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Statement of the Problem

Philosophic studies in the area of outdoor education are few. The main aim of this project is to trace the development of philosophy existing in today's resident outdoor education programs and survey elements of this philosophy as they are found in resident programs of California. Resident outdoor education is camping sponsored by a school district or county for the purpose of teaching children subjects which can best be taught in the out-of-doors.

Procedure

This descriptive project based its findings on the examination of printed statements of philosophy found in handbooks, outdoor education guides, and other materials received from various county and district-sponsored resident outdoor education programs in California. A total of one hundred contacts were made, including all fifty-eight California counties and forty-two districts known to have been involved in resident programs.

This project traces the philosophy of outdoor education as a method of education from ancient Egypt to modern outdoor education programs in California. Through a review of literature and research on outdoor education, common elements of philosophy in the forms of stated objectives were then matched to each of Fitzpatrick's nine
goals for outdoor education.

Clinton Neal Fitzpatrick's goals were approved by a panel of experts in the field of outdoor education. They represent the latest, and possibly the best, of the scanty number of philosophic research studies done in the field.

The above objective-goal matchups became a tool of comparison for printed objectives and other statements containing philosophy found in the literature of the twenty-two California resident outdoor education programs under study in this project. All fifty-eight of California's counties were contacted for this survey, as well as forty-two district-sponsored programs. The lack of a comprehensive up-to-date list of California resident outdoor education programs currently functioning remains a major need in the field and is a limitation to this present study.

Though sixty-five percent of contacted programs replied to the present survey, only twenty-two percent replied with materials useful and appearing to meet the definition of resident outdoor education stated in this project. All useful programs were therefore examined, with no attempt at randomization. The programs under study, however, were found to involve over 64,000 children and well over one hundred school districts spread all over California.

Conclusions and Observations

The entire field of outdoor education remains a relatively new, disorganized, and unresearched area of American education. There exists a great need for a central organization to coordinate research efforts in areas of
need such as: (1) In-depth research into various historical roots of the field, (2) Philosophical studies, (3) Broadened administrative studies, (4) Empirical studies in the areas of curriculum and learning, (5) Studies on the education of teachers for outdoor instruction, (6) Cognitive studies in school camping with impressive findings, (7) Further replication and validation of the more impressive affective domain studies, as well as replication and expansion of research in cognitive and psychomotor learning.

Designers of present resident outdoor education programs appear to have borrowed heavily from existing programs for philosophy. Philosophic differences separating most of the examined programs were slight in terms of total goals met. A mean average of eighty percent of Fitzpatrick's nine goals appeared to have been met by the programs studied.

Only four programs appeared to meet all nine goals. Goals II, III, and IX received mean average objective-goal matchups of at least ninety percent among all twenty-two programs. Goals I, V, and VI received good support, scoring mean average goal-objective matchups of between sixty-five and seventy-eight percent.

Three goals received a mean average objective-goal matchup of below fifty percent. It appeared that these goals stressing development of self-reliance in the out-of-doors, civic-mindedness, and vocational efficiency are no longer emphasized as major components of California's resident programs. There appeared to be a need for more clearly defined philosophy in terms of aims, purposes, goals, and objectives in most of the program literature examined.
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General Introduction

The Nature of Outdoor Educational Philosophy

Outdoor education is really a method of education. As such, it transcends all curriculum and shares the purposes and philosophy of education as a whole. The method of outdoor education operates basically on the assumption and evidence that some things are learned more quickly and thoroughly through direct, firsthand experiences in the out-of-doors, rather than in the conventional classroom setting.

Resident outdoor education is merely outdoor education involving the additional advantages of an extended school camping experience in an outdoor setting. As defined in this paper, resident outdoor education is barely over thirty years old in this country.

Being a method of education, resident outdoor education has, from the beginning, looked to philosophic leadership from two very significant sets of goals. These goals are those established by the National Education Association's Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Schools in 1918, and the NEA's Policies Commission's 1938 statement of objectives.

The Need for the Present Study

Both of the above mentioned sets of goals and objectives have served as guidelines for the establishment of resident outdoor educational programs in California since the first
program was started by the San Diego City-County Camp Commission in 1946. These same goals continue to guide the development of present programs as well.

The problem of this study is to trace common elements of philosophy existing in resident outdoor education programs functioning now in California and to compare these elements as they appear as written statements of philosophy, goals, and objectives in the various available outdoor education handbooks and guides. Research has indicated a need for a survey which classified and organized stated educational philosophies of these programs. Philosophic studies are one of five major needs in outdoor education research.

Because outdoor education involves selection of what can best be taught in the out-of-doors, counties and districts, in the process of building their programs, copied programs already under operation, picking only those goals, objectives, and philosophic elements which best suited their own needs. Often wide variations exist, therefore, in regard to selection of curriculum and philosophy in California's resident outdoor education programs.

Further examination of written materials sent from various county and district programs reveals that there are many programs operating without guidebooks or with guidebooks which contain no clearly written philosophic aims. Still other districts are in the process of developing guidebooks and are reluctant or unable to give them up.
Statement of Aims

It is the intention of this project to contribute to outdoor education research in an area of need. This will be done by use of present research to develop a format by which a descriptive survey can be made, comparing the philosophic elements underlying various county and district-sponsored resident outdoor education programs functioning in the public schools of California.
Definition of Terms

Outdoor Education. A method of teaching wherein established topics and concepts which can best be taught outdoors are taught outdoors.

Resident Outdoor Education. Formerly known as "school camping," it is one of the components of outdoor education. It is camping sponsored by a school district or county. In the context of this project, it is school camping primarily for sixth graders for a period of from three days to one week. Areas commonly taught as being natural to an outdoor setting usually include Environmental and Conservation education, social living and science, though any area of learning considered natural to a camping situation would be selected for study.

On-site Outdoor Education. Outdoor education practiced on the school grounds.

Environmental Education. The study of all things surrounding man which affect his existence. It is aimed at developing an informed citizenry motivated to the recognition of problems and to collective action for solution. It may be included as one facet of outdoor education.

Conservation Education. It is the study of man's intelligent use of his natural environment through the development, management, preservation, and renewal of natural resources for his material, cultural, and aesthetic needs to benefit present and future generations. Another facet of outdoor education.

"Outdoor Activity-Oriented Group." Identified by B. Ray Horn as those who are oriented toward the physical location of where an activity is conducted and feel than an interaction with a natural environment is not a necessary condition of "outdoor education". These people are philosophically oriented toward physical education and recreation education activities conducted in an outdoor setting.

---


2Ibid.

3B. Roy Horn, A Factor Analysis of Attitudes Toward the "Outdoor Education" as Given by the Members of the AAHPER Council on Outdoor Education and Camping (ERIC Document Reproduction, E050877, 1970).
"Environment-Oriented Group". Horn's identification of those who tend to view the use of the outdoors as a learning medium, as a vehicle of communication, yet did not want to exclude activities related to conservation education.4

"Conservation-Oriented Group". Identified by Horn as those who were generally conservation-oriented and felt that "outdoor education" encompassed those activities that focus upon conservation ends. These people tended to favor those with predominantly wildlife, natural science and conservation interests.5

4Ibid.
5Ibid.
Review and Critique of Research Literature

The Meaning of Outdoor Education

An examination of the "Definition of Terms" section of this paper will reveal definitions for the terms "outdoor education", "resident outdoor education", and other terms appropriate to the topic under study. An examination of the literature and research surrounding outdoor education, however, will quickly serve to point out the fact that outdoor education terms are used interchangeably and that many discrepancies exist as to the objectives of outdoor education.

One illustration of the interchangeability of terms may be found by comparing Frederick Partridge's definition of "outdoor education" with a first-hand knowledge of the nature of the Long Beach program he was describing and also with other definitions of "resident outdoor education". It becomes obvious that some writers made no distinction between "outdoor education" and "resident outdoor education". Still others made even further differentiations in terminology, while writers in this relatively new field of education defined "resident

outdoor education" in the broadest possible terms.7

B. Roy Horn and Gale B. Orford produced studies aimed at categorizing discrepancies in terminology and objectives for outdoor education. Horn’s study indicated the existence of three prominent attitude groups accounting for discrepancies over the term "outdoor education" among authorities in the field. He identified the "Environmental-Oriented Group", the "Conservation-Oriented Group", and the "Activity-Oriented Group".8 The thinking of all three groups permeates the philosophy of resident outdoor education programs in California.

Availability of Empirical Research

Gabrielson and Holtzer stated that very little scientific investigation had been conducted in outdoor education, though more had been done in related areas.9 A year earlier, Donald R. Hammerman stated that since 1930 there have been approximately 150 studies conducted at the masters and doctoral level, but that there was a notable lack of research connected with philosophical implications of the outdoor education


George W. Donaldson and Alan D. Donaldson mention that practically all outdoor education research to date has been done in graduate schools as masters and doctoral theses. They claim that these studies have primarily concerned themselves with resident programs and administration—upon subjects easy to study, rather than on what is needed to be known. They indicated philosophic studies as one of five major needs in outdoor education research. This lack of philosophic studies make it feasible to examine aims, goals and objectives for philosophic insight into this present study.

