Male Outdoor Educators' Understandings of Masculinity in Practice: A North American Case Study

Jay Kennedy

Faculty of Education, Lakehead University Thunder Bay, Ontario

February 2021

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the degree of Doctor of

Philosophy in Educational Studies

Abstract

This exploratory, single embedded case study examined male outdoor educators' understandings of masculinity in the field and how such notions impact their practices. Data were collected via interviews (n = 18), observations of outdoor leaders' practice (n = 8), and artifactual data provided by participants' employers. Qualitative coding and analysis techniques were employed within a framework shaped by hegemonic masculinity theory and informed by critical feminist theory. Findings indicate that these male outdoor leaders were expanding their skills to include non-traditional gender practices in response to professional demands. They also indicated a willingness to confront sexist language and behaviour of their students. However, despite many participants' claims of progressive gender ideals, all demonstrated stereotypical masculine performances, essentialist beliefs, and/or blinkered viewpoints. The apparent contradiction may reflect that nearly all participants expressed confused or vague ideas about what it means to be a man and a perception that the culture is changing rapidly, leading some to claim that they have been vilified. Participants' take on gender equity also largely dovetailed with their employers' training and resourcing. It is recommended that outdoor organizations continue to enhance their work on gender equity and that organizations and outdoor leaders consider collective, rather than individualistic, approaches to promoting gender equity and cultivating space for diverse gender performances.

Acknowledgments

Many people have played important roles in supporting this research, from those who initially helped to raise my critical awareness, to those directly involved in the study, and the people who provided more regular support such as my supervisor, committee members, mentors, and friends and family. I am extremely grateful to all for their contributions and assistance.

I must first thank the participants who, because of their enthusiasm for the topic, volunteered their time and energy. Your candour and eloquence surprised and delighted me. I made every effort to represent your words respectfully and in the spirit in which they were offered.

Similarly, I must express my gratitude to the outdoor organizations that permitted me on their site(s) to collect data. All were generous and accommodating. Allowing me on their sites and sharing program materials demonstrates the commitment of the participating organizations to critically reflect on their practices and continually search for avenues to improve and better serve their staff and students.

My supervisor, Connie Russell and my committee members Gerald Walton and Chris Greig have all been extremely supportive throughout my PhD journey. Connie, your energy, enthusiasm, and understanding were always very much appreciated. I have very much enjoyed being your student and I recommend you as a supervisor every chance I get! Thank you Gerald, your keen eye always makes my work sharper and it has been a pleasure to work with you in a variety of settings, including having the opportunity to teach with you. Chris, I was very fortunate to see the poster for your book, *Canadian Men and Masculinities* on your office door during a breakout session of my first doctoral course; you provided me with support and a start-up library of essential texts that got me on my way and I have appreciated your input ever since.

Paul Berger, as my Internal Examiner you provided fresh insights and critical questions that helped me polish my dissertation. Finally, thanks to TA Loeffler, my External Examiner. It was a pleasure to have someone of your stature in the outdoor education field take the time to provide input and further shape my work.

My research skills have also been enhanced by mentors who promoted my work and offered invaluable invitations to collaborate. My sincerest thanks to Tonia Gray whose catalogue of work inspires me constantly. Tonia, your invitation to present with you, Denise Mitten, and Tom Potter at the IOERC8 Conference and to collaborate on the resulting article were pivotal in my academic journey. Hopefully I can get some more public speaking practice before we present together next! Another significant figure has been Leslie Medema, Head of Learning for Green School International, who has been a steadfast supporter who allowed me to present at professional development days and participate in Green School Bali's V-Day. And terima kasih to Desak Putu Ratmini whose teaching excellence and resilience of spirit has been a perennial inspiration.

A few people have taken the time to nurture my critical abilities informally, and whether directly or indirectly, they have shepherded me along this path. Thanks first to Nancy Taber who introduced me to the idea of hegemonic masculinity and whose class was always so engaging that I couldn't help but want to learn more. More informally, Jackie Pye, Cede Rogers, and Lex Scully challenged me in ways that made me rethink my established and unconsidered viewpoints, leading me to be more critical generally. Thank you for your help and patience!

My partner, Alex, deserves special thanks for her patience and ability to feign interest in my rantings about my latest readings. Your support and positive attitude have been so needed through the (COVID-19-influenced) dissertation process. I more than love you. Lastly, thanks to

my mother, Margaret whose sacrifices and indefatigable nature have provided for me at every turn.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Across most modern societies and cultures, masculine values and qualities and masculine presentations and expressions afford men higher status than women. (Connell, 2005; hooks, 2004). Hegemonic masculinity, the most socially valued expression of being a man, includes displays of strength, toughness, aggression, and emotional stoicism (Connell, 2005). Under this regime women are often devalued due to essentialist associations linking their bodies to femininity (Butler, 1999). Men too are labelled as feminine when they fail to adequately adhere to culturally or contextually influenced masculine norms. Critical feminist scholars have noted hegemonic masculinity's association with negative health impacts for both men (Good & Wood, 1995; Hearn, 2015) and women (Fleming et al., 2014), and that gender inequality has deleterious social, economic, and psychological impacts (hooks, 2004). Hegemonic masculinity is problematic in education as well (Saul, 2015). For example, Connell (2000) found that schools pressure students to conform to stereotypical gender roles. In addition, Smith (2007) found that teachers often model and police stereotypical gender performances, including looking the other way when girls and male students who do not perform masculinity in the expected, socially normative ways, were derogated or harassed.

Hegemonic masculinity is apparent in outdoor education as well. The outdoors has typically been seen as a masculine domain (Gray, 2016; Humberstone, 2000; Newbery, 2003) and outdoor recreational activities often valorize masculine physical strength (Avery, 2015; Newbery, 2003). The same is true in outdoor education, with its discourses of resilience and rugged individualism (Newbery, 2003) that seem to correspond with the hegemonic masculine values of toughness and independence (Connell, 2005). It is also evident in the persistent valuing of "hard" technical skills over "soft" interpersonal skills (Martin et al., 2017, 2018), that are

assumed to be gendered (Warren et al., 2019), despite all outdoor educators requiring skills traditionally seen as more feminine such as relationship-building and cooperation (Breunig et al., 2010; Gray, 2016).

Several studies have investigated women's perceptions of how their experiences in outdoor education influence their gender identity (e.g., Mitten, 2018; Newbery, 2003), but next to no research examines how outdoor education culture influences the development of men's gender identities beyond one paper that describes the impact of dominant forms of masculinity on environmentally-minded boys and young adults (Blenkinsop et al., 2018). This is a gap that needs to be filled, and is timely given many researchers have now made clear that the outdoor education field is gendered in many ways (e.g., Gough, 2013; Gray, 2016, 2018; Mitten, 2018; Wigglesworth, 2019) and suffering from the influence of hegemonic masculinity (Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Breunig & Russell, 2020; Davies et al., 2019; Gray et al., 2020; Kennedy & Russell, 2020). Such claims are supported by recent popular media reports of sexual harassment (Joyce, 2016; Langlois, 2017) and academic accounts of gender-based harassment in the outdoors (Avery, 2015; Davies et al., 2019; Newbery, 2004). Scholarly articles have described sexual comments made about women trip leaders (Avery, 2015; Davies et al., 2019; Gray, Mitten, Potter, & Kennedy, 2020), instructions from women trip leaders being ignored (Gray et al., 2017; Jordan, 2018), and accomplishments of women going unrecognized in the field (Gray, 2016; Gray et al., 2017; Mitten et al., 2018).

Given this state of affairs, multiple outdoor education scholars have called for investigation into how hegemonic masculinity is maintained but also challenged in the outdoors (Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Gray, 2016; Humberstone, 2000; Kennedy & Russell, 2020; Warren, 2016). Moreover, women researchers have questioned why few, if any, men researchers have

questioned the patriarchal structure of outdoor education (Mitten et al., 2018), despite more general entreaties for outdoor professionals to engage in research to improve the culture and practices of the field (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Priest & Gass, 2017) and focus on social justice issues (Martin et al., 2017). To date, there has been very little study of masculinity in outdoor education (Kennedy & Russell, 2020), although some tidbits relating to men's changing practices have recently emerged (Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Davies et al., 2019), which I will discuss in the literature review in the next chapter.

Understanding male outdoor educators' conception of their gender identity and performance, particularly as informed by the profession and the outdoor setting, can help construct a more complete picture of the gendered culture of outdoor education. With such knowledge, the obstacles and opportunities that exist to enable diverse gender performances and promote gender equity can be examined. My research questions for this dissertation thus were:

How do male outdoor educators understand and experience masculinity?

How do their ideas about masculinity impact their practice in the field?

How might their practice challenge and/or reinforce hegemonic masculinity?

Personal Stance

Before turning to the literature review in the next chapter, I want to acknowledge my own personal connection to and grounding in the research topic. My experiences and ruminations upon the constructed nature of masculinity and the status that valued masculine performances confer, as well as the multiple expressions of masculinity experienced in the outdoors, led me to this study. Consistent with Seidman's (1994) assertion that objectivity in qualitative, or any other type of research, is unachievable, the experiences detailed below and my perceptions of them

have impacted my approach to the research and no doubt colour my interpretation of the findings.

Upon my father's sudden death when I was four years of age, my mother undertook as a single parent to maintain our lifestyle in the affluent neighbourhood where we lived. To do so, she enacted valued masculine traits such as emotional stoicism, taking on the breadwinner role, and devaluing feminine practices (Connell, 2005) to improve her odds of success in a male-defined and dominated workplace. As she worked long hours, my care was passed to a succession of nannies. In addition, immediately after my father's death I was tested for cystic fibrosis and spent the next three years in and out of hospital receiving treatment for breathing issues. My mother became concerned that due to her influence, my female nannies, the time spent with largely female nurses, and my inability to engage in sport that I would become feminized and lose masculine status (Connell, 2005). She enrolled me in a private, boys-only school and summer camp. She also arranged contact with male mentors who modeled sporting prowess, devotion to their careers, and financial success, all of which are associated with hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005).

At the boys' school I was introduced to Christianity, in which I became very involved. After the significant tumult following my father's death and other family events, I welcomed the stability, tradition, and rules that religion offered. Later, however, I came to recognize that in the school and in the Church there was a significant patriarchal theme running through the parables and biblical quotations shared. My discomfort with the sexism and patriarchy of Christianity was part of my later decision to leave the Church. Despite the very traditional and conservative aspects of both my private school and summer camp, however, both of these settings also permitted alternative expressions of masculinity (Connell, 2005; Houston, 2012). Artistic

expression was valued at both institutions. At the summer camp, emotional displays of caring by male staff and fellow campers were also common. These experiences provided me with a sense that masculinity need not be rigidly defined.

My mother met a man while on holiday, quickly married, and she and I moved to Detroit where I attended a co-ed private school in the suburbs. The culture there was extremely stereotypical in that sports, confidence, and traditional gender norms were highly valued (Meyer, 2017). I had been growing my hair long and was still not terribly athletic. I immediately became the subject of gendered harassment and taunts questioning my masculinity and sexuality, consistent with those described by Meyer (2017). Further, like those described by Smith (2007), teachers at my school often policed gender norms, both passively and actively. Because being male was a default at my previous boys' school and various artistic and non-athletic pursuits were valued, I had never worried about how to gain masculine status or prestige. In this new context, however, I set about, very deliberately through trial and error, to determine what was valued in terms of masculine performance in order to conform (Meyer, 2017).

Three years later, I undertook an extended backcountry canoe trip through the same Ontario boys' summer camp that I continued to attend while living in Detroit. Over those 36 days I developed muscle, gained social confidence, and refined my sense of humour. On my return to the U.S., I also learned that my mother had divorced my stepfather, of whom I had become increasingly critical for his hypermasculinity and celebration of militarism. On return to school, it was clear that my confidence and more muscular, masculinized body were greatly valued, consistent with Frank and Kehler's (2010) findings about the most valued physical embodiment for boys. Due to my memory of earlier persistent gendered harassment, I also used my newfound wit and self-assurance to mock my old harassers. This was my first understanding

of power and how it can be exercised from the bottom towards the top (Foucault, 1990). Now aware of the power I possessed, and reacting to my previous harassment due to gender non-conformity, I decided to taunt my former harassers by doing anything possible to challenge the hegemonic masculinity they valued such as through dressing in women's clothes, carrying dolls, and painting my fingernails. Coincidentally, many international students joined the school at this time. Since arriving, I had always strongly identified as Canadian and openly voiced that I would be returning to Canada upon completion of high school. As a group of non-American students, we were critical of the dominant culture and developed our own subculture, openly challenging many of the American cultural ideals; we could be considered to have coalesced into a sort of counterhegemonic subculture as described by Weiler (2017).

The topic of gender returned to my attention again much later in life after I was offered the position of Director of the all-boys summer camp I had attended as a child. Pursuing a career in marketing in my 20s had meant that I had not returned to camp for eight years. In the intervening years, the camp's culture had changed from an acceptance of alternative masculinities, and what I had perceived to be relative gender equality with women staff, to one that valued displays of hypermasculinity and open disparagement of women consistent with Connell's (2005) description of hegemonic masculinity. My co-director and I had no knowledge of feminist theory so could not precisely name what was going on, but we were unsettled by the inequity. We set to work on changing the camp culture to promote a broader definition of masculinity that embraced traditionally feminine values such as caring and nurturance. The experience renewed my focus on hegemonic masculinity and encouraged me to study gender theory in my master's studies.

Following the completion of my master's degree and with a newly critical eye, I began a new position as Head of Outdoor Education at a private boys' school in Vancouver, Canada. The program gave me the chance to engage in experiential learning, such as hiking in the Coastal Mountains to witness volcanic rock formations studied in the students' science class, which heightened my existing enthusiasm for that pedagogical approach. However, the school was highly competitive and was clearly reproducing hegemonic masculinity with sporting performance and academic success as the two most valued traits (Connell, 2005). Previously, I had always found outdoor guiding to be personalized and transformative, in line with Kiaw (2012), in that it provided time for reflection and engagement with students. In contrast, the program I led at this school was an extremely routinized and cookie-cutter operation. The expectation of the administration was to get all students on an outdoor experience as a matter of course, with little consideration of its message or its applicability to curricular goals. Timelines were tight and deadlines were absolute.

