resilience and social identity made unique contributions to post-voyage resilience. Strong relationship between self-esteem at pre- and post-voyage; only pre-voyage self-esteem made a unique contribution to post-voyage self-esteem. Statistically significant positive effect of time on outlook in both groups; significant relationship between pre- and post-voyage outlook, and post-voyage outlook and social identity. Pre-voyage outlook made a unique contribution to post-voyage outlook. Connection as a central concept that helps to promote resilience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbour, 2007</td>
<td>Investigate perceived resilience and ability to cope with challenges following a semester-long sail training programme for girls.</td>
<td>Unpublished MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>18 girls (aged 17-20 years); 8 completed both measures, 5 completed survey and 5 completed an interview.</td>
<td>The programme had features of a therapeutic community (i.e., community experience, control and responsibility experienced by the participants, peers and adult supervisors and intensely challenging environment) and all participants experienced positive change and increased their resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashworth, 2013</td>
<td>Explore young people's identity development and relationships between PSD and OAE.</td>
<td>Unpublished PhD Thesis</td>
<td>42 participants: 2 Board members, 12 staff aboard and 28 trainees (teens to 20’s).</td>
<td><strong>Workers</strong>: confidence is the biggest outcome and responsibility is the most common explanation; <strong>Trainees</strong>: removal from familiar environment and daily habits, activities requiring trust, reciprocity and responsibility; feelings of belonging &amp; group identity; &amp; developed confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman et al., 2004</td>
<td>Examine the interconnectons between the voyage experience and the construction of social capital.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>160 past trainees</td>
<td>Trainees' single provider five voyages on medium/large vessel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resources, seasickness, language, spatial and temporal constraints shaping the experience. A ship acts as an equaliser for people from different backgrounds. Trust, reciprocity, tolerance and social competency. Post-voyage narratives focused on interpersonal difficulties rather than immediately present fears of physical sailing-related tasks.

<p>| Capurso &amp; Borsci, 2013 | Investigate the impact of sail training experience on the self-concept of young people. | Empirical study | 143 young people (mean age 13.18 years; 56.4% M; some had either a chronic disease or were at risk). | Trainees’ 11 voyages by a single-provider on a medium vessel. | Quasi-experimental repeated measures: a questionnaire prior, on the last day, and 2 months post-voyage. | Positive short-term outcomes on social and competence self-concepts not sustained over time. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chiu, 2012</th>
<th>Investigate attitudinal and awareness-related aspects of intercultural competence as it relates to ESL.</th>
<th>Unpublished MSc Dissertation</th>
<th>43 young people (23 F &amp; 20 M; aged 15-26 years).</th>
<th>Trainees’ A single-voyage on a large vessel during a Tall Ship Race</th>
<th>Repeated measures mixed-methods case-study: pre- and post-voyage questionnaire (open &amp; closed questions) &amp; logbooks (during the voyage)</th>
<th>Perceived learning opportunities to develop intercultural competence; statistically significantly increase in intercultural competence related to awareness, and no statistically significant increase in intercultural competence related to attitudes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finkelstein, 2005</td>
<td>Investigate the effectiveness of the Young Endeavour Youth Scheme and relationship between the voyage experience and the long-term construction of social capital.</td>
<td>Unpublished empirical study report</td>
<td>160 programme alumni.</td>
<td>Trainees’ &amp; different stakeholders A single-provider’s multiple voyages on a large vessel</td>
<td>Retrospective case study: interviews and an observation of a single voyage</td>
<td>\textit{Trainees}: trust in staff due to authority; enhanced views on teamwork due to the pursuit of a common goal; increased tolerance towards people from different backgrounds; increased adaptability and confidence in dealing with unknown people and environments. \textit{Observations}: novel environment and people allow to experiment with different identities and personal attributes; significance of seasickness experience; diversity of people to bridge social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, 2013</td>
<td>Investigate the environment, activity and people components of a voyage and how these may operate to provide an increased sense of well-being.</td>
<td>A report on MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>14 young people (9 F &amp; 3 M; all aged 14 years).</td>
<td>Trainees'</td>
<td>A single-voyage on a small vessel.</td>
<td>Qualitative case study: post-voyage questionnaire with an inventory of activities aboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, 2017</td>
<td>Explore the sail training voyage using the role of the cultural community and guided participation</td>
<td>Unpublished EdD Thesis</td>
<td>18 participants (17 F and 1 M): 12 young girls (aged 12-13 years), 2 teachers, 3 staff-crew</td>
<td>Trainees' &amp; different stakeholders</td>
<td>A single-voyage on a small vessel</td>
<td>Qualitative case study: pre-, during- and post-voyage activities fostering reflection, pre- and post-voyage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher &amp; Prince, 2017*</td>
<td>Investigate the perceived significance of activities conducted aboard and how these activities may affect developmental outcomes identified in previous studies.</td>
<td>Empirical study based on MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>14 young people (9 F &amp; 3 M; all aged 14 years).</td>
<td>Trainees’ A single-voyage on a small vessel.</td>
<td>photo elicitation, semi-structured interviews during and 14-17 weeks post-voyage (focus group &amp; individual; observations; and other naturally occurring data (e.g., ship log). Qualitative repeated-measures case study: post-voyage and 6 months follow up questionnaire with an inventory of activities aboard. Most significant activities immediately following the voyage were perceived to be helming, man over board training, initial familiarisation, introductions, knots, and meal times compared to helming, night sailing, meal times, watch keeping, initial familiarisation, and introductions.</td>
<td>relationships in the community-based interests. Perceived significance of seasickness and a novel setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser et al., 2016</td>
<td>Track the development of trust and team cohesion over the 7-day sail voyage.</td>
<td>Empirical study based on MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>6 trainees (5 M and 1 F; mean age 24.3 years).</td>
<td>Trainees’ A single-voyage on a small vessel. Repeated measures mixed-methods: pre-, during-x2 and post-voyage questionnaire, post-voyage semi-structured interviews, and observation.</td>
<td>Three-phase development of trust (initial perception of shared identity; early trust; two-dimensional); importance of competence-oriented cognitive trust; some overlapping factors influencing both trust and team cohesion although trust is needed for cohesion to develop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinkevičiūtė, 2013</td>
<td>Track the development of trust and team cohesion over the 7-day sail voyage.</td>
<td>MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>6 trainees (5 M and 1 F; mean age 24.3 years).</td>
<td>Trainees’ A single-voyage on a small vessel. Repeated measures mixed-methods: pre-, during-x2 and post-voyage questionnaire, post-voyage semi-structured interviews, and observation.</td>
<td>Three-phase development of trust (initial perception of shared identity; early trust; two-dimensional); importance of competence-oriented cognitive trust; some overlapping factors influencing both trust and team cohesion although trust is needed for cohesion to develop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Grocott &amp; Hunter</td>
<td>Investigate the effects of sail training experience on global and specific self-esteem and whether it would have a lasting positive effect.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>193 young people (119 F &amp; 74 M aged 15-18 years); 158 participants (54 males, 104 females) completed 3+ measures.</td>
<td>Trainees' 5 voyages by a single-provider on a large vessel.</td>
<td>Statistically significant increases in esteem including feelings of global self-worth, opposite sex relations, physical appearance, and emotional stability all of which remained significant 3 months following the voyage; decrease in self-esteem on the first day of a voyage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Hayhurst et al.</td>
<td>Investigate whether resilience can be enhanced during a sail training voyage (study 1), whether it has a lasting effect (Study 2) and what factors may contribute to the increase.</td>
<td>Empirical study (2 studies)</td>
<td>Study 1: 126 young people (54 M &amp; 72 F; EG mean age 16.55 years &amp; CG mean age 19.42) Study 2: 146 young people (73 M &amp; 73 F; study 2; EG mean age 16.51 years &amp; CG mean age 16.43 years).</td>
<td>Trainees' Study 1: 3 voyages by a single-provider on a larger vessel Study 2: a single-voyage on a large vessel</td>
<td>Increased resilience from beginning to the end of the voyage (long-lasting effect); social effectiveness, self-efficacy and negative perceptions of weather were unique factors contributing/predicting increased resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henstock, 2012</td>
<td>Investigate the effect of a sail training programme on engagement with education and learning.</td>
<td>Master of Teaching Dissertation</td>
<td>5 young people at risk to disengaged with education (3F &amp; 2M aged 16-20 years)</td>
<td>Trainees' A single-voyage on a large/medium vessel.</td>
<td>Mixed-methods case study: pre- and 1-week post-voyage questionnaire and semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td>Positive effect on self-concept, friendships &amp; social networks (i.e., Social relationships), motivation to study, sense of purpose for learning. Key contributing factors: activities designed to support development (e.g., climbing aloft, watches, or control of a vessel); feeling a part of a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henstock et al., 2013</td>
<td>Investigating the impact on individual's self-concept and social networking skills through participation in a sail training voyage and how this may influence student engagement</td>
<td>Empirical study; pilot; based on Master of Teaching Dissertation</td>
<td>5 young people at risk to disengaged with education (3F &amp; 2M aged 16-20 years).</td>
<td>Trainees' A single-voyage on a large/medium vessel</td>
<td>Qualitative case study: pre- and 1 week post-voyage semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td>Positive effect on friendships &amp; social relationships, motivation to study, a strong sense of purpose for learning, and individuals' general self-concept; key contributing factors were activities designed to support such development (e.g., climbing aloft, watches, debrief exercises, or control of a vessel); feeling a part of a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind, 2016&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Identify the actions and behaviours of facilitators which may be essential for the educative experiences.</td>
<td>Unpublished MSc Dissertation not specified</td>
<td>Researchers’ 3 voyages by 3 different providers; 1 voyage on large, medium and small vessels.</td>
<td>A series of case studies: observations of facilitators aboard.</td>
<td>Implementation of novel, authentic, flexible and engaging programmes encouraging deep learning and experience considering that they were challenging, individually relevant, learner-centred, reflective, and that learning was experiential and self-regulated. Programmes provided social and collaborative support. Observed practices share features and qualities advocated by Dewey and resonate with philosophies of experience and education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind, 2016&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Identify how facilitators may accommodate personal learning needs within a complex environment.</td>
<td>Report on an unpublished MSc Dissertation not specified</td>
<td>Researchers’ 3 voyages by 3 different providers; 1 voyage on large, medium and small vessels.</td>
<td>A series of case studies: observations of facilitators aboard.</td>
<td>A range of strategies associated with personalised and experiential learning which promote self-regulation, agency &amp; self-realisation through permitting learners' voice and choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Methodology/Study Design</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindle, 2014</td>
<td>Investigate the effectiveness of the R. Tucker Thompson Sail Training Programmes.</td>
<td>Unpublished Manuscript 77 parents and 40 alumni (62.5% F &amp; 37.5% M; aged 13-18 years).</td>
<td>Case study: survey for parents (based on the existing survey used by the provider) and a survey for former trainees (loosely based on Allison et al., 2007). Majority of parents reported increased lasting confidence and ability to work with others in their child after a sail training voyage both of which were also reported by young people; majority of young people reported increased confidence in trying new things, leadership/responsibility, confidence with new friends, better understanding other people, and dealing with authority figures; seasickness and weather were top 2 least enjoyable aspects of a voyage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hunter et al., 2002  | Ascertain the range of sail training organisations worldwide and document                  | Unpublished Empirical study report: phase one 81 organisations worldwide (29% of all existing) | Cross-sectional: a questionnaire. Definitions of sail training varied from "training by the seas for life" to "training young people in seamanship, basic navigational skills, dealing with the basic elements of
practices and features that distinguish them.

wind and waves, and working and living with other people; further analysis looked at the process (group process, individual processes, adventure/risk/challenge, sailing activities, & general educational process) and the desired outcomes (social development, community development, & personal/self-development) of sail training (thematic analysis with no FC).

Majority of vessels used are 40-80 ft long ketches although a wide range is evident; class C - 56%, class A - 28%, class B - 19%. Biggest clientele groups are youth groups (350) and informal education (300). Dominance of 15-to-19-year-olds (40%); 85% are mixed gender voyages. 61% of trainees with no prior sail training experience. Captains are, on average, 43.88 years of
age compared to first mates (35 years of age) and bosuns (29 years of age). Low female representation - just over 90% captains and just over 80% of both bosuns and first mates are male. Captains experience is, on average, 10 years in their role. Professional development is focused on technical skills with group management, group facilitation, ecology and counselling being identified as social aspects needing development. Perceived degree of importance of programme activities - teambuilding (6.2), sailing (6), leadership (5.5), nautical (5.5), personal dev (5.2), conservation (4.2), challenges (4.2), interpersonal (4.1), marine ed. (4), first aid (3.8), counselling (2.8). Length of the voyage varies with median being 7 days and majority being 5 days.
| Hunter et al., 2013 | Investigate whether self-esteem can be elevated during a sail training voyage (study 1), whether it has a lasting effect (Study 2) and what factors may contribute to the increase. | Empirical study (2 studies) | Study 1: 62 young people (31 M & 31 F; EG mean age 16.48 years & CG mean age 16.45 years); Study 2: 396 young people (176 M & 220 F; EG mean age 16.34 years & CG’s mean ages 16.28 and 17.25 years). | Trainees’ Two single voyages on a medium/large vessel (1 per study). | Study 1: elevated self-esteem following a 10-day voyage; study 2: elevated self-esteem following a 10-day voyage which was sustained 12 months later, and perceived self-efficacy and belonging each made a unique contribution to elevated self-esteem. |
| Kafka et al., 2012 | Investigate whether self-esteem can be elevated with or without negative outcomes following a sail training voyage (study 1), sustained over time (study 2) and | Empirical study (3 studies) | Study 1: 60 young people (26 M & 34 F; EG mean age 16.21 years & CG mean age 16.24 years); Study 2: 106 young people (47 M & 59 F; EG mean age 16.38 years & CG mean age 16.34 years); Study 3: 142 | Trainees’ Multiple voyages by a single-provider on a medium/large vessel. | Experimental case study: Study 1 - a questionnaire on the first and last day of a voyage (same for a comparison group with 10 days apart); Study 2 - a questionnaire on the first and last day of a voyage and 12 months follow-up. | Study 1: elevated self-esteem and decreased gender prejudice following a voyage; Study 2: increased self-esteem from the first to the last day of the voyage which was sustained 4–5 months later; increased self-esteem was associated with corresponding decreases in gender prejudice which were sustained 4–5 months later; Study 3: same as study 2 + increased self-esteem |
whether there is a link between self-esteem and risky attitudes (study 3).

Liu, 2012

Explore the changes in young people's self-esteem (67 M & 75 F; EG aged 14-18 years & CG aged 15-18 years). Unpublished MSc Dissertation

34 young people (mean age 19.94 years). Trainees'


Positive changes in self-esteem were not associated with increases in negative behaviours and racial and gender bias (no significant increases were found).

Positive changes in self-efficacy and outcome expectations of future career choices; sailing activities, mastery and vicarious experience, interactions with others, intercultural activities and physical problems (e.g., seasickness) were major sources for increased self-efficacy; positive impact on thoughts about future careers choices.
| **Maekler, 2009** | Investigate experiences and motivation of trainees and staff crew members targeting sail training promotion. | Unpublished MA Dissertation | 136 participants (133 staff members + 3 trainees). | Trainees' and staff (mostly staff) | Single-provider multiple-voyages on a large vessel. | Mixed-methods case-study: semi-structured interviews (5), online questionnaire (131 staff) and secondary research. | Relationships (e.g., team spirit, belonging, helping), nature, recognition (i.e., for the crew for ego enhancement) and isolation. Characteristics of sail training were novelty, stimulation (i.e., anticipated rewards & nature), and team spirit. |
| **Marshall, 2016** | Clarify what it is meant by ‘practical wisdom; compared with PSD; understand the importance of residential OAE programmes and the role they have as a catalyst for Aristotelian practical wisdom. | Unpublished PhD Thesis | 141 participants | Trainees' at the time of the voyage | Single-provider multiple-one semester voyages on a large vessel | Retrospective (1985-2012) mixed-methods: online questionnaire (124) and phone/email interview (17; 2-5 participants per each year group). | Work & habit formation: PSD occurred from physical demands and routine of a vessel as a foundation for personal accountability, shared goals, community, reflective virtues, confidence and self-determination; ship duties as highly structured activities which become incubators for virtue development/accelerates PSD supporting Aristotle's notion of virtue cultivation. Obligation to the community was a key monitor for participation and engagement with ship. |
duties (forced dependence and shared load).

Personal and Social challenge and growth: both intentional & incidental context-driven experiences; a general notion of challenge associated with increased confidence; context-driven (incl. social challenges) and programmatic challenges as sub-types contributing to courage, self-awareness and perspective; social challenges created by space mainly focusing on building friendships and dealing with other people; shared goals influenced social bonds. Significant elements to PSD (from a questionnaire): Exposure to poverty; structure; service learning; home stays, post visits, discomfort, coursework, community life, friendship, ship duties.

Educators’ role: facilitation of teambuilding and community aboard
("programmatic steps"). Transferability: struggles at home after the experience as family and friends lacked awareness of changes; struggles to apply new values to the old context; experience as a catalyst for post-voyage PSD and ongoing growth. Overall: Context and programme-related challenges foster PSD outcomes while adventurous itself cultivates habits. Social experience motivated to identify the type of community trainees desired later in their lives. Ongoing practice of decision-making in relationships. Social growth influences one’s ability to deliberate with others, decision-making and come together toward wise action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCarrhny &amp; Kotzee, n.d.</td>
<td>Unpublished Pilot Study</td>
<td>15 participants (10 young people + 5 leaders)</td>
<td>A single-provider offering both sail training and land-based PSD programmes</td>
<td>Emphasised novelty of the environment, control for safety, being on the boat and use of saloon area for PSD activities, highlighted teamwork compared to land-based activities; no differences for the opportunities to form effective friendships but requirement to work in a team on board was the biggest differentiating factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, 2002*</td>
<td>PhD Thesis</td>
<td>Approx. 100 participants (46 young people aged 12-25 + approx. 55 staff)</td>
<td>A series of case studies: document analysis, semi-structured interviews (46 trainees some single + some multiple at various times + 55 staff) and observations.</td>
<td>Space and movement; boundaries and finite limits; routine and flexibility; harness discipline for safety; community and ‘institutionality’; staff: confined space; cooking skills; seasickness as a character-building experience; coping skills; figuring out own limits and being able to stretch them; the nature of communal living within clearly bounded community and isolation from the everyday life ashore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McCulloch, 2004

- Investigate and compare decision making and authority within two sail training traditions.
- Based on a PhD Thesis
- not specified
- 2 voyages by 2 providers reported
- A series of case studies: document analysis, interviews and observations.

McCulloch, 2007

- Exploring features of domestic and social life aboard, and their contribution to sail training compared to other types of residential programmes.
- Based on a PhD Thesis
- not specified
- Trainees' & different stakeholders
- 11 voyages on 6 vessels.
- Qualitative: structured observations & interviews.

McCulloch et al., 2010

- Investigate a range of values and beliefs about
- Empirical study
- 325 young people (173 for both interviews; 35 voyages by 17 operators on large (7).
- Repeated measures mixed-methods: structured
- The social aspect of being with a group and forming new friendships followed by teamwork and maritime life;

Traditions and values of the Royal Navy are alive in the contemporary context within Tall Ship tradition where hierarchies are reflected; structures of authority and command were found on all but smallest vessels.

Combination of limited space and privacy, ongoing movement of the vessel and no clear exist makes it profoundly different compared to other land-based activities; a vessel as a closed community and characteristics of a learning community (shared space and shared practices).
<p>| Nicol &amp; Young, 2007 | Investigating graduate nurse preceptor skills. | Empirical study | 23 Graduate nurses | Trainees' A single voyage on a max 2 people sail craft | Repeated measured case study: self-evaluation after the experience and 6 weeks later; a questionnaire 6 weeks post-voyage. | voyage observations &amp; summaries; structured (incl. a social confidence self-assessment scale) interviews during and 3 months after a voyage. | positive benefits in perceived social confidence (i.e., social relations &amp; trying new experiences) and self-perception in capacity to work collaboratively with others; opportunities for practical and cognitive domains; characteristics of structured activity combined with seafaring experience. Lasting increase in confidence regardless size of the vessel. Biggest changes were reported in being a resource person, interpersonal skills, feedback and congruency, empathy, and preceptor skills. The lasting effects included giving feedback, personal qualities, and responsibilities of the preceptor role. | the benefits of participation in a sail training voyage. | 51% M &amp; 49% F; 90% of sample aged 14-21 years). | medium (10) and small (3) vessels. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study Objective</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peng et al., 2016</td>
<td>Investigate the effects of a cutter boat experience education program.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>199 trainees (average age 12.5; 121 M and 78 F).</td>
<td>Trainees’ A single session of rowing a cutter boat.</td>
<td>Repeated measures: a questionnaire before, after and 1 month follow-up. Improved psychological-social, moral, and physical abilities; physical abilities decreased a month later. Sustained increases in positivity, adaptable behaviour, range of vision-judgment, diligence, and compassion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, 2014</td>
<td>Investigate to what extent EMCT sail training experience has a positive effect on young people’s lives.</td>
<td>Unpublished BMedSc Dissertation</td>
<td>173 participants with cancer diagnosis (121 young people aged 8-17 years &amp; their parents; 53% F + 52 young people aged 18-24 years; 28% F).</td>
<td>Trainees’ and parents only of trainees’ of &lt;18 of age. A single-provider multiple-voyages on small vessels.</td>
<td>Mixed-methods case-study: a questionnaire on the last day of the voyage. Majority of both age groups reported gained self-confidence and new friends. Majority of &lt;18 gained independence; social interactions and the social aspects (e.g., social skills, communication with friends on return to home) was the most frequently mentioned theme. Challenging environment, facilitation of social interaction and educational experiences positively enhanced personal growth, motivation, confidence and independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, 2014</td>
<td>Investigate the effectiveness of the One and All programme in meeting its stated aims and objectives.</td>
<td>Unpublished BBSc Dissertation</td>
<td>24 young people (aged 15-19 years)</td>
<td>Trainees’ and staff A single-voyage on a large vessel.</td>
<td>Qualitative case-study: documentation provided by the sail training provider incl. the Volunteer Log Book and Watch Leaders’ Manual, participant observation incl. video recordings of briefings, introductions, etc., semi-structured interviews at the end of the voyage with trainees, unstructured interviews with the crew, and a field visit one-week prior the voyage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammet, 2005</td>
<td>Identify short, medium and long-term programme outcomes and areas which are well/not well implemented as perceived by students and staff.</td>
<td>Unpublished Study report</td>
<td>38 participants (1st phase 1 executive director, 2 interns &amp; 9 students; second phase 26 young people (girls average age 16 years).</td>
<td>Trainees' A single-provider on a large vessel.</td>
<td>Mixed-methods case study: document review and meetings with staff; a survey prior- and 1 week after the voyage (14), semi-structured interviews (9) after the voyage, and a TSSG survey at the end of the semester (12); second phase of meetings and discussions with staff to discuss student data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
negative attitude, refused to do their share aboard and were constantly complaining; Sailing staff crew: hierarchy and discrimination against skills, negative attitude, tension between staff crew and executive director but trainees reported negative and difficult own behaviour causing problems.

Scarf et al., 2016

Investigate the extent to which different dimensions of social identity contribute to enhanced resilience; investigate whether an individual's sense of belonging makes a unique contribution.

Empirical study

180 young people (96 F and 84 M); 60 trainees', single-provider, medium/large-vessel voyages on a medium/large vessel (10-18 years of age); 60 Year 11 and 60 Year 12.)

Experiential study

180 young people (96 F and 84 M); 60 formed experiential group (10-day voyage; 15-18 years of age); controls - 120 (60 Year 11 and 60 Year 12).

Trainees' single-provider, multiple voyages on a medium/large vessel assessed 1 month prior, lls day, last day, and 9 months after the 10-day voyage. Social support, centrality of identity and group belonging assessed only on the last day of the voyage; Social support did not contribute to resilience on the last day and 9 months post-voyage, centrality contributed to resilience only on the last day, belonging was a significant predictor of resilience on the last day and 9 months later. Centrality was an indirect predictor of resilience on the last day of the voyage.

Increase in resilience was maintained over 9 months period; statistically significant difference between experimental and controls 9 months post-voyage. Social support did not contribute to resilience on the last day and 9 months post-voyage, centrality contributed to resilience only on the last day, belonging was a significant predictor of resilience on the last day and 9 months later. Centrality was an indirect predictor of resilience on the last day of the voyage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarf et al., 2018</td>
<td>Investigate a degree to which individuals sense of belonging to the group relates to the increases in self-esteem.</td>
<td>Study 1: 173 young people (72 M and 101 F; 15-19 years of age), EG - 100 (52M and 48 F), Rest CG (20M and 53 F). Study 2: 171 young persons (58M and 113F; 15-19 years of age), EG - 80 (33M and 47 F), CG - 91 (25M and 66F).</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>single-provider multiple voyages on a medium/large vessel</td>
<td>Both studies: Experimental repeated measures: questionnaires only (first and last day of the voyage; group belonging was measured only in the last day of the voyage; controls did the same 10 days apart; belonging was completed by controls only in study 1).</td>
<td>Increase in self-esteem prior to post-voyage in experimental but not controls (both studies); post-voyage self-esteem was correlated to group belonging and initial self-esteem (both studies). The relationships between group belonging and self-esteem remained when controlling for self-efficacy and group esteem (study 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schijf, 2014**</td>
<td>Summarise existing sail training literature and provide thematic</td>
<td>23 studies</td>
<td>MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A systematic literature review protocol using a thematic analysis approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schijf et al., 2017**</td>
<td>Systematic Literature Review based on MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>24 studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A systematic literature review protocol using a thematic analysis approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Limited methods used with majority being self-reported measures; socioeconomic and demographic features of participants are underreported and not explored in great detail; structured programmes can lead to more purposeful outcomes; positive long-term effects on PSD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vives, 2013</td>
<td>Unpublished MSc Dissertation</td>
<td>29 trainees and staff</td>
<td>Trainees’ Multi-provider multiple-voyages (5)</td>
<td>Qualitative: interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ships as a community; transformation is influenced by the significance of relationships; diversity of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White et al., 2016</td>
<td>has a transforming effect on young people. Investigate how people in rehab experience and understand sail training experience, what challenges it presents and what significance the voyage has on them and rehab recovery.</td>
<td>Empirical study</td>
<td>11 adults in drug and alcohol rehab (2 F &amp; 9 M average age 40.2)</td>
<td>Trainees'</td>
<td>Qualitative case study: pre- and post-voyage interviews ranging between 1-11 weeks after the voyage.</td>
<td>Novelty of the environment, limited space contributed to a sense of group cohesion, trust &amp; cooperation, real risk and need for rules and hardwork; teamwork, responsibility in relation to sailing tasks; professional crew and authority figures (role models, accessible and approachable, created supporting setting and structure); emotional and social experiences incl. self-reflection, group interaction reassembling a family; proximity &amp; bonding as both a stressor and positive effect on relationships; helping and caring for others due to risk. Facilitation of social identity due to physical proximity, working and living together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wojcikiewicz &amp; Mural, 2010</td>
<td>Propose a framework based on Dewey’s ideas, so that OAE and youth development practitioners outside OAE could employ on programme design and assessment.</td>
<td>Philosophical study</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Researchers’ n/a</td>
<td>Philosophical/theoretical framework related to sail training activities in light of authors’ experiences.</td>
<td>4 key features: lively and purposeful activities associated with informal learning (ST: skills are taught to be used); the learning environment must be intentionally shaped (ST: taught skills are adjusted by skilled instructors to suit the novice participants within the sail training environment); the activities must have pedagogical intentions (ST: purpose is to teach sailing); activities must be educative (ST: realness of skills and activity).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The synthesised sail training literature provides a succinct and critical summary of existing tendencies within sail training literature building on Schijf et al.'s (2017) findings who identified the following key issues: failure to discuss socio-economic background of participants in detail; dominance of self-reported questionnaires as primary data collection method; and unbalanced focus on outcomes of sail training experience rather than the process. However, five shortcomings were identified in the current review. These shortcomings are: poor overall reporting; undertaking either a single-voyage or a single-provider case study \( (n = 29) \); dominance of self-reported measures \( (n = 24) \), although 11 of which used a combination of methods (e.g., questionnaires and observations); over-representation of trainees’ voices \( (n = 22) \); and half of literature is unpublished \( (n = 18) \). Only one study made significant connections with possible philosophical underpinnings of sail training programmes (i.e., Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010) and another study only briefly mentioned such links (i.e., Hind, 2016). The above figures are presented graphically in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3. Visual representation of features of the synthesised empirical sail training literature: (a) Represented perspectives; (b) Data collected from single versus multiple voyages; (c) Designs used; and (d) Methodologies employed.

Even though 13 studies primarily focused on the outcomes of the sail training experience conducting either cross-sectional or experimental studies (e.g., Scarf,
Kafka, Hayhurst, Jang, Boyes, Thomson, & Hunter, 2018), another seven studies primarily focused on identifying elements of sail training experience helping us to understand the underpinning mechanisms (e.g., McCarthy & Kotzee, n.d.). In addition, another 11 studies identified outcomes and provided further insights into elements of a voyage that contribute to the identified outcomes (e.g., Henstock, Barker, & Knijnik, 2013). It should be noted that a retrospective study conducted by Marshall (2016) investigated outcomes and elements of a successful sail training voyage in light of Aristotelian practical wisdom. Marshall (2016) employed an online questionnaire (n = 141) and later conducted interviews (n = 17) with past trainees to better understand importance of OAE programmes. His results also offered further insights into transferability of the developed outcomes and ongoing growth experienced by young people during their post-voyage lives. The final four studies had slightly different objectives and therefore, these studies cannot be easily classified with the above studies (e.g., Hunter et al., 2002 investigated the nature and characteristics of sail training providers). These points contradict one of the Schijf et al.’s (2017) conclusions that sail training literature is heavily focused on outcomes rather than the process of sail training experience.

Table 4.2 provides a summary of key elements of the sail training experience which were identified after synthesising the literature. It should be noted that Table 4.2 is heavily based on young people’s views for two reasons. First, the majority of empirical studies have investigated the perceptions of young people (see Figure 4.3), although some studies also provide useful insights based on observations, document analysis or programme design (e.g., Allison et al., 2007; Hindle, 2016). Second, studies which investigated the perceptions of other stakeholders (e.g., staff crew, ashore staff or parents) as well as young people’s views did not make clear distinctions between different perspectives with the exception of Ashworth (2013), Hindle (2014), McCulloch (2002) and J. M. Roberts (2014). Within this group, only Ashworth (2013) and McCulloch (2002) provide some insights into elements of the sail training experience by obtaining staff members’ views while Hindle (2014) and J. M. Roberts (2014) used parents’ perspectives to investigate the outcomes of sail training. As a result of this trend in the existing literature, Table 4.2 is limited in its ability to present key elements of sail training as perceived by staff or other stakeholders.
Table 4.2

*A Summary of the Top 10 Key Elements of Sail Training as Perceived by Young People Compared with the Views of Other Stakeholders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young people's view (FC)</th>
<th>Key Elements</th>
<th>Other stakeholders’ views (i.e., staff, organisations, researchers) (FC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Small group dynamics (e.g., teamwork, shared goals, social interactions)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Novel experience and environment (physical and social) away from home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community/communal living</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Responsibility, control and care for self and others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured programme/facilitation of relationships/created environment/provided support/educative activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Relationships with staff/staff as role models</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sailing activities (e.g., knots, night sailing)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Limited space</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seasickness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive social experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Frequency count indicates how many studies found and reported the identified element. FC = frequency count.

In summary, sail training literature often adapts measures used within OAE literature and repeats OAE findings within a sail training context (e.g., Hayhurst, Hunter, Kafka, & Boyes, 2013; Sammet, 2005). Thorough and critical analysis of the sail training literature highlighted another similarity between sail training and OAE (see Chapter 2) literatures. That is, sail training literature fails to provide substantial insights into the *relationships* between the key programme elements leading to poor
understanding of the underlying mechanisms and theoretical framework. Another issue is prevalence of case studies based on single examples (i.e., either a voyage or a provider). Hence, most empirical findings within sail training literature have low transferability and generalisability of research findings, and fail to produce cumulative research (Schijf et al., 2017). Similar to OAE literature reviewed in Chapter 2, sail training literature almost completely neglects the perspectives of other stakeholders and have concentrated on the perceptions of young people while trying to identify the outcomes of the programmes (Allison & Von Wald, 2013; Sibthorp et al., 2007). Lack of balanced view is evident in Figure 4.3. The significance of staff crew members on the overall sail training experience has also been identified by young people as captured in Table 4.1. Bearing the above points in mind, this thesis aims at vocalising skippers’ views using semi-structured interviews to gain further understanding of the processes underpinning sail training experience. Such an approach also facilitates a better understanding of the underlying skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and the commonality of such beliefs, at least within the UK.

### 4.5 Theoretical Framework of the Current Study: Part Three

The identified features of the sail training experience revealed by empirical sail training literature provide beneficial insights into further contextualising the aims and research questions of this thesis. As noted throughout this thesis so far, working interpersonal relationships between young people and staff members may affect the perceived outcomes and the overall sail training experience. These relationships are also affected by a number of contextual factors which have been introduced throughout this chapter, and which may have a further effect on skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions. Fletcher (2013) provides an insightful explanation on why and how the sail training experience may work, highlighting the complex nature of a sailing training environment:

> A sailing training experience is more than the sum of its component parts...[and] benefits for participants arise from a complex mix of the environmental, activity and people components which are brought together in a social situation. Each voyage consists of a unique blend of crew and sea staff performances immersed in this novel setting, where individuals adapt their performance relative to the interaction with their audience. (p. 18)

Figure 4.4 illustrates working interpersonal relationships between a skipper, staff crew members and trainees which are influenced by contextual factors. A visual
representation was conceptualised as the understanding of key concepts and settings emerged throughout the preceding chapters and keeping in mind Fletcher’s (2013) comments (see above). The final part of the theoretical framework allows for further positioning this thesis within the sail training context while providing a better understanding of interpersonal relationships. It also delineates, to some extent, contextual factors potentially affecting both the interpersonal relationships and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. I will return to this assumption in later chapters.

Figure 4.4. A visual representation of working interpersonal relationships between a skipper, staff crew members and trainees, where all three groups have different abilities, backgrounds and beliefs. The working interpersonal relationships which form are then influenced and further shaped by contextual factors.

4.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduced and reviewed features of sail training settings necessary to further contextualise both the concepts of beliefs, the role and expectations of educators introduced and reviewed within teachers' beliefs and OAE literatures (see Chapter 2) and Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts (see Chapter 3). As noted by B. B. Levin (2015), the context cannot be separated from the beliefs and actions in which they occur. Therefore, the discussion of sail training environment has helped to develop a more in-depth understanding on how subtle sail training features may affect skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions. It has also helped to weave Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts into the context of this thesis. A
systematic sail training literature review highlighted existing gaps and informed sampling and methodological decisions that were made in development of this thesis. As such, the next chapter recaps the theoretical framework, research aims and questions before the ontological and epistemological positions, methodological assumptions and methods employed are outlined.
Chapter 5. Methodology

5.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by explaining the ontological and epistemological positions and methodological assumptions adopted in this thesis. Then, in light of these ontological and epistemological assumptions, and the research aims and questions detailed in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.4), this chapter explains the underpinning methodological assumptions. The focus then shifts to outlining the research strategy including explanations of research ethics, sampling decisions, participants, methods, data collection procedure and data analysis. All of these areas are once again discussed in light of the ontology, epistemology and methodological assumptions of this thesis.

Before introducing and explaining the above points, it is important to recap the theoretical framework developed in the preceding chapters, and the research aims and questions detailed in Chapter 1. As this thesis conducted a multi-literature enquiry, the theoretical framework was constructed in parts while bearing in mind different literatures, theories and assumptions, and the arguments each of them presents (see Chapters 2, 3 and 4). This approach allowed me to pay attention to relevant theories, understand the underlying phenomena better and to construct a framework that seeks for new ways to investigate skippers' beliefs, their development and skippers' perceived roles within young people’s PSD (Maxwell, 2013). Although Heinrich (1984 as cited in Maxwell, 2013) also referred to the theoretical framework as an “underlying context of assumptions” (p. 39), the literal context of investigation is equally important. Therefore, contextual nuances of sail training experience are also taken into consideration to prevent misleading data collection and later analysis and interpretation of results following my epistemological position (Heinrich, 1984 as cited in Maxwell, 2013, p. 39).

Overall, this thesis is concerned with providing a better understanding of what skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD are. There are two research questions: What is the nature of skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience? (RQ1); and What are Dewey and Hahn’s contributions in relation to literature and skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience? (RQ2; also see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). Using both an inductive and a deductive approach provided the means to conduct multi-literature enquiry and allowed me to refine the interpretations of the research questions. That is, RQ1 was investigated mainly by employing an inductive approach in light of the first and third
parts of the theoretical framework as guiding principles (see Chapter 2, Figure 2.4 and Chapter 4, Figure 4.4 respectively). Teachers’ beliefs literature is the main drive of this investigation where Chapter 2 explains key ideas and notions relative to this thesis. Nonetheless, OAE and sail training literatures provide much needed contextualisation, nuanced details and an explanation of certain relationships commonly existing aboard a sail training vessel (see Chapter 4; also see Cleland, 2011; Sammet, 2005). The RQ2 was investigated following a deductive approach where the inductively analysed data was further compared with and contrasted against the second part of the theoretical framework (see Chapter 3, Figure 3.1). That is, deductive comparisons between skippers’ beliefs and key features of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies are the main drive of this enquiry.

5.2 Ontological and Epistemological Position

Ontology is defined as the study of reality or, in other words, what is being studied whereas epistemology refers to how it is best to understand what is being studied (Guba, Lynham, & Lincoln, 2018; T. Thomas, 2010; Waring, 2012). As noted by Waring (2012), “methodological assumptions are a reflection of the ontological and epistemological assumptions” (p. 16) and thus, both ontology and epistemology have to be addressed first before appropriate research methodologies and methods can be identified and applied. Although ontology and epistemology are closely related to each other, both ontological and epistemological positions of this research are explained separately in light of research aims and questions (D. Gray, 2004; Waring, 2012). This section concludes with methodological assumptions.