George W. Donaldson pointed out that empirical studies were few, poorly designed and had populations too small for valid results. The more impressive of the few empirical studies which existed at that time had to do with the affective domain. They showed positive gains among children in personal-social characteristics following camp experiences. Other notable gains were made in improved relations, and improved teacher-pupil relations. Cognitive studies were fewer, less well-designed, and showed little or no difference between


12 Ibid.

13 Ibid.
traditional and outdoor educational methods.\(^\text{15}\)

The 1930's and early 1940's were the formative years of resident outdoor education (formerly known as school camping). During these years activities centered around the Life Camps-National Camp (New Jersey) programs and around the activities coming from the Kellogg Foundation's three children's camps in Michigan.\(^\text{16}\) Though none of them were available, Donald R. Hammerman lists only a total of eight doctoral studies done during the first two decades of outdoor education.\(^\text{17}\) Of these, only one appears to be experimental and empirical in nature.\(^\text{18}\) Hammerman points out that many of these early studies were really "attempts to justify resident outdoor education as a legitimate function of the public school."\(^\text{19}\)

The late 1940's and 1950's were marked by a concentration of studies devoted to administrative and organizational aspects of running an outdoor educational facility.\(^\text{20}\) There were also many studies, experimental in nature, which were basically proposals for the implementation of a specific resident outdoor school development.

\(^{15}\) Ibid.

\(^{16}\) Ibid.

\(^{17}\) Donald R. Hammerman, "A List of Doctoral Studies on Outdoor Education," Lorado Taft Field Campus, Oregon, Illinois.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 3.

\(^{19}\) Hammerman, "Research Implications."

\(^{20}\) Ibid.
Nadine A. Cragg's empirical study evaluating the year-round school camp of Long Beach, California produced evidence of superior intellectual development among children who had experienced one week of school camp when compared to the control group which remained in the classroom.\(^{21}\) This superiority was particularly evident in nature study. Social gains and gains made in home-making and camp-living skills were not as clear-cut.\(^{22}\) This seemed to be a well-designed study mostly in the cognitive domain.

Everett Hebel produced a significant piece of empirical research in 1956 conducted by the New York city Board of Education in cooperation with Life Camps and Life Inc. A class of thirty students that spent three weeks at camp made significantly higher improvement in subject matter and personal growth areas than did the control groups that stayed in the city. Though not directly available, this study was described by Gabrielsen and Holtzer.\(^{23}\)

Forrest Purman Evans examined the results on an experimental arithmetic enrichment program completed under the effects of a summer camp over a period of six weeks and covering a range of 115 different camp arithmetic enrichment


\(^{22}\)Ibid.

\(^{23}\)Gabrielsen and Holtzer, Role of Outdoor Education, p. 15.
This cognitive study showed greater monthly gain in arithmetic growth which was partly attributed to the value of utilizing real day-to-day experiences in maintaining arithmetic competence. There was a loss, however, of about seven months in computation and four months in reasoning among members of the experimental group. This was attributed to the fact that the enrichment experiences required no pencil and paper and the camp staff stressed reasoning processes during the enrichment experiences.

An affective domain study produced by Roy Cole set out to determine: (1) whether a work-learn camp for potential drop-outs had more holding power than the regular high school program for a comparison group of potential drop-outs who remained in school and (2) whether or not the camp helped campers to improve in their home, school and social adjustment upon their return. Three sample groups were used. Results showed that the change of setting from the normal school routine produced socially desirable changes in the campers' attitudes and in their behavior. Some of the other changes involved more friendly and cooperative attitudes towards adults, teachers and school.

---

25 Ibid., p. 164.
27 Ibid., p. 1300.
Another study in the affective domain was done by Jerome Beker for the purpose of evaluating the effects of school camping on the self-concepts and social relationships of pupils. This study was done on seven groups of campers attending the New York University at Sloatsburg, New York. Results showed the experimental groups attending school camp showed more positive feelings toward themselves after the camp experience than before. These changes were of greater magnitude than those of the non-camper control group. Also, the pattern of social relationships were influenced in a positive direction. Furthermore, these changes were even greater ten weeks after the camp experience.

In 1960, Genevieve Carter Stack produced an affective sociological study evaluating the attitudes of fifth and sixth-graders toward self, classmates, school, teacher, camping, and friends prior and subsequent to a period of school camping. Eight major conclusions resulted from this study. There was an over-all change to more positive attitudes toward school camping, following the experience, with boys reacting more positively to the concept than girls. Students regarded school


29 Ibid.

more positively after camp, with wide friendship patterns exerting an influence for an improved emotional tone in the classroom. School camping served as a stronger stimulus for boys than for girls in rekindling interests regarding school, teacher, camping, self, and friends. Boys also formed more friendships during camp than girls.

Morris Davidson's affective study, however, did show a positive change on the self-concept scale he used, following his experiment with fifth and sixth-grade children. Davidson investigated the relationship between two opposing school camp curricula and measured changes in pupil social relationships and self concepts. Although one camp program was adult-centered and one was child-centered, camper growth in self concepts did not vary significantly between the two approaches. Social relationships in both encampments also showed positive change.

Stephen Nowicki's research and development study in 1970 for the Atlanta Public Schools was also in the affective domain. It involved seventh, eighth, and ninth grade pupils and a total of 380 Black and Caucasian students over a five-

---

31 Ibid.
and one-half-day camping experience. This study attempted to measure, through a program of conservation, ecology and nature study, growth in pupil self-worth and self-respect and a greater sense of responsibility. Results suggested that the camping experience made the youngsters feel more in control of events, and more confident in themselves. Use of the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale was made for these findings.

Mansfield Woolfolk discovered essentially no change in self-concept in a randomly selected sample of 124 children picked from approximately fourteen hundred campers in 1971.34 There was, however, a 90 percent gain in group responsibility.

Joseph Adam Kalla experimented with the effects of a four-day, off-campus outdoor education program involving second year students enrolled in a two-year elementary teacher preparation program.35 Results showed the program contributed to statistically significant and favorable changes in students' attitudes on three of four scales related to conditions that existed in the professional education classes. There was no statistically significant effect on attitudes concerned with student to student relationships.

Project BACSTOP (Better Acquisition of Cognitive Skills


Through Outdoor Programming) was a structured experience in a wilderness setting used to generate changes in feelings and attitudes of students and faculty in seventh-grade classes in Battle Creek, Michigan Public Schools.\textsuperscript{36}

The title is misleading. This is as much, or more, an affective attitude study as it is a cognitive study. This is about a series of structured experiences used to generate changes in feelings and attitudes of students and faculty in seventh-grade classes in Battle Creek, Michigan Public Schools. The objectives were to: (1) reduce racial separatism and racially related black/white incidents in the cafeteria and buses, (2) reduce absenteeism by improving interpersonal relationships, and (3) increase student performance on standardized tests. Interesting study, but too many variables to control.

Historical Research

Studies into the historical background and development of camping and outdoor education seem plentiful. In-depth studies into various historical roots of the field, however, are not plentiful and are listed by Donaldson and Donaldson as a prime research need in outdoor education.\textsuperscript{37}

Dorothy Lou MacMillan traces the beginnings of outdoor education in this country to the first recorded experiments of


\textsuperscript{37}Donaldson and Donaldson, "Its Promising Future," p. 28.
William Gunn, generally considered "the father of organized camping".38 James M. Clarke, Julian Smith, and others, also contributed historical research.39 Thomas J. Rillo, a prolific writer in the field of outdoor education, covered education's connection with each of four types of camps: private camps, agency camps, church camps, and institutional camps.40

George W. Donaldson and Oswald H. Goering offer insight into philosophy and many other aspects of outdoor education.41 Donald R. Hammerman examined the premise that the development of camping education was a natural outgrowth of the socio-economic forces at work in America between 1930 and 1960.42

California's 1946 entry into outdoor education, through the launching of a San Diego City-County program, is researched by Schram, Roehling, and others.43 There is a need for updated studies on California's ever-increasing involvement in

outdoor education programs.

Summary and Need for Future Research

Outdoor education is relatively new to the field of education. It lacks well-designed empirical research in many areas. Donaldson claims the studies which have been made are poorly designed and have populations too small for valid results. Most research in outdoor education has concentrated on school camping and administration, leaving the rest of the field in need of research. Cognitive studies made in school camping programs are few with unimpressive findings. More well-designed cognitive studies are needed, but there also exists a critical need to validate the existing more impressive affective domain studies through replication, as well as to expand research in this area.

Donaldson identifies five areas of outdoor education in particular need of empirical study: (1) In-depth research into the various historical roots of the field, (2) Philosophical studies, (3) Empirical studies in the area of curriculum and learning, (4) Broadened administrative studies, and (5) Studies focusing on the education of teachers for outdoor instruction.

Administrative research was examined but considered irrelevant to the philosophic nature of this project. Doctoral

---

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
dissertation abstracts were used where original full-length copies of the originals were not available or financially feasible.

Specific questions left unanswered by outdoor educational research or which need further validation are many. Some of these include:

1. What are the motivational elements in a camping experience which effect children?
2. What elements of subject matter can best be taught in the out-of-doors?
3. Can a group experience actually change the personality of a child?
4. What outdoor education experiences contribute most to the development of the child?
5. To what extent is the learning rate of different age children changed by a resident camp experience?
6. What type and quality of preparation for teachers is essential to effective leadership in the out-of-door?

One of the biggest needs in outdoor educational research is the need for effective leadership to form to focus research efforts on what educators want and need to know about outdoor education. Donaldson states that, "Lacking such leadership, it is doubtful that much relevant research will come about."  