During this time, multiple women guides I employed returned from trips indicating that the students they led would only take instruction from the male staff. In addition, despite the male trip leaders' claims that they enacted a more democratic leadership style and were different than men in the wider culture because of their valuing of nature and communal living in the backcountry, it became very clear that other stereotypically masculine qualities were highly valued in the programs such as directive leadership, ostentatious displays of skill, and physical strength. Following Enloe's (2007) feminist curiosity, I determined that the school was most definitely a very formalized patriarchal structure, valuing competition, hierarchy, and militarism.

In both of the outdoor management roles I undertook, the institutions used a permutation of the phrase "we make men out of boys" as their motto. At both the camp and the school, I

witnessed male trip leaders display emotion by demonstrating appropriate physical affection or by sharing personal stories with camper or student groups, acts that contravene hegemonic masculine norms. However, as noted above, I also observed in both settings some stereotypical masculine behaviours. Both institutions claimed to mould boys into men, but I questioned what kind of men?

These personal experiences were formative to my growing understanding of gender and masculinity and clearly helped lead me to my dissertation topic. Before I turn to the details of my research, however, I will provide further academic context in the next chapter through a review of relevant literature.

Chapter Two: Setting the Stage

In this chapter, I discuss scholarly literature relevant to my dissertation research. If I chose only to review literature that specifically addressed masculinity in outdoor education, it would be extremely brief and it would not provide sufficient breadth to allow me to ground my work in either educational scholarship or gender scholarship. I thus broadened my scope, which enabled me to identify a number of knowledge gaps, some of which my dissertation research has attempted to address.

To begin, I first discuss the concepts of sex and gender because they are so fundamental to gender scholarship, elucidating how these relate to the notion of hegemonic masculinity. I then turn attention to the broader educational literature, particularly related to student and teacher conceptions of gender, before zeroing in on outdoor education, including the challenges hegemonic masculinity poses for the field and opportunities for fostering more diverse gender expression and equity. This review laid the foundation for determining my research questions as well as the most appropriate theoretical frame and methodological approach to help me answer them.

Sex and Gender

In contemporary Western society, sex is considered by most people to be a binary proposition, with humans being assigned as male or female by biology. Biological sex is considered the signal that indicates appropriate behaviours and expectations for men and women (Humberstone, 2000). However, these expectations, when assumed to be natural or inherent, confuse biological sex with the expectations imposed on sex categories by the social context (Humberstone, 2000). Collections of context-dependent expectations for each sex form the concept of gender. In Western society, the genders historically were essentialized and assumed to

be binary opposites, but complementary (Connell, 2005). Such conceptions were supported by religious and political means to maintain a gendered hierarchy (Benayon, 2012; Kimmel, 1995), typically favouring the male sex and masculine gender enactment while devaluing females and divergent gender expression (Foucault, 1990).

Judeo-Christian traditions and Western liberal politics have informed the expectations for each sex (Connell, 2005). However, researchers such as Humberstone (2000) note that expectations have changed for each gender throughout history, particularly in the past 300 years (Greig, 2012; Kimmel, 1995). These shifts in gendered expectations and performances have often accompanied shocks in the economy or radical changes in technology and social structure (Greig, 2012; Kimmel, 1995). While there were major shifts to gender theory and gendered roles in society in the twentieth century, the values assigned to each gender in Western culture have remained relatively stable. Until recently, gendered behaviours in mainstream society were therefore considered natural and essential. Qualities popularly associated with men and therefore deemed masculine are: competitiveness, aggression, toughness, emotional stoicism, heterosexuality, physicality, logic, rationality, objectivity, individuality, and culture (Connell, 2005; Humberstone, 2000; Kimmel, 1995). Female or feminine characteristics are typically conceived as the inferior opposite of men's, including softness, caring, deference, emotionality, subjectivity, irrationality, and nature (Connell, 2005; Humberstone, 2000).

Owing to the historical and cultural factors described above, masculine traits have tended to be valorized in society, while feminine traits have typically been devalued (Connell, 2005). Because sex and gender have been conflated in the modern era, men's and women's work has likewise been mostly gendered. Though this is a relatively recent development, as will be explained below, men have been associated with physical work, work outside the home, and

leadership positions, whereas women's work roles have been constrained by conceptions of women as principally mothers and caretakers (Kimmel, 1995).

Disputing Sex/Gender Claims

In contemporary Western society, many still perceive sex in binary terms with people being either biologically male or female, as complementary opposites that determine "appropriate" behaviours for boys and girls, men and women (Connell, 2005; Fine, 2010; Humberstone, 2000). This understanding, however, is not only simplistic in biological terms but conflates sex with gender (Butler, 1999). Scholars such as Butler (1999) and West and Zimmerman (1987) distinguish between sexed bodies and culturally constructed gender, calling into question the notion that an inherent binary exists, and asserting that gender is performed according to socially acceptable parameters that reflect and maintain power imbalance. Further, as Butler (1999) herself points out, sex can variously be defined in numerous terms, such as by physical anatomy, chromosomes, and hormone levels, few or none of which may point in the same direction.

Those who insist on an anatomical definition of sex face some ambiguous cases. For instance, children born with hermaphroditic genitalia, penile or testicular agenesis, or a number of other genital ambiguities present a problem of categorization within a binary system (Fine, 2010). A response to such genital "atypicalities" is often to default to chromosomal sex. Since current wisdom suggests that women have an XX genotype on the 23rd chromosome and men have an XY, such a sex distinction could be straightforward, but as Fine (2010, 2017) points out there are multiple cases that might challenge the notion of chromosomal dualism. Chromosomal "irregularities" such as XYY Syndrome, XXYY Syndrome, Turner Syndrome (X chromosome only), and Triple X Syndrome are but a few. The use of the term "syndrome" in the

nomenclature is telling in that it pathologizes difference and reifies the gender binary. Since the listed conditions are relatively rare, it could be argued that they form an insignificant portion of the population. However, children born with Klinefelter Syndrome, or those having an XXY genotype, have an estimated incidence of 1:1000 births (Fine, 2010). Such a ratio means that a substantial percentage of the living population is represented. The variety of chromosomal combinations has led Fausto–Sterling (2008) to assert that there are five or more chromosomal genders. Added to this argument is Fine's (2010) assertion that recent biological research states that physical sex is determined by a combination of genetic information provided by numerous chromosomes along the string, rather than by the 23rd chromosome alone.

To rely on hormonal ratios in individuals to determine sex is also a fraught endeavour. Sex hormones, testosterone specifically, are often invoked to determine sex, since the average man tends to have roughly ten times the free testosterone circulating in his bloodstream than (of) the average woman (Kemper, 1990). However, the effects of free testosterone are mainly observed in sustaining secondary sexual characteristics following puberty, such as facial hair growth, deepening of the voice, and upper body strength (Miller et al., 1993), and not behaviourally as is popularly assumed (Fine, 2017; Kemper, 1990; Van Anders, 2013). Van Anders' (2013) neuroendocrinology study results demonstrate that both men and women's testosterone levels vary, leading some women's to be higher than some men's. Further, while testosterone level tends to be higher in men, testosterone levels are responsive to social stimuli (Fine, 2017; Kemper, 1990; Van Anders, 2013); thus, Kemper (1990) suggests that men's behaviours that have been assumed to be caused by testosterone, such as aggression, high libido, risk-taking, and competitiveness are not so caused. Instead, feelings of dominance (e.g., forcing someone to concede an argument by making an aggressive and forceful case) or eminence (i.e.,

attaining high social status, even very briefly or in an isolated context) cause neurological

changes that release spikes in testosterone. These testosterone spikes provoke pleasure, making

the causal behaviour more likely, and creating a self-perpetuating cycle (Fine, 2017; Kemper,

1990; Van Anders, 2013). The same testosterone cycle can occur in women, and Kemper (1990)

suggests that the effect of even a small surge may be a greater reinforcing agent of behaviour in

women given their relative low level of free testosterone, and hence lower tolerance for the

hormone. One must ask at this point, then, since men have historically been privileged in society

or held higher status, would this cycle of testosterone spikes not occur more often, thereby

reinforcing and naturalizing what we think of as typically male behaviour?

Continuing the examination of the effects of sex hormones, children are deemed to

behave in certain stereotypical gendered ways connected to their sex. However, the testosterone

effects outlined above could not take place because pre-puberty boys and girls have very low sex

hormone levels (Eliot, 2010; Fine, 2010; Kemper, 1990). Some claim that the variable levels of

sex hormones are not the cause of gendered behaviours; instead the cause is that the two sexes

(considered in binary terms for the sake of this argument) have differently formed or patterned

brains. This line of theory asserts that divergence occurs during gestation when, at a critical

point, male embryos are bathed in testosterone, differentiating them from the female embryos,

causing anatomical and cerebral differences. However, studies of girls with CAH (congenital

adrenal hyperplasia), a condition in which female XX embryos are exposed to high levels of

testosterone in utero, causing some masculinizing of the external genitalia, demonstrate more

androgynous behavioural traits in those with CAH than girls without. Although this finding of

androgynous behaviour may support a sex differentiated brain at face value, Fine (2017) notes

that such conclusions are questionable, since parents may socialize or cue children with CAH differently given that they are born with ambiguous genitalia.

Given that some behavioural differences are observed in girls with CAH, the sexed brain debate deserves greater consideration. Some research results claim to have found different physical structures in men's and women's brains. Eliot (2010) attributes any such differences to neuroplasticity and the different socialization of boys and girls. In this thinking, boys and girls are born with roughly similar brains, but boys receive certain socially sanctioned stimuli, and girls others, thus reinforcing certain neural pathways and letting others die off (Fine, 2010; Rippon, 2019). Some studies have attempted to address this issue by studying the behaviours of newborns who would have experienced little to no socialization. Among these is the work of Fausto-Sterling (2008) who noted that parents of male and female newborns interact with them differently based on their perceived sex. For example, Fausto-Sterling (2008) found that boys are often held farther from the parents' bodies than are girls. Boys are praised or given physical comfort more often in response to making physical movements whereas girls receive encouragement for making vocalizations and smiling but not for physical movement. Fausto-Sterling (2008) even found the same, though more subtle, reward system at work when she studied parents who were attempting gender-neutral parenting. She observed that the children received subtle cues such as parents' slight hesitation before giving praise for non-traditional gender performances.

Fausto-Sterling's (2008) research is contradicted by a study that tracked newborn eye movements. Connellan et al. (2000) studied where newborns' gaze fell because earlier research had established that babies look for longer durations at objects that interest them. In this research, newborns were brought into a room with a mobile hanging from the ceiling and were

then held by a person with whom they were unfamiliar. Connellan et al. (2000) found that girls'

gazes tended to rest on the holder's face while the boys gazed longer at the mobile. That finding

was then extrapolated to mean that girls have inherent interest in relational contact and boys are

inherently interested in geometric shapes and math. The methodology of Connellan et al.'s study

was criticized on multiple fronts (Fine, 2010). Nash and Grossi (2007) argue that the face and the

mobile were presented serially not concurrently, meaning that the newborns' eyes could have

tired after one stimulus, making them more likely to gaze at the first stimulus presented. As well,

the two stimuli were not presented from the same angle or at the same distance. The second

criticism was that newborns of both sexes have a demonstrated preference for top-heavy patterns

such as faces, making faces more attractive to all newborns. Other studies have shown that

newborns prefer geometric patterns that are more top-heavy to human faces (Fine, 2010). And

finally, Nash and Grossi (2007) criticized the Connellan et al. (2000) study for experimenter bias

as newborns were typically dressed in gender-typed clothing, meaning that the holder or

experimenter could have been affected by expectations or bias. Another study that implemented

controls to respond to these criticisms found no difference in gaze duration between boy and girl

newborns, although such a difference was found on re-test four months later, leading the

researchers to suspect a socializing effect on the infants' behaviour (Leeb & Rejskind, 2004).

Fine (2017) conducted a review of much of the established research on biological sex

differences and found that multiple foundational studies were methodologically flawed or

revealed researcher bias. Fine's research supports Connell's (2005) assertion that female

scientists, once permitted in academia, questioned the methods and conclusions of many existing

studies. Research conducted with a careful eye on gender bias finds that "sex differences on

almost every psychological trait measured, are either non-existent or fairly small" (Connell,

2005, p. 21). As one example, sex differences were questioned by Hyde (2007) who conducted a meta-analysis of 46 studies of characteristics such as cognitive abilities, communication styles, social behaviour, and personality traits. Her meta-analysis found few significant differences and those that were found were small or very small. At the time, Hyde's work was roundly criticized for her method of meta-analysis and her conclusions. Several years later, Zell et al. (2015) undertook another meta-analysis that included approximately three times the number of studies to increase validity and refine the criticized methods. Their results supported Hyde's (2007) conclusions. Interestingly, Fine (2010) raised a point about questionnaire measures, noting that gendered wording of questions (by including references to activities or qualities that are traditionally associated with men or women) or requesting a participant's gender at the beginning can cue a participant to respond in a more gender-stereotypical manner. Fine's (2010) concerns lead one to question if even the small differences found in Hyde (2007) and Zell et al.'s (2015) meta-analyses would be eliminated if the measures used were also analyzed for gender-cuing language.

A good example of the impact of social context and gendered hierarchy on gender performance comes from a study by Gneezy et al. (2009). The researchers studied competitive behaviours in men and women by participation in a simple gambling activity. The study was conducted in two isolated communities, one with a patriarchal structure (the Maasai) and one with a matriarchal structure (the Khasai). Researchers found that, on average, women in the matriarchal society exhibited the same level of competitiveness as men did in the patriarchal society. Women in the matriarchal society also demonstrated greater competitiveness than men in their own society and women in the patriarchal society. These results indicate that

competitiveness, often assumed in Western society to be an inherent male characteristic, is instead learned and can be as easily demonstrated by women in particular contexts.

These last few studies I have mentioned were published, but have received little attention (Fine, 2010). Even more concerning, Fine (2017) found that many methodologically sound findings were not accepted for publication seemingly because their results contradicted established wisdom, a phenomenon that Eliot (2010) termed "the file drawer effect" wherein results that do not support sexed brain differences never see the light of day and are relegated to a researcher's file of unpublished data. In contrast, Fine (2017) found that studies with smaller sample sizes and more tenuous methodological footing that supported sex differences were published. Fine's (2017) assertion of a publication bias may partly explain the tenacity of traditional gender performances in Western society. Given the numerous problems with sex difference research, the claims about the binary nature of sex and the qualities traditionally ascribed to each sex as naturally occurring or essential are dubious. Such findings simultaneously highlight the degree of gender policing occurring in society and in research contexts, as well as indicate that a wider spectrum of gender expressions from all sexes is possible.