5.2.1 Ontological position.

Different ontological positions – or perceptions of reality – are best described as a continuum with realism to constructivism being to opposite and extreme ends of this continuum. To illustrate the difference, realist ontology suggests that there is “a singular objective reality that exists independent of individual’s perceptions of it” (Waring, 2012, p. 16). Constructivist ontology, however, suggests that there are multiple realities constructed by each individual through interactions with each other and the world. Thus, each individual infers their own meaning of the reality which is subject to individual interpretations and biases (Waring, 2012). The difference in establishing the truthiness of reality is particular evident between natural and social sciences. For instance, natural sciences often assume that there is a singular
objective reality which can be scientifically observed and measured through deductive reasoning (i.e., an established theory is used to formulate a hypothesis, which is then tested for its either confirmation or rejection with specific data; Hyde, 2000; Trochim, 2006). Social scientists are often concerned with social reality and actions of the individual implying the existence of multiple realities (D. Gray, 2004). Constructivist ontology also suggests that some form consensus reality can be described following inductive reasoning and based on one’s common experiences, beliefs, community of practice and societal norms (Robson, 2011; Waring, 2012). That is, specific observations and understanding of individual accounts are used to establish patterns and to develop theory (i.e., inductive reasoning; G. Thomas, 2013). Therefore, researchers differ in the perspectives they take on what is the nature of what is being study (i.e., ontology) which are determined by researcher’s views and beliefs and their understanding of the reality. Researcher’s ontological position, in turn, affects what questions are being asked, what methodological assumptions are being made and what methods are being implemented (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Waring, 2012). Investigating skippers’ beliefs and perceptions is within the boundaries of social reality as reflected within aims and research questions of this thesis (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4).

Waring (2012) pointed out that “the knower [the researcher] and the process of knowing cannot be separated from that is known and the facts cannot be separated from values” (p. 18). Indeed, as I am trying to better understand the “social constructions of meaning and knowledge” (Robson, 2011, p. 24) each skipper developed from the interactions with their physical and social environments, social constructivist ontological position underpins this thesis. Taking the ontological position of social constructivism, I had “to ask questions about the beliefs people hold and the meanings they attach to action. [I] have to concern [myself] with the inner world of [my] subjects in order to understand why they act as they do” (O’Connell Davidson & Layder, 1994/2003, p. 31). Consequently, conducting research underpinned by social constructivism led to employment of semi-structured interviews (see Section 5.6.1). They allowed me to develop an in-depth understanding of individual beliefs and behaviours as socially constructed meanings before describing consensus reality. This is where I initially used inductive reasoning to derive theory based on observed patterns (G. Thomas, 2013; Hyde, 2000).
5.2.2 Epistemological position.

Undertaking the ontological position of social constructivism relates to the belief that it is not possible to achieve direct knowledge through observations or measurements but rather “it is the accounts and observations of the world that provide indirect indications of phenomena, and thus knowledge is developed through a process of interpretation” (Waring, 2012, p. 16). That is, social constructivism—my ontological position—goes closely with interpretivism as its epistemological approach whereas ontological position of realism goes closely with positivism as its epistemological approach (D. Gray, 2004; Waring, 2012).

Interpretivist epistemology interprets human behaviour in light of individual’s ideas, meanings and motivations. According to G. Thomas (2013), reality is socially constructed which is the core belief of interpretivism while understanding is its key feature. Even though understanding aims at helping researchers to interpret the expressed opinions and observed behaviours, it should be viewed from two different perspectives: understanding of context and understanding of participants (G. Thomas, 2013; Thanh & Thanh, 2015). D. Gray (2004) also explained that interpretivists perceive the social world to be a product of human interaction and engagement. Therefore, the understanding of this engagement and interaction within a given social context is more important than aims of generalisability which are key for positivism. G. Thomas (2010) further noted interpretivism is also known as a naturalistic tradition as researchers aim to conduct research in a natural social world or context. This point echoes the need to better understand the social context in which a phenomenon-in-question is being addressed.

The need to understand research participants was well explained by Thanh and Thanh (2015). According to authors, interpretivism allows researchers “to view the world through the perceptions and experiences of the participants [emphasis added]” (p. 24). That is, interpretivist epistemology allows the researcher to explore the surrounding world through experiences and perceptions of the research participants. This, in turn, implies the need to develop a better understanding of the participants, their expressed opinions and behaviours.

As noted earlier, interpretivists conduct research in natural surroundings. However, researchers are strongly encouraged to be the participants of the research context. G. Thomas (2010) noted that researchers can better interpret the views and behaviours of research participants only when researchers use their own
interpretations and understanding to do so. This highlights the need to better understand the research “as an insider” (G. Thomas, 2010, p. 109).

Therefore, I immersed myself in as many aspects of the research context as possible to develop an understanding of multiple perspectives of my research participants and research context. The developed overall understanding allowed me to inductively interpret data with all its nuances. I attended to pre-interview communications I had with skippers, in-depth interviews and off-record talks, behavioural observations and non-verbal clues, and post-interview follow-up communications. Such immersion provided me with valuable details, leading to more in-depth understanding and critical evaluations. For instance, pre- and post-communications with Oliver (pseudonym) combined with a visit to the marina where the sail training vessel was moored gave me a better understanding of the logistical arrangements of his work, his background, and ideals he was trying to convey to young people (see Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005). As Oliver showed me around the vessel, he pointed out the contextual factors he had mentioned in the recorded interview. A clear picture of the physical environment Oliver worked in provided real context in which to place the skipper’s explanation of the beliefs he expressed during the interview.

My own professional and personal experiences as a young professional working with young people within sports settings, along with my emerging understanding of the context of the study helped me to go back to the relevant empirical literatures with deeper understanding, and also to re-interpret skippers’ accounts in light of my research questions. As noted by G. Thomas (2013), I used my own “understandings to help interpret views and behaviour[s]” (p. 109) of skippers. Such understanding and interpretations guided the creation of consensus reality between each skipper and myself as I develop sound understanding of both research context and participants.

Interpretivism is not without its limitations. Subjectivity of interpretivism is perceived to be its biggest weaknesses as it prevents researchers from identifying to what degree findings are transferable to other populations and contexts—or generalisability—which are key for positivist epistemology (Thanh & Thanh, 2015; Ryan & Bernard, 2000). However, as noted earlier in this section, interpretivism does not aim to provide generalisability (T. Grey, 2010). Instead, interpretivism aims at understanding subjective experiences, multiple perceptions of the social world around us and meanings we develop through various interactions. Therefore, interpretivism...
values subjectivity and seeks to answer different questions compared with positivism (Thanh & Thanh, 2015). But importantly, G. Thomas (2010) highlighted that “being objective is not the same as being thorough and balance.... [One] can be thorough and balanced without pretending to objectiveness” (p. 109). As such, interpretivism and its subjective nature is “simply a different take on research” (G. Thomas, 2010, p. 109).

Overall, employing interpretivism as my epistemological position allowed me to better understand how different skippers constructed various meanings about young people’s PSD during sail training experience. By immersing myself into the research context (e.g., I interviewed Collin (pseudonym) on a vessel he sailed and lived on) and used my own experiences as a trainee and a volunteer aboard. These experiences helped me to better interpret the research context alongside with the inner world—thoughts and beliefs—of my research participants to better understand the reasons behind their behaviours (Robson, 2011). Combined, it allowed me to develop a shared understanding of how the process of trainees’ PSD through sail training may be conceptualised more thoroughly. These points lead me to my methodological assumptions explained in the following sub-section.

5.2.3 Methodological assumptions.

In order to do justice to the level of individuality acknowledged by social constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology, and to maintain richness and complexity of data, qualitative methodology was adopted in this thesis. Qualitative approach allows for making in-depth interpretations on the phenomenon-in-question, gather thick descriptions needed to interpret data in light of the context and the meanings an individual makes from their interactions with the social word. Therefore, it relates well to interpretivist epistemology undertaken in this thesis.

There are different approaches to qualitative methodology, for example symbolic interactionism, action research or ethnography (D. Gray, 2004). Each of the possible approaches is grounded in slightly different beliefs and methods as tools to better understand interactions with social environment. Naturalistic inquiry would closest describe my approach to this research study. That is, the social world is too complex to be understood in isolation implying the need to take into consideration the interactions between the skippers and their environment as well as the meanings they made from these interactions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Naturalistic inquiry allowed for identifying less common beliefs which were strongly held by some of the skippers,
comparing and contrasting multiple constructs, and led to the identification of observable patterns among skippers’ perceptions. It also helped me to better comprehend the philosophical underpinnings of skippers’ beliefs and develop an understanding of how Dewey and Hahn’s philosophies can be applied to sail training context. Therefore, a combination of inductive and deductive qualitative methodologies was used during the research process.

Maxwell (2013) noted that inductive reasoning (i.e., conductive observations, noticing patterns and deriving theory based on the observed patterns) is more aligned with qualitative methodology and social constructivist ontology due to its flexibility and ongoing development and elaboration of theory and research questions. Nevertheless, Patton (2002) explained that qualitative methodology can adopt both inductive and deductive approaches as a researcher proceeds from observing patterns to verifying those patterns with a more deductive approach to data analysis. Hyde (2000) also pointed out that even though qualitative researchers often use deductive approach informally, there are formal procedures in place to “enhance confidence in the validity of the concepts and their relationships” (p. 85). Blackstone (2012) later noted that a combination of inductive and deductive analysis allows for achieving a more complete understanding of a phenomenon-in-question.

As a means to ensure such benefits, provide more complete understanding and to refine some of the existing theory, I conducted both inductive and deductive thematic analyses (see Section 5.8). Indeed, combining both inductive and deductive reasoning and approaches to data analysis was a better fitting approach to my research questions and my ontological and epistemological positions. That is, inductive thematic analysis allowed me to investigate skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD as the prior knowledge of this topic is limited (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Deductive thematic analysis, however, helped me to better understand the theoretical framework developed from Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies, as applied to sail training context (Cho & Lee, 2014). Hence, despite the broad principle of using an idiographic approach, the research did incorporate some characteristics of nomothetic methodology too.

To further explain this point, ideographic methodology aims to understand subjective meanings each individual assigns to a phenomenon-in-question (D. Gray, 2004). That is, I aimed to develop an in-depth understanding of each skipper’s perspectives first before any patterns could emerge. The emerging patterns then formed the basis for reconstructions which were a collaborative effort between me
and the skippers to refine the individual constructs “so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds” (Waring, 2012, p. 18). Nonetheless, because “joint, collaborative reconstructions” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 244) are “more informed and sophisticated than any of the individual constructions” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 139), I did strive to evaluate emerging patterns critically implementing features on nomothetic methodology (e.g., keeping frequency counts; see Section 5.8). Indeed, D. Gray (2004) described that nomothetic methodology aims to “deduce ‘laws’” (p. 20) and uses thorough statistical analysis as a means to achieve this, which is contrary to interpretivists’ epistemology. Implementing idiographic methodology with nomothetic features provided more concrete findings which could be compared with empirical literature reviewed in preceding chapters (Conner, Tennen, Fleeson, & Feldman Barrett, 2009; D. Gray, 2004; Waring, 2012).

5.2.4 Section summary.

This research undertakes interpretivist epistemology underpinned by social constructivists ontological assumptions (Waring, 2012). Developing an in-depth understanding of multiple realities created by individual skippers was possible by using a combination of inductive and deductive reasoning, following qualitative approach and identifying skippers’ unique dispositions (i.e., idiographic methodology). I then sought to construct a more sophisticated joint consensus among skippers by utilising features of nomothetic methodological assumptions as a means to address the first research question (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). The developed understanding allowed me to refine existing theory through a combination of inductive and deductive analyses and to address the second research question (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). In the context of my ontological and epistemological positions as well as the research aims and questions, the following sections outline ethical considerations, sampling strategies, participants, methods, procedure and approaches to data analysis.

5.3 Ethical Considerations

Before commencing this research, ethical approval was sought and obtained from the Ethics Committee at Moray House School of Education, The University of Edinburgh, UK. As part of the process, an initial letter of invitation to take part in the study, a study information sheet and an informed consent form (see Appendix B) were submitted to the Ethics Committee for approval. This process ensured that the study
complied with all necessary ethical procedures and standards at the University of Edinburgh and that all potential ethical issues were considered and addressed prior to commencing the research (Israel, 2015; The University of Edinburgh, 2017). The main ethical issues which were dealt with included: voluntary participation with the right to withdraw at any stage and without giving a reason; protecting skippers’ confidentiality; and considering any relevant health and safety regulations to protect both the skippers and myself for any physical or psychological harm caused by participation in this research study (e.g., I travelled alone around the UK to conduct interviews but kept in touch with a designated contact as a way to protect myself against any potential harm; Israel, 2015; G. Thomas, 2013).

To protect participants’ confidentiality and align with the research ethics procedure at The University of Edinburgh, all identifying data was removed for the data analysis stage. True identities were known only to my supervisors and myself. Pseudonyms were used throughout the research process and especially during the peer review exercise (see Liamputtong, 2013) or when disseminating preliminary findings. All data was kept on a password-protected computer and University-provided cloud services which were used as a backup option. All data were encrypted and will be stored on a password-protected laptop for a period of five years after the final submission of this thesis.

In order to protect participants’ confidentiality further, ensure anonymity and create a sense of ownership for presented data, consistent gender representative pseudonyms are used throughout Chapters 6 and 7 (Fraser et al., 2016; Israel, 2015). Likewise, all names of other people and locations are left out and substituted with the commentary [name] or [location] respectively. Names of Scottish mountains are used as pseudonyms of the vessels as a further precaution to protect the confidentiality of research participants because the UK sail training community is a small one (Israel, 2015).

5.4 Sampling Strategy

The sampling procedure started with the identification of all sail training providers in the UK listed on the Association of Sail Training Organisations (ASTO) website (n = 31; see Figure 5.1). The letter of invitation to take part in this study and the study information sheet were e-mailed to all identified organisations on 15th December 2015. Former and current skippers holding relevant industry qualifications were invited to take part in this study and express their interest by making direct
contact with me. The only criterion was that skippers had to be qualified and commercially endorsed sail training skippers with some experience in this capacity.

Twenty-nine organisations agreed to help me with recruiting by forwarding the email of invitation to their skippers. Twenty-four skippers—or potential participants—expressed interest in taking part in this study. Once direct contact was made, I sent a follow-up email thanking the respondent for their interest. I also asked for basic demographic information to check their eligibility against the criteria and obtain the logistical details needed to arrange data collection for the period between January and March 2016 (i.e., off-season; see Appendix B). All information was combined and stored on a spreadsheet.

I contacted each skipper-participant a second time in January 2016 to schedule individual face-to-face interviews. A follow-up email was sent one week later if no reply was received, and a second follow-up email was sent another two weeks later (d’Ardenne & Blake, 2012). If no response was provided at that point, the potential participant was classified as non-contact and removed from the participants’ list (see Figure 5.1; Ritchie, Lewis, Elam, Tennant, & Rahim, 2014).

The final sample resulted in 16 skipper-participants following convenience and purposeful sampling techniques both of which are generally acceptable with qualitative methodology (D. Gray, 2004; Liamputtong, 2013). Two out of 16 skippers were put forward by their managers and another two skippers were purposefully approached using snowballing technique during the field work (D. Gray, 2004; Robson, 2011). That is, a gatekeeper to one particular sail training organisation put me in contact with two skippers who lived in the area of my field work and who agreed to meet me on short notice (Liamputtong, 2013). The sample size proved to be sufficient as saturation point was reached, and no new information emerged as interviews continued (Fusch & Ness, 2015; O’Reilly & Parker, 2013).
Figure 5.1. Procedure and sampling decisions.
5.5 Participants

Three female and 13 male skippers were interviewed. All skippers met eligibility criteria. The age of participants varied from 27 to 65 years old (43.75% were 45 to 54 years of age); overall experience within a sail training setting varied from four to 46 years (50% had up to 10 years of experience); and experience as a qualified skipper varied from seven months to 30 years at the time of the interview (50% had 6-to-14 years of experience; see Table 5.1). Only one skipper obtained his skipper’s qualification through the Merchant Navy before he joined a sail training organisation. The rest of the skippers had some experience within a sail training setting before they qualified as skippers (e.g., volunteered as a staff crew member). Therefore, 15 participants had experience of different roles within the sail training context, including being trainees themselves, volunteers and first mates. Five participants were involved in office-based sail training jobs at the time of the interview, for example a CEO, a trustee of a trust, or an operations and fundraising manager. It should be noted that I decided not to provide general demographic background information for each skipper to further protect participants’ confidentiality and reduce the likelihood of identification by members of the (relatively small) UK sail training community (Pring, 2004/2006).
Table 5.1
*Summary Table of Skippers’ Age, Experience in Sail Training and Experience as Qualified Skippers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Participants (FC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skippers’ Age</td>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>45 - 54</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 - 65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Sail Training</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11 – 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21 – 30</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a Qualified Skipper</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6 – 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11 – 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Frequency count indicates how many skippers were under the specified range. The highest counts per each category are in boldface. FC = frequency count.

Sail training organisations. At the time of the interview, 11 participants were working for at least one sail training operator either as a seasonal or relief skipper. Three participants had worked for only one sail training operator throughout their experience whereas 13 participants had worked for at least two sail training operators. Overall, 32 UK sail training operators (including 4 organisations which had been disbanded) were reached through the sample of this study (see Appendix C).

Size of vessel. Only one participant was a qualified Master (or First Commander) of a class A vessel, although the majority of skippers had some
experience working on class A tall ships as staff crew members (e.g., trainees or mates).

**Educational background.** Participants varied in terms of their educational background and experience with young people outside sail training environment (see Figures 5.2 and 5.3). Six skippers had an undergraduate degree which varied from leadership, geography and ocean related studies to English, mathematics and physics. None of the academic degrees had direct relevance to youth work, even though they provided additional skillsets when working with youth (e.g., management skills or ability to organise a shore-based activity in conjunction with sailing activities). Although none of the participants had formal training in youth work, three participants had extensive prior experience with young people, including working with young people who were abused and/or homeless or taking outdoor activities as a fully qualified OAE practitioner. One participant had a qualified teacher certification and 10 participants had no training or experience in youth work or working with young people outside sail training experience (or did not identify; see Figures 5.2 and 5.3).

![Pie chart showing educational background](image)

*Figure 5.2. Frequency counts of participants’ educational background. Note that one participant had achieved both qualified teacher status and undertaken specialised vocational studies.*
Experience within a sail training setting. All participants had experience with people from a range of backgrounds either as skippers or while undertaking other roles on board such as first mate. Overall, all participants had experience with young people from both private and public schools; underprivileged young people (e.g., expelled from school, criminal offenders or those with behavioural problems), and adults (e.g., families or recreational adult sailing). Based on the nature of the sail training operator the participants worked for, some participants had more experience with, for example, young carers whereas others had extensive experience in working with people with various disabilities.

5.6 Methods

5.6.1 Interviews.

Semi-structured interviews were deemed to be the appropriate primary data collection method employed to address research questions (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4; D. Gray, 2004; G. Thomas, 2013). As beliefs about PSD may not be particularly explicit and may require further probing in light of personal experiences (see Chapter 2), interviews were chosen as the preferred method over questionnaires (D. Gray, 2004). Liamputtong (2013) explained:
Through conversation, Kvale (2007) tells us, individuals have an opportunity to know others and learn about their feelings, experiences, and the world in which they live. So if we wish to learn how people see their world, we need to talk to people. (p. 51)

Seeking to better understand the individual perceptions constructed about one’s social environment and in line with the social constructivist ontology underpinned by interpretivist epistemology (see Section 5.2), semi-structured in-depth interviews provide a means for the researcher to see “the world from the participant’s point of view” (Liamputtong, 2013, p. 52). Byrne (2017) noted that this method is “more open to hearing respondents’ views ‘in their own words’” (p. 220) which allows more complex data analysis and production of richer data. Semi-structured interviews are time-consuming in terms of preparation, development of skills, transcribing and analysis (Liamputtong, 2013; D. Gray, 2004). However, this method provides an opportunity for further probing and expansion on the “subjective meaning that responders ascribe to concepts or events” (D. Gray, 2004, p. 217).

In contrast, structured interviews often use standardised questions and pre-prepared questionnaires to allow for collection of a larger quantity of data (D. Gray, 2004). During this process, richness of data is often lost as structured interviews do not allow for follow-up questions or further probing in comparison with semi-structured interviews. On the other hand, unstructured interviews are more spontaneous, and questions are often generated during the interview itself which prolongs the time needed to interview sufficient amount of responders to make some comparisons and generate a better understanding of the phenomenon (D. Gray, 2004). Semi-structured interviews, therefore, have “the purpose of obtaining descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 6).

Interviews, conversations and dialogues have been used as a method to obtain knowledge for centuries. Socrates is commonly credited for using “a disciplined practice of thoughtful questioning” (Science Education Resource Centre Carleton Centre, 2016, para 1) to build philosophical knowledge, establish ideas logically and assess their validity. According to Kvale (2006), the “Socratic approach to interviewing would imply emphasizing conflicts in interpretations” (p. 486) even though such an approach—or adaptation of Socratic questioning—is often used simply to challenge thought and gain deeper understanding of meaning. For instance, Socratic questioning uses both open questions (e.g., What events throughout your life have
influenced your current beliefs?) and follow-up questions to clarify and probe for further discussion (e.g., Why do you think that…?), and asks for evidence to justify an argument (e.g., Can you give me an example here?; Liamputtong, 2013; J. Rogers, 2004). Socratic questioning allows us not only to establish the logic and validity of ideas but also to gain a deeper understanding of the responder’s reality and the interpretations of meaning assigned to that reality, all of which are crucial for social constructivists (Kvale, 2007). Therefore, in light of the research questions and theoretical framework explained in earlier chapters, Socratic questioning was adopted in this study to gain further understanding of skippers’ beliefs. Using a Socratic approach to interviewing also allowed me to engage with skippers at a deeper level and help skippers to further reflect on their beliefs which are often not immediately accessible due to their complexity (see Chapter 2; Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005).

Interviews have traditionally been carried out either face-to-face or via the telephone (see D. Gray, 2004). The advancement of technology in recent years has influenced interviewing with virtual video interviews employing online telecommunications such as Skype often being used not only for convenience reasons (e.g., in cases where participants and the researcher stay far apart and a face-to-face interview is not feasible) but also because they allow for face-to-face interaction and attention to non-verbal cues which are lost during the telephone interview (Janghorban, Latifnejad Roudsari, & Taghipour, 2014). Although Deakin and Wakefield (2014) noted that the need for basic digital literacy, familiarity with online telecommunication or a stable Internet connection may become an issue for some responders, online telecommunications offer a suitable alternative to the more traditional face-to-face interview (Janghorban et al., 2014). Janghorban et al. (2014) also highlighted the fact that online interviews have advantages and disadvantages just as any other method has, and as with any other method, both should be considered before employing telecommunications as the main data collection method.

Therefore, the main data collection method in this study was ‘live’ face-to-face interviews which allowed me to meet skippers in their preferred environment, provided an opportunity to visit a vessel they referred to, and allowed me to observe and learn more about skippers’ surroundings. All this information provided valuable insights into their current social and physical environments. Where necessary, Skype interviews were used as an alternative because they allowed me to maintain face-to-face
interaction, attend to non-verbal cues and build rapport with the participant which telephone interviews would not have done (Deakin & Wakefield, 2014; D. Gray, 2004). Telephone interviews were chosen as a backup option if a Skype interview failed to work due to a poor connection or as a result of other technical issues as described by Deakin and Wakefield (2014; see Section 5.7 for more details on procedure).

**Interview guide.** According to Liamputtong (2013), some preparation is needed before conducting the interview, so that a level of focus can be maintained (Daly, 2007). An interview guide is often developed following literature review, choosing a theoretical framework, and identifying researcher’s interests and gaps in current knowledge (Liamputtong, 2013). Both D. Gray (2004) and Kvale (2007) noted that an interview guide does not have to be followed strictly, especially during semi-structured in-depth interviews so that the interview fits the flow of ideas and emerging concepts.

The interview guide I developed was based on a literature review and theoretical framework discussed throughout Chapters 2, 3 and 4 (see Appendix D). Interview questions were focused on: individual skippers’ perceptions on the process of trainees’ PSD; perceived skippers’ roles; sources of knowledge; and perceived influences on skippers’ beliefs about trainees’ PSD. The questions were critically underpinned by references to Buehl and Beck (2015), Collins et al. (2012), Day and Gu (2010), Fives and Buehl (2012), Fox (1983), Hill (2010), B. B. Levin et al. (2013), McCulloch (2004; 2007), Sibthorp et al. (2007), Taylor (2006; 2011); and Taylor and Caldarelli (2004). The interview schedule was piloted twice with two different skippers (05/02/2016 and 11/03/2016). The first pilot interview was conducted over the phone due to unforeseen circumstances and resulted in no audio recording. The second pilot interview was conducted face-to-face, recorded and a part of it was transcribed using NVivo 10 software (QSR International, 2014). Minor changes were made as a result of pilot interviews. For example, questions on to what extent the skipper felt their beliefs were aligned with the sail training provider’s philosophy and values they worked for were excluded from the interview schedule following participants’ feedback. That is, the sail training provider’s philosophy is generally based on governing body’s philosophy (i.e., UK Sail Training and Sail Training International).
Besides, there is an anecdotal tendency for skippers to work for several providers throughout their career or even at the same.

The interview guide provided me with a flexible framework in which all lead questions were the same throughout all interviews to allow for some consistency, while follow-up questions could be adapted depending on skippers’ answers. This approach provided more depth and richness, and a more sophisticated understanding of skipper’s interpretations (Brinkmann, 2018; Kvale, 2007). For instance, Adam was asked “What is the main focus of sail training?” and the following question was “What is social development for you?” In contrast, the follow-up question I asked Todd was “You mentioned development on the broad scale and you started mentioning some skills such as leadership, confidence [and] management. I wondered, in your opinion, what personal qualities are developed during sail training?” The difference here was based on answers provided by Adam and Todd. That is, Adam used a specific example from his experience to explain the main focus of sail training and raised some questions with regards to how sail training is perceived by other people. On the other hand, Todd identified a number of skills developed during sail training experience which provided the context to explore these in more detail.

5.6.2 Fact sheet.

Esterberg (2002) suggested that researchers should keep a fact sheet in which key socio-demographic information would be immediately recorded. Liamuttong (2013) explained that such information is “useful in the interpretation of the research findings and help[s] researchers to avoid stereotyping their participants” (p. 63). D. Gray (2004) also noted that obtaining participants’ demographic information prior to the interview—or after as in this case—allows the researcher to “focus on more substantive matters” (p. 222) during the interview. Hence, I used a fact sheet to facilitate my recall as I immediately recorded key demographic and socio-demographic data about each skipper, and my overall impression of the interview (see Appendix D; D. Gray, 2004; Liamputtong, 2013). The fact sheet aimed at recording estimated skipper’s age, experiences, qualifications, educational background, date of the last sail training voyage and first impressions of the interview. The fact sheet was piloted as a part of the pilot interview process and no changes were made. This approach allowed me to use interview time effectively to explore skippers’ beliefs and provided an opportunity to look at a later time for other influences.
across the sample in terms of skippers’ educational background, experiences, working for the same sail training provider or experiences with young people. For example, Reuben provided numerous examples and short stories of his development from a young person to an experienced skipper even though he was the youngest skipper interviewed. In contrast, Thomas struggled to provide diverse examples from the sail training environment as he had been qualified for under a year at the time of the interview. However, sail training was a second career for Thomas, so his personal life experiences were—to some extent—richer than Reuben’s.

5.6.3 Researcher’s reflective diary.

Research diaries are often used as a way to reflect on the research process, better understand the influences within the research process and how these influences affect the researcher’s interpretations (Nadin & Cassell, 2006; Watt, 2007). The process of a researcher monitoring their impact on the research process and the phenomenon being investigated is called *reflexivity*. According to Berger (2015), reflexivity provides a control for the quality and transparency of qualitative research, and “challenges the view of knowledge production as independent of the researcher producing it and of knowledge as objective” (p. 220). As such, reflexivity accords well with my social constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology (see Section 5.2).

The reflective research diary was developed following suggestions by Woodcock, Richards and Mugford (2008) and later adaptation by Fraser et al. (2016). I used the diary to record my holistic reflections and experiences where the following questions prompted my reflection: *Date of interview and date of entry; Event; What happened?; and What does it mean?*

The reflective diary helped me to understand, reflect on and interpret the emerging findings in light of the overall research process (see Berger, 2015; Nadin & Cassell, 2006; Watt, 2007). But it also allowed me to further employ the idiographic methodology explained in Section 5.2.2 to develop a better understanding of individual skipper’s constructions and interpretations of young people’s PSD (Waring, 2012). The reflections helped me to control for researcher’s bias as each interview influenced the theories, beliefs and preconceptions I had about the subject (Maxwell, 2013). As I understood how each interview shaped my own understanding of the research questions, I adjusted follow-up questions for the next interview to gain
further understanding on how common the identified perception was (D. Gray, 2004). During this process, I started noticing emerging themes, and could identify when a saturation point was reached. This allowed me to move towards developing an initial joint consensus on the process of PSD and the underlying beliefs held by skippers (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Gaskell, 2000). Finally, keeping a reflective diary guided me on how I influenced the participants’ responses—or reactivity (Maxwell, 2013)—so that I could reflect on any potential issues before conducting the next interview (e.g., asking a leading question). A brief example of an emerging theme that was recognised and noted in the reflective diary is provided later in this chapter.

5.7 Procedure

The investigation followed a three-stage process. First, pre-interview e-mail communications lasted from when an initial contact was made (i.e., after 15th December 2015) to completion of the interview process (last interview was completed on 26th April 2016; see Section 5.4; D. Gray, 2004). This stage was used not only for sampling, but also for maintaining participants’ engagement with the research project, building some rapport prior to the interview, gaining demographic data, and providing skippers with an opportunity to reflect on their beliefs in their own time (Chawla, 1998; Deakin & Wakefield, 2014; Hodge et al., 2004). Thirteen face-to-face interviews were conducted at a location convenient for the participants, two video interviews were conducted via Skype for practical and logistical reasons, and one interview was conducted via telephone due to technical issues with Skype on the day of the interview (see Table 5.2; Janghorban et al., 2014; D. Gray, 2004; G. Thomas, 2013). Interviews lasted 73 minutes on average and were audio recorded for later transcription. All participants completed an informed consent form (either signed or verbal and audio recorded) at the beginning of the interview.
As soon as the interview was finished, I completed the reflective fact sheet away from the participant. I used interview notes to complete each section accurately and immediately record my overall impression of the interview. I also completed the reflective diary, reporting how my understanding of PSD and the development of skippers’ beliefs was influenced by each interview. Each diary entry was made no later than two days after the interview was conducted (see Appendix D).

5.8 Data Analysis Approach and Procedure

5.8.1 Interviews.

All interviews were audio recorded and later transcribed verbatim using NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2014) software to increase richness of data and overall validity of qualitative research (D. Gray, 2004; Maxwell, 2013). Halcomb and Davidson (2006)
explained that transcription verbatim brings “the researcher closer to their data” (p. 40), enhances degree of closeness and facilitates an audit trail – one of the trustworthiness criteria identified by Lincoln and Guba (1985). All interviews were coded inductively following Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-step guidelines in conducting thematic analysis (i.e., familiarisation with data; getting initial codes; searching for themes; reviewing themes; defining and naming themes; and producing the report). Once full inductive analysis was complete, a three-stage framework described by Elo and Kyngäs (2008) was used for deductive thematic analysis. As explained in Section 5.2, a combination of inductive and deductive analysis was guided by the research questions and gaps identified in the relevant literatures. Above all, both inductive and deductive thematic analyses were underpinned by social constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology described earlier in this chapter.

**Inductive analysis.** Inductive thematic analysis followed a six-step model developed by Braun and Clarke (2006). Braun and Clarke’s (2006) guidelines provide a rigorous, logical and systematic framework to approach inductive thematic analysis which is often perceived as descriptive and poorly conceptualised data analysis method. While the six-step model is theoretically flexible and the level of interpretations are left for the researcher to be made (Braun & Clarke, 2014), the framework allows for conducting and recording systematic analysis and identifying patterns. With this in mind, each step is described below, including any guidance and suggestions which were adapted from other qualitative analysis methods (e.g., Wilkinson, 2000). The adaptations were made to enhance richness, credibility and confirmability of findings.

**Stage one.** Familiarisation with data began during the interview process where I used different interviewing techniques suggested by both J. Rogers (2004) and Murphy and Murphy (2010). These included reflecting meaning or paraphrasing. The latter is illustrated in the following excerpt from Maria’s interview:

**Maria:** There is no one here doing the same sort of thing. We get lots of wildlife. So, people get something different. So yeah, there is a formula that we do the same thing every day. The returns are slightly different. [0:32:09].

**Kotryna:** So, is it fair to say that this formula is the same for every single boat and for every single group of trainees. However, some activities and how
much a young person gets involved changes from group to group and from person to person? [0:32:22].

**Maria:** Yeah.

As evident in the above example, paraphrasing allowed me to conduct immediate member-checking to gain clarity, elicit and refine Maria's constructions and interpretations. Sandelowski (2008) explained that immediate member-checking promotes the development of shared understanding between the participant and the researcher.

As suggested by J. Rogers (2004) and later by Liamputtong (2013), I also took practical ‘steps’ in maximising the participant’s voice through showing empathy, using non-verbal cues and giving space to reflect through silence which was possible to achieve due to my professional background and training (i.e., significant experience in Applied Sport and Performance Psychology and teaching). This helped me to established rapport quickly and create a safe environment for each skipper to share their story with me (Martindale, 2011). The extract from the reflective diary which follows illustrates this point as I reflected on my decision not to ask Emma more follow-up questions in light of her feeling uncomfortable:

Emma also admitted she never emphasised interpersonal skills (so I skipped this question as I didn't want to dwell on that). She does seem to be one of the least experienced and confident in herself as a skipper among my participants to date. (Reflective Diary, Entry Date 23/02/2016)

The familiarisation with data continued through engaging with both fact sheets and my reflective diary during the data collection stage (February – April 2016). As mentioned earlier, these techniques helped me to notice emerging patterns, adjust the follow-up questions to deepen my understanding, identify the saturation point, and track how the research process shaped my own understanding of the research questions (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Gaskell, 2000; G. G. Thomas, 2013; Waring, 2012). The example below, taken from my reflective research diary, illustrates the emerging patterns I noticed during the field work:

At this point I see some themes coming out already especially in terms of the role on board; playing the strengths of your crew members; being very much group needs orientated; working as a group, getting along with each other and
respecting other people’s needs as the main outcome of ST; IT being a part of skipper’s role; skipper’s role changes from situation to situation, group to group and crew on board; and probably something else I can’t think of anymore. One more – not being taught how to work with young people; being expected to know it and the value of sailing under many different skippers as a crew member to pick and choose what type of skipper you want to be; the engagement with young people has changed over the years from not knowing how to approach them and focusing on sailing to having a conversation with young people, understanding them better and aiming to develop each individual using a group and a boat as a tool.

Many skippers also mentioned sail training to be unique or different environment because everyone works for a boat which is bigger than everyone else. (Reflective Diary, Entry Date 18/02/2016)

The process of familiarisation continued through transcription—including re-listening and checking for accuracy—multiple re-readings of transcripts, taking notes and memos about the data (e.g., emerging patterns) and about the interview and the participant in general (e.g., nervous; Maxwell, 2013). The iterative process provided me with further ideas for potential raw codes and themes, and the relationships among them and with existing literature, and helped me to identify broad, theory-driven, overarching themes (i.e., deductive approach; Wright, Jacobs, Ressler, & Jung, 2016; Maxwell, 2013). This stage also included the production of a one-page summary for each interview which I used for external member-checking—or respondent validation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)—to clarify factual information and meaning (descriptive and interpretive validity respectively; see Appendix E; Maxwell, 1992). This decision was made following Sandelowski’s (2008) remarks that providing interview transcripts to participants can potentially cause emotional discomfort and regret about what was said and produce cognitive bias. The decision was also influenced by the limited availability of participants at the time of external member-checking (i.e., September – December 2016). An interpretive validity check helped to develop a better understanding of skippers’ interpretations, emerging patterns and the meanings attached to those patterns, and allowed me to strive towards a more sophisticated construction of consensus reality (Waring, 2012).

Stage two. Once the above steps were completed, an in-depth thematic analysis was initiated through generating initial codes, identifying and refining emerging patterns, similarities and distinctions across all interviews using NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2014) software. Although the overarching themes were theory-driven, all initial codes were data-driven, as befits inductive thematic analysis (Braun
& Clarke, 2006). For instance, the overarching theme process of PSD was theory-driven whereas codes within this theme (e.g., physical and social environments) were data-driven. Maxwell (2013) and later Wright et al. (2016) explained that combining both inductive and deductive approaches to in-depth data analysis helps to avoid any theoretical or practical preconceptions and gives voice to research participants.

**Stages three, four and five.** The third stage included searching for themes, merging initial codes to form mid-order and lower-order themes and renaming initial codes into the raw data codes using NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2014) software. I produced a thematic table to aid my thinking about the relationships between themes, similarities and different possibilities for merging themes without altering their underlying meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The next stage involved reviewing and refining all themes to enhance the validity of each individual theme and accurately reflect meaning, and the fifth stage involved further defining and finalising thematic labels. As an example, I initially identified 20 mid-order themes around the factors that affected skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD over time (see Figure 5.4). These were merged into 12 final, mid-order themes (see Figure 5.5.). Stages three, four and five were part of an on-going organic process that reflects “the search for alternative interpretations or disconfirming evidence” (Ayres, 2008, p. 867) and aids the development of “informed consensus reality” (Waring, 2012, p. 18).

![Figure 5.4. An example of initial coding conducted for the factors affecting skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD where 20 mid-order themes were identified. Coding was conducted using NVivo 10 software.](image-url)
Figure 5.5. An example of finalised coding of the factors affecting skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD where initial 20 mid-order themes were merged into 12. Coding was conducted using NVivo 10 software.

I also conducted internal member-checking—or a peer review exercise (see Liamputtong, 2013)—throughout these stages to enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis, decrease my bias, develop further understanding of the data and enhance the credibility of findings (D. Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, & Marteau, 1997; Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013). From December 2016 to February 2017, I sought feedback from an independent applied researcher who had related but differing perspective (Collins & Collins, 2015a). Our discussions took place face-to-face, over the telephone and by e-mail during this period. When we disagreed (i.e., 14.4% of initial codes), we engaged in a discussion to reach consensus and to keep the thematic table accurately fitting the data. By the end of the process, there was a disagreement on 2.27% of initial codes which were kept in their original themes. This process allowed me to build “confidence in research…[due to] openness to criticism and alternative interpretations” (Pring, 2004/2006, p. 152). The final thematic summary table was developed to present data, support thorough thematic analysis carried out, and to further conceptualise relationships between the elements reported in Chapter 6 (see Appendix F). More simplistic diagrams are used throughout the
Chapter 6 to visually illustrate results and relationships between the themes that emerged during the inductive thematic analysis.