48 Gabrielsen and Holtzer, "Role of Outdoor Education", p. 17.
Historical and Philosophic Foundations

Philosophic Elements from the Old World

The philosophy of resident outdoor education in California is the basic philosophy of outdoor education, tailored primarily to the needs of sixth-graders, and geared to a school camp setting which was designed as an extension of the regular school curriculum. The central philosophy of outdoor education can be traced back to the writings of John Dewey and others who believed that a direct experience is better than a vicarious one.50

Karen Blomberg traces this belief in direct experience to Comenius—more than 300 years ago.51 William H. Freeberg and others, however, trace mistrust of dependence on the written word back to the beginnings of writing itself. William H. Freeberg and Loren B. Taylor mention that, "The prehistoric period of man represented one facet of the outdoor education program—emphasis on direct and real life


The accumulation of knowledge through the use of writing in ancient Egypt gives us one of the earliest recorded criticisms of overdependency on learning from the written word. Thamus, a well-known Egyptian king once said of writing:

This discovery of yours will create a forgetfulness in the learner's souls, because they will not use their memories; they will trust to the external written character and not remember themselves. The specific which you have discovered is an aid not to memory but to reminiscence, and you give your disciples not truth, but only semblance of truth; they will be hearers of many things and will have learned nothing.  

Freeberg and Taylor also point out that India and the Semitic nations helped elevate the positions of education and the teacher in society, improving pupil-teacher relationships through close contact. India and the Semitic nations also added an ethical spiritual fabric to education, though it remained for Western civilizations to exalt the worth and needs of the individual. The purpose of education in the West was to turn man's mind outward to his environment and to nature and to develop the individual's ability to make his own place in society rather than accept the place assigned to him by birth.

53 Ibid., p. 142.
54 Ibid.
The contributions of ancient Greece to education and philosophy have been well documented. Their significance to the field of outdoor education are solidly rooted to the great thinkers of Athens, birthplace of democratic living espoused by outdoor education programs today. Freeberg and Taylor state that outdoor education was a basic educational technique in a Greek era which produced most of the essentials recommended for sound educational practices.55

The Greeks amassed large amounts of experience and knowledge through their strong belief in observation, inquiry, critical thinking and analysis of life about them. Aristotle's use of the inductive, objective method earns him credit for founding practically all the sciences.56

Wise use of leisure time is another precept of outdoor education programs, particularly resident programs. Aristotle believed leisure to be the most important aspect of man's life because it gave him time to contemplate and meditate.

Socrates taught in the out-of-doors or anywhere he saw fit. The whole world was his classroom, as he believed that education did not require a formal school or an organized student body. Socrates was also probably the first person to use the outdoor education technique which consisted of skillful questions and thoughtful answers, and forming concepts and precepts—as a method of teaching.57

55 Ibid., p. 152.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid., p. 151.
Plato is often credited with having founded the present day school system. Not only did he stress the importance of training the body as well as the mind, but he was one of the first educators to emphasize the principle of individual differences in talent. Plato saw education related to the whole of life. It is this integrative approach to life as well as Plato's entire method of teaching which is consistent with today's concept of outdoor education.

Jesus Christ used outdoor education methods in teaching the gospel. The out-of-doors and the marketplace became his classroom, providing a natural variety of subjects for the simple parables He used to present the most sublime truths. Christ's emphasis on love and compassion as a way of leading children into learning laid the foundations of a new method of education in direct contrast to the forceful coercion of other methods. Understanding and compassion were stressed by Christ, rather than the knowledge of facts.

Erasmus, one of the chief scholars of the Renaissance, was influential in promoting outdoor education methods. Erasmus criticized the narrow verbalistic approach to learning fostered by the humanistic movement of his time. He advocated the importance of practical experience to help clarify the classics and believed that learning, morality and religion were an integrated whole. His conviction that education must

---

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., p. 157.
60 Ibid., pp. 161-162.
be open to everyone according to each person's ability is a basic precept of modern education. 60

The belief in learning through direct experience, so essential to the philosophy of outdoor education programs today had a great boost in the seventeenth century from the sense-realist movement initiated by Francis Bacon. Perhaps the best representative of this movement was John Amos Comenius.

Comenius stressed sensory learning as a basic fundamental of primary education. 61 He believed that education and life were related and that learning is best accomplished by direct experience. Comenius recognized the importance of pre-school exposure of children to picture books at home and produced Orbis Pictus, the first visualized textbook in history. 62 He also realized that not all things should be taught in the classroom. The purpose of education to Comenius was not simply to collect information, but rather to stir up the creative urge and the imagination of the pupil. Fostering the creativity of students is a main principle of many outdoor education programs. 63

The seventeenth century saw the development of the sense-realist movement. In a larger sense, this movement was

60 Ibid., pp. 161-162.
61 Ibid., p. 167.
63 Freeberg and Taylor, Philosophy of Education, p. 167.
a fragment of a larger movement which stressed the development of scientific technology. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, outdoor educational philosophy gained renewed emphasis on sense perception methodology from the idealistic naturalism of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

Rousseau’s writings contain the germ of the outdoor educational principle of democratic living. He mentions the democratic educational concerns of liberty, equality, and fraternity and the natural social equality of the individual which would occur if men were allowed to exist free from domination by their fellow men.64

Rousseau theorized that the traits of human personality would cause children to learn naturally and directly from nature.65 Many of his colleagues and disciples, including Johann Bernard Basedow and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi practiced Rousseau’s theory by taking children on nature hikes. Much of Basedow and Pestalozzi’s curriculum stressed nature study such as that found in today’s conservation and environmental-oriented programs but also included teaching arithmetic, geography and physics. There was an effort to relate these subjects to the practical needs and interests of the students.66

In summary, the philosophic and historical foundations of modern resident outdoor education programs may be traced at

64 Ibid., p. 169.
66 Freeberg and Taylor, Philosophy of Outdoor Education, p. 170.
least as far back as the peripatetic school of Aristotle, begun in the year 335 B.C. Though Eastern cultures helped elevate the social, moral and ethical status of education, thereby improving the position of the teacher as well, it remained for the West to elevate the worth of the individual.

Certain philosophic elements of outdoor education have been traced from the beginnings of Western civilization up through the nineteenth century. Philosophic elements contributed by Eastern cultures include: (1) a belief in direct and real life experiences; (2) a belief in the development of spiritual values; (3) better teacher-pupil relationships.

Western society added the following philosophic elements to outdoor education: (4) creative expression of the individual; (5) belief in the effectiveness of the Socratic questioning method of inquiry common to outdoor education; (6) belief in the integrative approach to curriculum in education; (7) belief in the use of the out-of-doors as a classroom or laboratory in which to learn things which may best be learned there; (8) belief in the Christian ethic of compassionate guiding to understanding, rather than forceful coercion to learn facts (begun in the Middle East but spread through Christian countries of the West); (9) a belief in the principle of democratic living; (10) a belief in the preservation of life and health; (11) a belief in the value of leisure time.

---

The late nineteenth century saw Johann Friedrich Herbart advance the beliefs of (12) development of personal character and (13) the development of social morality. Herbert Spencer contributed the beliefs in (14) vocational activities related to earning a living, (15) domestic activities related to family living, and (16) social and political activities related to citizenship. With the precedence of these sixteen philosophic elements behind it, outdoor education was ready to come to the United States.

Philosophic Developments in the United States

The sixteen philosophic elements mentioned in the previous section entered this country in the form of what was called "school camping" as early as 1861. At this time, William Gunn, generally considered the "father of organized camping", began one of the first recorded experiments in learning through camping experience. 68

Resident outdoor education in this country, as we know it, had its beginnings as a public school function through a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to the public schools of Michigan in 1940. It was clear from the objectives that resident outdoor education, then called "school camping", was to be made an integral part of the public schools:

The content of the school camping program was focused on one objective: to help the campers achieve socially desirable attitudes, skills, habits, interests, appreciation, and knowledge in four areas—social living, leisure pursuits

and healthful living and work experience. 69

With camping now a legitimate function of public education, new resident outdoor education programs were free to draw freely for philosophy from two very famous sets of goals which were to become the backbone of future outdoor education programs. These were the 1918 set of educational goals established by the National Education Association's Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Schools, and the NEA's Educational Policies Commission's 1938 statement of objectives. 70

The seven cardinal objectives contributed by the 1918 sets of goals were: (1) health, (2) command of fundamental processes, (3) worthy home membership, (4) vocation, (5) citizenship, (6) worthy use of leisure time, and (7) ethical character. The NEA's Educational Policies Commission's goals of 1938 added the following concepts: (1) self realization, (2) human relationship, (3) economic efficiency, and (4) civic responsibility. 71

Donald R. Hammerman examined the premise that the development of camping education was a natural outgrowth of the socio-economic forces at work in America between 1930 and 1960. 72 Julian Smith, head of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation mentions three major forces at

69 Gabrielsen and Holtzer, *Role of Outdoor Education*.

70 Ibid., pp. 13-14.

71 Ibid.

72 Donald R. Hammerman, "An Historical Analysis".
work which influenced and shaped the aims of early school camping. These forces include: (1) industrialization, (2) newer views on learning, (3) publicized reaction to the effects of World War I.  

Industrialization brought with it urbanization and an increased pace of living. Julian Smith, Reynolds Carlson, George Donaldson, and Hugh Masters have summarized the philosophic influences behind the need for living and learning in the out-of-doors as follows:

1. Urbanization
2. The frenzied tempo of modern living
3. Automation and mechanization
4. Sedentary living
5. Abstractions

The same forces listed above have, according to these authors, created basic human needs which can best be met, in part, by outdoor education. These needs are:

1. The need for creative living
2. The need for physical and mental fitness
3. The need for roots in the soil
4. The need for spiritual satisfactions

Tracing the influence of outdoor education philosophy on curriculum, George Donaldson writes that the philosophy of early school camps was almost totally activity-oriented, with little emphasis on form or curricular subject matter, such as Science, and Math, except where needed to solve problems at
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The two cardinal principles, mentioned earlier, of health and wise use of leisure received a great deal of emphasis in the curriculum of early outdoor education programs up into the 1940's.