The social and environmental influences mentioned above only serve to highlight the socially constructed nature of gender, meaning that as individuals we learn how to act in sex-congruent ways based on social cues, both subtle and explicit (Fausto-Sterling, 2008; Fine, 2010; Rippon, 2019), rather than acting in accordance with an essential gendered nature as is often popularly thought. Instead of a simplistic essential nature embedded in biology, the process of gender instruction is complex and reciprocal. Individuals act, influence their context, and receive feedback from peers and the environment, learning through trial and error which performances accrue benefits. This reflexively constructed aspect of gender is the foundation of Butler's (1999)

theory of performativity. Butler (1999) questions whether the assumed naturalness of gendered performances is encouraged by scientific discourse towards certain political and social ends. She argues that alternative performances exist to those portrayed as natural, but that sanctioned performances serve best to maintain the existing hierarchy. These gendered enactments are subject to surveillance and policing by others (Foucault, 1990) in overt and subtle ways, resulting in a seemingly natural masculine gender performance. By implication, then, there are infinite masculinities and femininities that can be performed, including masculine femininities and feminine masculinities (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012), but these are limited by context and feedback.

The concept of hierarchy recalls Gramsci's notion of class hegemony, wherein a dominant group exercises power and influence over subordinate groups by establishing social structures (e.g., Church, school, mass media, political system, economic system, family) and practices. Generating legitimacy using the above avenues, the dominant culture gains the acquiescence of the subordinate classes (McLaren, 2017). Hegemony, then, is the "struggle in which the powerful win consent of those who are oppressed, with the oppressed unknowingly participating in their own oppression" (McLaren, 2017, p. 62). This consent allows the hierarchy to remain hidden, seeming natural and just rather than deliberately enforced.

Feminist scholars have long attempted to call attention to the gendered hierarchy, or patriarchy, that maintains a gendered hegemony (Enloe, 2007; hooks, 2004). Connell (2005), building on works from feminist theorists and others, observed that not only does a hierarchy exist that maintains the domination of men over women, but that hierarchy also subjugates certain masculinities, or performances of maleness, by valorizing an idealized and hegemonic form of masculinity, to which I turn my attention next.

Hegemonic Masculinities Theory

Connell's (2005) theory of hegemonic masculinity built upon and diverged from the formerly popular, but still often cited, theories about sex roles. Connell took issue with sex role theory's homogenizing and prescriptive nature and instead was influenced by the work of Pleck who broke from the theory with the publication in 1981 of *The Myth of Masculinity*. Pleck (1981) adopted a view of masculinities and femininities as existing within an oppositional power relationship, noting how the interplay resembled a political dynamic in which groups compete for dominance, attaining status or being subordinated based on adherence to the exalted norms. Pleck's (1981) claims contrasted with the polar binary, stable, and complementary roles assigned to each sex as asserted by gender role theory. Although Pleck's (1981) theory recognized that multiple, non-essentialized performances of masculinity and femininity exist, each influenced by factors such as class, race, and sexuality, he argued that the struggle for influence remained between those two categories only.

Connell (2005) extended Pleck's approach in two significant ways. First, she incorporated a concept, similar in some respects to Butler's (1999) theory of performativity, to suggest that the individual and the surrounding context exert reciprocal influence, meaning that although individuals are influenced by their environment, they can also influence it in return. Second, Connell asserted that, not only do masculinities and femininities compete for influence, but different definitions of masculinity (and femininity) vie for dominance amongst themselves. Further, Connell (2005) contended that multiple masculinities and femininities competed within an existing power structure that promoted norms that were dynamic and could be amended through the influence of individuals or groups to maintain or increase their standing. Over time,

Connell refined her ideas, settling on four main elements that influence gender performance: hegemony, subordination, complicity, and marginalization.

Connell (2005) embraced Gramsci's notion of hegemony in which one group elevates itself to a dominant position within a relational hierarchy while simultaneously subordinating other groups. Connell's theory applied Gramsci's structure to gender, in which one conception of masculinity is esteemed, inculcating a patriarchal structure in which femininity and alternative masculinities are delegitimized. Because the power dynamic is constantly contested, the dominant group may change by adopting characteristics or values in order to maintain its dominant position.

Regarding subordination, in the context of gender relations, the hegemonic group institutes normative standards that ensure its primacy and concurrently devalue or delegitimize the feminine and masculinities that exhibit values or traits not sanctioned by the celebrated group. These masculinities are then equated, to varying degrees, with the denigrated feminine. Connell (2005) uses the example of gay men and men who do not demonstrate adequate toughness or aggression being devalued through the mechanism of feminine-themed name-calling.

The valued norms of "toughness, physical and sexual prowess, aggressiveness and the distancing of femininity" (Connell, 1990, p. 94) are maintained partly through the complicity of groups of men. By adhering to, or appearing to support, the hegemonic standards, men can maintain a higher status thereby gaining benefits from patriarchy. Many men recognize that it may be impossible to conform to all or most of the normative standards, but in order to maintain a relative standing within the hierarchy of masculinities they endorse, tacitly or explicitly, the idealized standard and avoid identification with devalued groups even though they may share

traits or values with groups such as environmentalists or feminists. They recognize at some level that deviation from the celebrated norms or affiliation with subordinated groups may cause loss of status.

The idea of marginalization is employed by Connell (2005) to illustrate how other social variables, such as class and race, intersect with gender. Using African-American sports stars as an example, she notes that certain individuals may become emblematic of hegemonic masculinity yet the same status is not conferred to all members of that group. Instead, these individuals become seen as exceptional examples of uptake of exalted values within the marginalized group. However, as Connell (2005) explains through the example of Oscar Wilde, the opposite effect also can occur. Wilde was lionized and held a lofty hierarchical position while transgressing sexual norms, but when he broke taboo by his involvement with a member of the lower class he was likewise subordinated.

As indicated above, the hierarchy of masculinities is variable and is therefore susceptible to challenge or disruption. Challenges to the established hierarchy are states of "crisis" to use Connell's (2005) terms. Crises often necessitate changes to the dominant norms in order to accommodate emerging cultural trends to ensure that the dominant group maintains its position of power. Modifications to established norms at points of crisis agitate and disquiet members of the dominant group until suitable amendments to practice are found. Connell (2005) identified three persistent crises to the dominant masculine hierarchy in conventional society.

The first crisis, which Connell (2005) named power relations, can be seen as a result of the rise of feminism since feminists' claims for women's rights required changes to men's assumed roles and values as well as renegotiation of societal and interpersonal dynamics. An

example of a trend in gender relations that could contribute to this sort of crisis is women's sexual and reproductive liberation.

The second crisis, which Connell termed production relations, was precipitated by women's entry en masse into the workforce. The resultant flood of new workers, technological change, and globalist economic and foreign trade policies (Connell, 2006) excluded some men from what had been their traditional jobs while new employment avenues were opened due to the removal of social stigma and changes in the nature of work. The resulting changes to familial and financial dynamics required reconsideration of expected roles, and this process has been ongoing. For example, more recently there has been increased paternal labour in the home and involvement in childcare as well as a willingness to take paternity leave. Such changes have been precipitated by women's push for a more equitable share of unpaid labour in the home (Fine, 2010), a de-industrialized and globalized Western employment market that leads to men being unemployed or financially insecure (Greig & Martino, 2012) and unable to fulfill the breadwinner role (Kimmel, 2013), and a resulting willingness of men to take on care work both inside and outside the home (Tarrant, 2018). Moreover, neoliberal policies have led to wage stagnation and erosion of social assistance programs, which has led to misplaced anger at feminising influences in society and a lost masculine imaginary (Greig & Martino, 2012).

The final crisis, what Connell calls relations of cathexis, concerns demonstrations of personal affection and love. Cathexis is a term coined by Freud to indicate an attachment to certain traditions, objects, or ideas, particularly those that involve sexual dynamics. Increasing acceptance of LGBTQ+ communities and notions of women's sexual liberation have led to dramatic changes in views of relationships, personal intimacy, and sexuality. Such changes can provoke crisis in an individual who holds to traditional (e.g., Judaeo-Christian) notions of

relationships and sexual identities. Examples of things that might trigger this type of crisis are the increasing acceptance of gay marriage or the popularity of transgender celebrities such as Caitlyn Jenner.

Connell's theory has become immensely popular because of its explanatory power and has inspired a great deal of research. Nonetheless, it has also attracted critics. Before describing the critiques and uses of Connell's theory, I want to spend a bit of time on the origins of some of her ideas. Connell (2005) contends that the first scientific inquiries into the concept of masculinity and its formation were conducted by Freud (1961). Before Freud, all published efforts assumed essentialized notions of gender, inseparable from biological sex. Freud's attempts to define masculinity led him to consider that gender and sexuality were constructed notions rather than natural and inevitable qualities rooted in biology. According to Connell (2005), Freud developed the notion that masculine and feminine traits were not unique to each sex through his case studies in the early 20th century of "The Rat Man" and "Wolf Man." Masculinity, Freud found, was an ill-defined and fragile construction, an interpretation later shared by Freudian scholar Chodorow (2014). Freud (1961) also later pioneered the idea that one's social context exerts influence on desires, values, and self-conceptions.

After Freud's work, consideration of gender was largely absent in scholarly literature until the expansion of role theory. Role theory was initially proposed by the anthropologist Linton (1936) in *The Study of Man* [sic] in which he argued that defined and complementary roles in a society were required in order to ensure its proper functioning. Role theory was later applied to multiple scholarly domains including psychology and sociology (Goffman, 1971; Slater, 1955). As role theory gained popularity, it was further refined with some contending that roles could be viewed as dynamic (Connell, 1979) and others claiming roles were fixed

(Goffman, 1971). Given the theory's intrinsic assumption that roles maintained societal harmony, sex roles were also viewed as mostly functional (Komarovsky & Philips, 1962). In latter role theory variants, gender roles persisted in being seen as sets of well-defined and acknowledged expectations, adherence to which resulted in a functioning social and economic structure (Connell, 2005). However, it was also accepted that strict gender roles could be defined in other ways given differing cultural or political circumstances.

The rise of feminist theory disrupted assumptions that conventional sex roles created universal harmony. It also problematized these roles as oppressive to women (Connell, 2005) and to men (Farrell, 1974; Kimmel, 1995). As described earlier, Pleck (1981) and Kimmel (1987) questioned the homogeneity of the male sex role since homophobia clearly demonstrated that masculinity was not a singular concept and some men were oppressed or subordinated by other men (Altman, 1972). Other research in this vein described hierarchy amongst men in schools (Willis, 1977) and in the workplace (Cockburn, 1983). Later, Crenshaw (1989) proposed the term intersectionality to describe the imbricated oppressions experienced by Black women who had to deal with both sexism and racism and potentially other factors such as classism, heterosexism, ageism, and ableism. Intersectionality can be a helpful lens for understanding the complexity of masculinities (Christensen & Jensen, 2014); for example, an intersectional analysis can illuminate how racism or classism impacts the performance and status of masculinity. The variety of masculine performances, and the struggle for status between groups of men in each context, illuminate that gender relations can function in similar ways to the class struggles described in the Gramscian theory of hegemony (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Connell's (1979) initial interest in role theory was in its description of mechanisms that supported a harmonious society, which she critiqued. Later, as she examined men's roles in

politics, her sociopolitical focus turned to consider gender (Connell, 1982). The theory of

hegemonic masculinity was first proposed in a study of social dynamics among Australian high

school boys (Kessler et al., 1982). That study was later integrated into an article critiquing male

sex role theory (Carrigan et al., 1985). Connell built on her early theorizing by positing that

multiple masculinities existed in hierarchy in her book, *Gender and Power* (Connell, 1987).

These ideas were fully fleshed out in a later book, *Masculinities* (Connell, 2005), in which she

asserted a "systematic sociological theory of gender" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 830)

that considered intersections of class, race, and sexuality. Connell's (2005) theory of hegemonic

masculinities asserted the existence of multiple competing masculinities in a hierarchy that

placed femininity at the bottom. As noted earlier, the hegemonic masculine ideals are recognized

as unattainable by many, if not most, men but by actively striving to achieve them, or in

complying with these norms, men and women can secure greater benefits from patriarchy

through higher relative status (Connell, 2005).

Hegemonic masculinity theory has, since its publication, become the most popular and

widely used theory of masculinity (Beasley, 2019; Hearn & Howson, 2019), leading Hearn and

Howson (2019) to describe it as the "central pillar of the critical studies of men and

masculinities" (p. 43). However, with such pervasive use has come greater scrutiny and

criticism. In the revised edition of *Masculinities* that came out ten years after its original

publication, Connell (2005) outlined some of the critiques that the theory had drawn. One

objection was made by Jefferson (2002) who argued that the framework was too general, thereby

not accounting for individual agency and personal construction of one's own masculinity.

Demetriou (2001) offered that, in order to maintain a Gramscian hegemony, the dominant group

may borrow traits from marginalized or subordinated masculinities. For example, the dominant

group might enact a masculinity that is less openly homophobic in progressive contexts, but still subtly enact homophobic behaviours that reinforce the gender hierarchy. Connell and Messerschmit (2005) responded to these critiques by amending their theory to indicate that hegemonic masculinity is discursively defined within a specific context, which includes one's personal history and how that interacts with local, regional, and global influences, in a move similar to Butler's (1999) idea of performativity. Over time, performances may come to be seen as "natural" and thus become more difficult to identify (Butler, 1999). Indeed, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) agree that researchers need to take personal and contextual factors into account in their analysis when considering hegemonic masculinities.