The frequency counts were used throughout this process to help me to identify the communalities across my sample and to better understand the prevalence of each code and theme (Maxwell, 2010; Sandelowski, 2001). Although this method is commonly used within content analysis to carry out statistical analysis with qualitative data (see Wilkinson, 2000), there was a need to adapt a more quantifiable measure to make clear decisions and suggestions of what is common across the sample (i.e., nomothetic features; D. Gray, 2004). According to Morgan (1993), frequency counts allow for summary and identification of patterns which are then further examined to make interpretations and produce theory. Taking into consideration these points combined with space limitation, themes with frequency counts equal to or higher than 10 are reported in greater detail in Chapters 6 and 7. The reason for setting a reporting threshold at FC ≥ 10 was that it clearly indicates a majority out of 16 interviewed skippers. However, I did maintain some flexibility, as some themes and codes were reported less frequently, and yet skippers conveyed a strong sense of significance of that theme (e.g., everyone is needed, FC = 1). In such instances, themes and codes with lower frequency counts captured important nuances in relation to overall research questions and relevant empirical literatures (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Stage six. A report was produced which formed the basis for writing Chapter 6. During the writing process, checks were made to ensure that the analytical narrative was logical and coherent. As suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006), relations back to the literature were made during this stage to conduct further analysis and engage with data at a more conceptual level. Excerpts from the interview transcripts using pseudonyms are used to illustrate findings and emerging patterns.

Deductive analysis. Deductive analysis was conducted after completing all six stages of the inductive analysis explained above. In doing so, a better understanding of skippers’ beliefs emerged first which was later used to achieve the second level of analysis and to develop further meanings of deductively coded data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Deductive analysis consisted of three key stages: preparation, organisation and reporting (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). In light of existing criticism for the lack of established deductive thematic analysis procedures (see Cho & Lee, 2014), Elo and Kyngäs (2008) provided a clear and simplistic framework for
conducting formal deductive thematic analysis leading to more rigorous systematic analysis and reporting.

Each stage is described below, including any guidance and suggestions which were adapted from other sources (e.g., Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid, & Redwood, 2013). The adaptations were made to enhance richness of findings and develop deeper insights.

**Preparation.** According to Elo and Kyngäs (2008), the aim of this stage is to familiarise oneself with data and to develop a sense of what is going on. Since inductive data analysis was completed at this point, I had developed a good understanding of data as well as skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD. Therefore, this stage was completed through engaging with data inductively and following Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-step model (see previous section). The final codes and themes presented in the inductive thematic summary table (see Appendix F) were used as a starting point for the deductive analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Gale et al., 2013).

**Organisation.** This stage was concerned with developing framework matrices based on a framework developed in Chapter 3 and following Elo and Kyngäs (2008) and Maxwell’s (2013) advice. Each framework matrix was developed based on the components identified in the second part of the theoretical framework used for this thesis (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1). Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet was used for each coding matrix where categories for each component were then developed in light of meanings attributed by Dewey, Hahn or both. Next, I had to decide which method of coding will be adopted. As explained by Elo and Kyngäs (2008), framework matrices can be used to code data which fits and confirms existing theory, or which does not fit with the theory and provides new insights (i.e., negative case analysis). Following Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) advice, I utilised both fitting and not fitting data as a means to enhance trustworthiness of findings. This also allowed for the development of further understanding of skippers’ beliefs, underpinning philosophical groundings and applications of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts into sail training context.

Next, all data, coded and analysed inductively using NVivo 10 (QSR International, 2014) software, was reviewed for content and re-coded deductively using the framework matrices (see Figure 5.6.). I also kept frequency counts which helped me to identify the communalities across the sample and to better understand the prevalence of each component. The frequency counts were also used to make...
initial comparisons between the negative case analysis and data fitting with Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives, and ease the organisation of data reporting. A summary table of all framework matrices was developed to present data, support thorough thematic analysis carried out, and to further conceptualise relationships between the elements reported in Chapter 7 (see Appendix G).

**Figure 5.6.** An example of coding conducted against framework matrices using Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet.

**Reporting.** Similar to the final stage of the inductive analysis, a report was produced which formed the basis for writing Chapter 7. An understanding developed in Chapter 6 was taken forward in Chapter 7 to build cumulative knowledge. It also led to a better understanding of the meanings developed by skippers and the philosophical underpinnings of their beliefs. In addition, it allowed for comparisons to be made between skippers’ conceptualisations and the ones offered by Dewey and Hahn. Interview excerpts are used to report data, illustrate these points and enhance the trustworthiness of results (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Erickson, 2012).
5.8.2 Fact sheet.
Information obtained from the fact sheets was used to produce descriptive statistics of the demographic data to gain more insights into the sample. Data was entered into an Excel spreadsheet after each interview. Once all interviews were completed, descriptive statistics were produced using Microsoft Excel by categorising data and producing frequency distributions which are deemed to be appropriate when working with nominal data (Clark-Carter, 2004).

5.8.3 Researcher’s reflective diary.
Reflections on the research process were used to identify an appropriate sample size using the saturation point technique (see previous sections; Fusch, & Ness, 2015; O’Reilly & Parker, 2013) and to support the inductive thematic interview analysis through stages one to five. The reflective diary was not analysed in detail but used to facilitate my recall on individual interviews and interpretations I had immediately or shortly after each interview.

5.9 Chapter Summary
This chapter recapped the theoretical framework developed in preceding chapters as a means to conduct a multi-literature enquiry and addressed both research questions. It also defined and explained my ontological and epistemological positions to justify my choices of data collection and analysis strategies. The chapter provided a foundation for the emerging findings presented and discussed in the chapters which follow. As discussed, a social constructivist ontological position underpinned by an interpretivist standpoint led to the qualitative methodology with idiographic methodological assumptions and nomothetic features used to develop this thesis. In light of these assumptions and the aims and research question of this thesis, semi-structured interviews were used as a primary method for data collection. Inductive data analysis was used to develop an in-depth understanding of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD, whereas deductive approach to data analysis allowed for comparing and contrasting data against Dewey- and Hahn-informed philosophical perspectives.

The next chapter reports and discusses findings in relation to RQ1 which emerged during the inductive data analysis stages. Excerpts from interview
transcripts are used to illustrate the points discussed, and to make stronger connections to the empirical literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 4.
Chapter 6. Research Question One: Critical Exploration of the Nature of Skippers’ Beliefs about Young People’s PSD

6.1 Introduction

To fulfil the aim of better understanding skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD through sail training, this chapter reports findings and inductively analyses the interviews conducted with sail training skippers. Specifically, this chapter addresses the first research question: What is the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience? Results are organised and reported in light of the four parts of RQ1 (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). Further analysis of results combined with discussion is then offered as a means to draw relationships between the identified elements and to provide in-depth insights and explanations. The literature on teachers’ beliefs and the OAE literature (as presented in Chapters 2 and 4 respectively) are used to engage with the data analysis and discussion produced in the second part of this chapter. Links with Dewey and Hahn’s educational perspectives will be discussed in Chapter 7.

6.2 Results

This section reports on four overarching themes that emerged during thematic data analysis and which provide insights into potential responses to the first research question. The identified themes are: skippers’ beliefs about the process of trainees’ PSD; perceived skippers’ roles; changes in skippers’ beliefs over time; and skippers’ practices to promote trainees’ PSD. All the overarching themes are summarised in the thematic summary tables and presented in Appendix F. Quotes and visual representations of the most frequently mentioned (FC ≥ 10) mid-order themes are used throughout this chapter to report results, illustrate relationships and demonstrate a variety of meanings within each mid-order theme as explained in Chapter 5.

6.2.1 Skippers’ beliefs about the process of trainees’ PSD.

This theme investigates skippers’ beliefs about the process of trainees’ PSD through researcher’s evolving understanding of how skippers perceived and conceptualised the overall process of PSD. This theme, therefore, explores the 21 elements identified by skippers which they believed contribute towards successful PSD during sail training voyages (see Appendix F). The four most frequently mentioned mid-order themes (i.e., FQ ≥ 10) are visually presented in Figure 6.1 and further reported below.
Environmental structures and social systems. There was mutual agreement among all skippers on the importance of the physical and emotional environments in shaping the experience of trainees’ PSD. As captured in Figure 6.1, skippers highlighted the importance of physical space and situational demands, as such taking trainees away from their home environment, modelling a functional community, and lack of familiarity with the environment, staff and activity. Holly believed that situational demands and naturally occurring situations created opportunities to address and resolve conflict:

I’ve seen some quite hard-to-reach kids who did not get on with each other...but getting on really well when they were chopping veg. Unbelievable, they even asked the next day if they could chop veg because they didn’t argue.
Nine skippers felt that the novel environment allowed them to create a functional, supportive and accepting community. Todd, Emma, Felix, Thomas and Liam believed that the novel environment allowed them to take trainees away from any problems that may be present at home. Thomas mentioned that sail training created “space which is away from difficulties they face [at home].”

On the other hand, Harry noted a growing issue relating to mobile phones which, in his opinion, allowed trainees to “bring their home environment with them” and disengage with the overall process.

**Social behaviours.** All skippers believed that social behaviours expressed aboard were another key component in the process of PSD. Fourteen skippers identified teamwork and team cohesion as central components to trainees’ PSD (see Figure 6.1). For example, Reuben and Collin noted the importance of staff crew and trainees coming together, with Reuben suggesting that the lack of such cohesion could create a “them and us” situation:

So, you don't get “We’re the crew. We’re the boat crew and you’re the group that are here”. You don't want that developed, you need everybody to be together. And then that means, you know, sitting around the table all together, having dinner and just, you know, talking through everything you’re doing and giving them all information that is there. Even getting them [trainees] involved as much as possible.

Twelve skippers emphasised the importance of highlighting team needs over individual needs which also helps the trainees to figure out individual roles within the team. According to Ryan, one’s role can go beyond technical sailing tasks as long as it contributes towards overall team goals:

I remember one kid who couldn't get a hang of anything but... he said “I will go in the galley [kitchen]” and he was turning out meals when the rest of us were feeling pretty shitty…He was happy just to go and make a hot meal. Or cups of soup. Or sandwiches for us. And he was a part of the crew…He wanted to contribute, and he was a part of it. And they respected him.

George, Emma, Ryan, Adam, Oliver, Liam and Reuben reflected that as a voyage progresses, mutual trust continues to develop (i.e., trainees trust skipper, trainees trust staff crew and skipper trusts trainees; see Appendix F). Adam explained how a skipper placing trust in a trainee may contribute to their PSD:
[Name] had some difficulties and was expelled from his group for behavioural issues and came to work with us, the boatmen. One of the things I taught [name] to do was to recover a life jacket in the representation of the man overboard scenario. When one day without warning I threw myself out of the boat. I took one or two other precautions about another boat being not too far away and so on. But he came round and picked me up….Now, the real significance was that I trusted [name] and [name] responded to that trust. That [is] PSD because he was going back to [location] where he was never going to handle a boat again in his life.

As illustrated in Figure 6.1, other team-related behaviours included social etiquette and forced dependence on each other, or created equality and inclusiveness which John explained as follows: “No matter who you are, when you step onto the boat—to a certain degree anyway—you’re all equal.”

Attainable challenge. The key component of this mid-order theme consisted of physical, psychological and social challenges produced by both environment and the activity which are necessary for trainees’ PSD (see Appendix F). Skippers felt that trainees had to have some experiences of success (i.e., to complete a challenge) for the benefits of their PSD. Regardless of how success was achieved, all of the little experiences were perceived to add up. Thus, the ‘sum’ of successful experiences contributes towards building trainees’ overall confidence in themselves. Harry explained:

The reason why people generate confidence is that they are doing something which initially seems quite scary, maybe a bit weird and something which they perhaps don’t have great confidence that they can achieve. But because they’re in a fairly well-oiled machine, if you like, the process carries them forward. And they do achieve everything, because, you know, the voyage’s been set up so that they do [achieve] and so people do end up achieving often more than they think.

On the other hand, Liam thought that trainees and skippers’ perceptions on the challenge may differ significantly:

There have been times on voyages where their [trainees] perception is that they are not safe. Their perception is that actually [there] is some danger. But we know that there isn’t….There is an element to them feeling unsafe. It doesn’t do any harm because it actually highlights their sense of achievement.

Essential sailing skills. This mid-order theme focused around learning essential sailing skills. Adam highlighted the need for such skills regardless of the
aims of the voyage, so that trainees could get involved in an activity itself. This would allow them to engage in the process of PSD:

Now even if you’re training through the sea, you still need to be able to tie a bowline, make off a line, snub it, release it safely on the load, and one or two similar type of skills. But those are not useful unless you want to train for a Marine career. So, what you need to do is to have sufficient knowledge for people to take part in an activity.

Harry, Todd, Collin, Oliver and Reuben felt that more practical skills such as cooking, planning or cleaning are a part of sailing skills due to the nature of activity and tasks that are involved within it. Collin called the “skills of being at sea”, and Harry explained that “it’s such a wide range of activities that are involved in sail training.” For instance, making “a cup of tea for 12-15 people” (Reuben) or to “start cooking early enough” (Todd) so that the dinner would not be spoiled, becomes important within the context of sail training which further contributes towards the process of trainees’ PSD.

**6.2.2 Changes in skippers’ beliefs.**

Fourteen skippers identified the change in their engagement with trainees as the most significant transformation over time (see Figure 6.2). A central component of this theme was skippers’ increased understanding of trainees and hence their ability to relate better to the trainees (cited by 8 skippers). John illustrated: “As I gain experience, I constantly develop a better understanding of where people are coming from and the issues they face.”
Other mid-order themes had significantly lower frequency counts (i.e., in a range between 1 and 4; see Appendix F), although there were some significant shifts in skippers’ beliefs. For instance, Holly, Ryan, Felix and Oliver changed their beliefs from sail training being all about sailing to sail training being all about the young people who come aboard. Holly reflected:

When I first started, I probably didn’t think it [sail training] was more about taking them [trainees] sailing and giving them an experience on a boat. I think it’s only in the last half-a-dozen years I’ve really appreciated that it has absolutely nothing to do with sailing as a skill.

A part of this change was illustrated by both Ryan and Felix who had strong feelings about their approach to sail training. That is, Felix admitted that he used to focus on actively teaching sailing-related skills whereas now he creates space for trial and error:

In my mid 20’s …I probably approached it [sail training] much more as... I have knowledge and skill about an activity that I am passing on to some young people. So, “OK guys, this is how we tie a knot”….And probably the thing that changed gradually from then to now; I am very much into that point of “Guys, you can work this out”. And giving them much more scope to experiment; to develop their own understanding of what’s going on. Obviously not a safety
critical element where you obviously have to step in. But often...I will allow experimentation up to the point I have to say “OK, just stop there because if you carry on any further, you will get hurt”. But really allowing that full breadth of experiential learning and experimentation...There are many other stands that changed but that's a very distinct one that is very obvious to me.

6.2.3 Perceived skippers’ roles.

While discussing the perceived roles of skippers, 18 mid-order themes emerged (see Appendix F). Figure 6.3 visually summarises the four most frequently mentioned themes which are further explained below.

Figure 6.3. Visual representation of the most frequently mentioned mid-order and lower-order themes under perceived skippers’ roles.

Safety. As presented in Figure 6.3, all skippers agreed that safety is a primary role of the skipper, which consisted of two key components: physical safety and legal requirements of the industry (16 skippers); and emotional safety and wellbeing (15 skippers). At first, all skippers spoke about overall safety, where George noted: “Fundamentally...it is safety of the ship and the crew. So that has to overwrite everything else.” When further prompted, 15 skippers noted the importance of emotional safety too, as Harry explained:
Everybody’s got so obsessed with physical safety and actually, psychological safety is hugely important, because you want to lead people into something which is challenging but you don’t want to scare the daylights out of them and put them off sailing for life.

In line with Harry’s comment, emotional safety was also expressed through highlighting the need to provide an enjoyable and inspirational sail training experience. For instance, Maria believed that her role included “creating opportunities for people”, whereas Adam noted the need to create an “emotionally safe” environment in which trainees feel “safe enough to put themselves into the place where they can learn.”

**Leadership.** Although all skippers identified leadership as one of their key roles, a range of meanings was evident in the study (also see Figure 6.3). Seven skippers felt that they had to establish some hierarchy to be perceived as an authority. Holly explained the benefits of power relationships aboard as follows:

> If you’re too hands-on, then you sort of lose a little bit of that hierarchy. So, they see you as quite senior, and you want that. Because if...they’re kicking off, something is going on, you can step in and they see you as a higher authority, [they] tend to accept things a bit better from you.

According to Todd, Collin, Ryan, Felix and John, the skippers’ role involves decision-making. Felix explained that he needs to “think on [his] feet” whereas John noted he is “the one who is making the decision and they [the crew] are doing as they’re told.” The skippers’ role was also described as including various communications with people aboard and ashore (e.g., parents, teachers or sail training operators). Leon explained the need to stay well-informed in case there were further communications after the voyage: “I need to know because if there is a problem further down the road, with a parent or something like. If I don’t know what happened, when it makes really difficult for me.”

**Promoting trainees’ PSD.** There was mutual agreement that the skippers’ role included promoting trainees’ PSD aboard (15 skippers; see Figure 6.3). When asked, all but one skipper thought a part of their role was to develop trainees’ interpersonal skills which was a component of PSD. Maria illustrated: “I would emphasise it [interpersonal skills] all the time. It was to me a big thing because it’s all about living on a boat. Interpersonal skills are about living on a boat with 17 other
Emma, who did not feel promoting PSD was a part of her role, reflected that her approach to PSD was, perhaps, not very effective as she would leave trainees to figure it out by themselves: “I think my approach has been more to let them get on with it, and then they can kind of work it out themselves…I’m not sure if that’s the most effective approach.”

**Observing, assessing and adapting.** There were two central components to this mid-order theme as identified by 15 skippers: observing and assessing young people and staff, their experience and ability levels, conditions, interpersonal conflicts and maintaining an overall picture; and adapting and adjusting the skippers’ role and decisions to match their observations and assessment. According to Harry, the skipper has “to be observant and vigilant and make sure that everybody is included.” In line with Harry, John though he was “very aware if somebody is withdrawn or somebody didn’t take part, or somebody is too loud.” Both Thomas and Oliver agreed that they paid attention and stayed risk-aware to “what’s possible with that particular group and the culture within that group” (Oliver).

As skippers continually observe and assess the situation aboard, they also adapt and adjust to their observations to provide the most beneficial sail training experience. Todd noted that the voyage would depend on “how long they [trainees] can concentrate for, whether they’re any good at listening, whether they’re good at fighting with each other, whether they know each other or not.” On the other hand, John emphasised the need to plan a trip which is appropriate for the group on board:

You have to make sure that what you’re doing is appropriate for the people there. So, if you’ve got people who have been sailing lots and lots before, then they need it [to be] quite challenging. Otherwise it won’t work. But for people who have never been out of London before, just being on board is a challenge.

Todd, Holly, Harry, Thomas, Oliver, Leon and Reuben highlighted the need to recognise and adapt to individual preferences too, as each group consists of different persons. For example, Oliver explained the importance of working at the speed “that’s slow enough or fast enough” for the individual to deal with. Thomas, however, used a more specific example to explain how he used technology to engage a more challenging young person:

He was going to be a navigator. But instead of me telling him what to do— he
couldn’t cope with that aspect and stuff—...we found the means by which we can both look at something and still get a message across. And that’s when I used an iPad.

Finally, Collin, Maria, Emma, Harry, John and Reuben believed that adapting to staff crew members was equally important. According to Reuben, his role was influenced by “the crew members you’re working with. Some crew that you’re working with need more pushing in one area or more help than another group.”

6.2.4 Skippers’ practices to promote trainees’ PSD.

This final theme illustrates practices skippers engage with to fulfil their roles and to promote trainees’ PSD. Overall, 31 mid-order themes emerged (see Appendix F). Everyone but Emma and Leon encouraged PSD through an indirect approach. That is, the skippers would use environment, activities and naturally occurring situations to address trainees’ PSD. For example, Oliver would try to promote trainees’ PSD through culture created on board: “It isn’t always something that they would even recognise is happening, but the way that we treat them and the culture we’re creating on board has got to be about all of that [PSD].”

The six most frequently mentioned practices are visually illustrated in Figure 6.4 and further explained in the sub-sections which follow.
Active trainees’ involvement. There was common agreement among all skippers that PSD could be promoted through involving trainees in different activities. For instance, skippers would assign trainees to various responsibilities which would gradually increase over the voyage, split trainees into watches so that they would be involved in running the ship, or conduct various tasks (sometimes even unnecessary ones). In doing so, trainees would have an opportunity to get involved.

In seeking to create a sense of ownership and further promote PSD, Holly, Collin, Oliver, Liam, Lion and Reuben highlighted the need to involve trainees in the process of decision-making. This often included deciding which activities they wanted to do or how far they wanted to sail as a group. Oliver explained: “We'll change what
we do the following day as a result of talking about the options with them; so, making them feel that what they have to participate in is theirs.”

On the other hand, both Holly and Reuben admitted that they would guide trainees towards the decision they thought was the most beneficial in given circumstances. Reuben explained:

A lot of the times we're constrained to where we can go and what we can do. So quite often you present all the options, but you might make one seem a lot more favourable than all the rest which is the option that you're after. So, they still come to that decision but it's the decision that you sort of already made in your head already.

**Getting trainees comfortable and familiar.** As evident in Figure 6.4, 14 skippers agreed that a part of trainees’ PSD was achieved through getting them comfortable and familiar with the boat and with each other. Todd, John and Reuben thought it was important to start off slowly and get young people relaxed in order to enjoy spending a week on a sail training vessel. Reuben explained that

If on the first day they hate it, it's never really gonna get a lot better. They might start ‘not too sure’ and then start come in into it, but if they did stay against it on the first day, they are not going to stay for the rest of the voyage.

All 14 skippers also highlighted the need for practical familiarisation with the overall environment which is often novel to young people. According to Maria, an important role for the skipper and staff crew is “getting them used to the environment – you're telling where they are sleeping, how we organise food, how we organise all day.” Oliver would give trainees “space to settle in” whereas Thomas and Harry highlighted the need for familiarisation with others. According to Harry, trainees have “got to get used to living in quite close proximity with different people.”

**Team-based approach to PSD.** As illustrated in Figure 6.4, there was mutual agreement among 14 skippers on using team-based approach to promote trainees' PSD. The core of this theme focused on the need for teamwork because of the nature of sail training vessels. According to Leon,

To put *Ben Lomond’s* sails up, we need all 10 crew, all 10 trainees working together. They have to work in a team, coordinated. If they don't, it's just not gonna happen....In fact, we can't even leave the dock without all of them doing their job at the same time.

Similarly to Leon, Liam noted that using a boat was a means to conduct team-
building and teamwork activities: “It’s more about working together and using the boat as the base; going out and doing bits of sailing and shore-based activities.”

In order to further promote PSD through encouraging trainees to form relationships with strangers, Ryan and Harry would split young persons familiar with each other prior to the sail training experience into different watches. Ryan explained:

You normally get two people along from somewhere. But we will split them and put them in different watches. Last thing you want is four people from one school who know each other, and you put them in one watch because then you will have a little cabal…So, you actually tear [them] apart.

Ryan also added that he tries to mix young people up “so they are learning to mix with people from totally different backgrounds.”

**Observing, assessing and adjusting.** This mid-order theme focused around skippers’ ongoing observation and assessment of trainees and the overall situation, and making appropriate adjustments (14 skippers). Eight skippers felt that they assess an initial set of skills, abilities and character of people to gain a better understanding of who skippers would be dealing with and how. Collin explained that he starts assessing young people from the very beginning of the overall experience: “We go and meet them [the group], and introduce ourselves and bring them down to the boat. And within that time, you’re assessing them and also talking to the team leaders to find out as much information as you can.” Much the same way as Collin, Ryan uses different background cues to gain a fuller picture of where young people come from and what their initial skillsets and character may be:

We learn how to assess them [trainees and] what they come with. Some have been sailing with mummy and daddy; some may have never stepped a foot on the boat. You can tell some come from a privileged background because they talk about playing polo which means they must have access to horses and things. And others tell you very different things.

Further, George, Maria, Felix, Oliver and Liam spoke about adjusting how much sailing they would do with each group as a result of their observations and assessments. Felix reflected on voyages where the group wanted to spend some time doing other activities:

There’ve been trips where we sailed out to an island and then spent a day climbing up the hills…There’s been other trips where people were very desperate to see the wildlife. They’re less about sailing more about wildlife, in
which case we will try to sail to places where that wildlife is.

Todd, Ryan and Harry also spoke about using their assessment to adjust the level of challenge, so that it would be appropriate for the young people. Harry illustrated his point:

It’s like pulling them on a piece of elastic that you try and encourage them to do something that’s a bit outside of their comfort zone and then observe to see how uncomfortable or otherwise are they….Are you pulling too hard or are they getting bored and it’s too soft?

**Encouragement and support.** The key component of this theme according to 13 skippers is providing support, encouragement and motivation, so that trainees would engage with more challenging tasks. For Thomas, encouragement and support meant “being inclusive [and] empower[ing] them to work out what role they want to [undertake].”

Eight skippers believed that they needed to push trainees out of their comfort zone, and thus create opportunities for PSD. Through encouragement and support, Maria was “inviting them to take the small steps.” In line with Maria, George was aiming to achieve a balance between his trainees being out of their comfort zone while enjoying some recreation: “It is good to experience a bit of discomfort…But it is only of any value if you get to do that balanced with enough rest and recreation…to enable the learning side of it.”

**Briefings, meetings and reviews.** Twelve skippers exploited formal tasks as a means to promote trainees’ PSD. That is, these skippers believed that conducting the initial welcome and introductions, reviews of each day, and engaging in safety briefings and debriefs at the end of the voyage provided opportunities to address trainees’ PSD. Collin highlighted the benefits of conducting debriefs and reviews at the end of each day which are used to “voice feelings because they [trainees] can hear and perceive each other. They start to get a little bit more empathy."

Maria also explained that “the last day is all about you’ve had this amazing time, you need to pull everything together”, so that trainees would have a chance to reflect on their voyage and would leave with a sense of closure.

6.2.5 Section summary.

This section reported results that emerged in relation to the first research
question: What is the nature of skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of the sail training experience? Overall, four overarching themes were reported and explained by using excerpts from the interview transcripts. These themes were: beliefs about the process of trainees' PSD; changes in skippers' beliefs about trainees' PSD over time; perceived roles of skippers during the sail training experience; and skippers’ practices to promote trainees’ PSD. The most common mid-order themes, with frequency count at least 10, were visually illustrated and reported in this section. Essentially, skippers believed that:

- the key elements in the process of PSD were environmental structures and social systems, social behaviours, attainable challenge and essential sailing skills;
- the most significant change in skippers’ beliefs was the perceived engagement with young people;
- the most dominant roles of skippers were safety, leadership, promoting trainees' PSD and ongoing observations, assessments and adaptations;
- and the commonly utilised practices were encouraging trainees’ active involvement in ship duties, getting trainees comfortable and familiar with physical and social environments, observing, assessing and adjusting, providing encouragement and support, and conducting briefings, meetings and reviews.

Further analysis of these themes follows below, along with a discussion in which they are compared and contrasted with the literatures reviewed in Chapters 2 and 4.

6.3 Analysis and Discussion

Further to the initial insights into the emerging themes reported in the preceding section, this section combines the identified elements and provides further analysis and discussion, so that a more critical understanding can be developed. In particular, this section focuses on: identifying the relationships among skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices (or beliefs, intentions and actions as classified by Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005; see Chapter 2 Section 2.5); further unpacking the process of young people’s PSD during the sail training experience; and better understanding the effect of contextual influences on skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices.
6.3.1 The relationship between beliefs, roles and practices.

The results reported thus far reveal a relationship between skippers’ beliefs, their perceived roles, and their practices in terms of skippers’ current approaches to PSD compared with their past approaches. This comparison allows us to better understand what functions belief fulfil (also see Chapter 2), and evolution of skippers’ beliefs which comprises a change and formation of beliefs over time. Both areas are discussed below.

Function of beliefs in light of PSD. To recap, beliefs have three overlapping functions: filters for interpretation; frames used to further conceptualise collected data; and guides for actions (see Chapter 2 Figure 2.1; Buehl & Fives, 2012). The first function is closely related to skippers’ perceived roles which, in turn, leads to their choice of practice. The majority of skippers felt that a part of their role was to observe and assess. That is, skippers collected data on trainees coming aboard which helped them to decide what may be relevant to each group. Both Collin and Holly illustrated this function of beliefs through attending to various details on how trainees behaved in the first instance and during introductory activities. Once Collin starts collecting initial data, he uses his beliefs to interpret his assessment to adjust introductory activities and his overall approach to each group. This is in line with Pajares’s (1992) argument that individuals use their beliefs to make sense of the phenomenon in question. According to Five and Buehl (2012), the consensus within the literature is that such a function is particularly important for teachers’ education, that is: new information is interpreted against existing experiences to “shape what and how they learn about teaching” (p. 479). Although this may be one result of Collin’s approach, the example quoted above points mainly to making sense of the information presented by the trainees to shape their educational sail training experience rather than focusing on Collin’s development. This finding is in line with Taylor’s (2006; 2011) results that practitioners use their beliefs to collect and interpret the information presented by learners to adjust practitioners’ approaches. Taylor (2006; 2011) also argued that the collected information is used to identify what may be relevant to the learners. Based on this line of thinking, beliefs as filters for interpretation may be more important for practitioners working within dynamic contexts or with constantly changing groups of people. In such circumstances, the need for ongoing assessment is more prominent and hence, different beliefs as filters for interpretation might be more frequently activated in light of the contextual factors compared with more steady
environments.

The second function—beliefs as frames for interpretation—is evident through skippers’ comments on how observation and assessment allow them to better understand what and who they would be dealing with. For instance, Thomas’s decision to use a tablet to engage a young person due to the possibility of trouble with authority perceived from the young person’s behaviour, can be explained by D. M. Levin et al.’s (2009) findings that teachers use their own beliefs to better understand what a student is saying. That is, Thomas used his beliefs to interpret the situation and behaviours of a young person which led to certain perceptions and decisions for action. Likewise, Lau (2010) explained that a teacher is seeking mutual understanding between themselves and a student by framing the received information against the teacher’s own beliefs. However, it is important to keep in mind here that both D. M. Levin et al. (2009) and Lau (2010) investigated curriculum-related teachers’ beliefs within a classroom setting where they looked at teachers prompting students to further explain their ideas to establish mutual understanding. Such an approach can be problematic within the more complex area of PSD where straightforward questions to better understand young people’s home environment or past experiences may not be appropriate. While relevant, this function of beliefs may be less explicit within skippers, practitioners and teachers who aim to promote PSD within their practice. This observation is also in line with Reuben and Liam’s comments that a direct approach to promoting young people’s PSD is not necessarily appropriate or effective due to its sensitive nature. Therefore, skippers may need to use a combination of their beliefs from a greater variety of areas to better define the nature of the ‘problem’ through understanding where young people come from and what areas they may need help with.

As mentioned above, beliefs help skippers to decide what actions they should take based on their judgement, as evident in the previous example. Fives and Buehl (2012) explained that this function is largely based on teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs which inform teachers’ motivation, intentions, effort and goals for their actions. Fives and Buehl’s (2012) explanation is supported by Emma’s and Leon’s comments, that lack of self-efficacy beliefs about young people’s PSD leads them to rely (or even over-rely) on the role of physical and social environments. Emma’s and Leon’s reflections on low self-efficacy beliefs in relation to young people’s PSD also suggest that skippers’ self-efficacy beliefs should be strengthened because of their role in promoting and developing young people’s PSD.
Ensuring physical and emotional safety is always an ongoing intention of skippers’ practices and one of their primary roles (see Sections 6.2.3 and 6.2.4), as in line with the vast majority of OAE literature (e.g., Brown, 2002; Collins et al., 2015; McCulloch, 2004). However, beliefs as guides for educative practices and actions became evident throughout the interviews. Todd, Liam, Leon, Thomas and Harry, among others, believed that it was important to get young people comfortable and familiar with the physical and social environments first. Therefore, various introductory activities, including formal briefings and simple sailing tasks, were these skippers’ initial focus as these activities target safety requirements and provide opportunities to create the educative learning experiences needed for PSD. This example also highlights the competing demands skippers deal with on a daily basis, regardless of the clientele aboard. This finding is contrary to Collins and Collins’ (2012) claims that the role of the practitioner depends on the nature of the clientele, even though Collins et al. (2015) later noted that safety overrides philosophy. Indeed, the results reported here shed some light on how skippers deal with competing demands which, in turn, allows us to identify the intentions underpinning their practices on a situational basis. This then allows skippers to pick actions which correspond with their intentions and are also appropriate for the circumstances. One should note that the chosen actions and intentions are not necessarily related to PSD but are rather aligned with the activated belief. Essentially, different functions of beliefs are used in different ways to narrow down possible solutions and make a sound decision – a feature which is not clear from the literature.

**An evolution of skippers’ beliefs.** As skippers reflected on their beliefs over time, the relationship between skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices, and functions of beliefs outlined earlier became more evident. For example, Holly, Felix, Ryan and Oliver felt their understanding of the purpose of sail training changed over time which also influenced the intentions they had behind their roles and practices. Oliver explained that his initial belief was that the group of trainees was there to get involved occasionally and help with sailing tasks, which is in line with his initial belief that sail training “was all about the boat” (Oliver). As a result of this belief, Oliver’s intent was to focus on technical sailing tasks and to allow young people to get involved as much as they wanted (or did not want to). This intent and belief gradually changed as Oliver realised that sail training was “far more about the people than the boats” (Oliver). This change in Oliver’s belief resulted in him getting trainees more engaged with various
activities, which also indicates a change in his perceived role and overall intentions from being concerned about the boat to focusing on young people’s PSD. The changed belief (i.e., the focus of sail training experience) also shifted the function of other beliefs, and redefined which beliefs are activated to draw out relevant information, define and conceptualise the situation and choose an appropriate approach (also see Chapter 2 Figure 2.1). That is, if Oliver was primary concerned with the boat and technical sailing, beliefs as filters for interpretation, frames used to conceptualise collected information and guides for actions were gathered around the boat and sailing per se. But as Oliver's belief changed and his focus shifted on young people aboard, the same functions of beliefs were then used in relation to gathering information about young people’s PSD. Even though technical sailing ability remains relevant, the guiding principle and the function of this belief changed from what is the best for the boat to what is the best for young people.

The above example also highlighted the fact that even though skippers may continually conduct the same practice, the intention of this practice can change to reflect the evolvement of beliefs (e.g., using a boat to teach sailing vs. using a boat to teach sailing as a means to promote PSD). These findings are in line with existing evidence that different sets of beliefs act as filters, frames or guides (e.g., D. M. Levin et al., 2009). Therefore, as one’s belief changes and develops over time, a different set of beliefs, roles and practices are selected later on to reach an appropriate alignment among these elements.

The abovementioned change in belief about the purpose of the sail training experience is also linked to skippers’ practices. Both Felix and Ryan noted that they would now create opportunities for young people to experiment and promote a trial-and-error approach rather than purely transmitting sailing-related knowledge (see Appendix F). The change in teaching approach has been previously noted and recorded by Kugel (1993) and later by Domović et al. (2017), both of whom investigated the development of teachers over time. The current finding also reflects the changes in skippers’ beliefs and intentions of their practice reported by Pratt and Associates (1998/2005). That is, there was a subtle change in the relationships between the elements presented in the first part of the theoretical framework used for this thesis (see Figure 2.3). The primary goal of learning how to sail through conducting sailing tasks became a secondary goal, and the sailing tasks become a means to fulfil the primary goal of PSD. One should keep in mind that the requirement of safety is always constant, but while balancing the competing demands of ensuring
safety and promoting PSD, the significance of each element might be adjusted to reflect the change in skippers’ beliefs and the overall intentions of their practice. The change in belief about the purpose of sail training and significance of young people’s PSD through sail training does not only lead to a change in practices but also to a change in the perception of what the skippers’ role is on board, which highlights the overlapping relationship between beliefs, roles and practices.

In line with Fives and Buehl’s (2012) explanation, the findings in this study revealed a change in skippers’ self-efficacy beliefs over time as they engaged with young people (see the previous sub-section). This change influenced the skippers’ approach to PSD, their perceived roles, and the intentions of their practices. It appears that as beliefs about the purpose of sail training changed, the skippers’ engagement with young people changed to better ‘fit-in’ with these newly developed beliefs. This was particularly noticeable when Ryan, Collin, George and Maria spoke about the way in which their self-efficacy to work with young people had become enhanced over the years. This developing self-efficacy led George to engage with a less authoritarian approach whereas Maria reflected on her developing ability “to sit down and talk to young people” which enhanced her perceived engagement with trainees. The successful development of self-efficacy of some, and the failure of others, supports Swain et al.’s (2012) findings. Swain et al. (2012) reported that teachers with higher perceived self-efficacy to work with children with additional special needs used more inclusive practices and approaches compared with pre-service teachers with lower self-efficacy beliefs in their ability to create an inclusive environment. Essentially, this result appears to confirm Day and Gu’s (2010) and later B. B. Levin’s (2015) critique that current teachers’ beliefs literature overlooks the importance of other beliefs—including self-efficacy beliefs—on teachers’ practice. A very similar critique was noted towards OAE literature in Chapter 2, as in that literature, the focus has been placed on perceived technical competencies or knowledge related to subject content (see Schumann et al., 2014 and Taylor, 2006 respectively).