A book published in 1961 by AAHPER contains the following statement showing the activity-oriented philosophy still comprising one element of outdoor education:

"The entire school curriculum must be concerned as a tool for developing attitudes, understandings, knowledges and skills required for leisure literacy."

There was much public concern about physical fitness after World War I. Widely publicized statistics concerning physical rejection from military service caused a great deal of mandatory state legislation concerning health and physical education. State directors and supervisors were appointed to state departments of education to give direction to school districts. The fact that many early outdoor education programs stressed physical education, health, and recreation can be traced to these developments.

Since 1930's outdoor education programs have followed L. B. Sharp's principle thesis underlying the implications for all subject matter in all areas of study, and at

---
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all levels. Sharp probably best stated the philosophy underlying outdoor education when he said:

That which can best be learned inside the classroom should be learned there. That which can best be learned in the out-of-doors through direct experience, dealing with the native materials and the life situations should there be learned. 79

A look at some common objectives of outdoor education as they appeared in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's reveals some interesting shifts in philosophic emphasis. 80 Early objectives of the health-welfare camping period of the 1930's were:

1. Healthful living
2. Working
3. Social living
4. Leisure pursuits

The 1940's saw a swing to an emphasis on social living:

1. Learning to live together
2. Learning to work
3. Learning about the physical environment
4. Learning to live healthfully

The order in which these listed objectives appear is as revealing of the nature of philosophical priorities of a given decade as is what has been deleted from the list. The 1950's saw not only the concept of social living take top priority but also saw great expansion of outdoor education programs. Sputnik caused these programs to become curricula-centered, rather than activity-centered.


One extreme had gone to the other. Education for
the outdoors had reversed itself to education in the out-
doors. Outdoor education had begun to justify itself
almost solely in terms of cognitive learning, and began to
"divide itself up" into academic disciplines. William
H. Freeberg, however, saw outdoor education as a method of
enriching oral and written expression, rather than as a
separate discipline. As was mentioned previously,
outdoor education today is seen as a method of teaching.

Donaldson and Donaldson saw a renewed emphasis on
outdoor skills and predicted a return of outdoor educa-
tion to a better balance of cognitive, affective, and
psychomotor learning. They predicted that, "outdoor
education will once again be education in and for the
outdoors".

Donaldson and Donaldson indicated philosophic studies
as one of five major needs in outdoor education research. Very few research efforts at this time exist in this area.
Perhaps the study most directly related to philosophy of
outdoor education was that made by Clinton Neal Fitzpatrick
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who tried to (1) develop a statement of philosophy for outdoor education and (2) identify goals consistent with the statement of philosophy.  

Fitzpatrick analyzed the writings of educational leaders on the broad concept of outdoor education to determine common elements. From this was developed a statement of philosophy. A list of goals was obtained from a review of literature and from a survey of persons in outdoor education. These goals were submitted to twenty directors of outdoor education programs for approval and then to ten experts in outdoor education, ten leaders in disciplines and professional areas of education, and ten superintendents of school districts having outdoor education programs.  

From the approved goals, Fitzpatrick was able to define outdoor education as follows:

A method which utilizes resources beyond the classroom as a stimulus for learning and a means for curriculum enrichment. The knowledge obtained through this direct approach to learning should enable the individual to better understand the unity of all life. It should help him to develop a sense of pride for the historical, educational, scientific, recreational, and inspirational values that are a part of his heritage. Ultimately, he should be able to play a more constructive role in the society of which he is a part.  

---
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Fitzpatrick's goals and statement of philosophy will be used in this project to design a tool for the comparison of basic philosophic elements at work in resident outdoor education programs in California.

Other significant research contributions touching philosophy of outdoor education would have to include those of Gabrielsen and Holtzer who condensed ten major aims of outdoor education programs from an examination of some fifty statements of objectives of outdoor education programs. These statements include resident programs as a major component of outdoor education and are listed as follows:

1. To teach the elements of democratic living through group living, planning, and sharing.
2. To provide direct experiences in the natural and biological sciences.
3. To teach the importance and appreciation for natural resources through realistic projects.
4. To provide the opportunity for meaningful work experiences.
5. To teach the skills involved in outdoor recreation, such as: fishing, camping, boating, hunting, and hiking.
6. To teach personal health and safety.
7. To provide the opportunity for students to assume responsibility and develop self-reliance.
8. To provide the opportunity for enjoyable fun experiences in the out-of-doors.
9. To teach survival in the out-of-doors.
10. To integrate as much as possible the outdoor experiences with the school curriculum.

---

Horn's study indicated the existence of three prominent attitude groups accounting for disagreement over the term "outdoor education" among authorities in the field. He identified the existence and aims of the "Environment-Oriented," "Conservation-Oriented," and "Activity-Oriented" groups defined earlier in the "Definition of Terms" section of this paper. An examination of these terms reveals some basic differences in philosophy.

The development of twenty objectives for outdoor education brought about changes in the field. Key objectives in the field of outdoor education from 1925 to 1954 were approved. These were arrived at through an analysis of literature on outdoor education on these two points: Development of twenty objectives for outdoor education. Martin Human Rogers, "Principles and Functions of Outdoor Education," Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1956, Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 16, No. 16, pp. 1748-1749.
As has been previously mentioned, outdoor education has no curricula of its own. However, it can provide integrated learning in four areas of learning stressed by most outdoor programs as being learnable in the out-of-doors. These areas have traditionally included: (1) Democratic group living, (2) Healthful outdoor living, (3) Leisure time education, and (4) Conservation education.

Philosophic goals and objectives for Environmental education programs which have sprouted in the 1970's are in their infancy as far as research is concerned.92 These programs are heavily weighted toward the conservation and natural science areas of the curriculum. Commissioner of Education, S. P. Marland once announced that the American people were determined to make the 1970's the "Environmental Decade":

...we now see environmental education as a new approach to learning. Even as attitudes of individual worth, free agency, democratic consent, and cooperative effort are learned subconsciously in many parts of the school curriculum, so must new attitudes of environmental concern pervade each subject, each course, and each discipline, whether mathematics, English, science, social studies, music, or whatever. Environmental education is interdisciplinary, pervading in spirit of all teaching at all levels.93

Environmental education, by definition, is broader in scope than the study of conservation and, when taught in
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the out-of-doors, becomes one facet of outdoor education. The basic nature of environmental education is concerned with the study of mankind's relationship and interaction with his total environment. This includes working toward solution of environmental problems. More specifically defined, "Environmental Education is a process of developing a citizenry that is:

1. knowledgeable of the interrelated biophysical and sociocultural environments of which man is a part;
2. aware of the associated environmental problems and management alternatives of use in solving these problems; and
3. motivated to work toward the maintenance and further development of diverse environments that are optimum for living.94

Preliminary examination of guidebooks and materials developed for newly developed programs show these programs go under such titles as "Environmental education", "Conservation education", and "Science laboratory". Some of these programs seem heavily weighted toward the natural and physical sciences, while others seem to have a more traditional emphasis on total outdoor experiential learning.

Perhaps it is wise to hope that future development of Environmental programs, in the process of seeking solutions to man's technical problems, will not lose sight of values basic to man himself. Perhaps newly emerging programs will embrace a balanced share of the following underlying concepts

94 Ibid. (Introduction)
of outdoor education, as expressed by Freeberg and Taylor:

1. first-hand experiences with subject matter taught.

2. integrated and correlated learnings resulting from a study of nature.

3. personal discoveries, investigations and reasoning involved in nature study.

4. applications of facts to principles derived from experiences to develop the art of critical thinking through direct experience and through relationships.

5. aesthetic appreciations and inspirations derived from nature.

6. development of good physical and mental health through active learning situations.

7. development of group cooperation and human relationship.

8. enjoyment of challenging learning and recreational activities.\footnote{Freeberg and Taylor, Philosophy of Outdoor Education, p. 235.}

Philosophic Elements of California's Program

The philosophy of resident outdoor education in California is the basic philosophy of outdoor education, tailored primarily to the needs of sixth-graders, and geared to a school camp setting which was designed as an extension of the regular school curriculum. The establishment of Camp Cuyamaca in 1946, started and supported by the people of San Diego city and county, marked California's entry into modern resident outdoor education.

The San Diego effort was significant for two reasons; (1) Being California's first and possibly most successful...
venture into resident outdoor education, the San Diego program became a model of precedence for the establishment of many other California programs, and (2) San Diego's coordinator and founder, Denver Fox, contributed philosophy which was to affect future programs.

The San Diego pilot school camping project showed three types of educational contributions as a result of teacher, parent, and student evaluations of the experience. These included:

1. More knowledge gained about the natural world, a better awareness of principles of health, and the development of more cooperativeness and self-confidence.


3. Better understanding by the teacher of the students and better relationships between teachers and students.  

Denver Fox lamented children's loss of a natural heritage:

The world in which children are living today is a technical world of push buttons, automation and remote control. Children no longer have a natural heritage wherein they can orient and relate themselves to simple, natural laws of cause and effect. Children need to have experiences that go beyond abstractions. They need to take part in activities in which understanding and a strong feeling of purpose grow directly from firsthand, real life situations.