Budgeon (2014) also critiqued the theory, asserting that its effectiveness is limited given that it elides the idea of a hierarchy within femininity. Budgeon (2014) suggests that just as there are multiple masculinities in a negotiated hierarchy, so too are there many femininities in competition for power and status. These femininities have been overlooked, Budgeon (2014) asserts, since masculinities take priority of place in the hierarchy and the acceptable permutations of femininity are limited given their relatively low status. An education researcher, Budgeon (2014) calls for a conscious de-gendering in schools, which would allow men to adopt feminine practices without stigma, and similarly, for women to adopt masculine practices. The latter resonates with Halberstam's (1998) notion of female masculinity that can disrupt the assumed gender binary. Problematically, as Halberstam notes, female masculinities also often reinforce the supremacy of the masculine and therefore contribute to a gender hierarchy. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) had noted similar criticisms before and responded that hegemonic femininities had also been included in Connell's early publications on gender. However, consideration of hegemonic femininity was left out of later publications in order to focus more

precisely on what they felt was the under-researched topic of masculinities. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) acknowledge that the notion of hegemonic femininities merits more attention as does the possibilities for de-gendering.

Critiques have arisen since the last edition of *Masculinities* (Connell, 2005), with some suggesting that with the increasing acceptance of homosexuality, homosocial physical affection, and gender fluidity, hegemonic masculinity is an archaic concept that is no longer applicable (McCormack & Anderson, 2014) or has a very limited lifespan (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012). Multiple scholars disagree, arguing that such statements are highly optimistic (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014; O'Neill, 2015; Ravn & Roberts, 2020). Ravn and Roberts (2020) state that although men and boys may demonstrate less overt homophobia, they may not be more progressive about gender. Rather, Ravn and Roberts assert that men and boys may well be accommodating changes in social mores, consistent with Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) contention that hegemonic masculinity is variable, and that valued hegemonic masculine performances can be amended in order to maintain a dominant position in a given context. While acceptance of homosexuality may be an increasingly accepted value, it does not mean that a masculine hierarchy does not exist, nor that there is no struggle for status. One need only talk to boys who are devalued for their lack of masculine appearance (Kehler & Atkinson, 2010) or their lack of aggression or physicality (Smith, 2007), or to girls who face regular sexual harassment (Meyer, 2017), to see that gendered hierarchy is still very much alive and that a very particular type of masculinity remains valued above all others (Atkinson & Kehler, 2010). In addition, it should be noted that dominant masculinity is constantly contested (Connell, 2005), and that shifts toward inclusivity can be fleeting.

Bridges and Pascoe (2014) argue that the inclusive (McCormack & Anderson, 2014) or open (Elliott, 2020) masculinities demonstrated by some men's acceptance of homosexuality and increasing emotional vulnerability can instead be understood as a hybrid masculinity. Hybrid masculinity conceals adherence to hegemonic values beneath a veneer of socially acceptable progressivism consistent with current contextual (e.g., local, regional) norms and layered with group norms (e.g., class, race), thus obfuscating their maintenance of the gender hierarchy (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). Messerschmidt (2019) elaborates somewhat on this theory, differentiating between dominant masculinities (those that are most popular in a given context) and hegemonic masculinities (those that support patriarchal norms). An example of hybridization is provided by Matthews and Channon (2019) who observe that combat sports, once a "male preserve" (p. 373), have seen increasing numbers of women participants. The integration of women into the pugilistic realm as sparring partners and legitimate competitors represents a significant shift to an ostensibly more progressive culture. However, men in this context maintain essentialized views of male physical superiority and engage in highly demanding and risky training practices, thereby shifting the meaning and demonstration of masculinity and bolstering the gender hierarchy while being seen to enact an inclusive masculinity that is seemingly equitable (Matthews & Channon, 2019).

Building upon the notion of hybrid masculinities, Messerschmidt (2019) asserts that dominant masculinities need not be hegemonic and, in fact, hegemonic masculine enactments may be temporary. Messerschmidt gives the example of a group of popular, sporty, teen high school boys who are generally accepting of all, care about social issues and volunteer their time, and treat girls and women with respect. These traits or enactments may enhance their popularity as they embody the contextually defined dominant masculinity. However, on rare occasions,

these boys may bully less physically gifted boys, maintaining the masculine hierarchy and demonstrating a temporary hegemonic masculinity.

Another issue, raised by Hearn and Howson (2019), is that some critical studies of hegemonic masculinity are conducted without reference to feminism or any grounding in feminist theory. Beasley (2019) states that, although derived from feminist origins, critical studies of masculinities, of which Connell's theory is foundational, has diverged considerably from the postmodern theories favoured by many feminist theorists. Although passing references are often made to theorists like Foucault and Butler, much of the work in critical masculinity studies remains thoroughly grounded in modernist thought. For example, postmodernism seeks to undo gender categories entirely, such that gender as a concept is entirely open, individualized, and contestable (Seidman, 1994), but Connell's model, and the critical masculinities field generally, maintains the use of gender categories or identities. Beasley (2019) asserts that the modernist approach is helpful in highlighting the privileged status of the male or masculine category and thereby for critiquing attendant power structures. Further, given the prevalence of the of gender binary ideology, such a framework is more acceptable to a non-academic audience and therefore practically utile. That said, Beasley (2019) reminds us that feminists have a vested interest, as those who are subordinated in such a system, in dismantling it altogether. The rift between the modernist and postmodernist schools of thought can be bridged by the concept of "strategic essentialism" (Beasley, 2019, p. 37) drawn partly from Spivak (1988), wherein gender categories are recognized not in order to homogenize, but to highlight and contest power relationships as well as to connect theory and practice.

As a review of these various critiques reveal, Connell's (2005) theory of hegemonic masculinity has required some amendments and elaborations since its initial development.

However, its central points and explanatory power remain compelling. Indeed, the theory has been applied in a great variety of research domains. For instance, Kimmel (1995, 2013) has referenced the theory in his explorations of regional and localised masculinities in the United States and has proposed social and economic factors that contribute to hegemonic and toxic masculinities. Connell's theory has also been used to inform research on violent crime (Newburn & Stanko, 1994) and domestic violence and sexual assault (Breines et al., 2000), and been used to understand and critique men's representation in the media (Jansen & Sabo, 1994), male nationalism (Nagel, 1998), and men's physical and mental health (Galdas et al., 2005; Schofield et al., 2000). Of particular interest to me is how hegemonic masculinity theory has been used to study gender in education, to which I turn my attention next.

Hegemonic Masculinity in Education

As far back as the times of Plato and Seneca, questions have been posed concerning the aims and methods of education (Biesta & Miedema, 2002). Modern education typically is seen to function as a method of social reproduction, transmitting cultural values (Labaree, 2003), skilling the future workforce, passing on traditions and approved narratives (Connell, 2009), and, by some, for developing a complete human being (Biesta & Miedema, 2002). Many theories and philosophies of education have been proposed, often tied to political or economic concerns, and focusing on specific educational objectives and downplaying others (Connell, 2009). Currently, neoliberal policies dominate in many Western countries (Apple, 2017; Biesta, 2005; Connell, 2009). Neoliberalism is a form of capitalist economic model focused on free markets, consumer choice, and competition (Biesta, 2005; Chomsky, 1999; Connell, 2009; Greig & Holloway, 2012). The economic influence is felt in schools with teachers being encouraged to focus on skills that prepare future workers to be economically successful (Pedder & Opfer, 2013). Such a

focus translates into an accountability narrative wherein a pre-defined curriculum is enforced through standardized testing (Eaude, 2011), teacher credentialism that fosters hierarchy, and "best practices" that limit teacher autonomy and devalue theoretical knowledge (Biesta & Miedema, 2002; Connell, 2009; Labaree, 2003). In this model, teacher caring and emotional support is also devalued (Connell, 2009).

Capitalist, neoliberal-informed educational policies are of concern here because they promote hegemonic masculinity through valorisation of competition and hierarchy (Connell, 2005; Weiler, 2017) and obfuscation of inequality through promotion of a meritocratic narrative (Greig & Holloway, 2012; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012). Obscuring systemic inequity leads directly to popular narratives such as the "masculine crisis" or "boys' crisis" in schools in which boys are claimed to be failing and falling behind girls at a rapid rate due to feminized curricula and methods of pedagogy (Greig & Holloway, 2012).

The boys' crisis narrative calls for changes to pedagogy to serve boys' brain structure, supposedly different from that of girls, which, as described above, does not exist except through socialization (Eliot, 2010). The alleged crisis has been blamed on boy-specific learning styles that have very little support in research (Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012) and also been attributed to curricula that focus on language skills, which are thought to favours girls' abilities, another gendered difference that has little scholarly support (Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012). Girl students' heightened attainment has been misrepresented by mainstream media, especially given class and race as determining factors are often left out of the discussion (Weiler, 2017; Willis, 1977). Largely, many argue that the issue for boys in school is that academic achievement does not elicit praise and provide status in comparison to activities like sport and physicality (Frank et al., 2003; Greig & Holloway, 2012; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Millington & Wilson, 2010a**;** Skelton,

2001**).**

In addition, due to several factors such as the influence of neoliberalism and the generally traditionalist views held by teachers (Greig, 2012; Raible & Irizarry, 2017), men and women teachers promote hegemonic masculine ideals to their students, either tacitly or explicitly (Frank, et al., 2003; Martino, 2008b; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012; Meyer, 2017; Raible & Irizarry, 2017; Skelton, 2001, 2007; Smith, 2007; Weiler, 2017). For example, Smith (2007) found that women teachers affect a more masculine teaching style in order to garner respect from male students and avoid gendered harassment. Male teachers often overlook sexist comments and gendered harassment between students, considering it natural behaviour for boys (McCaughtry & Tischler, 2010; Smith, 2007).

Teachers themselves are enmeshed in the gender hierarchy as they are influenced by mentors and/or supervisors who enforce hegemonic masculine codes of behaviour through informal feedback and professional reviews (Frank et al., 2003; Kirk, 2010). Echoing Foucault's (1990) ideas about the panopticon, in which prisoners are held in a facility that allows them to be seen at all times and prisoners therefore limit behaviours to avoid sanction because they assume they are being watched, peer expectations also play a significant role in policing appropriate teacher gender performances (Kirk, 2010; Martino, 2008a; Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Smith, 2007) as do student and parent expectations of appropriate teacher comportment and pedagogical style (Martino & Frank, 2006; Millington & Wilson, 2010a). In the latter cases, the students and parents act similarly to a market to which services must be tailored in order to thrive in a supply and demand model (Evetts, 2018), further demonstrating the neoliberal influence.

Interestingly, Skelton (2001) found that male teachers in the upper-primary grades often enact a more strict, authoritarian, and traditional masculinity. She suspected that being in a

female-dominated profession that can entail more care work required male teachers to enact masculinity more in line with hegemonic values to compensate for their feminized role. This finding dovetails with the results of Henson and Rogers' (2001) study of male temporary office workers. The male temporary workers were subordinated in a role identified as feminine. The subordination was due to temporary work's demographics, indoor and deskbound nature, expectations of deference to full-time employees, and pay that prevented "breadwinner" status. Not only did the workers lose status but they were also subjected to open ridicule by other employees. These men used multiple strategies to restore lost status, including focusing on more traditionally masculine tasks, refusing feminized tasks or performing them poorly, identifying with the organization rather than the role, and claiming that temp work assisted them in pursuing more masculine projects such as being in a band. If fired or derided for poor performance they would claim the benefit of "failure as an asset," referring to the idea that men who fail at feminized tasks receive increased masculine status from peers for that failure (Fine, 2017). Perhaps most interestingly for the purposes of this review, Henson and Rogers (2001) reported that male temp workers who performed manual labour were not subjected to explicit gender-based devaluation.

Performing masculinity in more traditional ways is not always a response to operating in a feminized context, however. In a later study, Skelton (2007) noted that early primary (Grades K-3) teachers, whose role required more care work than those in upper primary (Grades 4-6), enacted an alternative masculinity that transgressed masculine norms. Skelton is unsure whether the male teachers were more secure with their masculinity before taking the job in lower primary or whether they were attracted to the job because they already enacted a divergent masculinity and therefore fit well with the role. One answer might be connected to Connell's (2006) work

that suggests that workers identify with their organizational or professional values and, over time, come to act accordingly. In this explanation, the early primary teachers may simply enact the values of the other teachers and those the school supports for work with that age group, likely encouraging patience and care. Meanwhile the upper primary teachers may receive a different set of expectations from administration, or they may identify more with middle school methods. An alternative explanation may be what Henson and Rogers (2001) describe as the "glass elevator" effect in which men who take roles predominately held by women are promoted more quickly due to the perception that men possess attributes more suitable for managerial or leadership roles. Following this rationale, the men in early primary may have taken the jobs hoping for more rapid advancement.

Schindel and Tolbert (2017) presented another example of alternative masculine caring performances in their case study research of a high school environmental science teacher who not only demonstrated the feminized characteristic of care for the environment (see Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Breunig & Russell, 2020; Connell, 2005), but also enacted interpersonal care for his students, taking keen interest in their lives and supporting them emotionally (Schindel & Tolbert, 2017). Like Skelton (2007), Schindel and Tolbert's (2017) study does not mention what factors might have permitted his transgressive masculine performance.

Martino (2008a) sheds some light on factors that might enable transgressive masculine performances in a study of two male primary teachers critical of hegemonic masculinity and performing alternative masculinities. One, a straight, White, middle class, cis-gendered man, consciously chose to role model alternative masculinities for his students as an act of counterhegemony. Noting that he did not share the social class of most students, his middle class cultural capital afforded him the privilege to enact an alternative masculinity although it also

reinforced his view of himself as superior to those adhering to a traditional working class hegemonic masculinity. In being free to enact alternative masculinities, this teacher demonstrates that he holds such a privileged position in the masculine hierarchy that he will not lose significant status by transgressing certain hegemonic masculine norms. The second teacher in Martino's (2008a) study identified as a gay man who was very aware of his gender performance. He was conscious of the expectations of parents and of his legitimacy in the eyes of his students, and he was careful in how he performed masculinity, adhering to some gender norms. Martino noted this teacher's privileged position of being knowledgeable of hegemonic norms and playing with them in order to ensure the highest possible status.

Martino (2008a) concluded that male teachers may transgress certain masculine norms, but also concurrently support hegemonic masculinity as a whole. In doing so, the teachers engaged in an almost political effort to limit risk and maximize status while performing their masculinity. Not all teachers may possess the critical awareness of the two teachers profiled in Martino's study, of course. Instead, they may look to maximize their masculine status within the school context in other ways. Smith (2007) suggests that engagement with, and interest in, sport is a marker of masculinity for both teachers and students. That being the case, students who maintain an athletic body and excel in physical education, as well as teachers of the subject, often hold high status (Kirk, 2010). Students who fail to perform to gendered standards are targets of ridicule from peers and academic punishment by teachers through loss of marks (Millington & Wilson, 2010a). Physical education teachers have historically presented athletic physiques as well as "dominant, competitive, aggressive" (Millington & Wilson, 2010a, p. 57) behaviours and anti-intellectual attitudes.