In summary, the intertwining of skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices aboard was borne out by the results of this study which also help to explain the different but overlapping functions of beliefs. It should be noted that skippers hold different beliefs at the same time but identify which beliefs will be further used as frames for interpretation and addressing problems and later as guides for actions. Evidently, the function of a belief can change over time to reflect a change in a belief itself. Such a
change, therefore, influences the intentions behind one’s practice although the practice may stay the same (e.g., the boat is used as a means to conduct a sail training experience). Skippers also reflected on their evolved self-efficacy beliefs to engage with young people which further highlighted skippers’ dual role aboard. That is, educative practices and experiences became as valued as safety and legal requirements. Nonetheless, skippers emphasised the difference between direct and indirect approach to trainees’ PSD where the latter was perceived to be more appropriate given the sensitive nature of the topic. This finding raised a question to what extent beliefs – used to reach mutual understanding between a learner and educator – can be used to do so within the given context (cf. Lau, 2010).

6.3.2 Process of young people’s PSD.

Skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD reported thus far provide insights into the process of PSD and its underpinning mechanisms. The process of PSD brings to focus the complex relationships between: skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices; and overlapping functions of beliefs. This section will discuss further skippers’ perspectives and unpacks the process of PSD in light of the results of this study and the elements identified and summarised in Chapter 4 (see Table 4.1).

Small group dynamics. According to all skippers, the process of PSD is centred around social behaviours created and expressed within the physical and social environments. This view is in line with the consensus across OAE and sail training literatures that understanding small group dynamics are essential to young people’s PSD (see Chapter 4). Indeed, small group dynamics have been frequently identified as a key part of the conceptual models of the OAE process, as discussed by Walsh and Golins (1978), Deane and Harré (2014) and Sibthorp and Jostad (2014). The sail training toolkit (see Chapter 4; Sail Training International, 2011) also emphasises small group dynamics within the key practice area briefly explained in Chapter 4.

During interview, however, skippers explained that while the physical nature of a sail training vessel presents its own challenges (also see Chapter 4), all four most frequently identified elements (i.e., environmental structures and social systems, social behaviours, attainable challenge and essential sailing skills) are used to promote PSD. For example, Emma, Harry and Adam used novel physical and social environments to enhance trainees’ self-awareness and highlight otherwise habitual
behaviours. The increased self-awareness of habitual behaviours as one of the perceived outcomes of the sail training experience was also reported by trainees in Ashworth’s (2013) ethnographic study. Skippers also reported trying to control physical and social environments to some extent, so that otherwise salient constraints could be identified, and pro-social behaviours could be promoted. These points provide unique insights which are missing in previous studies into how skippers manipulate small group dynamics to promote PSD. Even though some studies report the views of researchers who are involved with delivering OAE and/or sail training programmes and provide some insights into practitioners’ intentions based on own experience (e.g., Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010), the dominant trend in the literature is over-representation of young people’s perspectives. The consequence of this focus has been a limited understanding of how practitioners use small group dynamic to achieve desired outcomes (also see Chapter 4).

**Novelty.** It is evident that novelty of the environments and the activity itself is one of the key elements needed for young people’s PSD, which is in line with Walsh and Golins (1976), White et al. (2016) and later Fletcher’s (2017) findings. Nonetheless, these authors explain little about why novelty is important or how it works. In contrast, the findings reported here provide insights into why and how such novelty may help to promote young people’s PSD. It appears, for instance, that how the novelty is exploited to facilitate young people’s PSD is more important than the novelty itself. To illustrate, Todd believed that lack of familiarity with the activity and with other people aboard helped to create an inclusive community which becomes a shared mutual experience among the trainees. Essentially, regardless of which background a trainee comes from, all of them are “equally bad” (Todd) meaning that everyone is at the same level and need to learn some sailing skills to be able to take part in an activity. A similar finding was previously reported by Berman, Finkelstein and Powell (2004). The current study, however, explained why and how the sail training experience overrides the diversity among young people which go beyond simplistic explanations of mutual goals provided by Berman et al. (2004). During this study, three key aspects in terms of how overall novelty contributes to young people’s PSD emerged. These are: creating an inclusive and socially just community; teaching respect for and understanding of other people; and undertaking a meaningful role within the community created aboard.
**Inclusive and socially just community.** The fact that all trainees lack experience and understanding of how sail training operates helps to reduce perceived barriers between social classes, addresses stereotypes and promotes social inclusion. That is, to create a socially just and inclusive community as explained by Todd, Collin, George, Harry and John. In their views, everyone needs to learn the same skills which are not influenced by factors such as the area one comes from and other social indicators. Harry noted that the nature of the physical and social environments helps to create a sense of dependence and reliance. This is in line with C. J. Rogers (2014) and later Fraser et al.’s (2016) findings, who themselves have built on the significance of limited space, lack of exits and the physical boundaries of the vessel (see Maekler, 2009; McCulloch, 2002). According to Harry, forced dependence breaks down the barriers across the backgrounds because achieving a mutual goal of changing a sail or reaching the harbour becomes more important than differences in one’s background (also see Berman et al., 2004). Developing team identity and group belonging, as previously identified by Ashworth (2013) contributes towards creating a mutual team goal which goes beyond one’s technical skills or social classes, and helps trainees to develop their ability to “bridge social differences” (Finkelstein, 2005, p. 18).

**Respect and understanding.** According to George, Maria, Ryan, Felix, Adam, Harry, Liam and Reuben, a socially diverse group allows young people to expand their horizons, challenge core beliefs and develop a better understanding of others. A socially just and inclusive community, which goes beyond the bounds of individual egos or socio-economic backgrounds, fosters an environment in which cognitive dissonance can be created and those core trainees’ beliefs which are based on stereotypes can be challenged (see Appendix F). According to these skippers, sailing-related tasks provide a meaningful context in which cognitive dissonance can be created without appearing to do so. All tasks have to be completed and hence, pairing up trainees from different backgrounds and with different attitudes provides an opportunity to challenge stereotypes and prejudices while engaging with a physical ‘primary’ task. According to both Adam and John, socio-economic background suddenly becomes irrelevant as the tasks have to be completed and therefore, respect and understanding towards each other grow based on actual skills and character rather than perceived stereotypes.
This finding supports Vives’s (2013) comments that diversity among the crew also enforces reflection on their own limits and how they might be influenced by daily habits and cultural stereotypes. This point is particularly important when highlighting often assumed benefits—or even requirements—of successful OAE programmes which were previously reported by, for example Beames (2004a) and Takano (2010). Both authors alongside with many others reported the perceived benefits of social diversity among the programme participants but failed to explain the underpinning mechanisms providing little help to practitioners on how to use social diversity among young people as a catalyst to meaningful change. Instead, the assumed benefits simply lead to over-reliance on the environment and the activity itself which follows the “mountains speak for themselves” idea critiqued in earlier chapters (see Chapters 2 and 3).

Sailing-related skills. According to the majority of skippers in this study, trainees need to develop some sailing-related skills, so that they could take part in an activity to begin with. George, Ryan, Harry, Adam and Thomas point out that this was not necessarily about learning technical skills but rather about figuring out a meaningful individual role within the team (e.g., preparing meals). Adam especially emphasised that trainees have to “know enough” to engage with the process and the activity itself which, in turn, allows for exploration of different roles and discovering a match with the individual’s personality and unique competencies, as well as the skills and behaviours needed for each role. These factors then allow a trainee to identify a meaningful role within a team, as explained by Hopkins and Putnam (1993) and as evident—but under-reported— in McCulloch’s (2002) data. Later, Sail Training International (2011) noted in their guidance for the key practice areas on a sail training vessel, the significance of creating meaningful opportunities for membership and participation in a group. Group membership or developing a feeling of belonging to a community was also noted by Ashworth (2013), Henstock et al. (2013) and later Marshall (2016) although they failed to highlight the value and variety of the individual roles each trainee can undertake. With growing support for this aspect of young people’s PSD, Jirásek et al. (2017) explained that it “is not possible to arrange [the community] without personal participation and mutual help which contributes to the benefit for the whole community” (p. 87). Jirásek et al.’s (2017) point is borne out in this study, with skippers expressing their beliefs about the need for trainees to be able
to contribute to and fulfil an individually meaningful role within the created community on board (see Section 6.2 and Appendix F).

**Indirect approach to PSD.** The above discussion not only sheds some light on the underlying mechanism contributing to young people’s PSD, but also supports skippers’ strong belief in using an indirect approach towards PSD. That is, skippers believe that the overall sail training experience should be ‘orchestrated’ to some extent to achieve educational goals, or the outcomes of PSD (also see Sail Training International, 2011). For example, neither Maria nor Holly would tell young people that they were working on negotiating, coming to a mutual decision or learning teamwork skills. Instead, both skippers used a range of sailing-related activities to encourage such skills (e.g., a sail change or agreeing on a meal). Using a similar approach to Maria and Holly, Adam shared a story about when he purposefully created a man overboard situation in which a young person showed leadership and decision-making skills, and responded to mutual trust built between the young person and Adam (i.e., demonstration of interpersonal relationship built between the practitioner and the young person; also see Cleland, 2011). These examples further illustrate the benefits of developing a balanced perspective on young people’s PSD as trainees cannot be fully aware of skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions and therefore, skippers’ viewpoints provide better understanding of how certain outcomes are achieved or desirable situation are created.

The above examples also support Taylor and Caldarelli’s (2004) findings that practitioners believed in students learning about the environment without consciously realising it at the time of the experience. While environmental educators in Taylor and Caldarelli’s (2004) study focused on pointing out different living creatures, their study still describes a direct approach in comparison to skippers’ conceptualisations of “learning without knowing” (Taylor & Caldarelli, 2004, p. 462) in terms of trainees’ PSD. Therefore, the examples discussed above are unique findings not currently reported within existing literature, partially due to the strong focus there on programme outcomes and young people’s experiences, and also due to lack of understanding of the beliefs, actions and intentions of staff members (see Chapter 4).

**Meaningful context.** Both small group dynamics and an indirect approach to PSD are evident within skippers’ comments on creating a purposeful context in which PSD can occur. For instance, Felix saw his role as creating a learning environment in
which trainees were encouraged to experiment while monitoring this experimentation. According to Felix, experimentation applied to both sailing tasks and social behaviours, as trainees are provided with meaningful opportunities to experience social situations, to resolve interpersonal conflict, overcome individual fears, make mistakes within a relatively safe environment, and engage in purposeful tasks requiring teamwork, respect, negotiation or showing care and respect towards each other. This point relates to the previously noted benefits of novelty and provides further empirical support for the guidelines published by Sail Training International (2011; also see Chapter 4).

The created context offers opportunities for the trainees to have more agency as they determine their individual meaningful roles within the team and undertake an active participatory role in the activity. Thus, Collin, Oliver, Leon, Reuben and other skippers encouraged trainees’ ownership, responsibility and decision-making which is in line with Marshall (2016), White et al.’s (2016) and later Fletcher and Prince’s (2017) reports that young people perceived responsibility with sailing tasks to be a significant factor in the overall experience.

A number of authors also reported the perceived effect of seasickness as a key experience needed for young people’s PSD (see Finkelstein, 2005; Fletcher, 2017; Liu, 2012; McCulloch, 2002). In contrast to these authors, none of the interviewed skippers identified seasickness to be one of key sail training experiences. Although George, Ryan, Felix, Liam and Emma’s thoughts were similar to McCulloch’s (2002) comments that seasickness was a character-building experience that most trainees were likely to experience in severe weather, they also felt it provided a further opportunity to address social behaviours. Taking care of each other, reliance on other people or showing understanding and empathy were examples of social skills which might possibly be developed through the experience of seasickness. Therefore, in addition to having a direct effect on young people’s PSD because of its character-building nature, the experience of seasickness created another meaningful context through which PSD-related skills could be enhanced.

**Challenge.** The research data revealed a number of different challenges that emerge in relation to physical and social environments. A majority of skippers identified that their roles and practices were associated with their ongoing observations and assessment of trainees’ initial skillsets. Such assessment allowed for making necessary adjustments to identified weaknesses and creating
individualised/tailored challenges. For example, Oliver spoke about a girl whose challenge was not to break into tears in difficult circumstances, which she achieved by the end of the voyage. Oliver’s example prompts to further consideration of the appropriateness of creating challenges for each individual almost on daily basis, and reflects the need for learning to be “contextual and reflect the dynamism, complexity and risks involved” (Collins et al., 2015, p. 232). This also supports Fletcher’s (2017) observation that each trainee has individual needs which require alternative approaches from the skipper and staff crew members.

Another way to look at challenge is through a lens of small group dynamics and meaningful context discussed earlier. That is, the sail training environment presents a real technical challenge that the trainees have to overcome, which creates a team goal (e.g., reaching a destination A). During this process, trainees’ PSD is further promoted as trainees are forced to engage with other crew members to achieve common goals and to look past any differences that may initially be present among the trainees. This finding supports the view of Berman et al.’s (2004) as achievement of team goals were found to be more important than individual differences aboard a sail training vessel. Marshall (2016) also reported that obligation to the community perceived was a key monitor for participation and engagement with ship duties where shared goals influenced social bonds developed among trainees.

To sum up, the sail training experience is an example of an hyperdynamic environment in which weather conditions, staff and trainees’ ability levels, created culture, backgrounds, technical features of each task, and overall purpose for each voyage must be continually taken into consideration and reflected within practitioners’ actions and intentions. In addition to the challenges presented by this environment, the overall interaction of programme elements can enhance trainee-specific PSD if the process is monitored on a daily basis to echo the dynamism of the experience (see Figure 6.5 and Appendix F). This would allow taking into consideration the “complexities of human interaction and individuality” (Herbert, 1995, p. 31) and addressing multifaceted relationships among the different elements of outdoor education programmes, as previously reported by McKenzie (2000), Sibthorp et al. (2007) and later by Deane and Harré (2014).

Figure 6.5 captures the process of trainees’ PSD during sail training as it was conceptualised through this research process. Mutual consensus among skippers was reached on four key elements: environmental structures and social systems which are always present during any given sail training voyage and, therefore, are
depicted as the environment where PSD takes place; social behaviours which are unavoidable due to trainees and staff working and living together for a fixed period of time; attainable challenge which creates the sense of achievement and is essential to trainees’ development; and essential sailing skills which trainees have to learn to some extent to be able to take an active part in the sail training experience and engage with the overall process. These elements are further affected by the dynamic nature of the sail training experience as a result of continually changing weather conditions, different trainees and staff crew members being present aboard almost on weekly basis, and the subtler purposes of each voyage which depends on the needs of the group aboard. These factors influence how skippers use the four key elements identified above to promote PSD where, for example, social behaviours may attain more focus during one voyage than during another.

The significance of one element over the another one may also change on a situational basis as skippers have competing demands and roles to fulfil (see Figure 6.3). That is, as highlighted by the findings of this study, essential sailing skills may become more important than attainable challenge under certain circumstances where the skipper needs to focus more on technical aspects of the skills due to safety issues. Another example here, as anecdotally observed by skippers, is focusing on non-maladaptive behaviours and effective coping skills—which are a challenge to some trainees—rather than focusing on technical skills. It should be noted that trainee-specific PSD occurs when the identified elements interact with each other within the environment that promotes such development. However, the interaction among all elements is rarely possible; therefore, skippers’ flexibility, adaptability and situation-specific beliefs will aid their judgement on which elements of the overall process should take priority at that time. This combination of factors will also determine what role the skipper decides to undertake which, in turn, is closely related to the actions the skipper will decide to conduct.
6.3.3 Contextual influences on beliefs, role and practices.

The current results also reveal the strong contextual influences that skippers felt were affecting their beliefs, roles and practices. All overarching themes had a subtle thread where each skipper’s initial answer to numerous questions before further probing was similar to “it depends” (Felix). That is, the identified elements of the overall process of PSD were influenced by contextual factors embedded in the skippers’ environment (also see Figure 6.5). This finding supports Day and Gu’s (2010) conclusions on the importance of contextual factors within teachers’ workplaces, which have been often under-researched within teachers’ beliefs literature (see Chapter 2). As evident in Figure 4.2, there are several factors within each sail training voyage that skippers have to take into consideration. This section explains how contextual factors may affect skippers' beliefs, roles and practices in relation to young people’s PSD.

Figure 6.5. Visual representation of trainee-specific PSD during the sail training experience.
Effect on beliefs. The findings of this study support the idea that skippers’ core beliefs about young people’s PSD do not change from situation to situation. Instead, context-specific beliefs are activated which are otherwise masked by core beliefs (Fives & Buehl, 2012; Verjovsky & Waldegg, 2005). Despite the fact that a change in core beliefs is often expected over the prolonged period of time as explained in an earlier section (also see Lim & Chan, 2007), more significant changes in immediate beliefs were evident on a case-by-case basis. Skippers often used specific examples to illustrate their different approaches to different people and situations, implying different context-specific beliefs being activated. For instance, Maria pointed out that the people aboard have significant influence on the intentions behind her actions, perceived roles and approaches. As evident in Section 6.2, skippers highlighted the need to monitor the trainees, staff crew members, weather conditions and overall circumstances continually, resulting in the activation of certain beliefs. This, in turn, leads to actions and intentions associated with that belief. The consideration most skippers give to trainees and staff crew members takes into account each individual’s character, skills, socio-economic background, abilities, fears and personal goals of a voyage. This observation and overall assessment is compared against skippers’ beliefs, some of which then act as frames for addressing problems and some of which guide skippers’ actions (see earlier sections). Therefore, previously reported disparity between a core belief and a demonstrated practice (see Collins et al., 2015; Fang, 1996; Mansour, 2013) is not necessarily an indication of disparity between core beliefs and practices. Instead, the inconsistency reflects the activation of context-specific beliefs which form a system of core beliefs about a phenomenon-in-action. This explanation, however, have not been appropriately considered and acknowledged as possible explanations to date.

The key point that this study highlights, is that an overall understanding of beliefs is significantly deepened by shifting the focus from investigating separate factors in isolation to recognise complex interconnections among different aspects. To illustrate, Taylor and Caldarelli (2004), for example, found that park educators continually assess their audience to better understand learners’ needs, engagement and way of learning – all of which were also emphasised by this research participants in the context of sail training. Other studies, for example Collins et al. (2015), investigated more general core beliefs and practitioners’ personal philosophies through conducting interviews with the practitioners rather than simply observing and reporting actions of practitioners (e.g., Hind, 2016). The latter approach is likely to
overlook context-specific beliefs rather than identify inconsistencies between stated beliefs and observed practice. The current study, however, shows the complex, interconnected nature of contextual factors influencing skippers’ belief systems and highlights the significance not only of learners-related factors, but also of staff-members-related factors, which has not been widely acknowledged within the existing literature. Therefore, it is almost impossible to isolate each factor as the smallest change to any of the identified contextual factors affects skippers’ complex system of beliefs.

Finally, one should consider skippers’ normative beliefs (a part of other beliefs as conceptualised by Day & Gu, 2010) which influence skippers’ perceptions of what is and is not important for trainees’ PSD. This is reflected within Collin, George, Felix and Oliver’s views on the need to address what trainees’ behaviours are acceptable aboard through creating a fully functional community which mimicked the outside world. According to Emma, Todd, Collin, George, Maria, Harry, Ryan, Liam, Oliver, Felix and John (see Section 6.2 and Appendix F), the community created aboard followed similar social norms, established rules and expected behaviours mimicking broader society outside sail training environment. Despite this, interviewed skippers showed consideration for the culture created by trainees too which does not necessary fully reflect the outside world or skippers’ normative beliefs. For instance, both Maria and Ryan commented on how certain jokes or little behaviours—otherwise not appropriate within mainstream society—become appropriated and accepted aboard because of trainees’ socio-economic background and past experiences. This finding further illustrates the need to better understand both currently overlooked other beliefs and an interaction among beliefs that creates a complex system of beliefs. This should be done in light of the created community which has its own cultural and normative values and expectations.

**Effect on role.** As reported earlier in this chapter, skippers identified a range of roles they felt they would often undertake. In line with existing OAE literature, ensuring safety was the most important role, as a result of the risky environment and legal obligations. Skippers need to take charge and respond to situations which may be complicated due to the technical difficulty of the manoeuvres (e.g., mooring a boat), severe weather conditions or other environmental demands which are in line with findings previously reported by Boyes and O’Hare (2003), Brown and Fraser (2009) and Collins et al. (2015). But one should also keep in mind the dual nature of
the OAE practitioner’s role which comprises both safety and education (see Chapter 2; also see Priest & Gass, 2005). Although Collins and Collins (2012) conceptualised different roles the adventure sport coach would undertake based on their client group, this study indicates that the practitioner’s role can change not only from group to group as illustrated by Todd or Reuben, but also within the same group. That is, contextual factors and the quickly changing social dynamic forces skippers to assess and adjust their role in light of any given situation. Despite Boyes and O’Hare (2003) and later Taylor and Caldarelli (2004) reporting the role of the practitioner-assessor in their studies, neither of these studies looked at changing practitioners’ roles within the same group of learners. The findings reported and discussed thus far highlight skippers’ triple agency during each sail training voyage, as all skippers conceptualised their overall role to consist of physical safety, teaching essential sailing skills and promoting trainees’ PSD.

The complexity of the skipper’s role was also highlighted by Holly, Collin, Maria, Emma and John’s comments on being ‘Jack’s-of-all-trades’. Essentially, the skippers are not only the ones in command, but also the ones who need to have most knowledge about all areas contributing to the overall sail training experience. As explained by both Collin and Emma, skippers operate – or command to operate – the ship and the crew while making decisions about boat maintenance, food, logistical and practical arrangements and staying attentive to both the emotional wellbeing of trainees and the group dynamics aboard. Again, skippers’ decisions about when to take action and what action should be taken are based on their core and contextual beliefs, continual assessment and observations, immediate judgement, intentions of actions and self-efficacy beliefs (as previously discussed). Therefore, it is expected that previously discussed and explained functions of beliefs also influence skippers’ roles aboard, and an overall system of beliefs affects skippers’ intentions to take actions.

**Effect on practice.** The results, analysis and discussion presented to this point highlight the complex relationship between beliefs, perceived roles and practices, all of which are affected by each other as well as other contextual factors. The significance of the first two functions of beliefs—that is, beliefs as filters for interpretation and beliefs as frames for addressing problems—becomes more and more apparent, especially the effect beliefs have on guiding skipper’s actions and the intentions of those actions. How contextual factors affect skippers’ practices aboard
is evident from their comments on how they respond to different events, trainees, staff crew members and circumstances aboard. For example, skippers often spoke about adjusting how much actual sailing would be conducted per voyage based on their overall assessment and judgement of the group’s abilities, staff crew members’ skills and other environmental factors such as weather conditions.

Although the results reported here are in line with Boyes and O’Hare’s (2003) findings on OAE practitioners’ naturalistic decision-making and the process practitioners go through either to increase or to decrease the level of challenge to meet learners’ abilities, the current study reveals more subtle judgements and context-specific beliefs come into play in order to meet the educational purposes of the sail training experience. For instance, George, Maria, Felix, Oliver and Liam spoke about adjusting the ratio between sailing and other activities in light of identified factors. Todd, Ryan and Harry also highlighted the importance of adjusting the level of challenge to each trainee as a means of addressing trainee-specific PSD (also see Figure 6.5). Essentially, skippers’ practices underpinned by educational intentions were influenced by contextual factors, and all of these factors are combined to promote trainees’ PSD and emotional wellbeing to create a positive learning environment.

Pring (2004/2006) noted that educational practice includes teachers’ beliefs, values, intentions and the social context within which the teacher operates. Combining the current results with Pring’s (2004/2006) comment, leads to the conclusion that skippers’ practices are conducted not purely in response to contextual factors, but in response to their beliefs about those factors, potential consequences on trainees and the overall sail training experience. This explanation appears to support Verjovsky and Waldegg’s (2005) argument that context-specific beliefs are only activated under specific circumstances. This may result, for example, in a team-based approach to PSD which is in line with both existing OAE literature as discussed in earlier chapters (e.g., Sibthorp & Jostard, 2014) and with overall skippers’ beliefs about the importance of social behaviours, social systems and essential sailing skills as reflected in this study. In other words, skippers’ beliefs dictate the role they undertake which, in turn, influences the practices they choose to engage with in any given circumstances. Recognition of this complex relationship addresses some of the shortcomings identified within Hind’s (2016) study, which identified skippers’ practices without revealing an understanding of the intentions and goals behind their observed
practices. It also confirms Pratt and Associates’ (1998/2005) work used as the first part of the theoretical framework of this thesis (see Chapter 2).

6.3.5 Section summary.

This section provided further analysis and discussion of key findings in the light of the existing empirical evidence discussed earlier in this thesis. Various relationships between skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices in relation to the different functions of those beliefs were drawn and further explained. Overall, the importance of context-specific beliefs emerged throughout this section. This, in turn, helped to highlight the difference between core and context-specific beliefs which are often activated by numerous contextual factors. Such differentiation also allowed us to deepen our current understanding of the effect contextual factors have on beliefs, perceived roles and practices. In addition, this section further explained why the identified key elements were important to young people’s PSD which allowed for conceptualisation of the process of young people’s PSD during the sail training experience. That is, the four key elements identified in the previous section (i.e., environmental structures and social systems; social behaviours; attainable challenge; and essential sailing skills) were further explained and the relationships among them were drawn. The significance of each element and interaction among them were further influenced by contextual factors which comprised both staff crew members and trainees as well as weather conditions and overall goals of each voyage. Such an understanding led to the conceptualisation of what works, how and why in relation to skippers’ beliefs, roles and practices. This contributed to an emerging understanding of the mechanisms underpinning the process of PSD. In short, the underpinning mechanisms were:

- novelty which allows to: create an inclusive and socially just community; promote respect and understanding towards each other; and learn sailing-related skills so that one could engage with the process of PSD;

- indirect approach to PSD (i.e., the use of other components and common sailing practices with an intention to address PSD-related skills) which was perceived to be more suited compared with a direct teaching approach for the PSD-related skills;

- meaningful context in which small group dynamics could be applied through utilising skippers’ indirect approach to PSD;
• and challenges emerging from physical and social environments which need to be adjusted to suit individual trainees.

Bearing these findings in mind, not only a better understanding of the PSD, but also of skippers' beliefs, their functions and formation was developed in this section. Indeed, developing a better understanding of underpinning mechanisms is critical for moving the field forward (Sibthorp et al., 2007).

6.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter reported, analysed and discussed key findings relevant to the first research question: What is the nature of skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience? Four overarching themes emerged and were discussed in detail. These were: beliefs about the process of trainees' PSD; a change in skippers' beliefs about trainees’ PSD over time; perceived skippers’ roles during the sail training experience; and skippers' practices to promote trainees' PSD. The meaning of each overarching theme was explained and illustrated in the first part of this chapter while the second part of this chapter further analysed and discussed key findings in light of the existing empirical evidence presented in Chapters 2 and 4. The results show that there are complex relationships between skippers’ beliefs, roles, practices, intentions and contextual factors. The complexity and nature of these relationships were evident through different functions of beliefs and further reflected within the changes in skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD.

The emerging understanding of the complex nature of beliefs and dynamic relationships between beliefs, roles and practices provided new insights into the process of PSD which trainees undergo during sail training experience. Engaging with skippers’ perspectives provided further understanding of why and how the identified elements worked together, and helping to address one of the existing gaps within OAE and sail training literatures (see Chapter 4). Certainly, recognition of the skippers’ continual distinction between direct and indirect approaches to PSD confirms the need to better understand practitioners' perspectives, so that more informed judgments about their practices can be made.

Further, by highlighting and recognising a difference between when core and context-specific beliefs are brought into play, the current findings challenge the existing assumptions that it is contextual factors which affect skippers’ practices (Fives & Buehl, 2012). As explained in this chapter, skippers' context-specific beliefs
were activated by numerous contextual factors such as trainees’ ability, staff crew members or weather conditions. The activated context-specific beliefs then influenced skippers’ roles and the practices they chose to engage with, suggesting the importance of the belief itself rather than the contextual factor per se. This finding further confirms the influence of people—staff crew members and trainees aboard—on both skippers’ beliefs and the overall process of PSD. This finding also indicates that core beliefs do not rapidly change on a case-by-case basis suggesting inconsistencies between the belief and observed practice. Instead, different context-specific beliefs are activated within a system of beliefs resulting in the perceived inconsistencies. As revealed in this chapter, core beliefs change over longer periods of time. This slow change may also result in a changed perception of what is a suitable practice—or at least a changed intention behind that practice—once again confirming the complex relationship between beliefs, perceived roles and practices.

The next chapter addresses the second research question through a deductive data analysis approach and further analysis based on Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies as outlined in Chapter 3 (see Figure 3.1).
Chapter 7. Research Question Two: Dewey- and Hahn-Informed Perspective

7.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the second research question (RQ2): What are Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to an understanding of young people’s PSD in relation to literature and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training? (see Chapter 1 Section 1.4). This chapter comprises two sections. The first section reports relevant findings and provides initial comparisons with Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives to illustrate a variety of meanings that emerged during deductive data analysis. The second part of the chapter offers further analysis, comparisons, and discussion of the reported results in light of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts, emerging relationships among the components of the second part of the theoretical framework (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1) and OAE and sail training literatures. I will also return to key findings that emerged in Chapter 6 as a means to fully address RQ2.

7.2 Results

This section reports all components of the second part of the theoretical model and the meanings skippers associated with them compared with conceptualisations and explanations provided by Dewey and Hahn (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1). Each component identified in the second part of the theoretical framework had a range of meanings which was either consistent or inconsistent with Dewey and/or Hahn’s conceptualisations as provided in Chapter 3. Table 7.1 summarises the current results and reports: frequency counts for each component; a total number of meanings that were identified for each component; and whether the identified meanings were consistent with Dewey and/or Hahn’s perspectives. The difference between consistent and inconsistent meanings is used as a guide to identify significance and relevance of each meaning to sail training skippers; therefore, Table 7.1 is organised from most to least salient factors based on this difference. Appendix G provides a summary table of framework matrices used for deductive thematic analysis and exemplar quotes for each identified meaning (see Chapter 5 Section 5.8 on conducting deductive thematic analysis). In the following sub-sections, all components of the second part of the theoretical model are reported, further explained and initially compared with Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations. It was decided to report all components due to two reasons. First, it allows for checking to
the extent skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD can be explained by Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts (i.e., coherent meaning). Second, additional meanings provided by skippers can be used to expand theory and theoretical understanding of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts as they relate to the modern-day sail training environment (i.e., negative case analysis; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Hyde, 2000).

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component (FC)</th>
<th>No of meanings identified</th>
<th>Consistencies with</th>
<th>Mismatches</th>
<th>Difference (matches – mismatches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>Hahn</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with the environments and socially structured activities (16)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to build working interpersonal relationships (13)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Supervision and mentoring (14)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Adaptability to meet individual learner’s needs (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly challenging activity (13)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and service (16)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct approach to teaching (14)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models (10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect approach to teaching (15)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component (FC)</td>
<td>No of meanings identified</td>
<td>Consistencies with</td>
<td>Mismatches</td>
<td>Difference (matches – mismatches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar natural environment (11)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Initial control/training to a learner (10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of success before encountering adversity (12)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social diversity (7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Flexibility in approaches (15)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements marked by matching symbols were combined due to overlapping meanings. Negative difference indicates that there were more inconsistent than consistent meanings. Cognitive and emotional aspects of learning proved to be interconnected with other elements of the sail training environment, and therefore they were not coded for separately.

### 7.2.1 Interaction with physical and social environments and socially structured activities.

All skippers noted that trainees’ interactions with physical and social environments were essential to trainees’ PSD. Nine meanings emerged during data analysis, seven of which aligned with Dewey or Hahn’s notions (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). The most commonly agreed meaning identified by skippers was trainees’ interactions with the physical sail training environment. Emma, Harry, Holly, Collin, George, Felix, Liam and Harry echoed Dewey’s views in terms of the physical features of the sail training environment and trainees’ interactions with their immediate surroundings. For instance, Collin thought that “the boat is [sic] very useful and natural tool. A lot about the boat automatically helps with that; being in the close environment, there is no escape or very little. And I can choose how much and how little.” Harry also pointed out that the physical features of the boat helped to define group membership as “it has a boundary round it, so everybody who’s inside the boundary is clearly a member of the team. And everybody else is not. So, it’s a much easier platform—venue—to define the team; it defines it for you.”
Dewey valued collectivism where each member had a role to fill. In this respect, Thomas, Holly, George, Harry, Ryan, Felix and Adam noted that each trainee tried out different roles within the team to find out which one best suited their character, skills and abilities. George summarised this point as follows: “Not everybody can do everything, but everybody can do something.” Both Ryan and Felix highlighted the fact that all roles are equally important and respected as long as the trainee was able to make a meaningful contribution. Felix reflected:

They're trying to tackle the boat, the boat is not going around, and everyone turns round to the helm and goes “Your fault”. No, we are a team. You don’t need to point. We need to get the boat going rather than point blame at one person. And [recognise] that everyone’s role is important.

Thomas, Collin, George, Todd, Harry, Reuben and John also highlighted the inclusive nature of sail training, which is a principle evident throughout Hahn’s educational legacy (e.g., badge scheme; see Chapter 3). For instance, Todd felt that sail training promoted inclusivity because most trainees had never done sailing before and hence, “they are all equally bad.”

Echoing Dewey’s thoughts on young people’s interactions with their social environment, Maria, Ryan, Harry, Oliver, Adam, Liam and John identified the development of relationships among trainees. Most of the skippers’ comments reflected the need to get on with other people due to the nature of sail training (e.g., John said: “They learn to get on with people.”). Social interaction is further reported and discussed in more detail under the heading Ability to build interpersonal relationships (see Section 7.2.2).

Skippers provided two additional meanings which do not appear to form part of Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations. In addition to the active trainee interactions with both environments which some skippers reported, Holly, Oliver, John, Harry and Leon also spoke about a more passive interaction which, if anything, was critiqued by Dewey due to lacking educator’s guidance to make it an educative experience (see Chapter 3 Section 3.2). Holly, Oliver, John, Harry and Leon felt that trainees’ interactions with the environments “happen by virtue of being there and working together without it being spelled out” (Oliver). Despite this view contradicting Dewey’s points on educative and miseducative experiences (see Chapter 3), Harry explained his position as follows:

It [the environment] challenges their interpersonal skills. And it’s more
immediately obvious that they have to work together, because they can’t just disappear if somebody doesn’t like somebody else. They’re still gonna be on the boat for all five days, so they’re gonna have to work it out somehow, and I think that tends to mean that people do work harder at their interpersonal skills than they might do if they had just the opportunity to say “Hi” and then “Bye”.

Another insight was provided by Harry, Felix, Leon and Reuben who noted that the created dependence on each other and the vessel forced trainees to interact with the environment. Reuben explained it like this: “The boat is what we’ve got. This is what we’re living on....We’ve got to protect this.” Liam added that “everyone’s lives depend on each other.” Neither Dewey nor Hahn focused on this particular aspect of the interaction between trainees and the sail training experience, and hence the study provides a different perspective into how meaningful interaction with the environment can be created.

7.2.2 Ability to build working relationships.

The data relating to this component produced six meanings, four of which aligned with Hahn’s and one with Dewey’s educational principles (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). Nine skippers highlighted casual conversations among staff crew members, including themselves, and trainees. Harry felt that conversations have a “very powerful benefit, because if you’re part of the team, you’re part of the team, and it doesn’t really matter what you did outside the boat.” Maria added that “when you get to know them better, you know a bit what’s going on in their lives.”

Hahn highlighted mutual trust between the educator and the learner as a way to build successful interpersonal relationships. This was also evident in Adam, George, Oliver, Reuben, Harry, Emma and Liam’s views. These skippers explained the importance of the trainees’ trust in the skipper, the skipper’s trust in trainees, and the trainees’ trust in other staff crew members. For instance, both Oliver and Liam thought it was important to create “a feeling of confidence in what you’re doing so that everybody trusts you to do what you’re doing” (Oliver). Reuben, Emma, George, Collin and Ryan also noted the importance of mutual respect which accords with Hahn’s view. For Reuben, mutual respect was defined in terms of how he interacted with his staff crew, so that trainees would respect them: “You don’t want to come off too strong and put the crew member down in front of your group because then it will trigger a situation.”

Even though Dewey categorised interactions among young people as part of
their social environment (see Section 7.2.1), they are not separate from interpersonal
relationships, because interpersonal relationships will develop through such
interactions as noted by John, Reuben, Felix, Harry, Oliver, Maria and Ryan. Reuben
explained that trainees have to get “along with other people they haven't met before”
while Harry further illustrated the nature of relationships aboard: “They're on the boat
together and they either beat each other up for five days or they have to find a way of
getting on.”

Only one meaning under this component of the model provided new insights
to add to Dewey and Hahn's conceptualisations: developing staff crew members and
volunteers (mentioned by 9 skippers). Maria, Collin, George, Ryan, Harry, Adam,
Oliver, Reuben and John thought that they had a responsibility to develop their staff
crew members as well as their trainees. Maria would try and create “opportunities for
your staff and volunteers” while Collin would “encourage them and help them to find
funding for courses about boats and about youth work.”

7.2.3 Initial control/training and supervision and mentoring.

At the beginning of the study, initial control/training and supervision and
mentoring were identified as two separate components to illustrate the different
meanings conceptualised by Hahn and Dewey respectively and to reflect the
differences in the environments Dewey and Hahn worked at (see Chapter 3 Figure
3.1). However, the way that these concepts were twinned throughout the skippers’
comments meant that initial control/training and supervision and mentoring were
joined to represent two ends of the same continuum, further illustrating the instruction-
facilitation dualism explained in Chapter 3. Each end of this spectrum is explained in
more detail below.

**Initial control/training.** As evident in Table 7.1, three explanations emerged
under this sub-component, one of which was consistent with Hahn's notion of initial
training while the other two were non-consistent with either Dewey or Hahn's
perspective. Ten skippers explained that initial control—or training as described by
Hahn—was closely related to teaching and instructing trainees on sailing-related
skills given safety considerations. Ryan thought that trainees should receive initial
training to make sure “they've got a basic skill to keep them safe; know where the
food is; know how to use the toilet; and what to do if someone falls over.” Emma also
made sure that everyone had a turn at all key tasks so that they all could gain some
knowledge about the essential tasks:

I usually spent the first day not going very far but doing lots and lots of sailing manoeuvres, so lots and lots of tacking; getting everybody to have a turn at the helm, everybody to have a turn at operating the sails and setting the sails and that sort of thing.

Although Dewey advocated against external educator control, Adam and Collin provided some insights into why they felt that initial training was essential. Adam explained that initial training is needed to develop “sufficient knowledge” so that trainees could “take part in an activity.” Collin added that initial training was needed for broader trainee development as trainees had to learn some skills first before they were “able to ask questions and develop their interest in what is happening around them.” According to these skippers, because of the nature of the activity, initial training was an essential first step in the training-supervision continuum.