Since the Kellogg Foundation Workshop at Camp Palomar
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in San Diego County in 1950, resident outdoor education pro-
grams under the influence of heavy federal funding saw a
tremendous period of growth, even though this growth was small
in terms of potential. By 1959 there were more than thirty-
one thousand children attending school camps in California,
with 517 separate schools and 173 school districts operating
camping programs.98

It is very difficult, if not impossible, however, to
estimate the number of participating districts in California
today. Much funding dropped off in the 1960's, forcing many
districts to either drop their programs or gain county
sponsorship to make them economically feasible. The latest
study done to ascertain the number of programs involved was
in 1971 by way of questionnaire with a 38 percent reply rate.99
County offices replied well, but the actual number of district-
sponsored programs remains uncertain, indeed.

By 1959 the three largest camping programs in opera-
tion in California were San Diego City and County, Los Angeles
City and County, and the city of Long Beach.100 Manley and
Drury, in a graduate thesis questionnaire, acquired the follow-
ing data on objectives common to all school camps:
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1. To learn to live democratically with other children and adults through experiences in out-of-door living. The terms here included such statements of democratic social living, sharing responsibilities, getting along with others, group living and planning.

2. To learn to understand and appreciate the out-of-doors. This included terminology such as pioneer life, rural life, conservation, nature, and natural resources.

3. To learn to be more self-reliant. Other terms for this included personal independence, personal growth, self-confidence, discovering new interests and talents in one's self, self-realization, and initiative.

4. To give to campers an understanding and practice in rules of healthful living.

Not common to all school camps, but frequently mentioned were the following objectives:

1. To give campers worthy skills in recreation.

2. To make instruction more meaningful to the students in such fields as science, social science, language arts, creative dramatics, and music.

3. To grow in those intangible outcomes often labeled as "spiritual values".

4. To learn good methods and procedures in camping.

5. To learn to observe rules of individual and group safety.

Some school camps listed the following objectives:

1. Better teacher-pupil understanding.

2. Acquiring a broader philosophy of life.

3. Opportunity for a meaningful experience in the earning of savings.

4. Improved habits of observation (seeing rather
Concerning the study of science in outdoor education, Kenneth Pike stated:

Outdoor education can help individuals to understand the areas of scientific progress and add to those general understandings of certain fundamental concepts which scientists and others believe to be essential to the progress of society.\textsuperscript{103}

Pike identified two basic kinds of science concepts which can be demonstrated in outdoor education programs at the elementary school level: (1) those which are concerned with understanding the nature of the visible world, and (2) those which are concerned with relationships between forms.\textsuperscript{104}

Because it is not uncommon in California for resident outdoor education programs to run as long as one week in length, it is not too surprising to find philosophy advanced concerning the best age for school camping of this length. Although Donaldson and Donaldson predicted the decade of the seventies "should end the dogma, Outdoor education is for upper elementary children", the fact remains that most resident outdoor education programs in California are for sixth graders.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
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James Mitchell Clarke stated:

... the Camp Cuyamaca experience indicates that sixth grade children are at a particularly favorable stage of maturation and in a particularly favorable classroom situation to profit from a camping trip. At this age, coeducational camping is practicable and has educational advantages.

Holley Ashcraft, coordinator of the Long Beach resident outdoor education program in its early stages, identified six reasons why school camping is particularly appealing to the pre-teen sixth grader:

1. **He is adventurous.** The teacher takes advantage of this through techniques of exploration, discovery, and first-hand experiences. He uses all his senses in the learning process. He learns to observe carefully, the intricacies of nature about him, and through direct experience, the story of nature unfolds for him in a natural and realistic manner.

2. **The child is a realist.** He wants to experience things first-hand; he is not impressed by theory. Through effective teaching, the interrelationship and interdependence of all things in nature become real and understandable.

3. **The child continually seeks status with his peer group.** He learns he must be tolerant, cooperative, helpful, sportsmanlike, and willing to share responsibilities to "belong" in small group living. He gains experience in democratic social living.

4. **The normal child wishes above all things to be "grown up," and thus be increasingly independent of adults.** For some children it may be the first time away from home for quite so many days and nights.

5. **Children need wholesome, active outdoor living and the school camp provides an ideal environment in which to attain it.**

---

6. Children need fun.\textsuperscript{107}

Helen Heffernan, former Chief of the Bureau of Elementary Education for the California State Department of Education, is internationally known for her contributions to the advancement of early childhood education. Helen writes:

\textit{...We hope their outdoor experiences will help children to stretch mentally, to mature socially; to find inspiration, relaxation, physical and mental health close to nature; and to relate what they learn in school to realistic problems of man's wise utilization of his environment.}\textsuperscript{108}

The above statement contains nearly all the basic elements of philosophy which exist in California's resident outdoor education programs. Beautifully written in 1961, it even contains the basic idea behind the new "environmental education" programs blossoming in the 1970's. Heffernan felt that outdoor experiences of a wide variety help the learner to relate to the physical world about him and to appreciate its infinite variety.\textsuperscript{109}

Besides encouraging outdoor education to permeate the entire curriculum, Heffernan believed: (1) children need to learn some outdoor skills for survival, and (2) children need some scientific knowledge on which to base intelligent behavior as a participating and contributing


\textsuperscript{108}Helen Heffernan, "They Grow Nine Feet High," \textit{Childhood Education} 44 (October 1967): 74-78.
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In summary, this section of the project has attempted to trace developments in educational philosophy regarding resident outdoor education in California. The San Diego pilot project brought three types of educational contributions, and Denver Fox philosophized on the probability of firsthand real life experiences in the out-of-doors helping to compensate for children's loss of a natural heritage.

Manley and Drury identified data on objectives common to all school camps and Kenneth Pike identified kinds of science concepts which can be demonstrated at the elementary school level. Also, Clarke and Ashcraft philosophized on the special suitability of resident school camping for sixth grade students.

In conclusion, Helen Heffernan expressed her belief in the necessity for a wide variety of outdoor education experiences and identified two basic types of children's needs. Perhaps of most importance, was Heffernan's beautifully written, concise philosophy in California's resident outdoor education programs:

We know that through experience, children learn. Outdoor education is an unparalleled means to introduce curriculum.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{110}}\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{111}}\text{Ibid.}\]
Survey of Philosophic Elements in California

Purpose and General Description

The primary purpose of this survey is to compare the philosophic elements underlying various California county and district-sponsored outdoor education programs functioning at the present time. This will be accomplished by examining written statements in available guides and handbooks and by developing a tool from available research for their comparison.

A second purpose of this survey is to discover which and how many of the contacted county and district-sponsored programs are advanced enough to be willing or able to supply useful, clearly stated philosophic aims, goals and objectives.

Data for this survey was collected by means of mailing copies of the letter enclosed in the appendix. A total of one hundred county offices and school districts were contacted requesting handbooks regarding resident outdoor education programs.

Upon reception of these and other printed matter, data was sorted according to usefulness to the survey. A format containing elements of philosophy identified through review of research in the field was constructed. This was then used to identify and categorize commonalities and differences found

112 Appendix, p. 65.
among statements of beliefs, ideals and purposes of the various programs under study.\textsuperscript{113}

Limitations of the Study

The nature of this study is descriptive. Descriptive studies by their very nature are quickly outdated. It is very likely new resident outdoor education programs have developed during the writing of this project.

The intended scope of this project covers resident outdoor education programs throughout the whole of California's fifty-eight counties. Programs covered include both county and independent district-sponsored programs. A major limitation here is the unavailability of a comprehensive up-to-date survey listing all or most districts participating in resident outdoor education programs. This is a major research need in the field.

Information for this present study was taken from the 1972 \textit{California Conservation and Environmental Education Survey} by Melanie Hlade. This is the latest survey in existence attempting to list districts and counties participating in environmental and conservation programs in California. Resident outdoor programs were treated as a subheading of environmental and conservation programs, although this is not the way they are defined in this paper.

Hlade's survey received a thirty-eight percent reply by way of questionnaire, severely limiting the number of districts

\textsuperscript{113}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 72.
contacted by this present survey. Also, although all fifty-eight county offices were contacted at least twice by mail, only independent district programs fitting the definition of resident outdoor education found in this project were examined. Responding county programs were screened using the same criteria. Many of the county offices contacted either had no resident programs at the time of Elade's study or were sharing the services of adjoining counties.

A second limitation of this survey is that it is based strictly upon examination of philosophic elements extracted from printed guides, handbooks or bulletins which districts and county offices were willing or able to give up and there was no way of telling really which was the case. Programs not sending these materials are therefore included only in the tally sheet.

County offices, on the whole, seemed more responsive than districts, although some districts were very generous with materials. Others were willing to relinquish them only on loan or at a price. One district wanted a price of five dollars for a handbook and another, a price of ten dollars. Still others had no written guides developed, had obsolete guides resulting from discontinued programs, or sent materials so vague in philosophy they were useless.

The most interesting response came from a county superintendent of schools who, after reading a copy of the letter enclosed in this project, replied:
Thank you for your inquiry and we wish you success in finding a position of your choice.

A third limitation has to do with the actual reply rate. All fifty-eight counties and forty-two districts known to have been involved in resident programs were contacted at least twice by letter—a total of one hundred contacts. A total of sixty-five percent of these contacts replied, though only twenty-two percent of the one hundred sent materials useful to this study.