While Kirk (2010) asserts that physical education, as a discipline, has recently overcome some of the anti-intellectualism by incorporating theory and loosening of the mesomorphic body-type expectations, he concedes that physical education persists in reinforcing hegemonic masculinity and perpetuating weight-based oppression and limited notions of athleticism. Saul (2015) agrees, arguing that sporting culture often uses a militaristic discourse that valorizes domination and aggression. In addition, the nesting of physical education within schooling's institutionalized hegemonic masculinity, as supported by the neoliberal curriculum, standardized testing, and stakeholder expectations on teachers, means that critical examination of its gendered nature has been limited (Kehler, 2010)

McCaughtry and Tischler (2010) suggest that one way to limit support for hegemonic masculine ideals in physical education is to engage in non-competitive adventure activities (e.g., team-building initiatives, ropes courses, climbing walls, hiking, biking). While the authors concede that "strength, speed, coordination, aggressiveness and physicality are still involved in these activities" (McCaughtry & Tischler, 2010, p. 184), there may be more space for those who do not maintain the stereotypical athletic frame and approach to find success and enjoyment since "success is determined not by elevating individual performance over others, but by elevating collective performance and self-improvement" (McCaughtry & Tischler, 2010, p. 184). Interestingly, the recommended activities are commonly used in outdoor education.

Hegemonic Masculinity in Outdoor Education

Before proceeding to consider the ways in which outdoor education reproduces and resists hegemonic masculinity, I will pause to clarify terms and consider how non-competitive activities, such as those described above, are included in the field. To do so, I look at the underlying philosophies of outdoor education and how these have resulted in divergent fields of

practice. I then discuss some of the unique characteristics of outdoor education and the opportunities they may afford to resist hegemonic masculinity. I then trace the history of certain developments in European and North American outdoor education, asking questions about the impacts of hegemonic masculinity in current outdoor education culture and practices.

Scholars tracing the philosophical history of outdoor education usually refer only to White, male, Western thinkers, often beginning by naming Plato's approach as a key early epistemological foundation (e.g., Kiaw, 2012; Priest & Gass, 2017; Wurdinger, 1997). Such allusions to Plato focus on his assertion that direct experience with the world was necessary for learning and his belief that to develop the virtue of courage, one must be exposed to risk (Plato, 380 B.C.E./2000). Another influence commonly cited is Rousseau (1763/1979), who asserted that exercise and physical exertion allows one to overcome stress and that learning proceeds from sensory exploration of the world. Rousseau further purported that exposure to the natural environment is optimal for human development as he held a Romantic view and viewed urban environments as corrupting and dirty (Smith, 2011).

From the 20th century, Dewey (1997) also is seen as a key figure because of his championing of experiential education. Like Plato, Dewey (1916) valued risk-taking and uncertainty of outcome. He also argued that direct observation or experience with the real world was the best form of learning (Nichols & Parsons, 2011), and that solving real problems allowed abstraction and application to other contexts through reflection (Priest & Gass, 2017). Dewey (1916) argued that his model of experiential education democratized education, leveling the playing field for all learners. Importantly to my interests, Dewey was also a supporter of gender equality, which partly led to his practices being blamed in 1955 for boys' underachievement (Greig & Holloway, 2012). Reading such a claim in the current ethos, it is surprising given the

physical nature of the pedagogy he advocated that today is seen as boy-focused (Reichert &
Hawley, 2010).

Outdoor education, adventure education, and experiential education are often conflated,
and for good reason, as they share many activities, practices, and values. Even though adventure
activities have been practiced for a very long time, predating outdoor and experiential education,
Deweyan philosophy was later applied to these practices and tied to established curricula (Nicol,
2002a). Today, adventure education, outdoor education, and experiential education are employed
in a variety of ways, both inside and outside the formal school curriculum, but confusion exists
as to where each begins and the others end (Nicol, 2002a), as well as how to distinguish them
from outdoor recreational activities (Martin et al., 2017). Indeed, Nicol (2002a) argues that
distinguishing between the different fields is extremely difficult, as there is great overlap, an
assertion that will become important to keep in mind as I attempt nonetheless to define these
terms for clarity.

Experiential education is expressed most simply as learning by doing (Priest & Gass,
2017). Deweyan (1997) experiential education typically follows a discovery model in which the
learner is faced with real world problems and must determine solutions though inquiry,
observation, and application of existing knowledge. Outdoor education adheres to the
experiential philosophy as well, but takes place primarily in a natural environment. Outdoor
education differs from outdoor recreation in that the latter is performed for leisure and the
enjoyment of the act itself whereas outdoor education has overall objectives of fostering
interaction with and care for the natural environment and developing outdoor-focused knowledge
or skills (Priest & Gass, 2017).

Priest and Gass (2017) state that there are two main branches of outdoor education:

environmental education and adventure education (an assertion that would be contested by environmental educators like Sauvé (2005) who see outdoor education as instead a branch of the larger field of environmental education). Environmental education generally refers to education that addresses people-society-environment relationships with a goal of enabling sustainability, and it has myriad foci and is practiced in many sites, both formal and informal, including in the outdoors (Stevenson et al., 2013). Adventure education is largely focused on social learning and human relationships and typically sets challenges for groups or individuals to overcome, often through activities that are perceived as risky even though they are highly structured to minimize actual risk (Priest & Gass, 2017). Challenges often take the form of outdoor pursuits that are self-powered in unfamiliar or remote wilderness settings that "challenge participants physically, mentally, and emotionally" (Lugg, 1998, p. 26) through activities such as canoeing, kayaking, hiking, skiing, and snowshoeing in order to promote confidence and self-esteem (Asfeldt et al., 2020). Adventure education often also employs debriefing or reflection following program activities (Martin et al., 2017). That the combination of challenge, direct experience, and reflection can lead to transformative change is an often-referenced foundation of adventure education (Lugg, 1998).

If facilitated effectively, this transformative impact can include the development of socially critical analyses that enable participants to examine and understand power dynamics and structures pervasive in their usual context, partly by virtue of their removal from it (Martin, 1999). Such a possibility is part of the counterhegemonic potential of outdoor education. Although Priest and Gass (2017) have differentiated adventure education and environmental education, my own experience with summer camps, school outdoor programs, and recreational programs indicates that the division is not as stark as they describe. Instead, in practice most

programs use elements of adventure education to build skills, community, and enable participants' interactions with nature (Asfeldt et al., 2020), dovetailing with Ford's (1981) conception of outdoor education as "of, for and about the outdoors" (p. 12) and embracing Ford's (1981) notion of educating for environmental stewardship using many different activities and working in a range of contexts, which are not always limited to remote wilderness or backcountry settings.

The practices of outdoor education that work to include enjoyment of and care for the natural environment (Breunig et al., 2010) and to promote reflection and inquiry (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014) are also designed to encourage emotional bonding and caring for others. It thus is possible that these practices may work towards promoting alternative expressions of masculinity rather than only the emotional stoicism and toughness that is valued in hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005). Indeed, Connell (2005) posits that those who demonstrate care for the natural environment are more likely to accept tenets of feminism and enact alternative masculinities that may combat hegemonic masculine discourses, an assertion that is beginning to be echoed by recent research in outdoor and environmental education (Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Schindel & Tolbert, 2017).

Interestingly, one of the reasons that outdoor education may have potential for combatting hegemonic masculinity is because the outdoors has been seen as masculine space (Jordan, 2018; Kimmel, 1995; Nicholas, 2012; Warren, 2016). It was at the beginning of the industrial revolution, when men began moving to cities for work, that the gendered nature of work began to take shape and the outdoors became understood as masculine space (Kimmel, 1995). Up to that time, most families lived in rural areas and engaged in subsistence farming. Farming tasks were performed by all members of the family, regardless of gender, except when

other particular needs prevailed such as women needing to nurse (Kimmel, 1995). During the industrial revolution, many families moved to cities for factory work. For the first time, men were away from the family all day, making women the primary caregivers and responsible for domestic tasks. These roles that were initially functional and indeed necessary for survival were later enshrined in Victorian gendered moral codes as natural and essential qualities of each sex (Kimmel, 1995; Nicholas, 2012). Urban life, wage labour (i.e., being dependent on another for remuneration), and indoor work became femininized (Kimmel, 1995) whereas outdoor, physical work was seen as masculine (Nicholas, 2012). This was particularly true in North America, where escape to the frontier could liberate a man from the subjugation of wage labour. These changes to the nature and location of labour, alongside the closing of the American frontier, were the points of genesis for the compensatory need of men to assert their masculinity as they increasingly worked in an environment perceived as feminized (Kimmel, 1995).

A specific example can be seen in the work of Loomis (2017) who documented the culture of lumber camps in the Pacific Northwest in the early 20th century. The lumberjacks considered the outdoor setting health-giving and the mostly male lumber camps separated from wider society as well as the physical work added to their sense of strength and embodied manly identity. These lumberjacks looked down upon mill workers who did equally physical work but worked indoors, which was seen to be feminized (Loomis, 2017). Work in the outdoors, then, seemed to limit the need for compensatory masculine behaviours and provide status in ways similar to what was described by Henson and Rogers (2001) in their research on temp workers. Perhaps by virtue of its outdoor location, male outdoor educators may have more room to enact alternative masculinities?

Further, like the lumber camps described by Loomis (2017), outdoor education facilities

are often outdoors and removed from urban settings (Barnes, 2003). The community tends to have a different culture from that of mainstream society, including industry-specific language, activities, styles of dress, and norms of behaviour (Barnes, 2003; Humberstone, 2000). What is more, Barnes (2003) asserts that the outdoor education community is often critical of modern, commercial society. Thus, Humberstone (2000) states that the outdoor culture may offer a point of resistance to hegemonic masculine norms. There is some evidence outside of outdoor education research to support this suggestion. For example, Houston (2012) describes how the subculture of alternative rock creates its own norms that resist those of mainstream society, permitting alternative masculine displays such as emotional disclosure, participation in music and art, and a more feminine style of dress. Likewise, Haywood and Mac an Ghaill (2012) found that Jewish boys performed an alternative masculinity and were untroubled by challenges from mainstream societal pressures such as media advertising, and personal taunting and teasing by peers. Their imperviousness was seen to be due to the strong kinship and group affiliation they felt within the Jewish community. Because they prioritized the norms of their subculture over those of the mainstream, they found it easier to resist hegemonic norms.

While outdoor education scholars indicate that there do seem to be opportunities for resistance to hegemonic masculinity in the profession, there nonetheless remain significant impediments. For instance, feminist researchers have taken outdoor education to task for its gendered culture, practices, and influences (e.g., Gray, 2016; Humberstone, 2000; Lugg, 2003; Newbery, 2003, 2004; Warren, 2002, 2016). In addition, recent articles in academic publications and outdoor magazines have highlighted the misogyny and sexual harassment experienced by women trip leaders in certain sectors of the outdoor industry (Clark, 2015; Davies et al., 2019; Gray et al., 2020; Joyce, 2016; Langlois, 2017; Warren et al., 2018), which some claim are due

to the hidden curriculum and structure of the outdoor field itself (Lugg, 2003; Warren et al., 2019).

To understand the current culture of outdoor education, I return to a discussion of the history of the field. Some of the earliest stirrings of Western interest in the outdoors occurred in Europe when men and women took an interest in mountain climbing (Kimmel, 1995). Oftentimes, this interest was of a competitive and imperialist bent, operating within a discourse of conquering nature and claiming peaks for the climbers' home country (Nicol, 2002a). Later, during the Victorian period, hikes, outdoor exercise, and sport at middle and upper-class boys' schools were seen as encouraging a healthful body and inculcating values of effort, challenge, and moral rectitude (Kimmel, 1995; Martin et al., 2017) as well as providing an outlet for taboo sexual desire (Foucault, 1990). In the United States, lamentations over the loss of the frontier and the resultant romanticization of nature experience and "escape to nature" narratives were evident in the writings of figures such as John Muir and Henry Thoreau (Martin et al., 2017).

Further, many writers in the nineteenth century bemoaned the increase in city-living and indoor work that they felt led to effeminacy and moral decay, in contrast to health-giving physical labour outdoors (Putney, 2003). These writers were particularly concerned about the White, Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) gentry, and were reacting to the increasing urban population of non-White, "brutish" immigrants (Putney, 2003) that included Irish Catholics (Roediger, 1999), which highlights how WASP masculinity was not only centred in, but also associated with the outdoors. These writers promulgated the doctrine of a strenuous life that advocated "bodily vigor, action over reflection, experience over 'book learning,' and pragmatic idealism over romantic sentimentality" (Putney, 2003, p. 46).

This doctrine was embodied in the development of the Boy Scouts and the creation of Church camps to engage boys in the outdoors (Putney, 2003). Outdoor physical pursuits were thought to combat bookishness, which was associated with the sissy, or feminized male (Wall, 2008). Such pursuits were also thought to combat non-heterosexual behaviour, especially in the Boy Scouts of America and Christian camps, demonstrating the organizations' heteronormative bent (Macleod, 2004). Indeed, the Boys Scouts of America were so steadfast in their concerted effort to combat homosexuality in boys that that goal was enshrined in statements in the Boy Scout Manual (Zeiger, 2005). The cultivation of hegemonic masculinity went hand in hand with a heteronormative pedagogy in these organizations.

The first formally recognized organized camping program began in 1861 at the Gunnery School for Boys in Washington, Connecticut. This school program was followed shortly by the first YMCA summer camp in New York state, and later the implementation of a structured program at Camp Kehonka that had a focus on adventure and nature-focused activities. These early initiatives led to an explosion of summer camps, with the Camp Directors' Association of America formed in 1910 and the Canadian Camping Association arriving in 1936 (Martin et al., 2017). A similar boom took place in Canada with summer camps leading to a proliferation of outdoor educational program offerings (Asfeldt et al., 2020).