Supervision and mentoring. Both Dewey and Hahn believed that the focus should be on supervision, guidance and mentoring, which was also evident in the skippers’ comments (14 skippers). The most commonly perceived meaning of supervision and mentoring—out of four identified—was guidance and mentoring. Twelve skippers associated guidance and mentoring with providing support and encouragement. For instance, Todd would “try to encourage people to lead” while Maria described the skipper and staff crew members as “someone who is encouraging them to have a go and get involved.” Thomas, Felix and Liam also perceived the skipper “to be someone who can facilitate learning” (Thomas).

In line with Hahn’s philosophy as reflected in Hogan’s writings and practices (see Chapter 3), George, Liam, Ryan, Emma, Oliver and Felix also incrementally decreased the level of supervision they provided throughout the voyage. Ryan described a general tendency that “as this [the voyage] goes on, the skipper and the mate tend to stand further and further back and allow the watch officers and watch leaders to be running the boat most of the time.” Similarly, Liam shared a story about when “the sea staff all go and sit down below and drink tea and just let them go with it. They appoint their own skipper and the mate, and they do the passage.” Liam’s story illustrates both the continual decrease of supervision and also the corresponding increase in the abilities of trainees to engage with sailing-related tasks.

The only inconsistency which emerged between Dewey and Hahn’s suggestions for guidance and mentoring, and Todd, Emma and Leon’s views, was
related to the value of unguided supervision and mentoring in relation to PSD-related skills rather than technical sailing-related tasks. Todd said that he “let[s] them [trainees] to find it [PSD-related skills] themselves” whereas Leon explained that if the crew was “fairly experienced 16-17-year-olds on board, they all know each other quite well. If they have interpersonal problems, they can deal with it themselves.” In contrast, Dewey promoted structured activities to avoid miseducative or aimless experiences (see Chapter 3).

7.2.4 Flexibility in approaches and adaptability to meet individual learner’s needs.

Flexibility in approaches and skipper’s adaptability to meet individual trainee’s needs had overlapping meanings (see Appendix G). Fifteen skippers mentioned flexibility in taking different approaches aboard, resulting in six different explanations. Of these, only two aligned with Dewey and/or Hahn’s perspectives. Adaptability, on the other hand, was mentioned by 11 skippers but was aligned more clearly with Dewey and/or Hahn’s perspectives (see Table 7.1). Both components provided new insights into how skippers approach trainees’ PSD and extended existing understanding of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts. Therefore, the respective components are reported below.

**Flexibility in approaches.** As noted above, skippers identified six meanings relating to their flexibility in taking different approaches, only two of which were in line with insights provided by Dewey and Hahn (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). Both Dewey and Hahn emphasised the need to adapt to individual’s needs which was also noted by Thomas, Holly, Harry, Todd, Liam and Reuben. It was important for Thomas to “understand what they are engaged with and what they can get from it” while Liam noted the need to learn “how to communicate with them.” Oliver, Thomas, Holly and Ryan highlighted continuous adaptability throughout a voyage which was aligned with Dewey’s view. Oliver, for example, felt he needed to “read the situation.” Thomas also added that he would then “use a different technique” which was more suitable.

Skippers, however, provided four unique insights which broaden the understanding of flexibility that arises from Deweyan and Hahnian educational thoughts. Eleven skippers emphasised the need to adapt to the whole group which was mentioned neither by Dewey nor by Hahn. Holly explained: “The whole voyage will depend on…how long they can concentrate for; whether they’re any good at
listening; whether they’re...good at fighting with each other; whether they know each other or not." Another insight was provided by Maria, Collin, John, Ryan and Reuben who indicated the importance of adapting to different staff crew members and volunteers on board. Reuben illustrated: “It changes definitely and not only from group to group but also from the crew members you’re working with. Some crews that you’re working with need more pushing in one area or more help than another group.” The third meaning of having flexibility in approaches was noted by Adam and Felix. They considered the overall goals of the voyage which would indicate what approach the skipper would undertake. Felix illustrated: “You very much change your approach to your crews depending on what they are trying to achieve. What their aims are.” Emma provided the final insight which was weather conditions: “It’s actually quite hard if there isn’t much wind. You have to then think of other ways to get them to work together, which I think if it’s rough weather, it almost happens by itself.”

Adaptability to meet individual learner’s needs. Although this component specifically considered adaptability to each trainee reflecting Dewey and Hahn’s points (2 out of 3 meanings were in line with Dewey and/or Hahn’s perspectives; see Table 7.1), all three identified meanings overlapped with flexibility in skippers’ approaches. Harry, Reuben and Liam’s views were in line with Dewey and Hahn’s perceptions on the need to adapt to individual learner’s needs. Reuben illustrated: “You try and target each individual person depending on what you get from [them]….Then define how you respond back and then you just work from there.” Likewise, Harry, Oliver, George, Ryan, Adam, Collin and Todd echoed Dewey’s idea on the necessity to adapt continually to changing learner’s needs. Todd noted that “whatever you do, you have to be careful not to give too much to the person to scare them off.” Collin further explained: “We constantly re-evaluate what we’re doing.”

In line with the insights discussed under Flexibility in approaches above, Maria, Collin, John, Reuben and Ryan noted the need to adapt to staff crew members, where Ryan explained that “it depends on the abilities of the people underneath you.” Maria also reflected on the skipper’s responsibility to develop staff crew members which involved adapting to their needs. She illustrated: “Do the staff have the skills to do that? If not, you’re there to help them to develop those skills to enable those young people to do whatever it is.” Thus, skippers noted their responsibility to develop both trainees and staff crew members under both components, in contrast to Dewey and Hahn, neither of whom emphasise this point.
7.2.5 Increasingly challenging activity.

As evident in Table 7.1, this component elicited seven meanings, four of which were consistent with Dewey and/or Hahn’s ideas. Todd, George, Ryan, Felix, Adam, Reuben, Oliver, Harry and Emma agreed with Dewey and Hahn’s position that adjusting a challenge to suit individual people would enhance their development. According to Todd, a skipper has “to be careful not to give too much to the person to scare them off.” Adam expanded on Todd’s point: “What I think is important that you’re pitching the activity at the level that develops people, gives them a meaningful experience, allows them to take something positive and meaningful away.”

Ryan, Liam, Leon, Felix and Emma would incrementally increase the level of responsibility and challenge they allocate to the trainees which is in line with both Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts. Both Liam and Ryan explained that the level of responsibility and challenge would peak towards the end of the voyage when trainees would be much more actively involved in running the ship, would need less supervision and, at times, would take over from staff crew. Ryan gave the following example: “I have had on the last day where you’re doing sort of half of the day’s passage in order to clean the boat up where it was the watch leaders and the crew who managed everything, and we were redundant.” Along with the increasing level of responsibility given to the trainees, Collin, George and Liam also noted the importance of helping the trainees to “defeat their defeatism” (Hogan & Oldhams, 1941 as cited in Veevers & Allison, 2011, p. 69) which is in line with Hahn’s educational philosophy. Collin explained trainees’ defeatism in terms of their fears when the skipper would “help people to get over some of their fears and to prove that you can get over your fears is quite a useful tool in life.”

Skippers provided three additional meanings of challenge. For instance, Maria and Harry noted the importance of small challenges compared with increasingly challenging activities. She would push trainees “slightly out of their comfort zone…just inviting them to take the small steps” (Maria). Harry also felt responsible for challenging his staff crew a “little bit to do all the things they’re not very good at.” Instead of incremental challenge, John explained that a voyage may start with a challenging passage. Trainees would then build their knowledge and skills, and the same passage on their way back would be much more comfortable to deal with a few days later. John explained:
It can be quite a hard passage the first time, and quite often people would find that really very challenging. Some of them would really not like it at all, some would want to get off and some would be seasick.... Then you might spend two or three days around the area where you are and do nice gentle stuff and people would relax much more and really get into being the part on the boat.... And then we would take them to sea again for the way back, where [they] were very nervous about this but almost always they would find it really easy because they had done it all, they knew what they were doing.

7.2.6 Community and service.

There was mutual agreement that the sail training experience is based on the premise of building a community on board. This concept is key to Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts (see Chapter 3). Skippers identified six meanings, four of which were consistent with Dewey and Hahn’s educational principles (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). Overall, skippers perceived service as a communal way of living, which is an essential part of the sail training experience. Maria explained that service meant “looking for each other as a team”, and Reuben noted that “there will be a day when most people are sick, people are helping other people. And that just develops because you’re looking after [someone], someone is looking after you.”

Similar to Dewey’s emphasis on collectivism over individualism and Hahn’s use of team-based activities, 13 skippers indicated that they would use a team-based approach to tasks. Leon explained that all trainees are “a part of a team” while Collin highlighted that putting a team over an individual is also a tool to develop each individual:

I normally see it as a group and I try...having the individuals within the group and then use it within the whole group if you know what I mean...He is gonna need more confidence in that, how can we do that as a group?

In line with both Dewey and Hahn’s ideas about the consequences of actions, Adam, George, Reuben, Liam, Collin and Ryan thought that due to the nature of the sail training experience, the created community allows for explaining the rules, norms and consequences of one’s actions. Adam illustrated this point as follows:

What you’re effectively doing is laying down a set of rules for a way people behave on the boat. And those rules are typically linked back and emphasised by safety. Now if you’re going to talk to most young people who are being taken sail training, they have very poor idea what the rules are.
Skippers offered insights into community and service which provided additions to Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations. Liam, Oliver, Felix, Leon and Todd felt that the created community allowed for mimicking the society outside sail training which, in turn, further enhanced the sense of realness. Liam thought that sail training “does take them away from their life at home. It puts them in an artificial…real world, smaller world”, whereas Oliver equated it to “the world of work and that you do have to finish things and do them with other people.”

John, Collin, Felix and Oliver emphasised not only the realness of the community, but also the meaningful context that was created for applying social skills. According to John, young people “who are not necessarily the best at life skills sometimes don’t understand how to put it [sic] into context.” John further explained:

Sail training is a vehicle to do other things; you can teach cooking as a skill in its own right but more importantly you’re teaching that they are cooking for other people and they need to bear this in mind. And that’s in the context, they understand that.

7.2.7 Direct approach to teaching.

Fourteen skippers identified three meanings of a direct approach to teaching, two of which echoed Hahn’s practices and one of which provided a new insight. As evident in Appendix G, 13 skippers reported direct teaching of sailing-related skills which is in line with Hahn’s educational thoughts. Sailing-related skills, however, varied from teaching “sailing knots” (Reuben) and “what to do if someone falls over” (Ryan) to “teach[ing] people even how to peel [an] onion” (John).

John, Felix, Liam, Collin, George, Reuben and Harry made statements which reflect implicit Hahn’s point on the need to teach young people how to apply their social skills in context. For example, George reflected that if negative behaviours were being displayed, “we have to draw attention of individuals to the effect it may have had on everybody else.”

Felix, however, felt that direct teaching of PSD-related skills consisted of allowing trainees to express their emotions first, so that he could “help them [trainees] to identify that those are their emotions, they are valid emotions. They are what they feel.” This insight, however, is not evident within Hahn’s educational principles.

7.2.8 Role models.

As reported in Table 7.1, this component consisted of three explanations provided by skippers – one matched with Dewey’s view, one with Hahn’s view and
one provided a new insight. Eight skippers agreed with Dewey’s notion of a skipper being a role model with respect to how one should take part in a community. Emma, Felix, Oliver, Liam, Harry, Reuben, George and Leon associated this interpretation with how skippers talked to and behaved around trainees and other staff crew members. Oliver summarised this point as follows:

It's that point about the example that you’re setting. So, if you’re wanting people to have a stake in their community and be positive members of society, then it’s all about how you behave towards them and what they’re, therefore, hopefully able to emulate.

Felix, Oliver and Ryan agreed with Hahn’s point that trainees act as role models to each other. Oliver reflected on being a positive model for young people where he added that “the relationships develop between themselves [trainees], where we are setting the scene.”

The final insight—which makes a contribution beyond both Dewey and Hahn’s perspectives—was provided by Thomas, Reuben, Ryan and Harry. These skippers felt that besides being role models for community engagement, they were also an example of how certain technical skill should be conducted. For Thomas, being a role model meant doing a “demonstration”, whereas Reuben felt that he and his mate were the role models as they were the “only people who know how it works.”

7.2.9 Indirect approach to teaching.

As summarised in Table 7.1 and Appendix G, 15 skippers identified four different meanings of using an indirect approach to young people’s PSD, two of which were consistent with both Dewey and Hahn’s perspectives. As explained by Dewey and Hahn, an indirect approach to teaching consists of using the curriculum to engage with real-life problems. Twelve skippers concurred with this meaning, using sailing skills and situations to promote PSD. For instance, Maria would utilise conditions around her to create a situation in which trainees would need to apply their social skills.

I would make staff to sit amongst young people because I thought it was a very good interaction time…. Also sometimes we would have a roundtable to chat through dinner and I just ask a question but usually ask it to someone at another end of the table…. And suddenly somebody is involved into this discussion…. So those sort of things would be fed in all the time about how to be in a group; how to listen to people; how to be in a discussion. And how to talk to people who are very different to you.
In line with Dewey’s criticism but against his recommendations (see Chapter 3), Oliver, Liam, John, Holly, Reuben and Adam noted their reliance on the environment and social activities to promote trainees’ PSD. These skippers felt that trainees did not need further guidance as PSD was “happening naturally” (Liam). Likewise, Holly felt that PSD was a “by-product of the environment”, although Adam critiqued this view by saying that “I don’t think there is sufficient emphasis. I think that we almost hope that it will happen by accident.”

Finally, Maria, Holly, Harry and Reuben provided some insights into why the indirect approach was perceived to be more suitable for developing trainees’ social skills. For instance, Maria thought that “the whole structure has to keep on going in order to have all this other stuff to flex around it. So, you’ve got this underlying routine of stuff that happens. And then that allows all other conversations.”

### 7.2.10 Unfamiliar natural environment.

This component encompassed six meanings, three of with were consistent with Dewey and/or Hahn’s perspectives (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). In line with Hahn’s educational principle, Felix, Liam, Oliver, Reuben, Adam, Todd, Emma, Thomas and Holly thought that taking trainees away from familiarity helped to address otherwise habitual behaviours. Indeed, Harry noted that “it just shakes them out of their normal routine and makes them think about stuff.”

Similarly to trainees’ interactions with social environment and interpersonal relationships reported in earlier sections, Felix, Reuben and Ryan associated unfamiliar natural environment with an effect on social interactions. That is, the social interactions were perceived to be affected by the overall unfamiliarity as indicated by Felix:

> The social interaction is very different on the boat than it is in almost any other activity. And I think it's that close proximity...the unfamiliarity of the environment. The fact that they move. And that sort of draws people together. That causes a new type of social interaction, you know. Even down to the fact that people get seasick on the boat.

Emma, Todd and Reuben provided a different view. They thought that the unfamiliar sail training environment allowed trainees to have a fresh start regardless of their background. Emma explained that trainees were able to show themselves
what they “can do and they have no previous prejudice against whether you can do it or not.” Reuben further explained:

You can have a kid on the boat who is brilliant at chemistry; who is brilliant at school. And you can get a kid who gets picked on for anything. You put them on the boat and they all know as much as each other. No one is more competent than anyone else. But they are completely at the same level. And they all need each other.

In addition, Felix perceived the unfamiliar environment as a space in which trainees can experiment with different ways of reacting and coping (see Appendix G), while Harry saw it as an opportunity to provide trainees with a different perspective on their behaviours. Harry summarised:

You have somebody who is not part of their regular life, has never met them before, may not meet them again, but has got to know them very well over a period of a week…. It can be nice things to say, it can be really tough things to say.

**7.2.11 Experience of success before encountering adversity.**

Twelve skippers identified three different conceptualisations of experience of success, only one of which was in line with Hahn’s notion of ‘defeating defeatism’ (see Section 7.2.1 and Appendix G). Echoing points made in Section 7.2.1, Liam, George and Collin endorsed Hahn’s notion of helping young people to overcome their fears successfully. George illustrated as follows:

Overcoming fear of heights for one thing. Some trainees are extremely reluctant to steer the ship. And they are terrified by the thought of making a mistake. And what we often hear from those who overcome their fear of climbing and steering and various other things but these primarily; to say: “I never thought I could do that”.

Ten skippers offered new insights into this component. Liam, among other skippers, mentioned the importance of the overall sense of achievement which may be experienced after adversity. He explained: “You can't take that to the extremes but…[t]here is an element to them feeling unsafe. It doesn't do any harm because it actually highlights their sense of achievement.” Felix also noted a sense of achievement where team success became more important than individual achievement: “The overall success on the task is more important [than] who did which thing.” These new insights add to those already described by Hahn.
7.2.12 Social diversity.

Both Dewey and Hahn valued social diversity among young people as a means to promote growth. Ryan, Reuben, George, Liam, Harry, Felix and Adam’s comments illustrated four meanings which skippers associated with diversity. Of these, only socio-economic background was consistent with Dewey and Hahn’s views (see Table 7.1 and Appendix G). According to Ryan, Harry, George and Adam, trainees from different socio-economic backgrounds were able to learn and teach each other. Harry explained: “If you mix them up with some much more privileged people, then the learning process is much quicker, because they’re interacting with people who are quite different to them. And that can be bit of a shock.”

The other three sub-types of diversity which emerged were: broader experiences; age; and core beliefs (see Appendix G). Adam, Ryan and George spoke about broader differences in trainees’ background. George reflected on initial stereotypes which can be addressed through trainees’ exposure to people from diverse backgrounds: “It may not be apparent right at the start but it’s once when you had some time living and working together, then they realise actually they are not so different.” Both Liam and Felix also noted the benefits of diversity in age where trainees have an opportunity to interact with staff crew members and vice versa. Liam reflected on his own experience:

I am quite keen we have a mixture of age ranges because what it actually does, it gets the younger people bridging that age gap...[and] respecting older people. But also, the older volunteers and the people who are working at the marina; it's actually reconnecting them with young people cause quite often they have kids, the kids grow up, they leave home. And then suddenly this gap starts to appear.

In addition, Reuben provided further insights into how exposure to people with different core beliefs can be used to challenge young people’s perspectives. He explained:

A mate that I had on board with me last year was a lesbian.... We had one lad on board whose parents were very strict Christian and he had been told that...homosexuality is absolutely wrong.... So towards the end of the week...the questions being asked and he figured out [that the mate was lesbian] and you can see just something in his head trying to “Hold on, I've been told all my life that these people should be [inaudible]”. He really got on with that [mate] and really liked her. Surely, that's a part of your development showing that you don’t have to believe everything and there is a lot more out there.
7.2.13 Section summary.

This section reported to what extent and how the key ideas skippers have about young people's PSD during the sail training experience are in line with the theories of Dewey and Hahn. The results of the study reveal a range of meanings constructed by skippers which compare with Dewey and Hahn's educational thoughts, and therefore assist in answering RQ2. All components of the second part of the theoretical framework (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1) were explained through interview excerpts, including both those meanings which align with previous theory, and additional meanings that emerged through negative case analysis.

Some of the key findings include:

- an overall significance of staff crew members on board;
- the use of initial training-supervision dualism, and direct and indirect approaches to teaching both physical and PSD-related skills;
- the meaning of diversity comprising diversity in socio-economic status, age, background and core beliefs;
- and the interconnected nature and overlapping meanings among some key components.

The meanings and new insights discussed allow for further comparisons to be made with more detailed Dewey and Hahn's educational thoughts. They also allow for contrasting the current findings with the OAE and sail training literatures reviewed in preceding chapters. In doing so, some of the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD can be identified.

7.3 Analysis and Discussion

Results and initial comparisons made between skippers’ perspectives and Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts reported thus far are twofold. First, skippers’ thoughts are partially aligned with Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies as is evident throughout the provided examples and initial comparisons made in the preceding section (also see Appendix G). Second, the current results provide additional insights which broaden Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts and their applications into modern-day society and the sail training environment. These additional insights are made explicit through those perceptions from skippers which do not align specifically with Dewey and/or Hahn’s educational principles.
Dewey (1916) noted that “a theory apart from an experience cannot be definitely grasped even as theory. It tends to become a mere verbal formula, a set of catchwords used to render thinking, or genuine theorizing, unnecessary and impossible” (p. 169). Bearing this perspective in mind, looking into how theoretical ideas can be applied in practice, as well as considering how currently used practices can be conceptualised to develop the existing theory, are essential in developing an understanding of the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs. Thus, the combined effect of the results in this study, allow both for direct connections between OAE practices arguably based on Hahn’s educational thoughts and practices, and also for linking Dewey’s theoretical ideas about PSD with sail training practices (e.g., A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005; Thorburn & Marshall, 2011; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010).

This section provides the additional analysis and discussion needed to take the beliefs and ideas discussed in the previous section and develop them into a more critical understanding of the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs. The section also makes further links and refinements to the components developed in the second part of the theoretical model (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1). I will also return to key results discussed in Chapter 6 to make such links.

### 7.3.1 Philosophical underpinning to skippers’ beliefs about trainees’ PSD.

It is evident from results reported and discussed thus far that skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD are partially aligned with Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations explained throughout this thesis (see Chapters 3, 6 and 7 and Appendices H and I). To recap, four key elements needed for the process of young people’s PSD were revealed and discussed in Chapter 6: environmental structure and social systems; social behaviours; attainable challenge; and essential sailing skills. As there were overlapping meanings to skippers’ beliefs and complex relationships between beliefs, perceived roles and practices, the focus is maintained on the most frequently mentioned beliefs discussed in Chapter 6.

Each of the identified skippers’ beliefs will be discussed in turn to shed some light on its philosophical underpinnings in relation to Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations and results reported in Section 7.2, Table 7.1 and Appendix G. I will also continually return to key findings reported in Chapter 6 to make further links,
provide in-depth discussion and shed more light on possible responses to the second research question.

**Environmental structures and social systems.** This belief encompassed seven different meanings as reported and discussed in Chapter 6 (also see Appendix F) and it is aligned with at least three of Dewey and Hahn's key ideas as reported in this chapter. These are: interactions with physical and social environments and socially structured activities; community and service; and unfamiliar natural environment. The significance of environmental structures and social systems is primarily underpinned by the notion of how young people interact with them, which has some specific connections within Hahnian educational philosophy (see Chapter 6, Section 7.2.1 and Appendices H and I) but was mainly advocated by Dewey. As explained by Pring (2007), Dewey focused on a process of growth which "arises from interaction with the environment. That environment is social as well as physical, and so a purely biological conception of 'growth' would be misplaced" (p. 26).

This idea of Dewey’s is most straightforwardly created through the physical features of the sail training environment which relies on trainees’ interaction with the vessel itself. According to Adam, Reuben and Leon, among others, the sail training vessel allows them to take trainees away from their home environment, manipulate the physical space available aboard (also see Chapter 4) and use the physical boundary of the boat as a means to address rules and consequences. Indeed, Dewey (1938) explained the importance of physical conditions in the following quote from *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*:

> No individual person and no group does anything except in interaction with physical conditions. There are no consequences taking place, there are no social events that can be referred to the human factor exclusively…. The theoretical bearing of this consideration is that social phenomena cannot be understood except as there is prior understanding of physical conditions and the laws of their interactions. Social phenomena cannot be attacked, *qua* social, directly. Inquiry into them, with respect both to data that are significant and to theory relations or proper ordering, is conditioned upon extensive prior knowledge of physical phenomena and their laws. (pp. 491-492)

Despite skippers’ beliefs about the importance of social behaviours (as will be discussed in the following sub-section), the above quote also illustrates the importance of trainees’ interactions with their immediate social environment. That is, alongside sailing-related physical tasks where trainees interact with each other to
achieve mutual goals (e.g., show teamwork and communication to hoist the main sail), domestic situations are important too. Sharing physical space with other people for a fixed period of time results in the need to address issues related to cooking and cleaning, for instance, and means that trainees have little choice over who they can interact with. According to Holly, environmental demands such as food preparation and meal times create naturally occurring social situations—or socially structured activities—in which trainees’ interactions with their social environment are particularly evident. These thoughts are in line with those of Dewey (1913/1969):

In civilized society, eating is not merely a means to getting so much food-power into the system; it is a social process, a time of family and friendly reunion; moreover, each course of the meal has its own enjoyment just as a matter of partaking of food, that is, of an active continuing process. (pp. 28-29)

The above points are also in line with Todd, Collin, George, Maria’s and John’s comparisons made between the functional community created by the sail training experience and a real community outside the sail training vessel. As explained in Chapter 6 and Section 7.2, the created community mimics society outside sail training vessel and can be used to teach young people how to take part in the created community and thus how to take part in the wider community outside sail training. For Dewey, “work done which was meaningful in terms of the community’s needs was significant in a special sense” (Stewart & McCann, 1968, p. 212). Indeed, Liam, Oliver, Felix, John and Todd highlighted the realness of the community and therefore the way it established a meaningful context. These skippers also echoed Hahn’s (1965) and Hogan’s (1968) comments that educators should be discussing everyday problems to promote young people’s growth. Comparisons between the physical and social environments of the sail training experience and other community-based living environments and interests were previously made by McCulloch (2002; 2007), Henstock et al. (2013), Vives (2013), C. J. Roger (2014) and later Marshall (2016) and Fletcher (2017).

George, Harry and Ryan took the idea of the purpose of the physical and social sail training environments further. As part of the physical and social environments, they highlighted the benefits of community and service because it creates forced dependence on each other. This accords with Hahnian philosophy in which the need for service is one of the key themes. Rescue service—one of Hahn’s
educational antidotes (Van Oord, 2010)—and the parable of the Good Samaritan were a means to address a “decline in compassion” (Hahn, 1960, p. 7; also see Chapter 3). According to skippers, service enhances the sense of belonging to the created community which, in Hahn’s opinion, creates the feelings of being needed that “never fail” (Hahn, 1960, p. 6).

Finally, the skippers’ belief about the significance of environmental structures and social systems is also consonant with Hahn’s idea on the need to use unfamiliar natural environment for young people’s development (see Chapter 3; also see Brand et al., 2012; Hogan, 1968). Skippers emphasised how young people’s lack of familiarity with the sail training vessel, the activity itself and other people aboard influenced their learning experience empirically supporting Hahn’s view. This finding also contributes to empirically supporting the significance of the unfamiliar natural environment which is perceived to be a pre-requisite for a successful OAE experience where scholars often make simplistic connections with Hahn’s views and legacy (see Chapters 3 and 4; e.g., Beames, 2004a; Deane & Harré, 2014; Stott et al., 2016; Walsh & Golins, 1976). However, the views expressed by skippers in this study add a new perspective as to why removal from the familiar environment was one of the conditions for Hahn’s Erlebnistherapie (see Chapter 3; Brandt et al., 2012; Hogan, 1968) and how the novelty of the environment contributes to trainees’ PSD. For them, it was not only the novelty of the sail training physical environment, but also the social environment which was critical. This brings me to the next skippers’ belief which was about the importance of social behaviours on board.

**Social behaviours.** The skippers’ belief in the importance of this factor extensively overlaps with Dewey and Hahn’s thoughts on young people’s interactions with their social environment and socially structured activities as discussed in the preceding sub-section. Belief about how social behaviours contribute to PSD is particularly reinforced by Dewey and Hahn’s ideas on working relationships, role models, diversity and unfamiliar natural environment. As explained in Chapter 6, social behaviours during sail training centred around building working interpersonal relationships among all people on board. This is a more inclusive approach than either Dewey’s focus on the relationships between the learners or Hahn’s emphasis on the relationships between the learner and the educator. According to Hahn, “a strong mutual respect between teacher and pupil is necessary” (Röhrs, 1970, p. 126). Dewey, however, noted young people’s interactions with each other (i.e., interaction
with their social environment) and never emphasised the interpersonal relationships between learner and educator (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998; Petters, 1977).

Building upon trainees' interactions with both environments, socially structured activities and naturally occurring situations (see previous sub-section), this skippers' belief included a variety of meanings, such as adherence to social etiquette or resolution of interpersonal conflicts. For instance, both Liam and John explained that social situations such as meals are fruitful opportunities during which one can go beyond individual egocentric goals and address broader issues. For instance, both John and Liam would address what social etiquette is accepted within the created community. Indeed, such opportunities could be used to promote team goals and social behaviours associated with a community citizenship. According to George, Ryan, Harry, Thomas and Adam, citizenship was understood as undertaking a meaningful role within the created community and making an individual contribution towards the overall team goals. This skippers' belief and understanding reflects Hahn’s thoughts as captured by van Oord (2010) below:

Students were the crew and not the passengers of a school, and should therefore be given genuine responsibilities over the running of the school community (Flavin, 1996). This gave these students the opportunity to “practice active citizenship within a self-governing community” (Hahn, 1954). (p. 259)

This point also accords with young people’s views on the significance of individual contributions and community-like feeling created during the sail training experience (see Arbour, 2007; Cleland, 2011; Henstock et al., 2013). For instance, Berman et al. (2004) reported that shared team goals helped trainees to look beyond initial differences, which further supports the idea of the benefits of diversity as reported by skippers, and advocated by Dewey and Hahn (see Appendices H and I; e.g., Hahn, 1936, Hogan, 1968; Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). In Experience and Education, Dewey noted that exposure to different social groups allows young people to look beyond their own background and viewpoints. Hahn’s educational philosophy included teaching compassion towards each other through being exposed to the less fortunate ones (Stewart & McCann, 1968; Veevers & Allison, 2011). However, the results of this study revealed that it is not only social diversity as conceptualised by Dewey and Hahn that is valued and perceived to be beneficial, but also diversity in a broader sense. Reuben reflected on how people holding different core beliefs can teach compassion and understanding towards people with opposing viewpoints when
team goals have to be achieved and individual needs have to be put aside. Although not explicitly highlighted neither by Dewey or by Hahn, these insights are in line with Seaman and Pace’s (2009) explanations of the following point from Dewey: “The only way we can know the world is by interacting socially in it” (p. 14).

Belief in the benefits of an unfamiliar natural environment – especially a social environment – also underpins the belief skippers have about social behaviours, which is related to both diversity and the value of shared team goals mentioned above. Todd explained that due to overall novelty and the need to achieve team goals, the sail training environment promotes equality among trainees regardless of their background. This echoes other skippers’ views, Berman et al.’s (2004) findings and Dewey and Hahn’s ideas on the value of a team and team-based approach to promoting young people’s PSD.

Lastly, this skippers’ belief is also supported by Dewey and Hahn’s notions of role models which indicates the significance of interpersonal relationships built on board. According to Dewey, educators are role models for how to be participants in a democratic community (Simpson, 2011). In the context of modelling a functional community as explained in the previous sub-section as well as in Chapters 6 and 7, skippers enacted their perceived roles and beliefs about being role models in light of what social behaviours were acceptable, how interpersonal interactions should take place and interpersonal relationships could be promoted. Following Hahn’s ideas, Felix, Oliver and Ryan noted that trainees could also be role models for each other.

Overall, these views are in line with Sibthorp et al. (2011), Mirkin and Middleton (2014) and later White et al.’s (2016) reports of young people’s perceptions on the significance of social behaviours being modelled by OAE practitioners. From a slightly different angle, Felix, Leon, Reuben and Oliver explained that such modelling also took place through skippers’ relationships with other staff crew members – one of the contextual factors explained in Chapter 6 and a unique meaning that predominantly emerged during the deductive thematic analysis reported in this chapter. This finding partially supports Vernon and Seaman’s (2012) results on interpersonal issues experienced by OAE instructors when co-instructing, and later McCulloch’s (2016) point that skippers and staff crew members may have similar emotional experiences to young people. The importance of interpersonal relationships among staff crew members, their influence on ‘setting the scene’ and modelling a democratic community has been overlooked within OAE and sail training.
literatures to date. Nor did Dewey and Hahn provide sufficient insights into how such interpersonal relationships can contribute to young people’s PSD.

**Attainable challenge.** The belief which skippers held about the importance of attainable challenge is in line with Hahn’s conceptualisations of the need to engage young people in increasingly challenging activity (as reported earlier in this chapter). A variety of meanings were identified across both skippers’ beliefs about attainable challenge and Hahn’s conceptualisations of challenge needed for young people’s development (see Appendices H and I). Such a range provides a better understanding of what the challenges may consist of or how challenge is being created and used within the sail training environment. For instance, Felix and Harry noted the importance of experiencing success in achieving challenges which is consonant with Hahn’s educational thoughts. Brand et al. (2012) explained that “success in a Hahn-designed learning environment bolstered confidence and promoted learning through both success and failure” (Brand et al., 2012, p. 104) – the point that was particularly highlighted by Ryan, Maria, Oliver, Liam, John, Felix and Thomas. According to these skippers, building competence with a task increased trainees’ self-confidence, which was needed to engage with more difficult tasks or to further engage with the process of learning. A similar idea is reflected within Hahn’s educational practices as reported by Brand et al. (2012; also see Chapter 3). Nevertheless, Thomas, Reuben, Maria, Todd and Adam, among others, also believed that attainable challenge was centred around a sense of team success, or achievement of team rather than individual goals, which provided a different perspective into Hahn’s educational practice.

Further, this belief of skippers is also aligned with Dewey and Hahn’s notions of the need to adjust challenges to suit individual needs (see Section 7.2). With respect to the results reported and discussed thus far, Oliver and Liam noted that challenges often present themselves as physical or social. Given trainees’ interactions with both physical and social environments as explained earlier in this chapter, different trainees will encounter different type and degree of challenges. For example, George, Maria, Felix, Liam and Oliver explained that some trainees would feel challenged simply by being on the boat. In this particular case, although a level of physical challenge may be relatively low, it results in a high level of social challenge being encountered by some trainees. The point here is that individual and attainable challenges are often identified as physical challenges and are viewed in light of
difficulty of the physical tasks within existing OAE literature (e.g., Bell, 2017; Fletcher, 2017; A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005; McKenzie, 2000; 2003). Such view echoes Dewey and Hahn's points of the importance of adjusting physical challenges (e.g., Dewey, 1933; Hogan, 1968). For instance, Dewey thought that “the degree of challenge encompassed on any given journey is something specific to the individual and dependent in part on their previous experience” (Ord & Leather, 2011, p. 14).

Despite the focus above on physical challenge, skippers distinguished between physical and social challenges (e.g., being able to eat around the table with other people) as evident in preceding sections (also see Appendices H and I). Social challenges comprising of building relationships and dealing with other trainees on board were explicitly noted and reported in Marshall's (2016) study too. It is not clear, however, to what extent Dewey and Hahn had in mind social challenges together with physical challenges, although physical challenges are much easier to spot within Hahn’s practices and environment. The following quote from Brand et al. (2012), however, can be applied to both physical and social challenges:

Hahn believed in experiential learning where an individual character develops as a result of challenging experiences…. There are benefits to being challenged and overcoming adversity that have lasting and powerful effects. (p. 104)

Therefore, the data reported in this study regarding the belief about attainable challenge may extend Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts as they apply to the sail training context. Challenges created by the social environment become equally important to those created by the physical environment.

**Essential sailing skills.** The final skippers’ belief reported and discussed in Chapter 6 focused on the need to learn essential sailing skills. This belief is underpinned by the concept of initial training-supervision dualism and recognition of the importance of an unfamiliar natural environment—including both physical and social environments—as explained earlier in this chapter. Even though Dewey proposed that the educator’s supervision, guidance and mentoring was more beneficial to learning than the educator’s external control, Hogan (1968) reflected on the need to provide initial training to improve young people's technical competency and safety:

The object was to give initial training to complete watches in the cutters –
under oars and sail – and then as soon as possible and conditions permitted to get the boys away in the dinghies and half-deckers without officers so that they could learn from their own mistakes. (pp. 58-59)

Echoing previously made points about relationships between skippers’ beliefs and their philosophical alignment within a Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspective and Hogan’s (1968) comments (see above), a majority of skippers believed in a need to provide initial training due to lack of familiarity with the sailing and sail training environment. Emma, Todd, Ryan and many others noted that initial training was essential in addressing safety-related issues. It is important in this context to remember the key difference between the environments within which Dewey and Hahn worked. As explained in Chapter 3, Dewey worked within classroom and low-risk environments, such as gardening, whereas Hahn used riskier and more challenging environments and activities (e.g., sailing; McLachlan, 1970; Simpson, 2011, Veevers & Allison, 2011). For Dewey, supervision and mentoring was needed to avoid aimless and directionless activities and was more important than rigid external control, advancing a particular skill or imposing the educator’s authority over the learner. Dewey (1897/1926) had a clear idea of the need to mentor rather than direct:

The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to for certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences. (p. 77)

However, the sail training environment resembles Hahn’s environment more closely than Dewey’s. Therefore, the fact that skippers believed in the need to teach sailing skills rather than simply mentor and guide activity, which aligns with Hahn’s ideas while contradicting Dewey’s, is to be expected.

Hogan’s (1968) comment also illustrates that practitioners move along a training-supervision continuum. That is, intense initial training would eventually be reduced while supervision and mentoring would increase. This shift was evident within George, Liam, Ryan, Emma, Oliver and Felix’s responses. These skippers explained that they would provide a vast amount of training at the beginning of the voyage compared with instances when trainees ran the boat with minimum supervision towards the end of the voyage. Although not explicitly highlighted, this shift was also evident within Wojcikiewicz and Mural’s (2010) study in which the
authors made theoretical links between Deweyan educational philosophy and personal experiences within sailing and sail training environments. Wojcikiewic and Mural (2010) presented this shift as an example of encouraging young people to apply technical sailing skills into meaningful context under supervision and mentorship of practitioners.

Both Adam and Collin provided a different take on initial training-supervision dualism. For instance, Adam highlighted the need to address the novelty of the environment and the activity through initial training, so that trainees could start taking part in an activity to allow further gains in their PSD. Similar to the effect of team goals explained earlier in this section, initial training of sailing-related skills is needed to start looking beyond the initial differences and ‘boxes’ created by the familiar trainees’ environment. In doing so, skippers can provide more supervision and guidance rather than rigid external control. In this case, initial training on sailing-related skills becomes a means to later development and goes beyond simplistic assumptions of safety, and/or technical competence.

This view, as expressed by Adam, provides an additional insight into the nature of initial training-supervision dualism, and has not previously been expressed either by Hahn or by Dewey. Neither is it noted in existing OAE and sail training literatures. On the contrary, initial training and introductory briefings have been portrayed in the light of physical safety only, which presents too simplistic and one-dimensional perspective (e.g., Aadland et al., 2017; Fletcher & Prince, 2017). Similarly, Marshall (2016) reported sailing-related tasks to be essential elements for trainees’ PSD and ongoing growth during their post-voyage lives, although initial training-supervision dualism and teaching approaches were beyond the scope of Marshall’s (2016) thesis.