In view of the low amount of useable material, therefore, all programs matching the criteria were examined with no attempt at randomization. However, it seems only fair to point out that some of the county programs are huge, involving thousands of children. Los Angeles County alone has nearly a dozen districts under their sponsorship. A look at the tally sheet will indicate the distribution of children and districts.\footnote{Appendix, p. 66.} Also, the programs under examination are spread geographically all over California.

It must be assumed at this point that districts and counties having resident outdoor education programs would be more likely, on the whole, to reply to surveys such as this one and Elade's. Elade made a similar assumption based on the fact that one main purpose of her survey was to find out whether the legislative mandate of Senate Bill No. 1, signed into law November 13, 1968, was being carried out.

It must also be remembered that Elade's survey received
a thirty-eight percent reply rate—not particularly overwhelming, in light of her stated purpose and position in the California Department of Education. Elade stated that many small and rural school districts complained that it was nearly impossible for them to obtain funding for programs, since they do not have the resources available to develop and write effective grant proposals.

Organization of Data

Research has shown Fitzpatrick's study to be of prime importance to the formation of existing philosophy and statement of goals for modern outdoor education programs.

All nine of Fitzpatrick's goals approved by a panel of experts in the field, will constitute the means by which this paper will compare the goals of various outdoor education programs in California. Some of these goals are broad enough to encompass the goals and objectives of recently developed "Conservation", "Ecology" and "Environmental" programs which fit the broad definition of "resident outdoor education" found in this paper.

Robert E. Roth and Stanley L. Helgeson have indicated that the development of philosophy and goals appropriate for these new environmental programs is in its infancy. They show how these programs borrow philosophy and goals from Fitzpatrick and rely on other areas of outdoor education.

Using Fitzpatrick's goals as a framework, objectives
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for outdoor education drawn from studies done by Manley and Drury, Freeberg and Taylor, The San Diego Pilot School Camping Project, Martin Humann Rogers, and Gabrielsen and Holtzer were examined to discover objectives common to them. These common objectives were then charted and matched to Fitzpatrick’s broader goals as they appeared to fit, comprising a framework of comparison for the various California resident programs under study.

Statements of beliefs, ideals and purposes extracted from resident outdoor education handbooks and guides were matched to the above framework and checked off on a framework grid constructed for this purpose. Objectives were checked off as they applied to a particular program. All organized and charted data was then analyzed using simple percentage to discover answers to the following questions:

1. What percentage of contacted California resident outdoor education programs replied to this survey?
2. What percent of contacted programs replied with materials useful to this survey?
3. What percent of Fitzpatrick’s goals appeared to be met by each of the programs under study, scoring at least one objective match in each of the nine goal categories?
4. Which goals appeared to receive the greatest percentage of response by all the programs examined?
5. Which goals appeared to receive the least percentage of response by all programs examined?

Additional questions for consideration are:

6. What is the approximate number of children involved in the programs under examination?
7. Approximately how many children and school districts appear to be represented by programs responding to the greatest percentage of Fitzpatrick’s goals?
Fitzpatrick's Goals and Objectives

1. To help realize, through education, the full potential of the individual toward optimum development of the mind, body, and spirit:

Objectives:

a. To teach personal health and safety.

b. Development of good physical and mental health through active learning situations.

c. Application of facts and principles derived from experience to develop the art of critical thinking through direct experience and through relationships.

d. Development of new interests, new self-realizations, and spiritual gains.

2. To utilize fully and constructively resources beyond the classroom as a stimulus for learning and a means of curriculum development:

Objectives:

a. To provide direct experiences in the natural and biological sciences.

b. To integrate as much as possible the outdoor experiences with the school curriculum.

c. Integrated and correlated learnings resulting from a study of nature.

d. To make instruction more meaningful to the students in such fields as science, social science, language art, creative dramatics, and music.

3. To develop awareness, appreciation, and understanding of the natural environment and man's relation to it:

a. To teach the importance and appreciation for natural resources through realistic projects.

b. Adjustment to the natural, physical environment.

c. Personal discoveries, investigations and reasoning involved in nature study.

d. More knowledge gained about the natural world.

e. To learn to understand and appreciate the out-of-doors.
f. Improved habits of observation (seeing rather than merely looking).

4. To help the individual become self-reliant in the outdoors.
   a. To provide the opportunity for students to assume responsibility and develop self-reliance.
   b. To teach survival in the out-of-doors.
   c. To learn good methods and procedures in camping.

5. To develop knowledges, skills, attitudes, and appreciations for the wise use of leisure time:
   a. To teach the skills involved in outdoor recreation, such as: fishing, camping, boating, and hiking.
   b. To provide the opportunity for enjoyable fun experiences in the out-of-doors.

6. Promote democratic human relations and procedures through outdoor learning and group living experiences.
   a. To teach elements of democratic living through group living, planning, and sharing.
   b. Better teacher-pupil understanding.

7. To help the individual become more civic-minded through the utilization of resources within the community, state, nation, and world.
   a. Improvement of active-community cooperation and understanding.

8. To contribute to the vocational efficiency of the individual by providing purposeful work experiences beyond the classroom.
   a. To provide the opportunity for meaningful work experiences.

9. To permit an atmosphere conducive to the aesthetic development of the individual.
   a. Increase the capacity for scientific thinking, creativeness, and worthwhile emotional reactions.
   b. Aesthetic appreciations and inspirations derived from nature.
Analysis of Data

Data analysis will be presented by way of question and answer method. Questions to be answered include the following:

1. What percentage of contacted California resident outdoor education programs replied to this survey?
   Answer: sixty-five percent.

2. What percentage of contacted programs replied with materials useful to this survey?
   Answer: twenty-two percent.

3. What percentage of Fitzpatrick's goals appeared to be met by each of the programs under study, scoring at least one objective match in each of the nine goal categories?
   Answer:
   - Santa Clara County: seventy-eight percent
   - Merced County: sixty-seven percent
   - Rialto School District: seventy-eight percent
   - Los Angeles County: seventy-eight percent
   - Los Angeles City Schools: seventy-eight percent
   - Etiwanda School District: sixty-seven percent
   - Wheatland Elementary: forty-four percent
   - Murray School District: seventy-eight percent
   - Sutter County: seventy-eight percent
   - Santa Barbara County: eighty-nine percent
   - Kings County: sixty-seven percent
   - Windsor Union: seventy-eight percent
   - Tulare County: seventy-eight percent
   - Alvord Unified: sixty-seven percent
   - San Diego City-County: one hundred percent
   - Inyo County: eighty-nine percent
   - San Joaquin County: eighty-nine percent
   - Monterey County: one hundred percent
   - Glenn County: sixty-seven percent
   - Long Beach Unified: eighty-nine percent
   - Coalinga Unified: one hundred percent
   - Orange County: one hundred percent

4. Which goals appeared to receive the greatest percentage of response by all the programs examined?
   Answer: Three goals received a response of ninety percent or higher, according to the number of
objectives checked beside each goal. These goals included:

Goal III- To help realize, through outdoor education, the full potential of the individual toward optimum development of the mind, body, and spirit.

Apparent response equaled 97.6 percent.

Goal II- To utilize fully and constructively resources beyond the classroom as a stimulus for learning and a means of curriculum enrichment.

Apparent response equaled 98.8 percent.

Goal IX- To permit an atmosphere conducive to the aesthetic development of the individual.

Apparent response equaled 90.9 percent.

(5) Which goals appeared to receive the least percentage of response by all programs examined?

Answer: Three goals received a response of below fifty percent, according to the number of objectives checked beside each goal. These goals included:

Goal IV- To help the individual become more self-reliant in the outdoors.

Apparent response equaled 28.7 percent.

Goal VII- To help the individual become more civic-minded through utilization of resources within the community, state, nation, and world.

Apparent response equaled 40.9 percent.

Goal VIII- To contribute to the vocational efficiency of the individual by providing purposeful work experiences beyond the classroom.

Apparent response equaled 45.4 percent.

(6) What is the approximate number of children involved in the programs under examination?

Answer: at least 64,218.
Approximately how many children and school districts appear to be represented by programs responding to the greatest percentage of Fitzpatrick's goals?

Answer: 35,989 students and fifty school districts.

Eight programs appear to have responded to eighty-nine percent or more of Fitzpatrick's goals, scoring at least one objective in each of the goal categories. These include:

(a) San Diego City-County, scoring one hundred percent of the nine goals and representing at least nineteen thousand students, eight districts.

(b) Monterey County, scoring one hundred percent of the nine goals and representing at least twenty-six hundred students and five districts.

(c) Coalinga Unified School District, scoring one hundred percent of the nine goals and representing at least 189 students.

(d) Orange County, scoring one hundred percent or more of the nine goals and representing at least three thousand students and five school districts.

(e) Santa Barbara County, scoring eighty-nine percent of the nine goals and representing at least twenty-seven hundred students and eleven districts.

(f) Inyo County, scoring eighty-nine percent of the nine goals and representing at least school district. The approximate number of students involved was not available.

(g) San Joaquin County, scoring eighty-nine percent of the nine goals and representing at least four thousand students and eighteen school districts.

(h) Long Beach Unified School District, scoring eighty-nine percent of the nine goals and representing at least forty-five hundred students. This program, like San Diego's, became the model for the construction of many resident programs in California.
Needs

Elements of philosophy found in modern resident outdoor education programs in this country can be traced to ancient times. Still, the entire field of outdoor education remains a relatively new, disorganized, and unresearched area of American education.