Around the same time, Lord Baden-Powell lamented what he saw as "a lack of physical and moral character" (Martin et al., 2017, p. 43) in the British troops whom he had commanded in the Boer War as well as in the population in general. In response, Baden-Powell created the Boy Scouts to encourage responsible citizenship and fitness for military service (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017). A few years later, the Boy Scouts spawned the Campfire Girls that later became known as the Girl Guides or Girl Scouts. Atavistic sentiments in the

United States and Canada led to the creation of summer camps in the same time period (Kimmel, 1995). In Canada and the northeast United States, programs of these camps were heavily influenced by aspects of Baden-Powell's program, as promoted by Ernest Thompson Seton, the first leader of Boy Scouts of America.

Boys Scouts and summer camp programs appealed to White upper- and upper-middle class families who shared the growing concerns about the corrupting and effeminizing influences of the urban environment (Macleod, 2004). Working class and non-White boys were formally excluded from the Boy Scouts and early camp programs until the middle of the twentieth century and instead often relied on urban boys' clubs for recreation. Upper- and middle-class White boys enjoyed outdoor programs designed to foster leadership and character (Macleod, 2004).

Many of the outdoor programs at the time employed narratives of exploration and discovery, omitting acknowledgement that First Nations peoples had populated the land before their displacement by settler governments (Wall, 2008). Indeed, outdoor recreation in North American landscapes can be understood as racializing and nationalizing endeavours that illustrate what groups are, and what groups are not, included in national mythology (Mohanram, 1999). The Boy Scouts adopted an openly nationalistic and militarist approach to the outdoors, revealing a colonialist bent. Further, Seton also employed purportedly Indigenous stories and practices to imbue his "back to nature" narrative with a sense of spirituality, which he packaged and sold to camps in northeastern United States and Canada (Deloria, 1998; Wall, 2008).

The use of First Nations tropes and pageantry was based on White settler notions that Indigenous peoples were inferior, had been overcome by a superior society, and were relegated to the past, no longer a threat to the settler states (Wall, 2008). Such a perception allowed First Nations' culture and iconography to be appropriated and used in ways that appealed to anti-

modernist sentiments prevailing in the first half of the twentieth century (Wall, 2008). An example of this was Seton's development, after he left the Boy Scouts, of the Woodcraft Program (originally called the Woodcraft Indians), which was pitched to non-Indigenous children and youth and was a powerful influence on outdoor education practices in North America (Deloria, 1998). Such uses of First Nations' culture by White North Americans was especially galling given Indigenous peoples were, in some cases, legally prohibited from celebrating their culture (Deloria, 1998; Wall, 2008).

The cultural appropriation and othering of First Nations peoples shaped the antimodernist sentiment surrounding summer camp and other outdoors programs in a distinctly racialized way (Deloria, 1998). These organizations also were distinctly gendered as they were based on held-over Victorian essentialist sex roles (Deloria, 1998; Kimmel, 1995). Participation in Scouting became a very popular method of getting boys into what was seen as the health-promoting outdoors as well as inculcating dominant, White, middle-class values and nationalistic sentiments (Kimmel, 1995). Outward Bound, an outdoor organization that remains very popular, was started by Kurt Hahn at the behest of a financier who became concerned that British navy seamen would lack survival skills if marooned. Outward Bound developed into a survivalist training program, later becoming an educational/recreational program to develop character and "make men out of boys" (Newbery, 2004, p. 36; see also Martin et al., 2017). That Outward Bound originated in the British Navy reveals its links to the colonial project and a White settler viewpoint. The National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) was formed in 1965 to promote effective outdoor leadership skills such as competence, judgment, tolerance for adversity, communication, vision, and action (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017), many of which are hegemonic masculine traits. The above organizations have all grown to become staples in the

contemporary outdoor education domain. There also are a growing number of smaller educational and recreational service providers whose curriculum is often informed by these older and larger organizations.

The classed nature of these outdoor programs must not be overlooked. Newbery (2003) states that engaging in leisure outdoor pursuits (rather than subsistence hunting or fishing) marks one as upper- or middle class. In addition, Wall (2008) notes how private, longer-stay camps were designed for middle and upper-class patrons to encourage leadership, character, and networking opportunities. In contrast, day camps, outdoor centres, and a few wilderness-based programs like D.A.R.E. (Development through Adventure, Recreation, and Education) were begun to discourage delinquency and promote the moral rehabilitation of working-class children (Nicol, 2002a; Wall, 2008). One can still detect this classed legacy in many outdoor program objectives and a concomitant lack of awareness of privilege (Warren, 2002). At least partially because of the expense of certifications required to lead programs, outdoor leaders are composed almost exclusively of White people from the middle and upper classes (Nicol, 2002a; Warren et al., 2018; Warren et al., 2014).

There are bigger issues at play as well; Hickcox (2018), for example, asserts that concepts such as wilderness are part of a "white ideal" (p. 502) that defines what nature is and how it should be used, which has typically excluded those not considered White. Similarly, Finney (2014) notes that historical associations of the outdoors with Whites and with racial violence can discourage Black participants. A recent example of such discouragement is the White woman in New York's Central Park who, amidst well-publicized violence against Black people by police, threatened to call the police on a Black male birder who simply asked her to put a leash on her dog (Noor, 2020). The White woman's threat that, "I am going to call the

police and tell them an African American man is threatening my life" (Noor, 2020, para. 4) not-so-subtly weaponized his maleness as well as his Blackness due to a long-perpetuated stereotype of Black men as (sexually) aggressive and trouble-making and the police's historical propensity to target and harass Black men (Joseph, 2012). Similarly, Ahmaud Arbery, an African American man, was recently shot and killed whilst jogging in a suburb of Brunswick, Georgia by two men who accused him of perpetrating robberies in the neighbourhood, despite no robberies being known to the police. The killers claimed that they were attacked by Arbery and were forced to defend themselves, but video footage showed that the killers followed and approached Arbery (BBC, 2020).

In both of these incidents, a White person's hostility leveraged the stereotype of Black men as aggressive and dangerous to demonize a Black man engaged in recreation. Further, Arbery's murder upholds Finney's (2014) claim that Black people rightly fear entering, or passing through, the mainly White-populated suburbs to engage in recreation. Some scholarly attention has been given recently to matters of race in outdoor recreation and education, including how specific kinds of outdoor organizations and activities, as well as the outdoor context itself, discourage non-White participants and leaders (e.g., Davis, 2019; Finney, 2014; Warren & Breunig, 2019). These scholars have suggested possible ways to address this problem, but argue much more work is needed.

For some time, women were also a minority in the outdoor education community, although recently the gender balance of practitioners has improved in some contexts (Gray, 2016). That said, a recognized structural imbalance persists wherein male outdoor professionals occupy the majority of management positions and few opportunities for advancement exist for women (Allin, 2003; Bell et al., 2018; Gray, et al., 2017). This gender disparity and apparent

lack of will to address it is surprising given widespread calls for increased diversity in instruction and leadership (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017). With such calls being made by prominent leaders in the outdoor education field, one might expect to see a glass escalator effect for women (Henson & Rogers, 2001), a phenomenon in which an employee of one sex is promoted more quickly in a field dominated by the opposite sex, but that is not evident. In the outdoor education realm, a majority of policy setters remain male and historical accounts of the field tend to focus on the contributions of men (Mitten et al., 2018), an assertion supported by Gray and Mitten's (2018) recounting of the erasure of Marina Ewald, the co-founder of the Schule Schloss Salem, Kurt Hahn's first outdoor school, from the outdoor education history books. As a result of the field's "gender blinkers" (Gray & Mitten, 2018, p. 4) many values, practices and programmatic elements remain inequitable.

Another way in which outdoor education continues to be gendered is through the values expressed and terminology used in outdoor education. As mentioned, action, risk, challenge, adventure, and leadership are all core foci of established outdoor education programs like Outward Bound and NOLS that set the standard in terms of curriculum and practices for other, smaller providers (Martin et al., 2017). These foci are all associated with masculinity (Connell, 2005; Davidson, 2003; Newbery, 2004). Further, informal but often used terms such as "rugged individualism" have their roots in notions of the masculine ideal of the "frontiersman" (Kimmel, 1995). As well, ideas about wilderness being a masculine space in contrast to the feminization of city life means that the context in which many women trip leaders operate often excludes or devalues them (Newbery, 2004). Such devaluing based on the perceived gendering of contexts means that women are often subordinated from the outset.

Many outdoor education scholars have also criticized the underlying narratives of outdoor education leadership styles (e.g., Avery, 2015; Gray, 2016; Jordan, 2018; Lugg, 2003; Newbery, 2003; Warren, 2002). While textbooks describe a range of leadership and communication approaches, including democratic and distributed styles (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017), a directive leadership style and assertive tone is often the most valued in practice (Gray, 2016; Newbery, 2004; Warren, 2016), with other styles, especially when performed by women, devalued or ignored by participants and co-leaders (Avery, 2015; Lugg, 2003). This forces women in outdoor education to perform in a more traditionally masculine fashion, often to a greater degree than their male peers, in order to be judged as competent (Avery, 2015), echoing Smith's (2007) study of women teachers enacting more authoritarian styles in a bid for legitimacy. While some women outdoor educators may find this leadership style liberating, others find it inauthentic as well as galling when they know that their experience more than qualifies them to be leaders no matter the style employed (Newbery, 2004; Warren et al., 2018). Furthermore, if women adopt a too aggressive or masculine leadership style, they can be disliked or ridiculed (Gray & Mitten, 2018; Newbery, 2004).

Much the same as with leadership styles, masculine physical strength is also lauded and those deemed "weak" are devalued (Allen-Craig & Carpenter, 2018; Lugg, 2003; Mitten, 2018; Newbery, 2003, 2004; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). Researchers have noted how this valorization has played out in multiple outdoor activities (e.g., Musa et al., 2015; Newbery, 2003; Thorpe, 2010; Weaver-Hightower, 2010). Further, certain bodies are perceived as inherently weak or incapable regardless of actual strength or ability, which outdoor education scholars building on insights from feminist, critical disability, and fat studies have critiqued (Newbery, 2003, 2004; Russell et al., 2013; Warren & Loeffler, 2006). Muscular, athletic bodily presentations are

valorized for men, congruent with research on physical education (Millington & Wilson, 2010a), and society more generally (Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 1995; Mara, 2012). However, only certain bodily performances are acceptable for women (Newbery, 2004; Russell et al., 2013; Warren & Loeffler, 2006). While they need to be functionally muscular and do have some freedom to get dirty, freeing them from some traditional expectations (Newbery, 2003), there nonetheless are limits to what is acceptable (i.e., athletic but not an "Amazon" and not fat) and these limits are socially policed by peers and participants (Christie, 2018; Newbery, 2004; Russell et al., 2013).

Another bodily limit is imposed on women by the fit of gendered outdoor clothes, which tend to be sized small and are ill-fitting for those with the muscles built by sustained and effortful activity in the outdoors, such as backcountry skiing (Wise, 2018). Based on information acquired from an informal Facebook survey of the readership of the magazine, *Outside*, Wise (2018) found that women's outdoor clothing also enforces women's bodily presentation as feminine by limiting colours to pastels and pinks. In addition, women's clothing and outdoor gear includes smaller pockets, implicitly conveying the idea that women cannot or need not carry as much as men (Smith, 2016; Wise, 2018). As Stoddart (2011) notes, outdoor clothing is a signifier of gender through its colour and appearance.

Often associated with strength and bodily presentation are technical skills (Potter & Dyment, 2016). Warren et al. (2018) observe the way in which outdoor education skills are gendered, with men being assumed to be more technically skilled and women more relationally skilled. Until very recently, technical skills were called "hard" and interpersonal skills "soft" (Martin et al., 2017), terminology that persists in some circles (Martin et al., 2018); the gendering here is unmistakable and, according to Warren and Loeffler (2006), such terminology is an example of linguistic sexism. In outdoor leadership cultures, the ostentatious demonstration

of technical skills gains one high status (Hickman & Stokes, 2016; Lugg, 2003; Nicol, 2002b; Thorpe, 2010; Warren et al., 2014; Wheaton, 2000). Despite communication and interpersonal skills being foundational in outdoor and adventure education, very little focus is given to developing these (Lugg, 2018). In fact, leaders often skip group reflection sessions due to other programmatic priorities or a lack of self-confidence in their ability to facilitate such activities (Potter & Dyment, 2016). Recently, then, there have been calls for increased attention to the development of relational skills (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Hickman & Stokes, 2016; Martin et al., 2017). As Overholt and Ewert (2015) state, this may be particularly needed for male leaders and participants since reflection and discussion sessions have been seen to be challenging for males due to gendered expectations around communication and emotional disclosure.

Also of note is how technical skills are tested and certified to ensure that each outdoor leader meets industry standards (Martin et al., 2017). However, credentialism also increases competition and hierarchy, both masculine values, as those with greater levels of skill gain greatest status, both among peers and within organizational structures (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Hickman & Stokes, 2016). Newbery (2004) notes that one woman trip leader was worried that she would not curry enough respect from her group, and so detailed her list of experiences and certifications to assert dominance over the group. This example further demonstrates the masculinization of the certification culture that exists within organizations and the industry as a whole.

Credentialism also runs rampant in neoliberal contexts, so it is important to attend to some of the ways in which neoliberalism and hyper-capitalism have influenced outdoor education. Some in the industry have criticized outdoor organizations for being too rigid in their approach and their practices, with the risk and open-ended outcomes that used to be promoted

having been replaced by intricately planned and repetitive activities that outdoor education leaders facilitate as if by rote (Brown & Beames, 2017). Nicol (2002b) also asserts that programs have become too tied to curriculum and too regulated by governing bodies. The standardization of programming is driven by fear of litigation and loss of business, making educational possibilities a secondary consideration (Potter & Dyment, 2016). Warren et al. (2014) state that such uncritical prioritization is problematic.

Another issue, as Weaver-Hightower (2010) notes, is that standard program elements can reproduce gendered stereotypes even when the explicit intent of a program is to be gender-neutral, because the implicit physicality and challenge/bravery discourse that goes along with activities is often facilitated uncritically. Multiple authors have suggested that outdoor education practice is not sufficiently grounded in critical theory and research, which limits its capacity (Breunig & Rylander, 2015; Dyment & Potter, 2015; Martin et al., 2017; Warren et al., 2014). Social justice scholarship (Martin et al., 2017; Warren, 2002), feminist theories (Lugg, 2003; Warren et al., 2014), queer theory (Russell et al., 2002), decolonial and Indigenous perspectives (Lowan-Trudeau, 2019; Root, 2010), and critical sustainability and environmental philosophies (Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Breunig & Rylander, 2015) are just some of the domains deemed by scholars to be urgently needing attention in outdoor education.