In summary, the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD as expressed within the educational philosophies of John Dewey and Kurt Hahn were evident in the current results. Even though skippers’ views were mostly aligned with Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives, skippers offered additional insights in light of their own experiences, the hyperdynamic context of sail training and issues relevant to a modern-day society. The latter point is particularly important in an effort to modernise Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies to more accurately reflect the needs of current society. To illustrate, new insights were particularly prominent within the areas of diversity, the need to take into consideration other staff crew members and the overall effect of human capital on each voyage
(e.g., one’s strengths and weaknesses in technical and/or PSD-related skills). As comparisons between skippers’ beliefs and Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives were being made throughout this section, the interconnected relationships between different skippers’ beliefs as well as among the components of the second part of the theoretical model emerged. That is, each skippers’ belief was aligned with several key educational ideas from Dewey and/or Hahn, illustrating the underlying complexity of both skippers’ beliefs and Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts. Interactions with physical and social environments, the creation of a meaningful community emphasising service, the significance of interpersonal interactions among staff crew members, and initial training-supervision dualism as discussed in this section are only examples of key philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs. Notably, current findings pointed to a separation of physical and social components present within the sail training environment (e.g., physical challenge vs. social challenge or novelty of physical and social environments). This subtle differentiation supports the need to consider more closely the aims of OAE and sail training programmes in light of empirical evidence, dominant theory and philosophical underpinnings. The latter are often scarcely sought within Dewey and/or Hahn’s educational philosophies by OAE scholars (also see Ord & Leather, 2001; Quay, 2013).

7.3.2 Philosophical underpinning to perceived skippers’ roles and practices aimed at promoting young people’s PSD during the sail training experience.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD, it is useful to compare and contrast skippers’ perceived roles and practices as reported and discussed in Chapter 6 with Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives and the second part of the theoretical model used in this thesis. The interconnected nature of beliefs, perceived roles and practices and their entwined philosophical underpinnings became more visible in the proceeding section. The complex layering of relationships revealed in this study make real the following observation from Dewey’s (1938) *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*:

Understanding or interpretation is a matter of the *ordering* of those materials that are ascertained to be facts; that is, determination of their *relations*. In any given subject-matter there exist many relations of many kinds. That particular set of relations which is relevant to the problem in hand has to be determined…. A mechanic, for example, understands the various parts of a machine, say an automobile, when and only when he [sic] knows how the
parts *work together*; it is the way in which they work together that provides the principle of order upon and by which they are related to one another. The conception of “working together” involves the conception of consequences: the *significance* of things resides in the consequences they produce when they interact with other specified things. (p. 511)

This section, therefore, will address the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ perceived roles and practices, reported and discussed in Chapter 6, as a further layer affecting the relationships between the components discussed in the preceding section. Practices promoting PSD as conceptualised in light of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies but not as yet discussed in great depth are the main focus of this section. These are: direct and indirect approaches to teaching; and adaptability and flexibility to meet individual and voyage needs. Contextual factors (i.e., trainees, staff crew members, dynamic conditions and group-specific purpose of each voyage; see Chapter 6 Figure 6.5) also have a subtle influence on the identified elements, the perceived priority of each element and the relationships among the elements as explained in Chapter 6. These identified contextual factors have some effect on direct and indirect skippers’ approaches to teaching and their flexibility and ability to meet individual learners’ and overall voyages needs which form basis for this section. This approach was chosen to minimise the complications arising from the vast range of perceived roles and practices identified in Chapter 6, and to further address the overlapping meanings that emerged during the inductive and deductive data analyses.

**Direct and indirect approaches to teaching.** While this chapter offered additional insights into how skippers conceptualised direct and indirect approaches to teaching, a distinction between tasks aimed at physical skills and tasks targeting PSD-related skills became apparent (see Section 7.2 and Appendix G). The majority of skippers explained that a direct teaching approach was related to teaching sailing-related skills, which echoes the previously explained notion of initial training as advocated by Hahn, and as required by the nature of the sail training environment (see Section 7.2.3).

A few skippers noted using a direct teaching approach to address trainees’ PSD too. For example, Felix particularly emphasised the need to talk about different ways of coping and addressing trainees’ social skills while George explained the need to address young people’s negative behaviours and consequences those behaviours may have on others. This would help to raise trainees’ self-awareness and address
trainees’ weaknesses within the area of PSD. Direct teaching of PSD-related skills is implicitly evident within Hahnian educational philosophy where, for example, one can see the reference to teaching coping skills and dealing with adversity within Stewart and McCann’s (1968) writings on Kurt Hahn or within the Seven Laws of Salem (also see Chapter 3; Schule Schloss Salem, n.d.). But neither Dewey nor Hahn were very clear and explicit in distinguishing direct teaching of physical skills from direct teaching of PSD-related skills. Therefore, neither criticism nor strong links between using direct teaching to address young people’s PSD and Dewey and Hahn’s educational principles can be made. What does become clearer though is the subtle differences and relationships between educative, miseducative and directionless experiences, socially structured activities and an indirect approach to teaching, all of which were briefly discussed in Chapter 3 (see Simpson, 2011).

Further, Dewey emphasised the need for educator’s guidance and mentoring, so that curriculum learning rather than engaging with directionless activities or reinforcing bad habits would occur (Breunig, 2017; Dewey, 1938/1998). Simpson (2011) explained this principle in terms of socially structured activities where educative experience was the key. But the danger here is to equate socially structured educative experiences with indirect, unguided teaching which happens to take place within socially structured activities. Or, with over-reliance on the interactions with physical and social environments which were evident within Liam and Emma’s comments (see Section 7.2.9 and Appendix G). This was particularly emphasised by Dewey in the following quote: “Lack of mutual adaptation made the process of teaching and learning accidental. Those to whom the provided conditions were suitable managed to learn. Others got on as best they could” (pp. 44-45).

This point was raised in preceding chapters (see Chapters 3 and 6) as OAE and sail training literatures frequently rely on assumed interactions with physical and social environments to benefit young people’s PSD and therefore, Dewey’s principle of continuity is often taken for granted. McKenzie (2000), Priest and Gass (2005) and later Ewert and Sibthorp (2014) explained that a group has a social function within OAE programmes because a group setting can be used to address social skills (e.g., communication or co-operation). Similarly, diversity in socio-economic background among young people is often an assumed requirement within existing literature (e.g., Beames, 2004a; 2004b; Deane & Harré, 2014; Takano, 2010), indicating an indirect, unguided approach to teaching rather than explaining why or how diversity could be used to promote young people’s PSD. As such, there is a fine
line between promoting PSD through physical tasks directly addressing PSD, and hoping that PSD will accidently occur as a by-product of natural, unfamiliar and challenging environments. The latter point is in line with James's (1980) critique of the “mountains speak for themselves” (para 1) OAE philosophy introduced in earlier chapters.

Indeed, both physical and social sail training environments are a part of the sail training experience, but the key here is looking at conditions that are the most beneficial to each young person in any given circumstances. As noted by Reuben, Adam, George, Harry, Felix, Ryan and Liam, exposure to people of different ages, beliefs and backgrounds provides an opportunity to enhance young people’s PSD. It also helps to develop consideration for others and promote interactions with social environments which may make their experience transformative (Pring, 2007). Rather than depending on accidental learning, Dewey (1938/1998) emphasised the need for direction and supervision, so that indirect teaching would become guided and structured:

A primary responsibility of educators is that they not only be aware of the general principle of the shaping of actual experience by environing conditions, but that they also recognize in the concrete what surroundings are conductive to having experience that lead to growth. Above all, they should know how to utilize the surroundings, physical and social, that exists so as to extract from them all that they have to contribute to building up experiences that are worth while. (1938/1998, p. 35)

Holly, Felix and Reuben explained their indirect, guided approach to teaching PSD either through utilising naturally occurring situations and social interactions (e.g., meal preparation) or through creating conditions to use certain skills (e.g., conducting unnecessary sail changes to address teamwork and communication skills). Although the sail training experience is perceived as creating a meaningful community in which PSD skills can be learnt and applied, this does not mean that suitable conditions are being created by the environments themselves. Instead, the best conditions are a product of ongoing interpersonal interactions, assessments, adjustments, and re-evaluations, all of which are considered in the following sub-section.

**Flexibility and adaptability to meet individual learners’ and voyage needs.** In order to provide educative experiences and to utilise fully both the physical and the social sail training environments, skippers continually have to observe,
assess, adjust and evaluate persons, conditions and the overall picture. Indeed, one of the skippers’ perceived roles and practices is observation, assessment and adjustment (see Appendices H and I). Collin, Maria, Emma, Ryan, Harry, Thomas, Oliver and John explained that their observations and assessments are essential in understanding who they have aboard, what skillset people bring, and what skippers can anticipate from the overall group and the voyage itself. This, in turn, helps skippers to make initial decisions in terms of how certain people could be approached or what strengths and weaknesses skippers would need to deal with. According to the majority of skippers, continual re-evaluation and adjustments helped them to decide how best to use team-based approaches to PSD, and to what extent trainees are willing to get actively involved with different tasks.

This observation is firmly supported by both Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts. Although Dewey described educational practices in a vague way so that educators could adapt them to meet individual learners’ needs (Hollis, 1997; Thorburn, 2018), he explicitly emphasised the significance of observation as a means to better understand any given circumstances. Dewey explained:

Observations of facts and suggested meanings or ideas arise and develop in correspondence with each other. The more the facts of the case come to light in consequence of being subjected to observation, the clearer the idea, the more definite, as a truism, become the operations of observation and of execution that must be performed in order to resolve the situation. (1938, p. 109)

Hahn also supported the importance of tailoring experiences to meet individual needs which is evident throughout Hogan’s (1968) commentary on adjusting natural challenges so as not to overload young people.

Although reflecting both Hahn and Dewey’s views, skippers once again separated the physical and social elements of the experience, both of which they felt had to be observed, assessed and adapted to suit individual trainees, the overall group and the voyage. Adaptability of physical and social elements and flexibility in undertaking different approaches were particularly clear when talking about the different types of challenges present within a sail training environment. For example, the same challenge can be perceived as too difficult or not difficult enough by two different individuals, implying the further need for skippers to maintain adaptability and flexibility to facilitate effective educative experiences and PSD. Felix gave an example where a young person was challenged in terms of their social behaviour and,
therefore, their PSD goal was to ask for a snack without shouting. It should be noted that although observation was specifically mentioned by Dewey and Hahn, neither of them explicitly highlighted the need to stay flexible and be able to adjust to the social challenge to meet individual needs. Nor has it been emphasised by existing OAE and sail training literatures which focus heavily on physical challenge and the value of perceived risk (e.g., Bell, 2017; Brown & Beames, 2017).

The sail training environment presents young people with both social and physical challenges due to the perceived novelty of a task, environments and people. Overall, all skippers explained that their perceived roles include facilitation of familiarisation, involvement and development of trainees through identifying appropriate levels of challenges, using team-based, direct and indirect approaches to teaching, and being role models within the community modelled aboard (also see Section 7.3.1). According to Todd, Reuben, Holly, Collin, Maria, Emma and John, their roles were also influenced by contextual factors. A similarity between sail training and the outdoor environment used by Hahn and his followers presents an instant connection in terms of weather conditions and immediate living conditions as one of the contextual factors. For instance, George noted the need to balance the challenge of adverse weather conditions with some pleasure. Hogan (1968) – reflecting Hahn’s educational thoughts – shared very similar views:

If one were to expose youngsters for prolonged periods to wet, grime, cold and discomfort and to offer no compensations then one would do nothing to enhance sensitivity, to afford a contrast to what for many was a familiar element in their normal lives. (p. 85)

In addition, a majority of skippers felt strongly about the importance of taking into consideration staff crew members and the overall makeup of the group aboard (also see Chapter 6). Essentially, Collin, Maria, Emma, Ryan, John and Reuben advocated the same principles (i.e., adaptability to meet individual needs and flexibility in taking different approaches) to be applied to staff crew members, volunteers, teachers/group leaders and the voyage itself. These skippers not only advocated the need to develop staff crews in a similar fashion to trainees, but also emphasised the effect the makeup of staff crew members would have on skippers’ perceived roles, practices and overall approach. To recap, Chapter 6 noted that skippers and staff crew members may have similar feelings and may experience similar challenges to young people aboard, influencing skippers’ decisions and potentially affecting young people’s PSD (also see McCulloch, 2016; Vernon &
Seaman, 2012). This point has not been extensively covered in existing OAE and sail training literatures due to over-representation of young people’s views (see previous critique offered in Chapter 4). Neither Dewey nor Hahn highlighted the effect other teaching staff, instructors and co-instructors may have on the overall process of PSD, including the educators’ ability to take these factors into consideration to provide the most educative experience possible.

Dewey summarised in more general terms that the environment and conditions are never completely fixed but can be manipulated to meet individual’s and overall group needs. Essentially, he took the view that conditions can be altered to lead in the direction one needs. When establishing the desired interaction among the present conditions, this “will produce change in the direction that leads to the proposed objective consequence” (1938; p 500). Based on the results of the study reported here, these conditions and interactions consist of physical environmental features, weather conditions, young people (i.e., programme participants), all practitioners and an overall group culture, group dynamics and diversity.

Overall, the multifaceted relationships between skippers’ beliefs, perceived roles and practices and underlying philosophical underpinnings aligned with Dewey and Hahn educational philosophies were further evident within this section. The current results shed light on the process of young people’s PSD and its underlying philosophical underpinnings, and provide more insights into skippers’ approaches to PSD as well as factors affecting their choices. It is apparent that skippers’ perceived roles and practices are greatly affected by the interaction of social factors (e.g., each trainee’s background and ability within the overall group culture aboard) and as a consequence, the ability of skippers to stay flexible and adaptable becomes crucial. That is, the overall process of PSD reflects skippers’ flexibility to utilise different elements and take advantage of different conditions to adapt to each individual and overall group—including staff crew members—on a voyage-by-voyage basis.

This complex process also brings to our attention not only Dewey and Hahn’s ideas on direct and indirect teaching, but also the purposeful separation of using a more direct approach to teaching sailing-related skills compared with indirect, guided or unguided approaches to teaching PSD. This finding yet again highlights the subtle difference between the sailing-skills curriculum (i.e., physical) and the PSD curriculum (i.e., social) evident within sail training programmes. The discussion above indicates that indirect, unguided teaching of PSD appears not to be equivalent to using naturally occurring situations as socially structured activities. Instead, an indirect, guided
approach and careful manipulation of existing conditions is what Dewey perceived as a socially structured educative experiences and referred to as a principle of continuity (also see Fesmire, 2015). In *Experience and Education* Dewey (1938/1998) noted that “attentive care must be devoted to the conditions which give each present experience a worth-while meaning” (p. 51). The combination of both direct and indirect approaches to teaching physical and PSD-related skills echoes Simpson’s (2011) point on the need to strive for the balance between the two approaches. Once again, this highlights the importance of going beyond the simplistic connections often made between OAE and sail training practices and Dewey and/or Hahn’s educational philosophies (e.g., Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010), and developing a deeper understanding of how practice and theory connect.

### 7.3.3 Refined theoretical model based on Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts as applied to sail training/OAE context.

While the results, analysis and discussion presented here support the theoretical contributions of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts on young people’s PSD as conceptualised in Chapter 3 (see Figure 3.1), it became evident during the research process that some refinements and modifications to the developed second part of the theoretical model are needed to reflect the nature of the sail training environment and current practice. Skippers’ beliefs revealed the overlapping meanings of some elements and further illustrated the complex links and the interconnected nature of key components. This finding, together with the need to refine the theoretical model to suit the sail training environment, support Dewey’s (1938) thoughts on the importance of the relationships noted in his *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*:

> This examination consists in nothing what the meaning in question implies in relation to other meanings in the system of which it is a member, the formulated relation constituting a proposition. If such and such a relation of meanings is accepted, then we are committed to such and such other relations of meanings because of their membership in the same system. Through a series of intermediate meanings, a meaning is finally reached which is more clearly relevant to the problem in hand than the originally suggested idea. It indicates operations which can be performed to test its applicability, whereas the original idea is usually too vague to determine crucial operations. In other words, the idea or meaning when developed in discourse directs the activities which, when executed, provide needed evidential material. (pp. 111-112)
Acknowledgement of the fact that the relationships described here are complex and indirect, facilitates a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms of why certain practices work under certain conditions – the point earlier raised by Brookes (2003c).

Therefore, Figure 7.1 illustrates the refined second part of the theoretical model based on the results reported and discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 and in Appendices H and I. The refined model reflects the established links and relationships between skippers' beliefs and their philosophical underpinnings in light of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies (e.g., some components were joined to illustrate the existing dualism in skippers’ beliefs while other components were introduced or renamed to reflect the overlapping meanings identified by skippers). In its revised form, Figure 7.1 aims at reflecting the philosophical underpinnings relating to skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and providing an evidence-based theoretical/practical model which OAE practitioners could use to guide their practice. The refined model also provides a framework of how Dewey’s educational principles could be applied to specific, applied settings while Hahn’s educational practices could be conceptualised into more generalised theoretical guidelines (Quay & Seaman, 2013; Sutcliffe, 2012; Thorburn, 2018).
Figure 7.1. The refined theoretical model capturing key components of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts applied to the sail training context. The points in red represent changes made in light of results of the study while strikethrough points represent the removed points.

7.3.4 Section summary.

This section provided further analysis and discussion of key findings in light of the second part of the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3. Skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD, identified in Chapter 6, were compared with and contrasted to the central ideas of Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies. Overall, each skippers' belief was consonant with several of Dewey's and/or Hahn's ideas which led to further insights into the complex relationships among different components. The data revealed that skippers had additional but subtle meanings to some key Deweyan and Hahnian educational principles. The most notable insight that emerged was a clear separation between physical and social aspects of each component. For example, an unfamiliar natural environment was perceived to consist of the physical environment (i.e., a sail training vessel) and the social environment...
(i.e., unfamiliar people aboard) both of which created a meaningful, realistic community in which physical and social skills could be developed and applied. The links between the components were identified and discussed, leading to a better understanding of the philosophical underpinnings to the process of PSD as conceptualised in Chapter 6. Most of, why and how the central components of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies may work in the context of sail training were explained. These insights allowed for critical refinements to the second part of the theoretical model developed in Chapter 3.

7.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter reported, analysed and discussed the key findings relevant to the second research question. The second part of the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3 (see Figure 3.1) was used to make deductive comparisons between Dewey and Hahn’s key educational ideas and the meanings skippers associated with them. This approach offered in-depth comparisons between ideas central to Deweyan and Hahnian educational philosophies and skippers’ perceptions as to on how such ideas could be applied in the sail training environment, leading to consistent meanings as well as additional insights (i.e., ideas not present in Dewey or Hahn’s philosophies or in some cases, inconsistent with them). Identifying the meanings of each component enabled the establishment of the philosophical underpinnings to both skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and the process of PSD conceptualised in Chapter 6.

The overlapping meanings and multifaceted relationships across key educational ideas from both Dewey and Hahn and skippers’ beliefs provided deeper insights into how Dewey and Hahn’s ideas could be applied in practice. They also offered some insights into what adjustments and why are essential for Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies to work and to more accurately depict practitioners’ working environment. The developed understandings, ideas and the identified relationships among the key components highlighted not only the philosophical underpinnings to skippers’ beliefs and the process of PSD, but also emphasised the key differences. That is, skippers perceived most of Dewey and Hahn’s central ideas in light of physical and social components as well as safety considerations. This, in turn, prompted skippers to engage with the initial training-supervision dualism at different stages of the experience and to highlight the subtle differences between direct and indirect guided/unguided approaches to teaching both sailing-related skills
and PSD.

Further, the evidence suggests that interpersonal relationships among young people, among staff crew members and between staff crew members and young people all have significance. In contrast to Dewey and Hahn’s conceptualisations, skippers note the importance of staff crew members aboard. The evidence from this study illustrates skippers’ ability and flexibility to adjust to individual trainees, staff crew members and the overall group aboard. Altogether, contextual factors, social behaviours and social environment consist of all people aboard a sail training vessel on a voyage-by-voyage basis.

Bearing in mind the unique insights provided by skippers and the overlapping meanings of the components leading to multifunctional relationships among them, adjustments and refinements to the second part of the theoretical model were made (e.g., increasingly challenging activity was combined with experience of success and renamed into social and physical challenges combined with experiences of success throughout each voyage/programme; see Figure 7.1). The refinements reflect the meanings skippers associated with Dewey and Hahn’s key educational thoughts as relevant to the sail training environment. They also reflect the need to take into consideration current affairs, the primary purpose of the programme, and the key differences between Dewey and Hahn’s working environments. Altogether, the refinements build on Ord and Leather’s (2011) point on the need to come back to Dewey and Hahn’s original ideas to “fully understand the outdoor education experience as a lived experience” (p. 13) and to establish philosophical underpinnings to theory and practice.

The next chapter provides overall conclusions and summarises this thesis.
Chapter 8. Overall Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

8.1 Introduction

This thesis aimed at investigating skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD through sail training experience. In doing so, this thesis provides a better understanding of the beliefs, actions and intentions of skippers towards young people’s PSD, the process of OAE experience which facilitates PSD, and the philosophical underpinnings of both beliefs and the process of PSD compared with Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives. This thesis also sought to investigate the practical applications of Dewey’s educational thoughts in a specific environment, while aiming to construct thorough theoretical conceptualisations of Hahnian educational practices, both of which are often reported to underpin the overall process of OAE and sail training experiences (see Chapter 4; also see Priest & Gass, 2005). Teachers’ beliefs literature does not provide an in-depth understanding of beliefs about PSD, or sound philosophical underpinnings for dominant empirical research as a means to gain a deeper way of thinking about beliefs within the broader goals of education. Neither do OAE and sail training literatures provide sound theoretical underpinnings and rigorous explanations for the process of PSD, investigation of the perspectives of OAE practitioners, or thorough links with underpinning philosophy (see Chapters 1 and 3).

Therefore, a multi-literature enquiry was employed to address these gaps. It also allows for developing a further understanding of the practical applications of Dewey’s thoughts in a sail training context while aiming to achieve more theoretical conceptualisations of Hahn’s educational practices.

This thesis sought to answer the following two research questions:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What is the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What are Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to an understanding of young people’s PSD in relation to literature and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience?

This final chapter brings the thesis to a conclusion and provides some reflection on the research process as a whole. The chapter begins with a summary of empirical findings in relation to both research questions by bringing Chapters 6 and 7
together. The limitations of the thesis are then discussed before the focus is shifted to its contributions to knowledge. Implications for future research and recommendations for practice are offered before a final conclusion is presented.

8.2 Empirical Findings

The main empirical findings were summarised, reported and discussed within the respective empirical chapters: the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience (see Chapter 6); and the Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspective (see Chapter 7). It still remains to bring together the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD and Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies as applied to sail training context. In doing so, the focus is placed on the relationships between the identified elements and ideas explained in Chapters 6 and 7 rather than providing simplistic lists of elements (Whetten, 1989).

8.2.1 What is the nature of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD in the context of sail training experience?

This research question consisted of four sub-questions; empirical evidence to address each sub-question is presented below.

What process do young people undergo for their PSD? Skippers identified four key factors—environmental structures and social systems, social behaviours, attainable challenge and essential sailing skills—crucial for the process of young people’s PSD. The complicated and dynamic nature of the relationships among these elements was revealed in light of contextual factors. Essentially, the skipper must decide which elements to prioritise in any given situation to achieve desirable outcomes, and these will vary across different situations and individuals. A better understanding of each element needed for young people’s PSD as well as the complex interactions among them, will enable skippers to better structure the process and to use a combination of direct and indirect approaches. Furthermore, ongoing assessment, monitoring, adjustment and re-assessment are key concepts in establishing what skills and PSD-related behaviours should be targeted on a situation-by-situation basis (i.e., skippers’ intentions). This, in turn, affects the skippers’ perceived roles and the choice of practices they employ, so that the desired outcome can be achieved. It is worth noting that depending on the situation, a skipper can use the same practice to achieve different goals. For instance, teaching how to
hoist the main sail can be used as an exercise in: learning essential sailing skills to be able to take part in an activity; finding an individual role in the team through interaction with the physical environment; taking/following leadership, developing teamwork and communication skills through interacting with the social environment; overcoming a physical challenge to develop a sense of achievement; or being a role model of how to perform the task as well as how to communicate and build respectful relationships with other people. In addition, the skipper can manipulate the difficulty of the task to suit the individual and group needs.

**How do skippers develop their beliefs about young people’s PSD over time?** The results presented in Chapter 6 indicate that skippers' beliefs about young people’s PSD changed over time, particularly in relation to how skippers perceived their individual involvement with young people. As skippers gathered experience, they felt they could relate better and more easily to young people compared with when skippers first started. This was mainly because of exposure to different situations and people who, in turn, helped most skippers to develop their self-efficacy beliefs. Ability to relate to young people also meant better understanding of them, including recognising explanations for some of their behaviours. The developed understanding helped skippers to be more systematic and effective in approaching young people and their PSD while developing self-efficacy beliefs as a social educator, shaping their beliefs about PSD and influencing their understanding of the process of PSD.

**How do skippers perceive their roles and practices facilitating the process of young people’s PSD?** Skippers identified a range of perceived roles which were dominated by managing safety, providing leadership and promoting young people’s PSD. Similarly to the process of PSD itself, the skippers' roles were affected by the ongoing contextual factors, and only through ongoing assessment and prioritising, could a suitable role be chosen on a situational basis. That is, once skippers decided which element of PSD they will address in any given situation, such a decision will influence what role the skippers choose to fulfil. The chosen role, in turn, will influence the practice skippers decide to implement and intentions behind the chosen practice. For example, suppose the skipper decides to be a facilitator of PSD-related behaviours. In order to achieve this, the skipper exploits the immediate social environment to pair up young people with different attitudes to prepare meals for the rest of the crew while providing supervision. That is, the skipper utilises
situational demands and undertakes an indirect approach to teaching PSD-related skills (e.g., understanding other people’s point of view or looking beyond their immediate background). Skipper’s perceived role in the given example is a facilitator and promoter of young people’s PSD. On the other hand, the skipper can engage with more direct leadership to address safety-related concerns or provide an example of how to perform a certain skill (i.e., being a role model of a skill rather than a particular behaviour).

To what extent and how do contextual factors affect skippers’ perceptions on their roles and beliefs within the process of young people’s PSD? Contextual factors—individual young people, staff crew members, the overall group, and dynamic conditions—were shown to have a strong effect on skippers’ beliefs about the process of young people’s PSD, skippers’ perceived roles and practices, and the intentions behind their practices. The importance of contextual factors was especially dominant in activating context-specific beliefs, which highlighted a subtle difference between core and context-specific beliefs. Specifically, skippers hold a set of core beliefs about the process of PSD which are called upon on a case-by-case basis in light of contextual factors. This permits the most specific and relevant beliefs, intentions and practices to be filtered out from an available ‘database’, which also implies that the function of beliefs is multifaceted. In effect, this means that context-specific beliefs and actions are aligned, rather than the alternative explanation that more general core beliefs and specific actions are always inconsistent (cf. Buehl & Beck, 2015; Theriot & Tice, 2009).

8.2.2 What are Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to an understanding about young people’s PSD in relation to the literature and skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD during sail training experience?
This research question comprised two sub-questions; empirical evidence to address each sub-question is presented below.

What are the theoretical contributions of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts on young people’s PSD? Dewey and Hahn’s theoretical contributions to young people’ PSD were established in two parts. First, the critical literature review conducted in Chapter 3 concluded with the development of a theoretical model which summarised the key contributions and ideas of Dewey and Hahn’s educational
thoughts relevant to both young people’s PSD and this thesis. Second, the theoretical model was applied to the empirical part of this thesis and used to deductively analyse skippers’ beliefs and practices. As such, Dewey and Hahn’s contributions were further reflected upon in light of the information on skippers’ beliefs and practices which emerged from the empirical investigation. Combined, a modified and refined conceptual framework (see Chapter 7 Figure 7.1) emerged that allowed for deeper understanding and relevance of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts, which was applied to young people’s PSD during sail training experience. The refined framework takes into consideration additional meanings conceptualised by skippers (e.g., physical and social aspects of challenging activities) and provides different viewpoints on certain practices given the nature of PSD during sail training (e.g., indirect approach to teaching both physical and PSD-related skills and behaviours). This framework, therefore, provides a more nuanced viewpoint on Dewey and Hahn’s theoretical contributions to practice and the relevance of their ideas in relation to targeting young people’s PSD through OAE programmes.

To what extent do Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies underpin skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD? The critical understanding of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD which was developed for RQ1 (see Section 8.2.1) allowed further comparisons to be made with the theoretical framework based on Dewey and Hahn’s contributions to the literature. Despite some inconsistencies and additional viewpoints provided by skippers, it was clear that skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD were mostly consonant with Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts. The most significant additional meanings provided by skippers included a clear separation of physical and social elements of most components, influence of other staff crew members and broader views on diversity, socially structured activities and unfamiliarity of the environments. Essentially, skippers developed philosophical underpinnings of their beliefs and practices similar to those advocated by Dewey and Hahn without any formal training or exposure to these philosophers (only few skippers were familiar, to some extent, with Hahn’s contributions to OAE). Reflecting the refined theoretical model and conceptualisations achieved throughout the research process, skippers offered additional insights into how Dewey and Hahn’s ideas should be revised to reflect both the demands of OAE practice and the needs of current society.
8.3 Limitations

This thesis is not without its limitations, which should be acknowledged to allow for an informed interpretation of the findings. The first point to note is that this study had a small sample size with unbalanced gender representation (i.e., 13 male and 3 female skippers) which may raise questions of accurate representation of the UK sail training skippers' community and whether it provided “enough data to allow the research questions or aims to be thoroughly addressed (Mason 2002)” (Liamputtong, 2013, p. 18). As explained in Chapter 5, saturation point was reached when no new data emerged and therefore, the sample size was deemed to be appropriate to address the aims and research questions of the thesis (also see Fusch & Ness, 2015). Nonetheless, the small sample size could be considered appropriate for the nature of this thesis and the kind of knowledge it sought to develop. For developing an in-depth understanding of beliefs and practice, the appropriate method was identified as semi-structured interviews to allow skippers to express themselves freely. This generated rich qualitative data, the analysis of which would not have been manageable with a bigger sample size because of the extensive labour needed to collect, transcribe and analyse qualitative data without losing its meaning (Liamputtong, 2013).

With regard to the uneven representation of male and female skippers within the sample size, Hunter et al. (2002) reported that just over 90% of captains were male across 81 sail training organisations worldwide. In addition, due to the onerous legal requirements to qualify as a skipper (i.e., yachtmaster qualification; see Royal Yachting Association, 2018) and the limited number of sail training providers operating in the UK, the population of sail training skippers is anecdotally considered to be fairly small. In fact, the same skippers often work across different sail training organisations or have worked for multiple sail training operators throughout their careers. As noted in Chapter 5, the participants of this study had worked for as many as 32 sail training operators combined (i.e., when all the participants and their experiences were taken into account, all current UK sail training operators had been involved in employing one or more of them at some point). Taking into consideration the above factors, participants in this research seem to be representative of actual gender balance within UK sail training skippers’ population as well as in terms of its proportional representation.

An additional shortcoming may be that this thesis used semi-structured interviews which were not supported by observations (i.e., alignment between
identified beliefs and actual practice may not have been robustly investigated; see Chapter 2; Fang, 1996) and did not aim for methodological triangulation (Liamputtong, 2013). Nor did it conduct a larger scale, follow-up empirical study to gain further understanding of emerging data patterns or to establish credibility and transferability of developed conceptualisations within the broader sail training community (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Two points should be kept in mind here. First, the research process was underpinned by social constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology, aiming to better understand the meanings constructed by each skipper in light of teachers’ beliefs literature and Dewey- and Hahn-informed perspectives. Hence, a smaller scale, qualitative research study was deemed to be appropriate to maintain the theoretical, philosophical and practical focus of the thesis. Second, the thesis used theoretical triangulation to strengthen its credibility by employing an inductive data analysis approach based on teachers’ beliefs literature, and a deductive data analysis approach comparing the data with key Dewey and Hahn’s ideas (see Chapters 6 and 7 respectively; see Chapter 5 for more details on methodology). In doing so, key gaps that emerged in the literature review chapters were addressed.

Since this thesis was developed within the specific context of sail training, there may be questions about the transferability of its findings beyond the sail training environment. Nonetheless, detailed and thick descriptions of research context and the overall research process were provided in Chapter 4, while Chapters 6 and 7 reported qualitative findings supported by interview excerpts. Therefore, the specific but naturalistic setting of this thesis allowed for better understanding of contextual factors influencing practitioners’ beliefs, the in-depth understanding of the process of PSD during sail training, some insights into applications of Dewey’s educational thoughts into practice and conceptualisations of Hahn’s educational practices.

Finally, this thesis did not investigate other educational philosophies beyond Dewey and Hahn. Nor did it provide thorough links with other literatures which may be relevant, such as life skills development through sport, practitioners’ professional judgement and decision-making (PJDM), experiential learning or theories of leadership. Although these areas may provide further insights as a result of links and overlaps with the findings presented here, these topics were beyond the scope and practical capacity of this thesis. Besides, identifying the boundaries of this thesis and positioning it within a specific area of interest helped to ensure depth and rigor.

Despite the identified limitations (i.e., small sample size with disproportional male and female representation, a small scale empirical investigation and non-
conventional context of this study), this thesis implemented methods relevant to its aims and the nature of the research questions. Crucially, the implemented methods were informed by ontological position and epistemological assumptions of this thesis, and previous research conducted in related literatures. Furthermore, reflective measures were put in place to enhance the richness of data, provide detailed descriptions where appropriate and to record ongoing personal interpretations and a developing understanding, as a means to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of this research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2015).

8.4 Contributions to Knowledge

The findings that emerged during the research process make several contributions to existing bodies of knowledge. This section highlights and explains theoretical contributions first before reviewing other contributions to knowledge.

8.4.1 Theoretical contributions.

The multi-literature inquiry followed in this thesis facilitated three main theoretical contributions across relevant literatures: a better understanding of some of the underpinning mechanisms of key concepts of beliefs dominating teachers’ beliefs literature; the combination of Dewey and Hahn’s thoughts and their contextualisation to an OAE context; and a better understanding of the theories underpinning the process of PSD and OAE experience.

Teachers’ beliefs literature. Besides the summary noted above and investigation of beliefs about PSD outside formal schooling contexts, this thesis provides evidence that there is a subtle but significant difference between core and context-specific beliefs which will alter practitioners’ actions and intentions behind those actions.

The existing debate that beliefs and practices are not always consistent due to low self-efficacy beliefs or contextual factors preventing a teacher from implementing their beliefs in practice is beyond the scope of this thesis. It is evident, however, that inconsistency is much more complicated than proposed by Fang (1996). Indeed, Buehl and Fives (2012) encouraged scholars to investigate why there may be inconsistency. The empirical results of this thesis presented and discussed in Chapter 6, may contribute to this debate. That is, the perceived inconsistency may be due to the activation of context-specific beliefs which do not necessarily contradict
core beliefs. Instead, contextual factors allow the practitioner to choose which sub-category of the system of their beliefs will be activated to identify the most suitable action and adjust the intentions to suit the individual and group needs. This process is also supported by earlier explained functions of beliefs (see Chapter 2 Figure 2.1) and illustrates the multifaceted relationships between beliefs, their functions and contextual factors. These aspects help to determine which context-specific belief is being activated, for what reason and function (see Figure 8.1). Some of these complex relationships and paths in activating context-specific belief are visually explained in Figure 8.1.
Figure 8.1. Visual representation of the relationship between core beliefs, context-specific beliefs, contextual factors and function of beliefs. Belief x = any context-specific belief which is being activated; Beliefs y, z… = other context-specific beliefs which could be activated; core beliefs = a set of beliefs; contextual factors = young people, staff, group-specific purpose, dynamic conditions. Adapted from Fives and Buehl (2012) and Pratt and Associates (1998/2005).
**Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies.** This thesis developed a theoretical conceptualisation of Dewey and Hahn’s thoughts and educational practice which was further refined as a result of empirical investigation (see Chapter 7 Figure 7.1). Current results allow for going beyond purely theoretical and philosophical links made in the existing literature (e.g., Thorburn, 2018) or simplistic connections made between Hahn’s practice and activities commonly found within OAE programmes (e.g., A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005; McKenzie, 2003). Paradoxically, Dewey stated that one needs “to present the principals [sync] that are the most significant in framing [the] theory” (1938/1998, p. 23); a contribution of this thesis.

As explained earlier in this and preceding chapters, the developed theoretical framework was refined in light of empirical evidence obtained during the research process. The proposed refinements (e.g., distinguishing between physical and social elements and skills or stronger emphasis on interpersonal relationships and staff crew members) move away from simplistic and one-dimensional explanations of the relationships between the elements. Indeed, social environment comprises staff crew members, including a skipper, trainees and any other volunteers or leaders reflecting the complexity of our society and mimicking multifaceted relationships and social interactions among its members. It is obvious that many different relationships will be built within the period of a programme (e.g., between the lead practitioner and other staff members or staff members and young people) which model expectations and act as a catalyst in developing one’s social skills. Within such a mix, not only diversity with respect to socio-economic background but also diversity in terms of beliefs, skills and experiences become a vehicle to provide direct and indirect teaching. Diversity also becomes a means to promote interactions with physical and social environments, all of which are essential to young people’s PSD.

Therefore, this thesis highlighted subtle and unique meanings skippers attributed to some of Dewey and Hahn’s educational ideas. Skippers’ perceptions helped to develop better understanding of the dynamic *relationships* between the key elements identified after reviewing Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts (see Chapter 3) while refining certain components of the theoretical model applied to OAE context (see Figure 8.2).
Figure 8.2. Visual representation of the relationships between the elements of the refined model based on Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts and empirical evidence obtained during the research process. Practices, activity and conditions comprise a number of elements each. On the whole, all three components are mutually inclusive. An overlapping relationship between the three components, therefore, forms philosophical underpinning to the process of PSD.