The basic research needs of the field of outdoor education today remain what they were ten years ago: (1) In-depth research into the various historical roots of the field, (2) Philosophical studies, (3) Broadened administrative studies, (4) Empirical studies in the area of curriculum and learning, (5) Studies focusing on the education of teachers for outdoor instruction, (6) Cognitive studies in school camping with impressive findings, (7) Further replication and validation of the more impressive affective domain studies, as well as replication and expansion of research in cognitive and psychomotor learning.

Since resident outdoor education programs began in this country, there has been a philosophic struggle over the proper balance of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learnings which should make up resident programs. Beside the obvious need for research to help determine the most effective blends of these three areas of learning, there is an even greater need for a central organization which will survey, direct, and coordinate research efforts effectively in areas of need.
There is a great need to disseminate all available research to areas seeking to set up resident outdoor education programs so that unnecessary stumbling blocks might be avoided, such as the confusing and overlapping terminology which was evident through examination of handbooks. This occurred in spite of the existence of some fine research aimed at avoiding this very problem.

The variety and number of resident programs in California have far outstripped sound philosophical research done in support of them. Public demand for these programs is on the increase and is creating an even greater need for a central organization to survey, direct and coordinate research efforts in areas of need. It is not likely much progress in the field will be made until this occurs.

The philosophic studies done by Fitzpatrick, Rogers, and a few others who studied the writings of Sharp, Smith and other writers in the field of American outdoor education did much to give purpose and direction to resident programs throughout the country. The work of these men helped develop a rationale for outdoor education and traced the roots of school camping to Pestalozzi, Spencer, Rousseau, Hobart, and others.

Of prime importance to the present study was Fitzpatrick's attempt to develop a statement of philosophy for outdoor education and to identify its goals. Fitzpatrick's nine goals of outdoor education, submitted to, and approved by three juries of ten persons each in outdoor education, stand
today as the best available standard of philosophic comparison for modern resident outdoor education programs.

Conclusions and Observations

A number of conclusions are suggested by examination of information in the handbooks available for this present study. First, it appears that designers of resident outdoor education programs based more of their research efforts on examining usable philosophy of successful programs already in operation than on examination of actual available philosophic studies done in outdoor education.

Secondly, analysis of data reveals that twenty-two percent of contacted programs replied with materials useful to this survey. This was partly due to necessary rejection of many handbooks which made it appear as though programs these handbooks represented were operating without any clearly written philosophy at all, even though some of these programs had been operation a number of years and involved large numbers of children. Other programs rejected for study contained philosophic statements so vague and brief they were useless. There was a definite need for more clearly defined and stated philosophy in terms of aims, purposes, goals, and objectives.

A third observation involves the fact that, although only six of the twenty-two surveyed programs met less than seventy-eight percent of Fitzpatrick's goals, scoring at least one objective match in each of the nine goal categories, only eight programs scored higher than seventy-eight percent.
When it is realized that only one goal separates a seventy-eight from an eighty-nine percent rating, it becomes obvious that the philosophic differences separating most of the programs was slight in terms of total goals met. A mean average of eighty percent of Fitzpatrick's nine goals appeared to be met by the programs under study.

Only four programs appeared to meet all nine of Fitzpatrick's goals. One of these, the San Diego City-County program, is the oldest and probably the most successful program in California. Because of this, it has remained a prestigious model for emulation by budding resident programs for years. It is therefore a bit surprising to find only four programs appearing to meet all nine of Fitzpatrick's goals.

Three of Fitzpatrick's nine goals showed a very high match-up percentage with all of the objectives within each of their respective goal categories. A mean average match-up of at least ninety percent was achieved by each of these three goals among the twenty-two programs analyzed. It appears that a very strong emphasis is placed presently in California's resident outdoor education programs on the following goals and their objectives:

Goal III- To help realize, through outdoor education, the full potential of the individual toward optimum development of the mind, body, and spirit.

Objectives:

(1) To teach the importance and appreciation for natural resources through projects.
(2) Adjustment to the natural, physical environment.

(3) To develop the processes of discovery, investigation, and reasoning.

(4) To gain knowledge about the natural world.

(5) To understand and appreciate the out-of-doors.

(6) To improve powers of observation.

Goal II- To utilize fully and constructively resources beyond the classroom as a stimulus for learning and a means of curriculum enrichment.

Objectives:

(1) To gain direct experiences in the natural sciences.

(2) To integrate outdoor and classroom experiences.

(3) To gain integrate-correlated learnings from nature study.

(4) Meaningful instruction in various fields.

Goal IX- To permit an atmosphere conducive to the aesthetic development of the individual.

Objectives:

(1) To increase the capacity for scientific thinking, creativeness, and emotional reactions.

(2) To develop aesthetic appreciations and inspirations from nature.

Goals I, V, and VI appeared to receive good support from the programs examined, scoring mean average goal-objective match-ups of between sixty-five and seventy-eight percent.

It is felt that Goal I- Development of mind, body, and spirit, was expressed more vaguely in the handbooks and guides examined than were the other goals. It was also felt that Goals V and VI were stated rather clearly in the literature examined and represent a persistence of belief in values which appeared
very early in the history of school camping. The goals referred to here respectively are: (1) Wise use of leisure
time, and, (2) The development of democratic relationships
through group living experiences.

Goal VI has two objectives worth considering here:
(1) To teach elements of democratic living, and (2) To
promote better teacher-pupil understanding. Examination of
available literature showed better than a two-to-one response
in favor of the first of the above objectives. It is difficult
to understand the lack of stress on better teacher-pupil under­
standing in light of stresses made on social gains in other
areas and in view of the research done on teacher-pupil
relationships.

Self-reliance in the out-of-doors, as a goal of out­
door education, appears to be a remnant of earlier pre­
California programs which was left by the wayside in favor
of other goals. It received a mean goal-objective match-up
response of less than thirty percent from all programs
examined. Response to the objectives of teaching survival
in the out-of-doors and learning methods and procedures in
camping was extremely minimal; each of these objectives
receiving only four responses each.

Development of Civic-mindedness and contribution to
vocational efficiency are hold-overs from old N.E.A. goals
and objectives which formed the framework of early outdoor
education programs in this country. Examination of current
resident program literature in California, however, reveals
less than a forty-six percent mean average goal-objective response for both of these goals. There are signs, however, that the newly developing environmental and ecology programs in California are placing renewed stress on community cooperation and involvement in the solution to man's environmental problems. A few, in fact, see man himself as a natural resource to be developed to his potential on the way to the solution of these problems.

The idea of school camping being primarily suitable mentally and physically for sixth graders has been acted on for years without conclusive evidence to support it. Other unresolved and questioned concepts include the most effective length of camping experiences for youngsters, as well as the effectiveness of direct community and parent involvement in resident programs at the campsite.

Is it possible a shorter stay at camp could be made to provide significant gains in the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains, thereby saving a district considerable operating expense? Would the substitution of lay people and paraprofessionals on the camping staff for credentialed personnel give students a better feeling of personal community involvement, reach areas of a student's personality hitherto unexplored by a staff of professionals, and save the district considerable money at the same time?

An Overview

Analysis of data received for this survey revealed the existence of a great number of resident programs which
were either unwilling or unable to give up useful guides for examination. Equally evident was the cooperation and empathy displayed by sponsors of other programs.

Viewed in the light of past history, examination of the information received suggests a number of significant changes in philosophic emphases which have taken place in resident outdoor education over the years. An early emphasis on physical psychomotor learnings in the thirties and early forties gave way in the nineteen fifties to an emphasis on cognitive learnings in discipline areas and affective learning, with strong undertones of social and democratic living.

The nineteen sixties continued the trend of the fifties, stressing natural science as being of primary importance. Conservation of natural resources was an important aspect of these programs but would become of vital importance to resident programs of the seventies, in spite of predictions that outdoor education would return to a better balance of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning.

Partly prompted by state mandate, California resident programs took a new philosophical twist in the nineteen seventies. Some new "environmental" programs stress the importance of man relating to and understanding his total environment, not just his natural resources.

In some of these new programs, man himself is regarded as a prime natural resource to be developed through
the integration of natural, social, and behavioral sciences. One such program considers man to be the greatest of all natural resources. It operates on the premise that man has been out of touch with nature for so long that human personality itself must be shaped and developed and sensory awareness taught in order for man to regain a true understanding and appreciation of his task of conserving and developing his environment. Elaborate centers for the natural, physical, social, and behavioral sciences are included in the master plan.

The current emphasis of most of the new California resident outdoor education "environmental", "conservation", and "ecology" programs available for examination appears to place heavy stress on the natural and physical sciences, with more emphasis on the physical sciences than was evident in older programs. Possibly this is partially due to the highly technical nature of many environmental problems immediately at hand. It might be interesting in the future, however, to see whether or not these new programs meet the needs of human beings as well as some of the more traditional, established programs.

Most of the newer "environmental" and "ecology" programs give lip service, at least, to the importance of community education and its involvement in the effort to solve environmental problems. Few of the older, more traditional resident programs appeared to do this in their guides.
Dear Sirs:

Would you please mail me a copy of your resident outdoor education handbook (school camping). I am presently involved in Master's degree research concerned with surveying philosophic differences and commonalities among resident outdoor education programs in California's schools. My research and communications with William Hammerman and Rudolph Schafer have convinced me of the great need for philosophic research studies in outdoor education. Your cooperation would help to further organized research in a relatively unorganized but worthwhile area of education.