Achieving more criticality may be difficult because, as Brookes (2003) contends, outdoor education culture tends to be anti-intellectual and resistant to considering critical viewpoints, perhaps in part owing to its history and its overwhelmingly masculine culture that values physicality (Pryor, 2018) and views academia as effete (Lingard & Douglas, 1999). This tendency may have roots in the muscular Christianity movement that influenced key figures in the outdoor education movement, such as Lord Baden Powell. These sentiments were further

promoted by public figures such as famous outdoorsman U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt who claimed that, "an advanced state of intellectual development is too often associated with a certain effeminacy of character" (Putney, 2003, p. 39). The lack of criticality may also be connected to the neoliberal emphasis on competition and commodification that has influenced educational organizations. The neoliberal influence, Ball (2012) contends, has worn down the teacher-student relationship to that of educational provider and client and in the process also has watered down educational rigour. This problem may be particularly acute in outdoor education because it is not seen as contributing to students' competitiveness on standardized tests or in university applications (Nicol, 2002a), so outdoor providers may resort to neoliberal discourse and tactics to make their "product" sellable.

Assertions of anti-intellectualism and lack of criticality may be seen by some to go too far, but Lugg (2003), Barnes (2003), and Nicol (2002b) all concur that, at the very least, outdoor education culture often has been resistant to new ideas. That may be one reason why outdoor education is often devalued in the wider educational realm (Potter & Dyment, 2016), although Nicol (2002b) contends that outdoor education's low status in education is simply due to its relative newness. Others argue that education in general is highly anthropocentric and thus has ignored approaches that occur in settings beyond the traditional classroom, particularly outdoors (Bell & Russell, 2000). Regardless of the reason, the result of devaluation is the same: many school boards have cut their funding for outdoor centres, instead opting to hire service providers for limited programming (Nicol, 2002b; Potter & Dyment, 2016).

Another way in which hyper-capitalism has influenced outdoor education programs is that activities need to be "sold" to clients as exciting (James & Williams, 2017) yet also safe, which is accomplished through increased credentialism and standardization (Martin et al., 2017;

Nicol, 2002b). The catering to client desires has been called the "McDonaldisation" of outdoor

education (Foley et al., 2003) or "adventure in a bun" (Martin et al., 2017, p. 55). This results in

the commodification of outdoor education, and of nature that is rendered simply a setting for the

packaged adventure (Nicol, 2002b; Riley, 2018) rather than as a vital part in promoting

engagement with the natural environment (Martin et al., 2017).

Further, participant expectations likely determine leadership style and other gender

performances, echoing the research on teachers by Martino (2008a) and Martino and Frank

(2006). Client expectations of program leaders will almost certainly reflect the popular

hegemonic masculine performances of gender that are reinforced in outdoor-focused advertising

(McNiel et al., 2012) and adventure sports films (Musa et al., 2015). Jordan (2018) has found

that both men and women outdoor education participants prefer men over women leaders.

Outdoor education leaders who attempt to transgress gendered norms likely will be devalued and

almost certainly lose work, impacting them economically, since confronting ideas that trouble

existing conceptions can make others uncomfortable (Biesta & Miedema, 2002). In a neoliberal

economic model, where competition is valued (Chomsky, 1999; Risman, 2018), outdoor

providers will almost certainly hire leaders who demonstrate the qualities, and provide the

service, the client desires. This increasing consumerist influence in outdoor education (Brown &

Beames, 2017; Nicol, 2002b) will certainly continue to gender the field. As Connell (2005)

states, neoliberal capitalism supports hegemonic masculinity through its focus on competition,

hierarchy, and masculine norms.

Still, there remain cracks in consent to hegemonic gender norms in outdoor education.

Humberstone (2000) claimed that the outdoor education subculture may be an effective site of

resistance against hegemonic masculinity, given its explicit commitment to values of care,

reflection, and communication. Similarly, Kidd and Mason (2019) state that outdoor educational sites, such as summer camps, can provide a respite from predominant norms and allow for social experimentation. Further, Barnes (2003) found that the outdoor education community is suspicious and resistant to dominant norms and consumerist values, which also presents an opportunity. In addition there are documented examples of alternative masculinities in the outdoor realm.

Oakley et al. (2018) shared that, though rare, they have observed a few male practitioners exhibit alternative masculinity in the outdoors, which they describe as a lack of competitiveness and self-aggrandisement. These men also provided support and acceptance of others, creating an atmosphere in which the authors did not feel the need to prove themselves as adequately skilled or strong. In addition, these men demonstrated a willingness to engage in non-stereotypically masculine behaviours; as an example, they provided a photograph of Thunder Bay local Scott Read playing dress up with his daughter. Similarly, Blenkinsop et al. (2018) profiled three individuals performing alternative masculinities in the outdoors. In their first vignette, they describe a male environmentalist living in a "'resource-based' township" (p. 352) where masculinity was wrapped up with extractivism, similar to the industrial masculinity described by Hultman (2017), who advocated veganism and love of the environment despite threats from other men. In the latter two profiles, Blenkinsop et al. describe young boys who demonstrate care for the environment and non-human organisms, in direct contrast to the athletics-focused and, in one case, wantonly destructive enactments of other boys. Somewhat related to these examples is Thorpe's (2010) research on hegemonic masculinity in snowboarding culture in which she found that some men became critical of norms and willingly changed behaviours to incorporate a more inclusive masculinity. Wheaton (2000) also describes enactment of alternative masculinities in

older participants in the non-competitive windsurfing community as well, with men who transgressed hegemonic masculine norms forming a network that was openly critical.

These latter studies of outdoor cultures offer hope that alternative masculine performances may generate organically in some contexts. I wonder, though, whether and how it might be possible to create a wider counterhegemonic subculture in outdoor education? Although Bell et al. (2018) found that only a few men enact an alternative masculinity or question the gendered nature of outdoor practices in professional settings, Davies et al. (2019) recently found that the outdoor leaders in their study were knowledgeable about the gendering of outdoor skills and were enthusiastic about transgressing stereotypical gender roles. Moreover, their participants indicated that they were disdainful of hypermasculine practices and organizational cultures and actively confronted inappropriate gender comments when they heard them. However, Davies et al. also found that essentialist notions about gender still pervade the field and sexualization of women staff persists. That said, the work of Davies et al. (2019) offers some hope for changes in the field.

Beyond raising awareness of the issue, are there other ways to spur resistance to hegemonic masculinity in outdoor education? A few textbooks used in outdoor education pre-service courses already are trying to do so, albeit in a limited way (e.g., Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017). In addition, perhaps students and practitioners engaged in professional development could be made aware of the research cited in the sex and gender section of this literature review that discusses biological and behavioural similarities of the genders and criticizes essentialist conceptions. The discrepancy between the stated inclusive and egalitarian values of outdoor education and the multiple academic papers written on sexism and gendered practice in outdoor education (Martin et al., 2018) could also be highlighted. As well, official

departmental commitments to inclusion, resourcing, and curriculum review could be initiated, similar to those described in Gray et al. (2020).

Some scholars have observed, however, that students and practitioners seem to have difficulty applying theory learned in formal settings to more concrete examples (Breunig & Rylander, 2015; Laberge, & Albert, 1999; Millington & Wilson, 2010a). Perhaps, then, as Hickman and Stokes (2016) suggest, using the existing outdoor education practice of critical incident studies might be a more effective route due to familiarity with and trust in that method. Alternatively, hearing the personal stories of individuals who relate their experiences of devaluation based on gender or gender performance (e.g., Dubreil Karpa, 2018) may help spur recognition, given the stories are imbued with emotion and so could be more compelling. Perhaps such stories would encourage consideration of divergent ideas and experiences (Haidt, 2012).

Whatever approaches are taken, Overholt and Ewert (2015) argue that it is time for male outdoor education practitioners to step up and take on the challenge of proactively learning about these issues and engaging in critical self-reflection and emotional disclosure. Because alternative masculine performances to combat gender norms have been observed in outdoor recreation (Oakley et al., 2018) and reported in professional settings (Davies et al., 2019), perhaps mentorship offered by select men could provide some assistance. That may have promise since Whittington (2018), in a review of several studies about the impacts of outdoor education participation, found that observers of alternative gender performances tended to question their own gendered behaviour.

While problematic in their possible reinforcement of the gender binary, perhaps some mentoring needs to happen in men-only groups. Many scholars have hailed the benefits of

single-sex programs for women (e.g., Avery et al., 2018; Mitten, 2018; Warren, 2016; Warren & Loeffler, 2006). Although some scholars suggest that such programs may limit the potential for skill-building (Lugg, 2003), some women have stated that they found such an atmosphere supportive and less anxiety-inducing, making the process more enjoyable and enriching (Mitten, 2018) and others appreciated feeling free to perform gender in a non-essentialized manner (Martin et al., 2018). Further, women-only programs can provide a less competitive environment for the development of technical skills, which women are often socialized to avoid (Avery et al., 2018; Warren & Loeffler, 2006). Some authors also have recommended that men take responsibility for engaging other men in critically reflecting on their attitudes and behaviours (Flood, 2019; Katz, 2014). Perhaps men in outdoor education could benefit from similar programming, but with a focus on developing relational skills with which they have been found to struggle (Overholt & Ewert, 2015).

The idea of men-only professional development would not be without challenges, however. Men on outdoor education trips tend to overestimate their strength and ability (Musa et al., 2015), and since men are enculturated to value competition, a men-only group may only serve to exacerbate bravado (Warren et al., 2018), one-upmanship, or condescension towards women (Avery et al., 2018). Further, Overholt and Ewert (2015) found that men were less enthusiastic about single-sex outdoor education program elements than women were. Though Overhold and Ewert do not provide more detail about their finding that men lack enthusiasm for male-only excursions, the fact that the men found the centrality of extended debriefs and encouragement of emotional disclosure challenging in mixed-sex groupings, the relational focus of proposed men-only programming may have been a factor. As Oransky and Marecek (2009) found, male participants tend to resist admitting difficulty or expressing emotion to avoid

sanction and loss of status. To overcome men's distaste for men-only outdoor education groupings, perhaps appeals detailing how remedial work on relational skills and performances of alternative masculinities could directly benefit them, such as reducing depression and risk of suicide (Addis & Cohane, 2005) and increasing physical health (Hearn, 2015) would be helpful. An appeal to effectiveness and professionalism might also be helpful since Overholt and Ewert (2015) contend that those who enact alternative masculine performances make more effective and resilient trip leaders.

Whittington (2018) asserts that providing a single-gender space is not magically sufficient in itself, however, and suggests that such endeavours require careful facilitation focused on specific issues. One possible benefit is that sharing the experience and bonding in a course might allow participating men to create a support structure and culture that they value more than prevailing values, like the Jewish boys in Haywood and Mac an Ghaill's (2012) research had. This might be particularly valuable given Bell et al. (2018) indicate that men in professional contexts often are devalued when raising issues of gender. Perhaps it would be useful for men to know about Avery's (2015) research that indicated that women are regularly devalued by course participants and colleagues. She asserts that she does not think that sexist remarks and devaluing of femininity was intentional on the part of her colleagues. Martin et al. (2017) acknowledge that many people who discriminate against or devalue people by committing micro-aggressions are unaware of the impacts of their actions. Micro-aggressions can take the form of gendered language or subtle gendered assumptions that devalue one group of people, and which slowly compound to undermine confidence or appearance of capacity (Jordan, 2018).

Another question remains concerning the development of mentorship opportunities. Who are the mentors and how will they be recruited? There has been contradictory research about who might fill such roles. Thorpe (2010) and Wheaton (2000), for example, found that men can become less committed to hegemonic masculinity as they become older as a result of life experiences and changes in values (Thorpe, 2010) or diminishing strength or capacity due to age or injury (Wheaton, 2000), while Lilleaas (2007) found young men were more likely to enact masculinity in non-traditional ways because of changing social mores. Perhaps, then, there are mentorship roles to be played by men of all ages and abilities provided they have seriously grappled with hegemonic and alternative masculinities in the field?

Conclusion

Recent biological (Fausto-Sterling, 2008), neuroscientific (Eliot, 2010; Rippon, 2019), and psychological (Fine, 2010, 2017) research has demonstrated that traditional notions of sex and gender binaries are specious. Diverse gender expressions are possible and should be encouraged. Warren (2016) suggested that the outdoor education subculture could be critically engaged to combat hegemonic masculinity. If established, could a counterhegemony in this field impact wider societal values? Or, as Nicol (2003) suggests, does the mainstream exert much greater influence on the outdoor education community? That seems possible, given that McNiel et al. (2012) and Musa et al. (2015) suggest that the mass media depicts women's outdoor participation in a stereotypically gendered way. However, as writing in popular venues by Joyce (2016), Langlois (2017), and Wise (2018) demonstrate, the outdoor education community can speak up and use mass media to perhaps impact mainstream discourse.

To date, most critical voices concerning hegemonic masculinity and gendered practices in outdoor education have been women. Although Henderson and Gibson (2013) state that men are

beginning to research gendered leisure practices, more recent publications suggest that women still "aren't on their [male] radar" (Gray et al., 2017, p. 29). Consistent with this statement, Becker and Wright (2011) found that men simply do not recognize gendered discrimination, or if they do, they judge it to be less egregious than women do. More generally, Martino (2008a)indicates that having men raise gender issues is important because women are perceived to have a bias. Women scholars have found a similar attitude applies in outdoor education (Avery et al., 2018; Birrell, 2018; Jordan, 2018). And women are beginning to suffer "feminist fatigue" from repeated attempts to raise men's awareness of inequity (Gray et al., 2017). Subašić et al. (2018) found that when men promote gender equity, framing it as a common cause of all genders and implicating men as positioned to create change, men's commitment increases dramatically. With that in mind, I restate Mitten et al.'s (2018) question here: "Why are we not witnessing more men stepping up and leaning in to redress the imbalance as part of their transformed social conscience and shared quest for gender justice?" (p. 10).