**OAE and sail training literatures.** The results presented here make theoretical contributions to OAE and sail training literatures in two different ways. First, the thesis provides a more thorough understanding of the process of young people’s PSD compared with the descriptive Walsh and Golins’s (1978) model commonly used within OAE practice (see Sibthorp, 2003). The thesis also provides a new understanding of certain elements needed for an effective OAE experience proposed within other models (e.g., Deane & Harré, 2014; Sibthorp & Jostad, 2014).
These models, however, were often built on Walsh & Golins’s (1978) ideas combined with empirical research reporting the viewpoints of young people and the perceived outcomes of OAE programmes, which were subject to earlier critique. In contrast, this thesis suggests that the process of young people’s PSD is underpinned by three complex relationships. The first relationship is between practitioners’ core and context-specific beliefs about PSD, practices and intentions behind those actions in light of contextual factors. The second relationship is between young people’s interactions with physical and social environments some of which are naturally created through the environment the activity takes place in and the demands of the activity itself. Some interactions, however, are purposefully manipulated and exploited by practitioners to create educative interactions with the environments. And third, the interconnected nature between the essential elements of the process, their function and continually changing significance in light of contextual factors and the need to prioritise short- and long-term goals and potential outcomes. Figure 8.3 visually illustrates the complex relationships between these elements underpinned by skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions, all interacting within contextual factors which affect both skippers’ beliefs and the overall process of PSD. Figure 8.3 is built from the second and third parts of the theoretical model developed and presented in Chapters 3 and 4 respectively.
Figure 8.3. Visual representation of the relationships between: a. the key elements needed for the process of PSD; skippers’ beliefs, actions and intentions; underpinned by b. bearing in mind contextual factors.
In addition, the current study contributes to the theoretical understanding of practitioners’ beliefs within the OAE setting by applying the theory established within teachers’ beliefs literature to the OAE setting and further refining it in light of the results of the study (also see earlier section on other theoretical contributions; see Figures 8.1 and 8.2). This allows us to understand better how and why practitioners have a significant influence on the process of young people’s PSD and the overall OAE experience, as has been often reported in previous studies (see Chapter 4; Bobilya, Kalisch, & Daniel, 2014; White et al., 2016).

Although some of the proposed theoretical modifications may seem obvious to practitioners (e.g., skippers’ role in modelling the community on board through building respectful relationships with other staff members), empirical literature has not addressed these issues nor considered these aspects in detail until now, providing a further contribution of this research study. In using an empirical approach to prompt new ways of thinking about the processes of both PSD and OAE experience, this thesis takes a step towards using existing research to produce cumulative knowledge and use practice to further inform existing research. This, in turn, allows for bridging theory and practice – some of the key issues repeatedly discussed by scholars (e.g., Schijf et al., 2017; Simpson, 2011).

8.4.2 Other contributions.

In addition to theoretical contributions, this thesis also makes several methodological, philosophical and practical contributions to advance current thinking and practice.

*Methodological contributions.* This thesis implemented both inductive and deductive data analyses to address methodological limitations identified in earlier chapters. That is, inductive analysis was conducted to provide deeper insights into skippers’ beliefs as teachers’ beliefs literature is dominated by studies using a deductive approach (see Chapter 2). Deductive analysis, however, was conducted to establish an empirically-based understanding of Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies. This allowed for addressing earlier critique on: purely theoretical links made between Dewey’s thoughts and OAE experiences; and often assumed alignments between Hahn’s practices and the nature of OAE. Combined, insights into philosophical underpinnings currently lacking within purely empirical teachers’ beliefs literature were also offered.
The collection of skippers’ views through semi-structured interviews added a different viewpoint to the OAE and sail training literature which is dominated by studies investigating young people’s perspectives (see Chapter 4). Methodologically, this thesis demonstrated how studies introducing a different standpoint can build from existing evidence to offer comparisons between viewpoints. The thesis goes some way towards fulfilling the need to establish a more balanced viewpoint on the process of PSD and the overall process of OAE experience, where not only outcomes or elements, but also relationships between the elements are better understood. This then contributes to further conceptualisations of process and refinement of existing theory (also see Section 8.4.1) as well as developing cumulative research.

**Philosophical contributions.** In addition to methodological contributions in relation to gaining further insights into Dewey and Hahn’s educational philosophies, this thesis offers deeper understandings of the philosophical foundations underpinning beliefs about young people’s PSD, the process of PSD and broader purposes of OAE and sail training experiences. Hacker (2009) noted that “philosophy is not a quest for knowledge but for understanding” (p. 153). The findings indicate that seeking philosophical underpinnings of skippers’ beliefs about young people’s PSD can provide additional and more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question. Equally, comparing and contrasting skippers’ beliefs with well-established educational philosophies offered further insights into the meanings practitioners made of these educational philosophies and their applications in practice. These comparisons also led to the theoretical contributions discussed in Section 8.4.1 (also see Figure 8.2).

The philosophical contributions of this thesis consist of organising the findings of previous studies in a different manner, expanding upon them to include an empirical point of view (i.e., methodological contributions), and providing a much-needed, philosophy-informed conceptual framework facilitating a deeper understanding of the underpinning intentions of skippers’ practices.

**Practical contributions.** As a consequence of the research process and the informal feedback gathered after conference presentations (see Appendix A), some practical contributions were also identified. First, the conceptual and theoretical frameworks developed and refined during the research process can be used as a tool to guide practitioners’ understanding of how PSD takes place. Particularly, Figure 6.5
(see Chapter 6) offers insights into how the process of PSD takes place within a specific sail training environment, while Figure 7.1 (see Chapter 7) provides practical guidelines on how practitioners influence the process. Both figures and the overall understandings developed during this research process permit practitioners to better understand their own role within the process of young people’s PSD, what practices promote young people’s development, and how to create desirable conditions through various practices and activities. Second, practitioners can take more structured approaches to their practice, bearing in mind dynamic contextual factors. Likewise, practitioners can build on their understanding of their individual role and influence on the overall outcomes of the OAE experience.

8.5 Implications and Future Directions

Based on the findings and contributions of this research study, implications and recommendations for future research and applied practice are presented below.

8.5.1 Implications for future research.

There are at least four directions future research could pursue to provide further understandings of current results and address some of the questions raised in this thesis. In doing so, future research would address four main areas: generalisability of the proposed processes within the sail training community and their transferability into other contexts of OAE; practitioners’ PJDM during the programmes where an activity is used as a tool to promote participants’ PSD and is conducted within dynamic environments (e.g., life skills development through sport); the development of core and context-specific beliefs in light of one’s personal and professional life experiences; and further conceptualisations and applications of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts into specific contexts, helping to investigate the broader educational aims of one’s practice.

First, future research could conduct larger scale empirical investigations employing quantitative or mixed-methods within sail training communities—within and outside the UK—to assess the credibility of the findings and conceptualisations of this study. Not only skippers’ but also other staff members’ perspectives should be sought to provide deeper understanding and balance. As evident throughout interview excerpts with skippers, other staff members often influence a skipper’s approach as well as the overall process and, therefore, they could offer valuable insights to add to skippers’ perspectives.
Once further conceptualisations and understandings are developed within the wider sail training community, future research should focus on the transferability of conceptual models and theories into other OAE environments. This would aid further understanding of the process that underpins PSD within OAE, and would illuminate to what extent the underlying mechanisms of PSD developed throughout this thesis can be further refined. This line of investigation would also help to extend the continually critiqued OAE literature for the lack of understanding of the elements leading to programme outcomes, the relationships between the elements, and the lack of sound theoretical explanations for OAE practice (see Chapter 4; also see Sibthorp, 2010; Stott et al., 2016). Further definition of the processes of PSD—the aim of OAE programmes—could be used not only to build upon current knowledge but also to inform the structure of and practices commonly found within OAE.

A second potential line of enquiry is more related to practitioners’—including skippers’—PJDM. The data gathered in this study revealed that skippers’ beliefs influence their actions, intentions and practices, all of which are shaped by contextual factors (see Chapter 6). That is, skippers continually make decisions on how to approach certain individuals and situations, or when and how to balance out educational and technical aspects of the sail training experience to achieve its key educational goals while maintaining considerations for safety and wellbeing (see Chapter 6 and Appendix F). In light of these findings, as well as existing literatures on PJDM and OAE practitioners’ naturalistic decision-making, future research could investigate practitioners’ PJDM where a technical skill and competence is combined with the underlying educational aims.

One of many cases which the investigation outlined above could pursue, is life skills development through sport literature, where sport is used as a means to develop participants’ life skills or PSD (e.g., Côté, Turmidge, & Evans, 2014). For instance, Lauer and Dieffenbach (2013) noted in their literature review of youth sport coaches’ education that “because too much emphasis is placed on performance coaching and not enough on the role that a coach has in positively developing youth, the potentially positive things that coaches are doing have been overlooked and under studied” (p. 455). Lauer and Dieffenbach (2013) concluded that sports coaches “can directly and indirectly develop youth” (p. 455). This thesis supports Lauer and Dieffenbach’s (2013) conclusion and argues that practitioners— including coaches—need to prioritise which element is more important in a given situation for a given individual, as practitioners are presented with competing demands during such
programmes. Even though Vierimaa, Turnnidge, Bruner and Côté (2017) conducted an initial investigation into coaches’ perceptions on community youth programme through basketball league targeting disadvantaged youth, further research is needed to better understand how the decisions are being made to address competing demands and fulfil the educational goals of the programmes, given dynamic contextual circumstances.

Third, there is some scope to investigate the development of practitioners’ core and context-specific beliefs and their effect on one’s practice. As revealed and discussed in Chapter 6, core and context-specific beliefs are not necessarily inconsistent with each other or the practice being implemented. Instead, context-specific beliefs are activated when specific factors are present and indicate the many different ways in which core beliefs can be adjusted to meet the specific demands and situations the practitioner is presented with. Future research investigating the relationship among practitioners’ beliefs, contextual factors and chosen practices, and the mechanisms underlying this relationship would help us to address the perceived issue of inconsistency between teachers’ beliefs and their practices. During this research process it became apparent that contextual factors have a significant role in influencing the inconsistency between core beliefs and practices, which is, in fact, much more complex and dynamic than initially perceived. Indeed, practitioners’ personal and professional life experiences continually shape the development of both core and context-specific beliefs. Therefore, conducting longitudinal narrative research would aid our understanding of the development of beliefs and their complex relationship with practice in any given circumstances.

Finally, future research should continue to investigate Dewey’s educational thoughts not only through continual theorising, but also by implementing his ideas into applied practice within various settings. In fact, this type of empirical deductive research would aid our understanding of how Dewey’s educational philosophy can be applied into practice, so that more concrete context-specific guidelines can be developed. On the other hand, future research could also provide further insights in terms of the extent to which a general population of practitioners make sense of key Dewey’s ideas compared with theoretical links offered by scholars or scholar-practitioners who are familiar with Dewey’s educational philosophy very well (e.g., Simpson, 2011; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010).

Researchers more interested in Hahn’s educational ideas should consider building on the conceptualisations of Hahn’s practices offered in Chapter 7 (also see
Figure 8.2) as a starting point to engage with both further theorising of Hahn’s practices and making comparisons between Hahn’s educational philosophy and practices commonly found within OAE. This would allow for developing more defined and rigorous educational theory based on Hahn’s thoughts, practices and overall legacy so that deeper links between OAE practices and Hahn’s educational thoughts could be made. In essence, this would also allow for future research to investigate the extent to which the broad claims of OAE are actually underpinned by Hahn’s educational practices. Further conceptualisations of Hahn’s practices are needed to go beyond simplistic statements and ‘regurgitation’ of Hahn’s biography and practices as a way to explain basic links between the current practices and Hahn’s ideas (see Chapter 1; e.g., Hattie et al., 1997; A. J. Martin & Leberman, 2005).

The findings of this study also indicate that sound philosophical underpinnings of beliefs, practices and intentions provide another way of thinking and of understanding the relationships between these elements and how they are built into the broader educational goals of the organisation and the society (Pring, 2004/2006). Therefore, future studies should not be afraid to pursue a philosophical line of enquiry beyond Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts to provide deeper thinking on how the purpose of education could be enhanced to meet the demands of modern society, and what place beliefs have within the aims of education (also see Chapter 3; Fenstermacher, 1978).

8.5.2 Recommendations for applied practice.

Alongside implications for future research, several recommendations for applied practice are offered based on current findings. Recommendations for practitioners, providers and stakeholders are considered.

Practitioners. Regardless of which context the practitioner is working in, they should take into consideration: ability, skill level and personal factors that may inhibit learning of each learner; overall group dynamics, shared goals and the culture created by the group; environmental factors such as a classroom setting or natural setting outdoors; and other staff.

In terms of practices, activities and conditions, educators should seek to exploit physical and social environments first as a tool to promote and enhance young people’s PSD. The physical environment may present physical challenges and opportunities on how to overcome adversity, whereas the social environment may
present challenges on how to communicate with people of different ages and attitudes. Likewise, direct and indirect approaches should be integrated to allow the development of specific skills (i.e., direct) before these skills are implemented and tried out within a meaningful setting created by the social environment (i.e., indirect guided approach). The key here is that educative experiences come about when learners are guided and mentored through their interactions with the environment, rather than as a result of blind reliance on the environment per se. Overall, educators should consider the conceptual models developed throughout this thesis as guidelines for their own practice (e.g., using a combination of direct and indirect approaches to teaching physical and PSD-related skills where an appropriate approach is chosen in light of ongoing assessments, individual needs and environmental factors; see Figures 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3).

Finally, educators are advised to engage not only with ongoing continuous professional development, but also with different professional and life experiences. This will allow educators to expand their educational toolbox, develop awareness of different potential needs and build their ‘database’ of possible situations and methods. This will also help to promote educators’ self-efficacy beliefs. Individual reflections on personal and professional experiences, exposure to a diverse range of clientele and staff members, and peer support often achieved through informal conversations, allow educators to develop their skills, abilities and beliefs. Essentially, educators should spend time understanding themselves and clearly identifying the educational goals and ideals they are trying to achieve through their practice.

**Providers.** Taking into consideration skippers’ perspectives empirically explored in this thesis, providers should aim at helping the educators to address their individual fears and perceived weaknesses in terms of their technical abilities and PSD-related curricula. This would promote a growth culture in the work place and help educators to enhance their self-efficacy beliefs about delivery of a PSD programme. In fact, educators would also be able to further develop and enhance their beliefs about what is the most effective way to promote PSD in any given circumstances. In addition, providing educators with a variety of experiences within the specific context and encouraging the educators to engage with their personal and professional experiences at a deeper level would further enhance educators’ development. Essentially, organisations should follow their own advice and help their
staff and volunteers to develop in the same way that they strive to develop young people.

**Stakeholders and policy-makers.** Based on the results of this thesis, it is evident that different stakeholders and policy-makers should reconsider the demands placed on teachers and educators to deliver the curriculum given the support available. This point is particularly relevant in light of the Personal, Social, Health and Economic education (PSHE) curriculum in England and Wales and Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) in Scotland (Department of Education, 2013; The Scottish Government, 2008). If educators are expected to teach and implement PSD-related topics within their practice as a part of the overall curriculum, they should also be provided with on-going training and opportunities to develop their beliefs about PSD as a part of their complex belief system. Stakeholders should consider to what extent the PSD curriculum is congruent with broader educational goals, how it may be adjusted to fit with overall goals of specific educational establishments, and how the PSD curriculum could or should be further refined within educators’ beliefs about both the broad goals of education and the purpose of young people’s PSD.

One of many ways in which stakeholders and policy-makers could support educators is through closer collaboration with both the providers and educators. Educators need to be supported in the development of their beliefs, practices and intentions in relation to young people’s PSD bearing in mind contextual factors, so that the broader educational goals could be achieved. As educators develop their own professional philosophies over time, familiarisation with different educational philosophies may be a fruitful opportunity to better understand the ideals the educators are trying to convey through their teaching. This does not mean a strict adherence to Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts but rather providing some catalyst to continually develop educators’ system of beliefs and align it with the most suitable underpinning educational philosophy.

**8.5 Final Conclusions**

Despite what is often reported about the nature of teachers’ beliefs (Fives & Buehl, 2012), the need for promoting young people’s PSD (WHO, 2018) and the broader aims of education (Dewey, 1916; Hahn, 1947), the sparse nature and lack of diversity of the research conducted in these areas to date are somewhat troubling. Coupled with the gaps identified during this research process, this thesis aimed at
developing theory while enhancing current practice, so that cumulative knowledge could be built. Indeed, one of the most noteworthy issues to consider is that “theory without practice is for geniuses, practice without theory is for fools and rogues, but for the majority of educators the intimate and unbreakable union of both is necessary” (Langeveld, 1979 as cited in van Manen, 1996, p. 45).

This thesis offered several contributions to existing knowledge, current practice and policy. The key principles and theoretical concepts of the nature of beliefs (Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005; Taylor, 2006; 2011) and young people’s PSD through OAE (Deane & Harré, 2014; Sibthorp & Jostad, 2014) were used as a guide to explore skippers’ beliefs, so that a better understanding of beliefs about young people’s PSD could be achieved. The developed understanding then allowed for: clarifying key Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts; better understanding of philosophical underpinnings of skippers’ beliefs; and raising questions about applications of Dewey and Hahn’s educational thoughts in OAE contexts. While we may not be able to explain all possible relationships among different elements that emerged during the research process, we are able to identify general patterns to explain the overall process of PSD and to develop more practical and applied ways of thinking. This, in turn, allows for developing a better understanding of practitioners’ beliefs about PSD, actions and intentions—all of which have been previously recognised within formal settings (e.g., Pratt & Associates, 1998/2005). There also is considerable scope to conceptualise common practices lacking sound theoretical and philosophical underpinnings that help us to refine existing theories and models.

Overall, the emergent understanding and developed knowledge helped to facilitate meaningful links between existing relevant theories and current practice which should also be reflected within continuous professional and personal development of educators as well as PSD-related curriculum. Morrison and van der Werf (2012) summarised that “practice cannot be blind to theory, and theory cannot be blind to practice” (p. 400). That twofold view underpinned this thesis.
References


Brown, M., & Fraser, D. (2009). Re-evaluating risk and exploring educational
alternatives. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning, 9*, 61-77. doi:10.1080/14729670902789529


*Chiu, C.-W. (2012). An exploration of the potential changes to intercultural
competence-related awareness and the attitudes of the sail training international trainees during the tall ships races 2012. (Unpublished master’s thesis). The University of Edinburgh, UK.


course upon reported self-concepts of selected participants. (Doctoral thesis, University of Oregon, Eugene, USA).


Fraser, K.K. (2017a). Positive youth development through sail training: How do skippers make it work? Department of Kinesiology, The Pennsylvania State University, USA.

Fraser, K. K. (2017b). Positive youth development through sport: Experiential learning for coaches 5 slides in 5 minutes. *Oral presentation at the British Psychological Society (BPS) Division of Sport and Exercise Annual Conference 2017, Glasgow, UK.*

Fraser, K.K. (2017c). Skippers’ beliefs about social development: Four elements that make it work on MY vessel. *Invited speaker at Ocean Youth Trust North Annual Training Day, 2017, North Shields, UK.*

Fraser, K.K. (2017d). Skippers’ beliefs about social development: Four elements that make it work on MY vessel. *Invited speaker at The UK Sail Training Annual Conference 2017, Southampton, UK.*

*Fraser, K., Richards, H., & Allison, P. (2016). Sailing across the North Sea: The


*Grinkevičiūtė, K. K. (2012). *The development of interpersonal trust and team*
cohesion in a newly formed group of adults during a seven-day sail training programme. (Master’s thesis). The University of Edinburgh, UK.


Hahn, K. (1960, July 20th). Outward Bound [PDF document]. Address by Dr. Kurt
Accessed on 19/07/2017.


*Hunter, J. A., Hayhurst, J., Kafka, S., Boyes, M., Ruffman, T., O’Brien, K., &


holistic and creative approach to programme design. Aldershot: Gower.


York: Continuum.


Accessed on 01/04/2019


examination of wilderness first aid knowledge, self-efficacy, and skill retention. *Wilderness & Environmental Medicine, 23*, 281-287.


● Articles used as a starting set for conducting a more focused review of educators’ beliefs literature reported in Chapter 2.

†Empirical studies that investigated OAE practitioners’ beliefs systematically reviewed in Chapter 2.

*Articles used for a systematic sail training literature review reported in Chapter 4.
Appendix A
Dissemination of Knowledge

This appendix lists knowledge exchange opportunities during which knowledge obtained during this research process was disseminated with broader audiences (e.g., conference presentations).

Conference presentations on the process of young people’s PSD conceptualised during the research process:


Fraser, K.K. (2017). Skippers’ beliefs about social development: Four elements that make it work on MY vessel. *Invited speaker at The UK Sail Training Annual Conference 2017, Southampton, UK.*

Formal and informal feedback gathered after the presentations:

*Figure A.1. Feedback after an invited presentation at Ocean Youth Trust North Annual Training Day, 2017, North Shields, UK.*
Figure A.2. Feedback after an invited presentation at the UK Sail Training Annual Conference 2017, Southampton, UK.
Guest presentation of the overall research process focusing on the process of young people’s PSD conceptualised during the research process:


Presentation to PGR students and staff on the developing research idea (lunch-time seminars):


Abstract-based conference presentations on ideas inspired by the research process:

Appendix B

Research Ethics

This appendix consists of study information sheet, informed consent form, e-mail template sent out to all sail training operators in the UK and a follow-up email sent to potential skipper-participants.

Information sheet:

**INFORMATION SHEET**

**Skippers’ beliefs and values on social development during sail training**

*What is this study about and why is it important?*

This study aims at better understanding how skipper’s beliefs and values about sail training and young people’s social development guide their work during a voyage. I am especially interested in what behaviours and character features skippers value on board and how they appreciate them. Moreover, I am interested what experiences and events have influenced skippers to develop such beliefs and values about social development during sail training.

Understanding how skippers influence trainees’ development will help to enhance the overall quality of sail training experience. Importantly, it will give more insights into other roles and responsibilities skippers have beyond being in charge of a vessel.

*What will I be expected to do?*

You will be asked to take part in a face-to-face interview which will take approximately one hour. The interview questions will be sent out to you a few days before the interview for you to review. I will record the interview on an audio device for later analysis.

*What will happen to the information collected?*

The information provided will be treated confidentially and only I and my supervisors will know who said what. Pseudonyms will be assigned and no one will be able to identify you. This will ensure data analysis is confidential and anonymous. All information obtained will be securely stored on my password-protected laptop.
All information will be transcribed, analysed, written up, and then used for my Ph.D. thesis. The work may also be submitted for journal publication, conference presentations, news articles, and/or short reports for sail training operators or organisations such as Sail Training International.

**Do I need to take part?**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish to withdraw you can do so without needing to provide a reason.

**Are there any potential risks?**

There are no potential risks as a result of taking part in this study. This research project has been approved by Ethics Committee, Moray House School of Education, The University of Edinburgh.

**For further information**

I am happy to answer any other questions you might have before or after this study. You can contact me at kotryna.fraser@ed.ac.uk if any further information or clarity is needed. Alternatively, you can contact my supervisors Dr Pete Allison at peter.allison@ed.ac.uk or Dr Malcolm Thorburn at Malcolm.thorburn@ed.ac.uk.

*Thank you for considering participating.*
Informed consent form:

Skippers’ beliefs and values on social development during sail training

**PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Researcher’s Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supervisors’ Name</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kotryna K. Fraser</td>
<td>Dr Pete Allison and Dr Malcolm Thorburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Kotryna.fraser@ed.ac.uk">Kotryna.fraser@ed.ac.uk</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Peter.allison@ed.ac.uk">Peter.allison@ed.ac.uk</a>; <a href="mailto:Malcolm.thorburn@ed.ac.uk">Malcolm.thorburn@ed.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I acknowledge I have read and understood the above instructions regarding my participation in this study.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the study.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been made fully aware of the potential risks associated with this research and am satisfied with the information provided.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to be audio-recorded during the interview.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time and without having to give a reason for withdrawing.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information will be securely stored for a period of 5 years before being destroyed.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that in any presentation of research findings, participant’s contribution will be kept anonymous.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that interview recording and transcripts will be kept securely and confidential and only the researcher and the supervisors will have access to it.</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree to take part in this study. ☐ Yes ☐ No

I am willing to take part in a follow up study where the researcher will observe one of my voyages. ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name in Block Capitals

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Date

______________________________

Researcher’s Signature

______________________________

Date

______________________________
Dear <<PERSONAL NAME>>,

I hope this email finds you well in a busy time of refit before the sails back go up in the spring.

My name is Kotryna Fraser and I am a Ph.D. student at the University of Edinburgh. I am writing to invite INSERTS NAME to take part in a research study which analyses how skippers’ beliefs and values about sail training and youth development guide their work during a voyage.

There is anecdotal evidence that the experience trainees have are very much dependent on how a vessel is run by the staff members. It is believed that skippers contribute considerably to the quality of trainees experiences. However, little specific details are known. With this in mind, this study will focus on skippers’ beliefs and values and how these impact on trainees’ social development (see Study Information Sheet attached).

As such, I would like to invite skippers that had worked for <<Name of Trust>> in the past and all current skippers to consider taking part in this research study. All interested skippers will be asked to take part in one interview during which I will ask them to think about their development as skippers, how they normally run a voyage, and how they cope with different situations during a voyage. It is anticipated that the interview will take place face-to-face between January and April at the location convenient for both a skipper and a researcher. If impossible to arrange a face-to-face interview, Skype or phone interview will be arranged as an alternative.

All interested skippers are encouraged to contact me directly via email (kotryna.fraser@ed.ac.uk), so that further steps could be taken to arrange a possible interview before the sailing seasons starts.

I would like you to consider that The University of Edinburgh has a good track record of high-quality research into sail training experience. A number of research projects from The University of Edinburgh have contributed to better understanding what positive outcomes are achieved through sail training by looking at trainees’ experiences on board, cross-cultural education during tall ship races or development of trust and team cohesion on Class C vessels. In view of potential benefits such as reflecting back on skippers’ own learning experience accruing from this study I hope you will support this research project.

Thank you for your time in advance. Do not hesitate to contact me or my supervisors Pete Allison (peter.allison@ed.ac.uk) and Malcolm Thorburn (Malcolm.thorburn@ed.ac.uk) if you require any further information. I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours Sincerely,

Kotryna K. Fraser
Template follow-up email sent to potential skippers-participants:

Dear <<NAME>>,

Thank you for expressing an interest in my research study. Before we move on and arrange an interview, can you reply to this email by answering the following three questions? I need this information in order to get a better picture of skippers’ community.

1. How long have you been a skipper?
2. What sail training organisation do you currently work for/most recently worked for?
3. What class ship do you currently work on/most recently worked on?

Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to meeting in near future.

Kind regards,

Kotryna
Appendix C

Sail Training Operators in the UK

The following sail training operators were approached and invited to take part in this study as advertised on UK Sail Training (2008) website (see Table C.1). Figure C.1 visually illustrates geographical locations of the sail training operators listed in Table C.1.

Table C.1

The UK Sail Training Providers Approached to Take Part in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sail Training Provider</th>
<th>Number of Vessels</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Offshore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Under Sail (Pelican)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Zero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Humberside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Cadet Force</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauntsey’s School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Sailing Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Sail Trust Limited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen MacArthur Cancer Trust</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Largs; Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordonstoun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwennili Trust</td>
<td>Charter as required</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Sailing Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila Sailing Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Brig Sailing Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Society and Sea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe Sailing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Star Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Youth Trust North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Youth Trust Scotland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sail Training Provider</td>
<td>Number of Vessels</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Youth Trust South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Sailing Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sarisbury Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea-Change Sailing Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Ships Youth Trust</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Portsmouth, Whitehaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cirdan Sailing Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bradwell-on-Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pioneer Sailing Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brightlingsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swan Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shetland Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Sailing Foundation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brixham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKSA</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westward Quest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The list has been adapted from UK Sail Training (2008; 2015).

*Figure C.1.* A visual representation of the UK sail training operators. Adapted from UK Sail Training (2008).
Appendix D

Materials Used for Data Collection

This appendix comprises data collection materials used to obtain empirical data of this thesis: interview schedule; fact sheet; and researcher’s reflective diary. Only one follow-up question was deleted after pilot interview which is highlighted in grey. The interview schedule was reformatted into a simpler version to use in the field which consisted of lead and follow-up questions only.
### Table D.1

**Post-Pilot Interview Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Question</th>
<th>Follow up Questions/Prompts</th>
<th>Area of investigation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you come to sailing?</td>
<td>- How did you become interested in sailing?</td>
<td>Motivation to undertake activity (ability; social utility; social influences; effort; persistence; professional development)</td>
<td>Richardson &amp; Watt, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any experience with sail training working for specific operators? For how long and in what capacity?</td>
<td>- Why did you decide to join sail training and engage in youth development? What is your motivation in doing sail training (Intrinsic; extrinsic; altruistic)? - Was there a specific event that influenced your decision? - To what extend do you value youth development?</td>
<td>Motivation to work with young people (personal experience; shape future of young people; enhance social equality)</td>
<td>Richardson &amp; Watt, 2014; van Uden, Ritzen &amp; Pieters, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your beliefs and values about sail training in general.</td>
<td>- What is the main focus of sail training? - What qualities do you think are developed during sail training experience? What qualities are needed for successful involvement in sail training? - Do the developed qualities you have just mentioned change with respect to different situations, voyages, trainees or staff on board?</td>
<td>Aims and outcomes of sail training</td>
<td>Compare against research outcomes (Allison et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2005; McCulloch, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situated versus generalised beliefs</td>
<td>Fives &amp; Buehl, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Question</td>
<td>Follow up Questions/Prompts</td>
<td>Area of investigation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe a typical process of youth development on board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                      | - Why do you think so? Can you give me some examples please?  
|                                                      | - How typical is it? To what extend your described process is typical to all groups of trainees?  
|                                                      | - How is it different from group to group or person to person? Can you provide specific examples please?  
|                                                      | - Overall, what groups of trainees do you have experience working with? (Boarding school; disadvantaged; age range; disability, etc.)                                                                                                           | Understanding and witnessed process of youth development during sail training.                      | n/a; some bit and bops that can be related to Hayhurst et al., 2013; Sibthorp, Paisley & Gockin, 2007; Hill, 2010                                                                                                                                                      |
| How important do you think social skills are?      |
|                                                      | - Why do you think so? How do you understand and describe ‘social skills’?  
|                                                      | - What social skills are emphasised by the trust/organisation you currently work for? To what extend do you agree with them?  
<p>|                                                      | - Sail Training operators and Governing Bodies such as ASTO and STI emphasise the development of social skills, especially leadership, mutual trust, teamwork, and self-confidence as a result of sail training. To what extend do you agree, follow and actually notice such a development in your own practice? Can you give me an example please? | Alignment with organisational values; workplace influences                                          | Jones &amp; Lavallee, 2009; Durrant, 2005; Scales et al., 2000; Hill, 2010; Fang, 1996; Taylor &amp; Caldarelli, 2004; Five &amp; Buehl, 2008; Buehl &amp; Five, 2009; Five &amp; Buehl, 2012.                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Question</th>
<th>Follow up Questions/Prompts</th>
<th>Area of investigation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is your role on board during sail training activities?                  | - To what extend do you think that developing trainees' social skills is a part of your role on board? Why?  
- Do you think that your role is fixed or does it change? Can you give me an example please?  
- To what extend does your role change with respect to the group, personalities within the group or even other staff members on board?  *  | Perceived role; Anecdotal evidence; hierarchy and power relationship;                                                                                          | Collins & Collins, 2012; Fox, 1983; McCulloch, 2004;                                  |
| To what extend do you emphasise these social skills or personal qualities during a voyage and why? | - How do you do so? Can you give me a specific example please? To what extend do these practices change from situation to situation, from one group of trainees to the other?  *  
- How do you decide which practice you are going to use and when?  
- To what extend are you able to emphasise your beliefs about social development when on board?  - To what extend your practices are consistent with your beliefs? What influences that? Why things you do or say sometimes are inconsistent with what you actually believe in? | Situated versus generalized beliefs                                                        | Fives & Buehl, 2012;                                                                 |
<p>| Where does your knowledge on how to work with young                           | - How do you decide how you’re going to approach certain individuals or certain problems?                                                                         | Sources of teacher’s knowledge (Pedagogical; didactic; epistemological knowledge).      | Fives &amp; Buehl, 2008; Buehl &amp; Five, 2009;                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Question</th>
<th>Follow up Questions/Prompts</th>
<th>Area of investigation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>people during sail training come from?</td>
<td>- To what extent this knowledge comes from your own experiences and background?</td>
<td>“Wisdom of practice itself”</td>
<td>Shulman, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent do you think you convey your beliefs during each voyage? How do you do that?</td>
<td>Relationship between beliefs &amp; practices</td>
<td>Fives &amp; Gill, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent are you cautious about your interpersonal behaviour with trainees and other staff members on board? What behaviour do you normally show on board? Why?</td>
<td>“Perceived interpersonal teacher behaviour is the most important predictor of student engagement.”</td>
<td>Van Uden et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What events throughout your life influenced your current beliefs about trainees' social development?</td>
<td>While at school</td>
<td>Factors affecting teachers' beliefs; How teachers' beliefs are developed through life; Sources on teachers' beliefs</td>
<td>Hill, 2010; Fang, 1996; Taylor &amp; Caldarelli, 2004; Five &amp; Buehl, 2008; Buehl &amp; Five, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal life experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When in higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace/in house training/hands on experience at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extend have your beliefs and values on social development changed throughout your experience?</td>
<td>- What specific events influenced this change?</td>
<td>Stability over time;</td>
<td>Fives &amp; Buehl, 2012; Levin et al., 2013; Buehl &amp; Fives, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extend your engagement with young people and your own experiences during sail training have changed over the years? How would you draw it?</td>
<td>Own engagement over years (generational gap?)</td>
<td>Day &amp; Gu, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident and clear are you about your beliefs about social development?</td>
<td>- How often do you reflect back on your experiences on board?</td>
<td>Reflecting on own beliefs and values and how they interact with pedagogical practices.</td>
<td>Hill, 2010; Buehl &amp; Fives, 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do you find it beneficial to reflect on your experiences, beliefs and values through engaging into a dialogue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Question</td>
<td>Follow up Questions/Prompts</td>
<td>Area of investigation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to add anything else?</td>
<td>- To what extend discussion like this with other skippers would benefit your own professional development?</td>
<td>Opportunity to add comments, feedback and insights not covered by the researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Grey area indicates questions that were removed after pilot interviews.
Table D.2

*Template Fact Sheet used after Each Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How old are you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your origins?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been a fully qualified skipper?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been working in sail training context?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been working in sail training as a fully qualified skipper?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many sail training voyages have you approx. undertaken as a skipper (for how many years)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sail training operators have you worked for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What groups of trainees do you currently work with/have experience in working with? (e.g., age groups; disabled; cancer survivors; school curriculum; young offenders; seaman training; sea cadets, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was the last voyage you did as a skipper?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What class ships do you normally sail on/have experience/have recently commanded on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your educational background?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exemplar entry from the reflective diary:

**Date**

23/02/2016

Entry Date – 23/02/16

**Event**

11th Interview with Harry [pseudonym] at [location]

**What happened?**

I interviewed 3 people today and met with [name], so I will try to describe and reflect on each individual in turn.

**Reflection**

*Harry – Participant 11*

Harry did not receive lead questions for some reason and we spoke for 1.5 hours recorded plus a little chatter afterword.

Harry talked a lot without being prompt and brought some notes with him, even though he didn’t receive the lead questions (!!). It felt that he was covering a few questions at the same time while trying to answer another questions, so I will need to put all the pieces together at some point.

It is worth mentioning that he is a Trustee and an accountant (when he was younger; now in his mid60’s). Some questions he found very hard and took some time to think about them. Some pauses were made (which is fine), staring away and saying “I don’t really know how I do that”. He presented an interesting point of view which confidence and team work/teambuilding being the major points. Harry also spoke a lot about people from different backgrounds, making friends, learning about other backgrounds that you wouldn’t normally learn about; experiences with disabled people and learning about them through sail training; and talking to other skippers to share experiences but mainly to expand the social circle. Interestingly, Harry is only one participant (to date) who mentioned the importance of having both genders on board as they spot different things that are equally important.

He asked me at the end how much of sail training I have been doing and where about. Once he learnt that I am not doing sail training, he was actually happy that I am not biased or prejudiced about sail training from my own experience of doing it (or not doing it in this case).

While talking to Harry, random thoughts about PJDM kept popping into my mind. I kept thinking about Amanda and her research and for some reason I think I have some materials to look at skippers’ PJDM as they are very much about managing other people on board.

I really like Harry’s line that a skipper’s role is to be observant, not to do any hard work but stand with hands in the pockets while managing the crew on how to do that. So far Harry is only one who said he would push a mate towards his weak side little bit more to develop it.
Quite random thoughts but I feel too tired to think harder as it was my third interview. Even though it is a good practice before I go to [location] to interview 3 skippers in one day, I found it hard focusing on what he was saying.
Appendix E
Member-Checking Exercise

This appendix illustrates member-checking exercises which was conducted to enhance trustworthiness of this study and aid the accuracy of the developing meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maxwell, 1992). As explained in Chapter 5, one-page interview summary was produced and sent to each participant to check for understanding. Three participants provided further insights or clarifications. While the below summary provides an example of a one-page summary, it also illustrates corrections made by Liam that are highlighted in grey.

One-page member checking summary:

Purpose of Sail Training: For you this meant showing to young people that there is more to life than they think or see; creating a community; teaching about the society; promoting personal development; giving something to be proud of; helping them to expand their horizons and giving new experiences; and building confidence.

Quotes: “I don’t think there is one [purpose]; there are lots of them”, “gives people experiences that they have never had before”

Qualities developed during sail training: For you this meant very individual person-tailored qualities that might seem to be small and insignificant for one but a major achievement for others. Overall, trainees develop resilience and grit; coping with discomfort; reflect on where they are in life; live and work with other people; teamwork; dealing with new experiences and being out of comfort zone; ability to get on with other people; respect and responsibility for each other; and sense of identity and belonging.