Appreciatively yours,

Daniel Hynes
Number of Districts Sharing County-Sponsored Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>APPROX. NO. STUDENTS</th>
<th>NO. OF DISTRICTS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUTTE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
<td>USE SHASTA PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUSA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USE SHASTA PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENN</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(SENT NOTHING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INYO</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGS</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCED</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>USE MADERA. PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>5(replied)</td>
<td>(SENT NOTHING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USE SUTTER PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACER</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
<td>SACRAMENTO PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(SENT NOTHING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WITH SANTA CRUZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTTER</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULARE</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUBA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>USE SUTTER PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>109 DISTRICTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent District Programs Responding with Useful Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>APPROX. NO. STUDENTS</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>APPROX. NO. STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIALTO</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>WINDSOR UNION</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES CITY</td>
<td>NOT AVAIL.</td>
<td>ALVORD UNIFIED</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETIWANDA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LONG BEACH UNIFIED</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEATLAND ELEM.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>COALINGA UNIFIED</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY SCHOOL DIST.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL NO.</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,564</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td># STUDENTS</td>
<td>REPLY</td>
<td>RESIDENT PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAMEDA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NONE APPARENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPINE</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMADOR</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>UNDER SUTTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALAVERAS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUSA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>COUNTY PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL NORTE</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL DORADO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENN</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>(ENVIRONMENTAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMBOLDT</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERIAL</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INYO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGS</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASSEN</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADERA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIN</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>(ENVIRONMENTAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIPOSA</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENDOCINO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCED</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODOC</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td># STUDENTS</td>
<td>REPLY</td>
<td>RESIDENT PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPA</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES-USE SUTTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACER</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES-USE SACRAMENTO CO. PROG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMAS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO-ALVORD DIST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BENITO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES-CITY-COUNTY PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN LUIS OBISPO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MATEO</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>TRI-COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES-SHARE WITH MONTEREY COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHASTA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISKIYOU</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLANO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTTER</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEHAMA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULARE</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td># STUDENTS</td>
<td>REPLY</td>
<td>RESIDENT PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUOLUMNE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENTURA</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOLO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUBA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT:</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>REPLY</td>
<td>RESIDENT PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY ELEM.</td>
<td>ALAMEDA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREMONT UNIF.</td>
<td>ALAMEDA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALAVERAS UNIF.</td>
<td>CALIVERAS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT. DIAZLO</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER PORK ELEM.</td>
<td>EL DORADO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENDOTA ELEM.</td>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALINGA UNIF.</td>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTSIDE ELEM.</td>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe ELEM.</td>
<td>IMPERIAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEELEY ELEM.</td>
<td>IMPERIAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS VALLEY UNIF.</td>
<td>INYO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWAY ELEM.</td>
<td>KERN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE LAKE ELEM.</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISEBURN ELEM.</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POMONA UNIF.</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MONICA UN.</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODOC-TULARE UN.</td>
<td>MODOC</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLERTON ELEM.</td>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALO VERDE</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVORD</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESPERIA</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORO GRANDE ELEM.</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>OPERATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIALTO UNIF.</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETIWANDA</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT:</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>REPLY</td>
<td>RESIDENT PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCINTAS ELEM.</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTA UNIF.</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHISMAN ELEM.</td>
<td>SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CLARA UN.</td>
<td>SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCloud ELEM.</td>
<td>SISKIYOU</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON UNIF.</td>
<td>SOLANO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFIELD-SUISUN</td>
<td>SOLANO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES CITY</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piner-Olivet</td>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraldsburg</td>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Union</td>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise ELEM.</td>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turlock</td>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Unif.</td>
<td>YOLO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland ELEM.</td>
<td>YUBA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.A. means information not available.
* means a program existed at the time of Melanie Blade's California Conservation and Environmental Education Survey-1971. The number of students involved were taken from this survey, for the most part, as very few materials received listed this information. These figures, therefore, serve as only very rough approximations of present program enrollments.
Annotated Bibliography

Published Reports

An important source of information in locating existing resident outdoor education programs.

Contains good descriptive material concerning the philosophy, nature and research of environmental education programs.

Interviews

Provided useful insight into the development of the Rialto Outdoor Education Program and confirmed the need for the research project presently under study.

Books

Good historical background into formation of school camps.

Contains useful material concerning the background behind sensory awareness and the importance of learning through direct experience.


Probably the most comprehensive single source of stated philosophy behind outdoor education programs throughout the country. Valuable historical information. A definite "must" for anyone interested in outdoor education.

One of the best organized books covering all aspects of outdoor education, this book is written in an interesting style and contains useful comments on research findings.


Contains good background material on outdoor education. Most of the book is devoted to providing material helpful to the planning and administration of outdoor education programs.


A fifteen-chapter view of one of the three camps provided by the San Diego County Camp Commission. It provides background into the history and philosophic development of one of the biggest and best resident outdoor education programs in the nation, started in 1946.


Published Theses


A poorly designed study with very useful definition of outdoor education. It also includes good background material on the learning theory behind outdoor education.


Good study on self-concept (affective domain) showing carry-over ten weeks after camp experience. Self-concepts and social relationships both showed greater growth among seven groups of campers than among seven control groups of non-campers.

Provides useful background information into the rise of resident outdoor education programs in California. Charts are given showing which counties and districts in California were participating in programs by 1961.


Contains good references to writings on the philosophy behind resident school camp programs in California.


Explains the variety of programs, arrangements and funds available for use by outdoor education laboratories throughout the country.


An affective domain study supporting the theory that a prolonged camp experience with a change of setting from normal school routine produces socially desirable changes in campers' attitudes and behavior.


One of the better studies in the cognitive domain with strong sociological overtones. Children experiencing the one week camping program showed superior intellectual gain, particularly in nature study. Definite gains in social relationships occurred among children, though some children losses here. Boys demonstrated more social stability and continuity of leadership than did girls.

Another affective study into self-concept with a sociological overtone into pupil social relationships. This study compared social relationships and self-concept growth in child-centered and adult-centered school camps. Subjects were fifth and sixth-grade students. No significant difference. Positive gains shown in both camps.


A cognitive experiment aimed at lessening the considerable drop in arithmetical abilities during summer vacation. Boys attending a six-week enrichment camp experienced a lower loss than those not attending. Findings indicate the value of real day-to-day experiences in maintaining arithmetic competence.


Good review of the use and development of school camping. This also was a good source for identifying important changes and trends occurring in school camping.


Contained useful definition of terms. The writer of this present paper met Mr. Partridge years ago while Mr. Partridge was teaching in the Long Beach program and had a chance to observe outdoor education as he defined it in his thesis.


Good Background information into the San Diego County-City program and the educational aims of the Rialto camp program.


An early attempt to define "outdoor education" and its principles and objectives. Particularly useful for definitions of "outdoor education" and "school camping".

A one week camping experience showed greater affective changes toward a positive attitude toward school subjects among boys than girls. Ego-concept failed to show gain. Boys formed more friendships than girls. An affective study with heavy sociological overtones.

Microforms


The title is misleading. This is as much, or more, an affective attitude study as it is a cognitive study. This is about a series of structured experiences used to generate changes in feelings and attitudes of students and faculty in seventh-grade classes in Battle Creek, Michigan Public Schools. Objectives were to: (1) reduce racial separatism and racially related black/white incidents in cafeteria and buses, (2) reduce absenteeism by improving interpersonal relationships, and (3) increase student performance on standardized tests. Interesting study, but too many variables to control.


Provides some good insight into the justification and philosophy behind early and modern school camps. A short article interestingly done.


Donaldson and Goering in 1970 further clarified the nature of outdoor education by identifying eight basic principles which have emerged from successful outdoor education programs and research.


Helpful in locating research areas of concern to this study. The printed sheet obtained by writing to Hammerman's father at San Francisco State College was of help also. The report came originally out of the Laredo Taft Field Campus, Northern Illinois University, Oregon, Illinois.

A brief but interesting contradiction to the theory that outdoor experiences produce better cognitive results. This study showed traditional summer school produced more development in visual-motor areas and in arithmetic. No significant differences reported on reading and attitudinal modification. (affective)


Probably the best available study to date on the nature of disagreement existing among experts regarding the term "outdoor education".


An off-campus four-day experience is provided for selected second year students enrolled in a second year elementary teacher preparation program. Attitudes were measured.


An interesting attempt to measure internal and external effects of camping experiences on youngsters. Good study in the affective domain.


A study examining definitions of outdoor educational terminology. Attempts are made to find commonalities and differences between objectives of outdoor education programs and other programs.


Excellent source of terminology useful to this project.

A very useful background study into the history of outdoor education in this country. All types of educational camps described.


Explains aims of outdoor education to parents.


A study designed to measure self-concept, among other things, but weakly designed. No change in self-concept noted after two week experience on pre and post-test basis. Two summer camps were involved in the study. A nine-item questionnaire was used.

Journal and Magazine Articles


An article which supports the philosophy that the pre-teen sixth-grader is the perfect age for resident outdoor education. He points out that at this age, a sixth-grader is: (1) adventurous, (2) a realist wanting to experience things first hand, (3) status and peer-conscious and seeking ways of democratic and social living, (4) striving for independence from adults—good-time-away-from caring, (5) in need of wholesome active outdoor living, (6) in need of fun.


Mentions the trend toward increasing the "sense of community" and reducing the costs by using non-professional leaders. Also, there is a shift in some areas toward the "day-camp" idea, eliminating cost of housing and feeding and the problem of night supervision.


An excellent overview of progress made in outdoor education. Concise and prophetic in nature.

Contains a very comprehensive and clearly stated philosophic definition of "outdoor education".