Quotes: “it challenges people”, “people have to learn resilience, dig deep sometimes”, “get on with people”

Process of Sail Training and Young People’s Social Development: For you this meant not going very far on the first day if possible but making sure that the trainees get familiar with a boat and with each other. Then you would observe, monitor and assess the trainees to figure out who is who (in terms of character and abilities), and help them to build confidence in being on the boat and competence in conducting tasks. Once you sort out safety, you then would go to sea for a passage which is often hard and challenging, and making the crew quite nervous -- delete this part, I don’t really want them to be nervous -- just challenged. . Once you got as far as you were going to in that particular voyage, you spend a few days sailing around that area (not hard sailing). This makes the crew more relaxed, they start developing crew identity, learning about each other, making friends, and becoming the part on the boat. You thought that through sharing challenging experiences the crew comes together and learns about each other quicker. You then take the crew back to the sea again which they found nervous and challenging at the beginning. But because of shared challenges, working as a team well, developed confidence and competence, and learning about each other the same passage suddenly because manageable, pleasant and successful. You would always try to make sure that the passage back is successful although you may need to make some adjustments to make it happen. For you the process also meant modelling a community in which trainees are equal and where social interactions may become extreme quickly. This community matters to the trainees, which, in turn, helps them to re-engage, pushes the trainees out of their comfort zone, helps to learn and grow in themselves, and come back into society outside sail training a bit more.

Quotes: “I always try to arrange it so that their voyage back is a success”, “you’re all equal”,

Skippers’ Role and Practices on Board: For you this meant ensuring safety and welfare; managing the boat and people; teaching and instructing; looking after the overall planning and decision making; supporting others; providing positive experiences; developing staff crew; teaching and instructing; and overseeing everything and everyone. You also thought that developing interpersonal skills is a part of your role where you involve trainees into running the ship; spend time talking to people; teach interpersonal skills through teaching hard skills (cooking vs. cooking for other people and taking into consideration what they like); ask (reflective) questions; and use natural situations and sailing context to expand their horizons and enhance learning indirectly. You pay attention to details and listening to people. You thought that safety, management and welfare are fixed elements of your role; however, you read the situation, assess the trainees, gather information from staff, monitor whether the plan works and make necessary adjustments to adapt the approaches to suit the situation and the trip.

Quotes: “people are different and you respond to them differently”, “monitoring and making sure that it works”

Sources of Knowledge on How to Work with Young People: You thought your knowledge came from prior experience in social care; experience in sail training; experience working with people in general; experience working with trainees from different backgrounds; observing and sailing under different skippers; making mistakes and reflecting back on them; being self-aware and self-critical; understanding people; and watching your kids to grow up.

Quotes: “the more experience you have the better”, “people who taught me to sail train”

Your Beliefs about Young People’s Social Development: Your beliefs have changed as you’ve become more understanding and empathetic although your philosophy is to nurture as well as to take firm approach when needed.

Quotes: “As I gain experience, I constantly develop a better understanding of where people are coming from and the issues they face”
Appendix F

The Summary Tables of Inductive Thematic Analysis Conducted for Chapter 6

This appendix consists of four summary tables of the inductive thematic analysis reported in Chapter 6. Each table presents one overarching theme (e.g., Table F.1 summarises skippers’ beliefs about PSD) under which the initial coding was conducted and the mid-order theme (e.g., social behaviours) which was formed using inductive initial coding (see Chapter 5; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Patton, 2002). Initial coding is represented in the thematic tables as the exemplar quotes (e.g., Holly: “What we do is routine. I think we need to be predictable”). These were used to form raw data codes (e.g., following ship’s routine) which were later merged to form a lower-order theme (e.g., teamwork and cohesion).
Table F.1

Summary of Inductive Thematic Analysis of Skippers’ Beliefs about the Process of Young People’s PSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Mid-Order Theme (n)</th>
<th>Lower-Order Theme (n)</th>
<th>Raw Data Code (n)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skippers’ beliefs about the process of PSD</td>
<td>Environmental structures &amp; social systems (16)</td>
<td>Physical space &amp; situational demands (14)</td>
<td>By-product of environment (5)</td>
<td>Collin: “Using a boat as a platform or tool to develop them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take away from home environment (13)</td>
<td>Mobile phone policies (5)</td>
<td>Holly: “We take their phones off them for the majority of the time.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modelling a functional community (10)</td>
<td>From home life (5)</td>
<td>Emma: “You didn’t really talk about what happens at home, you just talked about what happens on the boat.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfamiliar environment, people &amp; activity affecting initial level of skills (9)</td>
<td>Address habits (3)</td>
<td>Harry: “It shakes them out of their normal routine and makes them think about stuff.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical entity or boundary (6)</td>
<td>No previous familiarity among trainees (7)</td>
<td>Emma: “It’s the sense of community on the vessel that I like the most.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment with new social skills (1)</td>
<td>George: “Often they don’t know the other people.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules that make sense (3)</td>
<td>Felix: “OK, well, we’re not at home… How about you deal with this like this and see what happens?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety aspects (2)</td>
<td>Adam: “Laying down a set of rules for a way people behave on the boat… they have very poor idea what the rules are.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver: “There’s a common sense boundary there that if you step over that boundary, you’re in the water.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Raw Data Code ( (n) )</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive &amp; accepting environment (4)</td>
<td>Boat is home, means of travel &amp; entertainment (3)</td>
<td>Thomas: “Being inclusive... empower them to work out what role they want to [be].”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social behaviours (16)</td>
<td>Teamwork &amp; cohesion (14)</td>
<td>Being a crew all together (12)</td>
<td>Collin: “More and more I do this, the more and more the groups that come on board are the extensions of my crew.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Following ship’s routines (12)</td>
<td>Holly: “What we do is routine. I think we need to be predictable.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team over an individual (12)</td>
<td>Figure out individual role (5)</td>
<td>Harry: “It’s difficult to be generic about this because no two people will end up playing the same role in a team.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social etiquette (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “You’re all waiting until everyone gets served.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build relationships &amp; resolve conflicts (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “It is always appropriate to be polite.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust (7)</td>
<td>Trainees trust skipper (5)</td>
<td>Reuben: “They’ve got two people who are only people who know how it works. So they do trust you, therefore, they look up to you.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skipper relies on trainees (4)</td>
<td>Adam: “The real significance was that I trusted [that trainee] and [he] responded to that trust.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building trust other staff on board (2)</td>
<td>Ryan: “They build confidence with their watch leader, they will be talking about things.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Raw Data Code ((n))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All equal ((5))</td>
<td>John: “No matter who you are when you step onto the boat, to a certain degree anyway, you’re all equal which is really good.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is and isn’t acceptable ((4))</td>
<td>George: “If we get negative behaviour, then we have to draw attention of individuals to the effect it may have had on everybody else.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion &amp; compromise ((3))</td>
<td>Felix: “The group will discuss the situation that arose and come up with different ways of dealing with it.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-engage with society outside sail training ((2))</td>
<td>John: “It gave them a sense of belonging and…actually allowed them to come back into society slightly more.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced dependence on each other ((1))</td>
<td>Harry: “On a boat, where you’re forced to get to know [other people].”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainable challenge ((14))</td>
<td>Felix: “The overall success on the task is more important who did which thing.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of success ((12))</td>
<td>Thomas: “We are giving something more than just a technique how to sail.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential sailing skills ((13))</td>
<td>Oliver: “They’re then reinforcing their own confidence by showing other people, and also they’re showing other people what they know.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence and competence with sailing ((7))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme $(n)$</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme $(n)$</td>
<td>Raw Data Code $(n)$</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing with other backgrounds (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “If you mix them up with some much more privileged people, then the learning process is much quicker because they’re interacting with people who are quite different to them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask question or question own beliefs (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “If I can actually let them see that there are other ways of doing it and that some people don’t find it acceptable what they do - question what they do. You will make some little difference.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need time to reflect to make sense of experience (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “Quite often they need that time to reflect. Also sort of start using the skills they haven’t realised they picked up.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is just back to basics (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felix: “Mobile phones, the Internet, television, there are actually not essential to life. Warmth, food, good companionship - all of those elements are the tribal type stuff.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General description (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “It’s obviously a well-known process through the week. Although people wouldn’t describe it as that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reviews (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “Generally speaking, in those interviews people listen.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young watch leaders (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma: “They have watch leaders who are quite young and quite close in age to the trainees.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing games (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “We play games with them and we also do educational stuff.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “They have…a logbook. And you would work through that. So that’s very much more about setting yourself goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Raw Data Code ((n))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited at first</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “They get on board and they are excited.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver: “You do get expectations that we can’t meet... The weather’s wrong for that... Matching of expectations and the preparation is what it’s all about.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly competition</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “There is friendly rivalry you can set up and exploit.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “If they try to do their best...we will give them an award...that entitles them to come back and do a Tall Ships Race.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School curriculum</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “It sits within their curriculum for what they do at school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas: “You have to start with people that understand the training. So that you can speak the language, find a commonality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their culture</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felix: “Communication is quite complex in sailing... You've got to be quite precise about your communication but also they need work very hard to describe what they are trying to.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using sailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “At the end of that day that's probably the low points of the voyage. And that's the bit where if anybody wants to go home, it's going to be then.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jargon</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low point of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voyage</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Skippers' Beliefs about PSD over Time (16)</td>
<td>Engagement with young people (14)</td>
<td>More understanding of where people come from/can easier relate to them now (8)</td>
<td>George: “I've come to understand their viewpoint a bit more [laughs]. And I think that it's not so different from what mine was 40 years ago [laughs].”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better at interacting with young people now (5)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy: more confident and relax (4)</td>
<td>Ryan: “I am a lot more relaxed about it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not an older brother anymore (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felix: “I guess when you're in your 20's, you're young and... you have the same sort of enthusiasm... if you're working with late teens... you're only 5-6 [years] ahead of them necessarily, so you're much closer... and that relationship is different to now when I am in my mid 40's and I am working with the teenagers. Yeah, that's the much bigger gap and it's a different relationship.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not as engaged (2)</td>
<td>Due to age difference (1)</td>
<td>Leon: “Definitely. Em... [Thinking] as I am... when I started I was 28. Yeah, as a captain. And I could listen to... [Thinking] I could part-take in the conversation with 15-year-olds and pretend I was interested. Not anymore.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to changed job (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “My engagement with young people has changed dramatically because I no longer work on the boat. So, it’s becomes slightly more remote.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn’t change (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd: “Not a huge amount, don’t think, really.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should ask young people (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “I think I still behave the same way to young people as I did thirty years ago...but I don’t think- I don’t think I can answer that one, because, certainly, you can really only get an answer there from somebody else.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From all about sailing to all about young people (4)</td>
<td>From transferring knowledge to letting young people to experiment (trial-and-error) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “It’s about giving them opportunities to try things; to get things wrong without a problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainees and staff crew are a part of each other (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “I mean the way I used to do it, I used to find out when I first started we did have almost ‘them and us’ all the time. We were almost split between the crew and the groups we had on board.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurture but be firm when needed (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “But I’ve also understood as well...sometimes people just need either a kick on the backside or take control of their own lives little bit more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sail training taught how to work with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “Coming to sail training changed my view of how to work with young people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young people in general (2)</td>
<td>No change in beliefs (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “I don’t think they’ve have really changed. I have just become more convinced that sail training is a good way of doing it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people don’t have same opportunities as oneself (1)</td>
<td>Realised sail training makes a difference and values it more now (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd: “I came to realise that there is a lot of people that don’t have an opportunity that I had.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received more reward due to changed perception on the value of sail training (1)</td>
<td>Development of staff crew and trainees (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd: “I saw the difference it made... Absolutely, yeah, I valued the whole youth development in terms of sailing particularly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “You get more back from being a part of it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “Suddenly over time I understood more about the development of the afterguard [staff crew] and especially the trainees and what you can manage to get out of them. That they didn’t even know they could do before.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; ( n ))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks more about the process now ( (1) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma: “I’m thinking more about it [thinking]. More about the process now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Everyone has a choice’ philosophy ( (1) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “I think this thing about that everybody has a choice is something which has changed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to talk and socialise with the young people as they are strangers to you ( (1) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “What I realised that actually just going and starting to talk to people not only the day goes faster but the passage becomes so much more enjoyable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to know earlier beliefs due to young age ( (1) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “It’s difficult to know what I thought before because I have been doing it for such a long time now. By the age of 17 you’re just sort of getting towards thinking about where you feel you should go yourself, and then it just grew from there.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller experiences can be meaningful for people depending on their background ( (1) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam: “What I think is important that you’re [thinking] pitching the activity at the level that develops people, gives them a meaningful experience, allows them to take something positive and meaningful away. Sometimes that would be something that I used to perhaps snare at.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.3

Summary of Inductive Thematic Analysis of Perceived Skippers’ Roles During Sail Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Mid-Order Theme (n)</th>
<th>Lower-Order Theme (n)</th>
<th>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Skippers’ roles aboard during sail training experience (16)</td>
<td>Safety (16)</td>
<td>Physical safety (16)</td>
<td>Ryan: “We want you to have a good time. And hopefully you will learn a lot from it. Not just sailing...You’re ensuring that those avenues are open, and people are not excluded, self-excluded or excluded by others. There is no bullying going on.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional safety and wellbeing (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “Make sure a ship is [in] a good working order and safe to go to sea. She has her certificates to go to sea.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (16)</td>
<td>Establishing some hierarchy or being an authority (7)</td>
<td>Discipliner (1)</td>
<td>Reuben: “You are also the discipline. If [it] goes out of hand, unfortunately you’re the one who’ve got to step up and say...‘Look guys, if this carries on, we will stop the voyage’. You’re where the boat stops, basically. Because it ends with you. So yeah that’s [thinking] that’s really [laughs] control.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking charge and stepping in when needed (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam: “I think you need to know when something is [thinking] probably safety critical and you do have to take charge and to be quite didactive.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “The final decision-making.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications (5)</td>
<td>Dealing with parents (2)</td>
<td>Leon: “I need to know because if there is a problem further down the road, with a parent or something like that”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ($n$)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ($n$)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; $n$)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report back to the sail training operator (1)</td>
<td>George: “Quite often I’ve got some reporting back to the ship owners whoever they may be.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication with team leaders who come with a specific group (1)</td>
<td>Collin: “informing communication between the team leaders and expectations cause quite a lot of time especially if they haven’t been before they are as clueless as the youngsters about the possibilities and what they’re about to do.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precise communication and turned down jargon (1)</td>
<td>Felix: “communication is quite complex in sailing. So, as a skipper you can very easily start off with a whole lot technical [thinking] just words about the names of things. And so you’ve got to be quite precise about your communication but also they need work very hard to describe what they are trying to.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting PSD among young people (15)</td>
<td>Liam: “As a skipper I think it [interpersonal skills] is a huge part…I think that’s what we are for, really.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing, assessing and adapting (15)</td>
<td>Todd: “[Young offenders] had short attention span, so you have to be very quick and snappy who you dealt with them…But [at] the same time with the young carers they are happy to set it slower.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ($n$)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ($n$)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; $n$)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to each young person’s preferences (7)</td>
<td>Oliver: “All I’m really saying is that your reaction needs to be tailored to what is possible within a group, but you’re always trying to get to the point where you’re doing things together and listening to each other.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to staff crew members aboard (6)</td>
<td>John: “I like to use people for what they are good at rather than for what they are not good at.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of and support to staff crew (9)</td>
<td>Reuben: “Sail training it's not just developing young people, it's also [thinking] your [staff] crew that develops hugely from that.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (8)</td>
<td>Collin: “Teaching them knots and stuff.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating opportunities and environment (8)</td>
<td>Maria: “you’re responsible for is creating opportunities for people. So, I think you’re creating opportunities for your staff and volunteers.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and support (7)</td>
<td>Harry: “You try and encourage them to do something that’s a bit outside of their comfort zone.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage (5)</td>
<td>Emma: “You need to inspire the crew, the trainees.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire (2)</td>
<td>Reuben: “That's quite tricky because you're constantly reassuring.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassure (2)</td>
<td>Liam: “I think the skill of the skipper and the staff is to keep them on board and to keep them going.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with young people (7)</td>
<td>Personal conversations (7)</td>
<td>Let young people bring some of their culture (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “I would always insist, if they want to bring music with them, they can play it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give everyone some of your time (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “it's a whole think about giving everybody a bit of your time is very important. Really importantly that you know everybody's name by day 1 in my book...because when you can go to them and say 'Hey Kotryna, how's it going?' And you know [thinking] they're important enough to me that I know their name.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a role model (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “You're a role model on board.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-of-all-trades (5)</td>
<td>Fill in gaps within the staff crew (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “I like to use people for what they are good at rather than for what they are not good at. In that case you use them to run a boat more. And then it would free me up to do more social work type of things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being truthful (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “to get the best out of people, they need to be treated with respect. They need to know the truth. They need to know what's going on [thinking]...It's without doubt true. I never openly to try to deceive a crew.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of learning (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felix: “I'm [a] facilitator rather than a teacher very much.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing reports (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “I have to liaise with whoever making a report to see that they are taking up to date with it and the report is being written. And it's a fair assessment.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting more formal tasks (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “Certainly there is a morning regime and the evening brief where I talk to the whole crew.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a trip (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “You're almost planning the week from the back end in reverse.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look after yourself (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “I've got a responsibility to myself as well...If I am not at the good state of mind, that puts everybody else at risk.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.4
Summary of Inductive Thematic Analysis of Skippers’ Practices to Promote Young People’s PSD During Sail Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Mid-Order Theme</th>
<th>Lower-Order Theme</th>
<th>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skippers’ practices to promote young people’s PSD (16)</td>
<td>Active involvement of young people (16)</td>
<td>Give them responsibility (7)</td>
<td>Allow young people to take charge (1)</td>
<td>Todd: “Start getting them to give the commands out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma: “That also made my job as a skipper much easier actually because you could then rely on them...to do it safely.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decison-making (6)</td>
<td>Steering young people towards a favourable decision (2)</td>
<td>Holly: “When I stand there to do my chart chats, I know exactly where I want them to tell me to go.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give out roles (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “You delegate and allow the people to do it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watches (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collin: “We run watches, yeah, depending on where we go, depends on how strict of watch it is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating unnecessary tasks (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma: “If there’s not much wind, you have to be much more creative in what tasks you set. And you might then make up things that you don’t really need to do, you know, you begin to put a reef in, even though we don’t need a reef now, to keep people occupied.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow start or easier stuff to get trainees relaxed (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd: “We didn't throw people to the deep end.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overarching Theme: Skippers’ practices to promote young people’s PSD (16)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Mid-Order Theme ((n))</th>
<th>Lower-Order Theme ((n))</th>
<th>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; (n))</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team approach to development ((14))</td>
<td>Splitting familiar kids into different watches ((2))</td>
<td>Harry: “we used to take two people from a number of organizations each. So you’d only have two people that knew each other and then when they come aboard, you split them into separate watches, so that that splits them, and then you end up with individual teams that don’t know each other, and that was a device we used a lot.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing, assessing and adjusting ((14))</td>
<td>Assess initial set of skills and character ((8))</td>
<td>Collin: “We gone and meet them and introduce ourselves and bring them down to the boat. And within that time, you’re assessing them and also talking to the team leaders to find out as much information as you can.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting a ratio between sailing and other activities ((5))</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “It might that one boat is really gets into sailing and others aren’t...[They are] happy just sitting on deck and...be[ing] a part of this but don’t really know what a jib is or anything like that.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust a level of challenge ((3))</td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd: “Whatever you do, you have to be careful not to give too much to the person to scare them off basically.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking out who is not integrating ((2))</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “The skipper’s and the sea staff’s job to look out for ones who are natural team players or who are perhaps, have other anxieties, or other, perhaps, disabilities or something which is stopping them from engaging.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ( (n) )</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; ( n ))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement &amp; support (13)</td>
<td>Push them out of their comfort zone (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “Do things slightly out of their comfort zone. Not massive challenges. People do make massive things but we are not pushing them to do that. Just inviting them to take the small steps.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings, meetings and reviews (12)</td>
<td>Review of the day (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver: “And then talking after the day around the table where [thinking], We are really interested in what they thought about their day and what could have been better about it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro briefings or welcome chat (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holly: “We always do a welcome chat which starts it off.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “Because the first day is normally safety, briefing, ensuring they’ve got basic skills to keep them safe.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria: “The last day is all about you’ve had this amazing time, you need to pull everything together, and then some sort of debrief. Different organisations do that differently. But some sort of debrief and then they go.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote reflection (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas: “Just ask a question. ‘How do you want to be? What do you want to get…from this particular thing?’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a role model (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver: “Comes about is through the relationship that they have with us, as positive models, we hope. How the relationships develop with, between themselves, where we are setting the scene.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; (n))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (8)</td>
<td>Specific feedback (4)</td>
<td>Getting feedback from other staff (3)</td>
<td>Felix: “How they approached the problem. How they dealt with the problem.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “I make sure that I meet with the mates at least once a day if not longer in a formal way to discuss the crew members.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing rules and expectations (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “We do enforce rules not only for the safety but also trying to get them to understand that there is time to use these devices and time to actually interact with other people.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show care and respect for young people (5)</td>
<td>No shouting (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “You don’t shout. You just have...a conversation about it and try to understand why a person thinks that way.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations behind decisions, rules and expectations (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam: “One of the perfect vehicles for talking about much broader development why we behave towards one another in a way that many of us would consider acceptable as oppose to the way that many of us would consider unacceptable.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being patient (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reuben: “A trouble you can often get in sailing is you get very, very good sailors who are very, very competitive and they want everything done now. And that doesn’t happen on the sail training vessel. You have to expect that it’s gonna take twice or three times as long.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver: “We immediately write their names on the whiteboard and we try very hard to remember those names.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing further and further back over a trip or less supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “Be able to carry out and achieve it. And then a couple days later do it again with less supervision.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General conversation with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting young people to talk about themselves (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “We make them talk about themselves and what their ambitions are.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let them find out themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td>No structured approach (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma: “Think my approach has been more to let them get on with it, and then they can kind of work it out themselves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating desirable situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structured experiential learning (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felix: “Obviously within the safety but actually go ‘Well, try something. See what you can do to make it work’.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liam: “We just insist that they are done. And we organise things so that they have to do that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme (n)</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not letting to give up (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “Trainees do get seasick and generally as you know they are not allowed to give up.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putting thought into the process (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam: “I thought very carefully about what it was that I could implant into these very young deck cadets and engineering cadets.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological coaching techniques (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas: “I think it is the GROW model.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration of sailing-related skills (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry: “In manoeuvring the boat...It’s important to do one or two yourself to show by example.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using humour (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “I tend to use humour a lot because people don’t regard it as...They don’t take offence normally if you’re using humour positively.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-door policy (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>George: “Then I am in command I do have that open-door policy.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention to detail (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “Actually small details that really mattered.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appealing to better nature of young people (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “I suppose you appeal to their better nature or you try and teach them the consequences of their actions.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Theme</td>
<td>Mid-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Lower-Order Theme ((n))</td>
<td>Raw Data Code (where appropriate; (n))</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow to express emotions and help young people to identify them</td>
<td>Felix: “Allowing them to express themselves to be angry, cross, upset, sad, happy, whatever it is. And to [Thinking] help them to identify that those are their emotions, they're valid emotions. They are what they are feeling.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand horizons</td>
<td>Reuben: “It's trying to build up a picture of there is more stuff out there that you can enjoy. So smaller things in life.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push down the hierarchy of running the boat</td>
<td>Ryan: “So you're actually try to push...down the hierarchy of running of the boat.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest as never will see them again or each other again</td>
<td>Harry: “The fact that you're not going to meet again, means you can say things which might be more difficult if you're going to continue an ongoing relationship with them.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard and challenging initial passage which goes as far as planned in that journey</td>
<td>John: “It can be quite a hard passage the first time, and quite often people would find that really very challenging.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
Summary Table of Deductive Thematic Analysis Conducted for Chapter 7

This appendix comprises a summary table of the framework matrices used for deductive thematic analysis explained in Chapter 5 and reported in Chapter 7. Each matrix represents one component from the second part of the theoretical framework based on Dewey and Hahn’s ideas (see Chapter 3 Figure 3.1). Each component has a number of meanings which were derived based on Dewey’s and/or Hahn’s ideas or on skippers’ perspectives. All meanings have an indication of the source they were derived from: D stands for Dewey; H for Hahn; D & H indicates that both Dewey and Hahn had the same point; and M stands for a mismatch with their ideas indicating a unique meaning offered by skippers. For instance, a component social diversity (D & H): What types of diversity were identified by skippers? had four meanings: socio-economic background (D & H); broader experiences (M); age (M); and core beliefs (M). Frequency counts were kept identifying communalities across a sample as well as prevalence of each meaning.
Table G.1

Summary of the Data Analysis Framework Matrices Used for Deductive Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
<th>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community and service (D &amp; H): How did skippers understand and perceive community/communal living and service? (16)</td>
<td>Collectivism vs. individualism (i.e., team over an individual (13) Consequences of actions or rules and norms (7)</td>
<td>Holly: “As much as possible, we would get an entire crew if possible, sitting around the table, chopping veg and peeling potatoes rather than just relying on one or two people.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam: “What you’re effectively doing is laying down a set of rules for a way people behave on the boat. And those rules are typically linked back and emphasised by safety. Now if you’re going to talk to most young people who are being taken sail training, they have very poor idea what the rules are.”</td>
<td>D &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mimicking society outside sail training (5) Context to apply social skills (4)</td>
<td>Oliver: “It’s very much like the world of work and that you do have to finish things and do them with other people.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John: “People who are not necessary the best at life skills sometimes don’t understand how to put it into context.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating community (3)</td>
<td>Felix: “I think this is there the modelling community. So, it's how you are. How I respond to people, talk to other adults on board. Obviously that relationship how you communicate to other people on board is modelling.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
<td>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with physical and social environments (D) and Socially structured activities (D): <em>How did skippers understand interaction with the environments?</em> (16)</td>
<td>Sense of belonging/contributing (3)</td>
<td>John: “But I think it is very important that everybody takes a turn at everything - good and bad. And that build an identity as a crew in respect.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical features of environment (8)</td>
<td>Emma: “I suppose an easy thing would be to…to give up, or, oh I don’t want to take part anymore, but it’s not an easy thing to do because you can’t get off.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social activities incl. routine activities (e.g., meals) (7)</td>
<td>Holly: “Everybody sits down. So, we serve up and everybody waits.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work out individual role (7)</td>
<td>Thomas: “Being inclusive [and] empower them to work out what role they want to [undertake].”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive environment (7)</td>
<td>John: “No matter who you are when you step onto the boat, to a certain degree anyway, you’re all equal which is really good.”</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction among trainees or development of relationships (7)</td>
<td>Maria: “You can create an environment for young people there they can [thinking]…There are the relationships that they develop.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity-related activities (6)</td>
<td>George: “In order for it to work, when we have to organise the ship in terms of duty times and rest times, meal times.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By-product of environment (5)</td>
<td>Oliver: “To recognize that people have personal space, people have their own belongings, people have the need to have quiet</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder of basic human needs/emotions (4)</td>
<td>Holly: “Life is just back to basics. When are we eating, how are we gonna get on together, when do we go to bed and how are we gonna get through today.” H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced dependence or practicality of environment (4)</td>
<td>Harry: “You can obviously do this in campsites, on mountains, other places, but a boat works well because it’s your home, your means of transport, your life support system.” M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of curriculum, i.e., sailing skills or situation to promote PSD (12)</td>
<td>Liam: “Get to put their life jackets on and then they realize that getting your life jacket on by yourself is a bit of a faff but if they actually work together, two of them together, they can help each other.” D &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an environment/meaningful context for PSD (8)</td>
<td>Adam: “If you’re dealing with someone who is slightly awkward and difficult, stand-off and doesn’t get involved in the activities, they can’t really learn until we’ve created the safe space for them to get involved.” D &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relying on environment/over-</td>
<td>Leon: “We don’t emphasise it at all. It’s happening naturally.” M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
<td>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in approaches (D &amp; H): How do skippers demonstrate flexibility in their approaches and what factors do they take into consideration? (15)</td>
<td>Overall group (11)</td>
<td>Reuben: “Just have to be flexible to go with a group you have.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual trainees (6)</td>
<td>Thomas: “Understand what they are engaged with and what they can get from it.”</td>
<td>D &amp; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to staff/volunteers (5)</td>
<td>Collin: “What crew I have on board, and their capabilities depends how many watches I split up in.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall ongoing adaptability (4)</td>
<td>Oliver: “It’s not anything other than just reading the situation.”</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal of a voyage (2)</td>
<td>Adam: “If what you’re trying to do is about people, you might use the same thing - briefing the sail, changing the headsail, but you’ve got a very different approach to what you’re actually trying to get them to do.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reliance on socially structured activities (6)

Reason for using indirect approach to PSD (4)

Maria: “The whole structure has to keep on going in order to have all this other stuff to flex around it. So, you’ve got this underlying… [Thinking] routine of stuff that happens. And then that allows all other conversations.”

Overall group (11)

Reuben: “Just have to be flexible to go with a group you have.”

M

Individual trainees (6)

Thomas: “Understand what they are engaged with and what they can get from it.”

D & H

In relation to staff/volunteers (5)

Collin: “What crew I have on board, and their capabilities depends how many watches I split up in.”

M

Overall ongoing adaptability (4)

Oliver: “It’s not anything other than just reading the situation.”

D

Goal of a voyage (2)

Adam: “If what you’re trying to do is about people, you might use the same thing - briefing the sail, changing the headsail, but you’ve got a very different approach to what you’re actually trying to get them to do.”

M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Meanings provided by skippers ($n$)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
<th>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather conditions (1)</td>
<td>Emma: it's actually quite hard if there isn’t much wind. You have to then think of other ways to get them to work together, which, I think if it’s rough weather, it almost happens itself.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct approach to teaching (H): What type of direct teaching was identified? (14)</td>
<td>John: “You teach people even how to peel [thinking]. How to peel onion. How to cook toast. How to make a cup of tea.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching sailing-related skills (13)</td>
<td>George: “We get, if you like, negative behaviour, then we have to draw attention of individuals to the effect it may have had on everybody else.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching PSD-related skills (7)</td>
<td>Felix: “Allowing them to express themselves to be angry, cross, upset, sad, happy, whatever it is. And to [thinking] help them to identify that those are their emotions, they’re valid emotions. They are what they are feeling.”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing to express emotions (1)</td>
<td>Harry: “You try and encourage them to…do something that’s a bit outside of their comfort zone.”</td>
<td>D &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and mentoring (D &amp; H): What meaning was attributed to supervision and mentoring? (14)</td>
<td>George: “Then be able to carry out and achieve it. And then a couple days later do it again with less supervision.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to build working interpersonal relationships (H): What meaning was attributed to interpersonal relationships aboard? (13)</td>
<td>Measurments provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
<td>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator (3)</td>
<td>Thomas: “The initial role is to be a leader; [it] is to be someone who can facilitate learning.”</td>
<td>D &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unguided (3)</td>
<td>Todd: “You let them to find it themselves.”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing staff crew members and volunteers (9)</td>
<td>Maria: “At the beginning of the voyage you would always say to volunteers ‘What do you want to get out this week?’”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations among staff and trainees (9)</td>
<td>Holly: “It’s little bit more personal, casual conversation.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Trust (7)</td>
<td>Oliver: “Creating a feeling of confidence in what you’re doing so that everybody trusts you to do what you’re doing.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among trainees (7)</td>
<td>Ryan: “The idea is for them to realise they’ve got to build relationship.”</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipper needs to be patient (5)</td>
<td>Reuben: “I think that’s the biggest part of understanding is patience.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect (5)</td>
<td>George: “To get the best out of people, they need to be treated with respect. They need to know the truth. They need to know what’s going on.”</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A Component from a Theoretical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotation</th>
<th>Matching with Dewey (D), Hahn (H), Dewey and Hahn (D &amp; H), or Mismatching (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly challenging activity (H): How did skipper understand and use challenges aboard? (13)</td>
<td>Reuben: “You try and target each individual person depending on...what you get from [them]...How they respond [and] then define how you respond back and then you just work from there really.”</td>
<td>D &amp; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing amount of responsibility and challenge (5)</td>
<td>Emma: “As the week goes on you give them more and more responsibility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defeating defeatism (i.e., overcoming fears (3))</td>
<td>Collin: “To help people to get over some of their fears and to prove that you can get over your fears is quite a useful tool in life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small challenges (2)</td>
<td>Maria: “Do things slightly out of their comfort zone. Not massive challenges. People do make massive things, but we are not pushing them to do that. Just inviting them to take the small steps.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For staff/volunteer crew development (1)</td>
<td>Harry: “somehow I feel responsibility, that’s not right, can’t tell you precisely why, I don’t think it’s developing people in the right way, I think people need to be challenged, a little bit to do all the things they’re not very good at.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced challenges (1)</td>
<td>George: “It is good to experience a bit of discomfort. It is good for all of us [laughs]. But it is only off any value if you...have that balanced with enough rest and recreation...to enable the learning side of it, because it is important.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard initial challenge (1)</td>
<td>John: “It can be quite a hard passage the first time, and quite often people would find that really very challenging. Some of them would really not like it at all, some would want to get off and some would be seasick but that would often happen, especially if it was bad weather.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of success before encountering adversity (H): how did skippers conceptualise experience of success? (12)</td>
<td>Overall sense of achievement (10)</td>
<td>Liam: “We don’t wish bad weather upon them but some best voyages I have had is when we had a storm. Because they all been...terrified, frightening... Certainly unsure of themselves. But they won through it and at the end they had a real feeling that overcome diversity and achieved something.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeating defeatism (i.e., overcoming fears (3)</td>
<td>Collin: “To help people to get over some of their fears and to prove that you can get over your fears is quite a useful tool in life.”</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team success over individual success (1)</td>
<td>Felix: “The overall success on the task is more important who did which thing.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability to meet individual learner's needs (D &amp; H): To what extent and how do skippers adapt to individual trainee's needs? (11)</td>
<td>Ongoing adaptability/finding balance (7)</td>
<td>Adam: “What I think is important that you're [thinking] pitching the activity that the level that develops people, gives them a meaningful experience, allows them to take something positive and meaningful away.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt to staff/volunteers (5)</td>
<td>Maria: “Do the staff have the skills to do that? If not, you're there to help them to develop those skills to enable those young people.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual needs of a trainee (3)</td>
<td>Harry: “I've had a completely deaf and blind person park a boat in Yarmouth harbour. Just because somebody was standing behind them, going [shows tapping on the left shoulder and on the right shoulder]. And that was because she got the signals organized as to how much to turn to the left, and how much to turn to the right.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar natural environment (H): What benefits of unfamiliar environment were identified by skippers? (11)</td>
<td>Take trainees away from familiarity and/or issues at home (9) Effect on social interaction (3)</td>
<td>Reuben: “They can see 'Wow, we have been taken out of our...standard environment.'...They just feel stuck in the hole. That's broken them out from that hole from there.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan: “They've got to work with people they have never worked with before.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh start (3)</td>
<td>Todd: “Most people that go to do sail training trips, have never been to the sea before. So, they're all equal. They are all equally bad.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address habits (2)</td>
<td>Harry: “It just shakes them out of their normal routine and makes them think about stuff.”</td>
<td>H &amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space for new ways to react/try new social skills (1)</td>
<td>Felix: “It is allowing them to experiment to say ‘OK, well, we’re not at home. We are not at the situation where you have to deal with this right now in this way’.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perspectives (1)</td>
<td>Harry: “They can rub off criticism from teachers and parents because they’re always there and they would say that anyway, wouldn’t they? They always nag. And if you have somebody who is not part of their regular life, has never met them before, may not meet them again, but has got to know them very well over a period of a week. What that person says, and particularly if those comments have been put together with all the sea-staff involved, so it’s clearly a team view.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial control/training to a learner (H): To what extent skippers</td>
<td>Emma: “I usually spent the first day not going very far but doing lots and lots of sailing manoeuvres, so lots and lots of tacking; getting everybody to have a turn at the helm, everybody to have a turn at operating the sails and setting the sails and that sort of thing.”</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived the importance of initial training of sailing-related skills and for what purpose? (10)</td>
<td>Broader development (1)</td>
<td>Collin: “Pick up skills of being at sea. And then start actually...have some knowledge to be able to ask questions and develop their interest and what is happening around them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be able to take part in an activity (1)</td>
<td>Adam: “Even if you're training through the sea, you still need to be able to tie bow line, make off a line, snub it, release it safely on the load and one or two similar type of skills. But those are not useful unless you want to train for the Marine career. So, what you need to do is to have sufficient knowledge for people to take part in an activity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models (D &amp; H): What type of role models were identified? (10)</td>
<td>A skipper being an example on how to take part in a community aboard (e.g., talking and behaving to other staff members and trainees) (8)</td>
<td>Oliver: “It’s that point about the example that you’re setting. So, if you’re wanting people to have a stake in their community and be positive members of society then it’s all about how you behave towards them and what they’re therefore hopefully able to emulate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example of leadership or model performer (i.e., technical skill) (4)</td>
<td>Reuben: “They’ve got 2 people who are only people who know how it works. So, they do trust you, therefore, they look up to you. So yeah, a role model to them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee to trainee (3)</td>
<td>Ryan: “I mean there is always good in the crew in 2 watches, say, 6 people each, there will always be people who have certain interpersonal skills. And those who don’t.”</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social diversity (D &amp; H): What types of diversity were identified by skippers? (7)</td>
<td>Socio-economic background (4)</td>
<td>Harry: “If you get somebody from a privileged background, often they will have a lot more personal confidence when they come on board. But their personal confidence may smack up against somebody who’s from the backstreets and doesn’t like being told what to do by some toff. And so, if you have a broad spectrum of different people, then the process of getting to know each other is a bit more challenging and I think it gives people achieve more out of it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader experiences (3)</td>
<td>Ryan: “It doesn’t matter what happens at home. It doesn’t matter what your background is.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age including staff/volunteers (2)</td>
<td>Felix: “How many [of] young people sit down and play card game or board game? Or have a conversation? And how many of them do it with a group of adults? That conversation between adults and children often doesn’t happen in our society as much as it could do.”</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core beliefs (e.g., about religion and sexuality) (1)</td>
<td>Reuben: “OK, a mate that I had on board with me last year was a lesbian...We had one lad on board whose parents were very strict Christian and he had been told that homosexuality is</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Component from a Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Meanings provided by skippers (n)</td>
<td>Exemplar Quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolutely wrong...So towards the end of the week, the questions being asked and he figured out and you can see just something in his head trying to ‘Hold on, I've been told all my life that these people should be [inaudible 0:27:39]’. He really got on with that [mate]. Surely, that's a part of your development showing that you don't have to belief everything.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Maxwell, 2013.