I suggest we need to ask men to share their experiences and consult them about a shared way forward, which is consistent with the recommendation of Lingard and Douglas (1999). As Haluza–Delay and Dyment (2003) assert, men need to be a part of any lasting effort to reject gender stereotypes. If action is to be taken to encourage greater gender equity in outdoor education, then we must, as Weiler (2017) states, "act at whatever sites we find ourselves" (p. 292). Frustratingly, at the moment, we are not certain where exactly we are in terms of masculinity in outdoor education (Kennedy & Russell, 2020). To date, there has been almost no explicit study of masculinity in outdoor education (Kennedy & Russell, 2020) aside from a few articles that touch on the topic (Blenkinsop et al., 2018; Breunig & Russell, 2020; Schindel & Tolbert, 2017). Understanding men's conception of their own gender identities, as informed by

the outdoor education profession and setting, will provide greater context, helping to construct a more complete picture of the culture of outdoor education. With such knowledge, the obstacles and opportunities that exist for promoting gender equity can be examined and hopefully acted upon, which is the underlying motivation of my own research.

To gather resources for my literature review, I used the Lakehead library search engine and sites like Google Scholar using a variety of key terms relevant to the literature review topics (e.g., "masculinity [and] education," "masculinity [and] outdoors"). In addition, some articles and texts were referred to me by other scholars, including my committee members and other experts like Tonia Gray, Tom Potter, and Martin Hultman. I also reviewed the research bibliographies shared in a number of Facebook groups, namely the Research in Masculinities, Feminist Masculinities Forum, Environmental Education Intersectional Feminist Caucus, and Benefits of Outdoor Education groups. I chose not to include some material I found, either because they were literature reviews and I made the decision to use the original sources, or because I found other sources more complete or more up-to-date. Masculinities in the outdoors generally, and in outdoor education specifically, is an emerging field and while I have attempted to make this literature review as thorough as possible, new literature is now starting to appear more regularly, which is both challenging and encouraging. In the next chapter, I turn to the details of how I went about conducting my study that I hope will itself contribute to this emerging field.

Chapter Three: Methodology and Methods

As a reminder, my research questions were:

How do male outdoor educators understand and experience masculinity?

How do their ideas about masculinity impact their practice in the field?

How might their practice challenge and/or reinforce hegemonic masculinity?

In this chapter, I begin with a description of the theoretical and methodological frameworks that guided data collection and interpretation. My rationale for the choice of a case study design is explained as well as how I view this research as ethnographically inspired. Later, I identify the cases that were examined, the types of data collected, and provide detail about the process of data collection. The methods used to increase the reliability and validity of the proposed research are also discussed. From there, I detail the coding and analysis procedures employed as well as how I have chosen to format the research findings. Lastly, I outline the ethical considerations that informed this research.

Theoretical Framework

As noted in my literature review, Connell's (2005) theory of hegemonic masculinities was influential in the design of my research plan and as a lens through which my data were viewed. To provide a brief recap, Connell (2005) applied Gramsci's notion of hegemony to her work on gender relations. Not only, she suggested, are women subordinated to men, but masculinity itself exists within a hierarchy such that some performances gain men more status than others. Gramsci's theory of hegemony indicates that consent of the devalued is secured by misdirection and equivocation such that the hierarchy remains hidden. In the case of gender, Connell (2005) asserts, the hierarchy is obscured by gender essentialism, which makes certain roles appear natural and unquestionable. Individuals work to increase their individual positioning

as much as possible by performing as many of the valued qualities as possible relative to others in the hierarchy. Hegemonic masculine norms are not static, however (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), and can change over time and between contexts although the supremacy of the dominant group is often maintained. Still, there are cracks in consent and certain cultural and subcultural contexts can provide space for performance of alternative masculinities (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012; Houston, 2012; Oakley et al., 2018; Wheaton, 2000).

Another framework I employ is critical feminist theory that maintains gender as the focus of inquiry. While historically this methodological focus was on highlighting women's experiences and voices (e.g., Rhode, 1990), more recently there has been more attention to broadening beyond the gender binary as well as to masculinity (Lorber, 2018; Messerschmidt & Messner, 2018). There also has been attention to what it means to be a male researcher using critical feminist theory (Hearn, 1997, 1998). I am a male researcher, an experienced trip leader, and outdoor educational administrator who could be described, in Acker's (2000) categorization, as an insider or at very least an "indigenous outsider" (p. 193) in the outdoor education realm. That said, I have found the critical feminist project theoretically intriguing yet functionally nebulous. By this, I mean that I had trouble identifying my own assumptions and blind spots and therefore I worried that I might find identifying, problematizing, or questioning certain structures or practices difficult.

To overcome this challenge, I found Enloe's (2007) concept of "feminist curiosity" generative. Enloe (2007) asserts that it is necessary to examine structures through a critical feminist lens, enquiring how gender plays a role in quotidian activities. In her work, she has applied the idea of feminist curiosity largely to militarist and globalist government policy, but, she provides very practical and easy to follow questions that are applicable to other domains. For

example, by employing a feminist curiosity, she suggests that one must consider questions such as: How does gender influence labour roles and management hierarchies? Are skills in the labour environment gendered? Do organizational structures, beliefs, or practices contribute to or combat gendered roles? Are structures, practices, and beliefs derived, or separate, from social expectations about gender? How are wider economic structures impacted by gender? How do the politics of the locality shape all of these and how are these politics impacted by gender? Guiding questions like these ones suggested by Enloe helped me to reflect on issues to which I might have otherwise remained oblivious and helped me scrutinize practices and artefacts that I might have once considered commonplace or benign. Further, those questions specifically called my attention to the nested or intersecting influences that combine with gender to impact outdoor education professionals' experiences, thereby encouraging an intersectional consideration of the data.

Methodological Framework

Enloe's (2007) feminist lens and guiding questions were particularly well suited to my research that takes inspiration from ethnographic methodology that seeks to understand a culture or subculture (Creswell, 2012). While ethnography grounded in the anthropological tradition typically demands extensive fieldwork in only one site, I sought in this research some breadth of context so chose instead to conduct case study research (Yin, 2013) at five different outdoor education sites. I thus am not conducting an ethnography per se, but nonetheless was inspired by the ethnographic tradition. That said, ethnography and case study research have a great deal in common (White et al., 2009), to the point that the two terms are often used interchangeably (Cohen & Court, 2003). Both methodologies take into account the impact of culture, both involve in-depth investigation of an entity to consider the impact of some phenomenon, and both

can incorporate field-based data collection (Willis et al., 2007).

Ethnography is unique in that it must be conducted in the field rather than in an artificial setting, as is possible with case study research (Yin, 2017). Further, in ethnographic research, culture is the focus rather than simply one of a number of factors to be considered in the functioning of a phenomenon. Cohen and Court (2003) argue that the goal of ethnographic research is to uncover a specific element of culture: the unwritten rules and tacit conventions that informally guide individuals' behaviours. When conducting ethnographic research, the objective, then, is for the researcher to gain sufficient insight to permit them to act appropriately in the setting and to make behavioural choices that would allow them to fit in with members of the population that adhere to culturally appropriate performances automatically, often unaware that alternative conduct is possible in the given sphere (Cohen & Court, 2003). In contrast, some researchers advocate ethnomethodological experimentation by violating the contextual social norms and recording responses to test the researchers' normative hypotheses, although others consider such experimentation unnecessary and provocative (Patton, 1990).

Given the focus on scrutinizing tacit beliefs and behaviours of a culture or subculture, ethnography is described by Cohen and Court (2003) as inward-looking. It is precisely ethnography's inward-looking nature and examination of unspoken norms that I wished to integrate into my research and analysis, and it is the reason that I describe my methods as ethnographically inspired. Specifically, I intended to compare observational and interview data to discern whether enacted behaviours were congruent with stated beliefs as well as the degree to which particular gender performances and actions were culturally valued at the five sites. In the end, however, comparison was constrained in practice due to limited organizational permissions and logistical impediments.

The impetus for comparing beliefs and actions also came from studies that have found that male and female participants can behave in ways that contradict their stated beliefs about gender (Atkinson & Kehler, 2010; Breunig & Rylander, 2015). Further, because I agree with Barnes (2003) who states that each outdoor education site has unique culture based on its location, history, and clientele, it followed that field research was integral. As White et al. (2009) assert, context matters and data collection *in situ* allows the researcher to more accurately describe a culture or subculture in its lived context.

Case Study Design

Case study research is most effectively used when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not easily discernable (Yin, 2017) as was the case in this research. A strong understanding of context is essential in order to better define and analyze its impacts on the results. Case study research is typically performed in one of three forms: exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory (Yin, 2017). Exploratory research is an initial foray into an unresearched or under-researched topic. Often exploratory case studies attempt to define a question for future research or determine the feasibility of more in-depth study. Descriptive case studies are more structured and attempt to present a complete description of a known phenomenon. Descriptive research is often designed to answer "what" questions such as "What have been the ways that communities have assimilated new immigrants?" (Yin, 2017, p. 10). By contrast, explanatory case studies address "how" research questions and researchers attempt to offer a cause-and-effect explanation for the phenomenon under consideration. Two case study foci can be combined in a single study, as described by Tellis (1997), provided the data collection procedures are adequate to support both foci and sufficient detail is present in the data.

My study is an example of an exploratory-descriptive case study model, which was

appropriate because there has been very little research done on the topic of masculinities in the outdoor education context but research conducted on masculinities in other educational contexts offered insights into men's views of their masculinity in similar professional contexts. As I demonstrated in the literature review, what role the outdoor education culture plays in views and performances of masculinity remains underexplored, as does how, or if, male outdoor educators' perceptions or behaviours accord with the assertions of women who have been writing about sexism in the field.

Another distinction between types of case study research is whether the research has an intrinsic or an instrumental objective (Yin, 2017). A case study with an intrinsic focus seeks only to describe the particular case under investigation. An instrumental case study is outward-looking, seeking to identify broader phenomena than just the case, or cases, examined. Case study researchers often argue that research is better extrapolated from common cases as opposed to extraordinary circumstances because the more mundane cases can, and do, provide a jumping-off point from which to consider similar cases (Cohen & Court, 2003). Due to outdoor education's long history and increasing popularity (Nicol, 2002b), I argue that it can be considered a common case. As such, my research did have an instrumental objective in that I consider the ways in which this research might generalize to the wider outdoor education culture.

Another decision when electing to use a case study method is whether the researcher's approach will be realist or relativist (Yin, 2017). A realist perspective assumes an objective reality that exists independent from the perception of the observer whereas a relativist stance takes a more constructivist approach, attempting to capture the perspectives of various participants and focusing on how their different perceptions inform the topic of study. My research adhered to a relativist approach in that I was interested in diverse ways in which

participants understand and perform masculinity while I also worked to determine the most valued masculinities that emerged from multiple participants' data.

More practically, the type of case study research design selected by the researcher provides a blueprint for identifying what case(s) to consider, which participants to select, and the logical model for analysis. Two main types exist, with variants of each used in different situations. Single-case studies can examine an individual or they can focus on a group; they can consider families, schools, or whole communities as the case entities (Yin, 2017). Multiple-case studies form profiles of different cases then compare the cases to determine whether the data are replicated from one case to another to support or refute a hypothesis. As well, single- and multiple-case study designs may be holistic or embedded, with holistic designs focusing on a solitary unit for analysis whereas embedded designs can include multiple units for analysis within one case (Yin, 2017).

My research study employed a single-case embedded design. In the context of outdoor education, the single case to be examined is outdoor education culture and the sub-units of analysis are the individual participants across three organizations operating in five different locations. Although a multiple-case design fit more with my original vision for the research, Yin (2017) states that a multiple-case study design requires extensive resources beyond those available to a single researcher, especially a student. In addition, multiple-case studies, as mentioned above, are most often employed for testing predictions or theories. Because my case study was exploratory in nature, and little or no evidence existed upon which to make predictions, in the end, a single-case embedded design seemed most appropriate and practical.

The Case

Yin (2017) indicates that cases must be bounded, meaning the cases chosen must be

clearly defined beforehand and justified as to why the identified entities were chosen rather than others. The cases must also be defined temporally, with a clear beginning and end of the case established. As my participants, I defined staff at three types of outdoor education sites—one summer camp, one professional guiding organization, and one school-based outdoor education program—to help me gain a more complete sense of the culture and practices in outdoor education. I felt that this variety was important given outdoor education sites often have a unique culture impacted by multiple factors such as location, history, clientele, and program content (Barnes, 2003).

I intended to recruit five male outdoor educators with a minimum of two years of outdoor education work experience from each site, for a total of 15 participants. I stipulated two years of work experience for participants to ensure a base amount of acclimatization into the professional and/or organizational culture. As I describe more fully below, I ended up with 18 participants, with four from Adventure Quest, six from Camp Laviron, and eight from Outdoor Skills Co-op. Not all participants had two years of experience, which I explain below.

Data collection began in late June 2019 and ended in September 2019, covering the operating season of summer camps and the high season of guiding organizations who offer commercial and school trips. This time frame provided the best opportunity for finding participants currently active in the field.

Data Collection

Yin (2017) recommends using key informants or an influential person to link the researcher with organizations or individual participants who might be willing to participate. My experience in the outdoor industry in Ontario provided me many such contacts and I asked several of them to help me gain entry to organizations, although only one was initially

successful, which led me to send emails to various outdoor organizations in the United States and Canada. Although many organizations were not interested in participating, two eventually agreed after lengthy negotiations concerning the terms of data collection.

Ultimately, the three participating organizations are all large, successful outdoor education providers in North America. Two are outdoor adventure organizations and one is a privately-owned summer camp. To protect anonymity, I have given the organizations pseudonyms. The two outdoor adventure organizations will be known as Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op. The summer camp will be referred to as Camp Laviron. Both of the outdoor adventure education providers had multiple base-sites that served as locations for staff to prepare before departing on outdoor excursions. I conducted interviews and gathered limited observational data at five of these sites (three of Adventure Quest's and two of Outdoor Skills Co-op) and I conducted interviews and observed at Camp Laviron. In total, then, I collected data at six sites of three organizations.

Participants

When selecting individual participants, Yin (2017) suggests a two-phase selection procedure when anticipating 12 or more participants. The first phase ideally would have been to collect some basic demographic data that could be provided by interested outdoor organizations without revealing identities. This phase would have helped me narrow the participant pool to only those individuals who met my selection criteria. In this instance, however, the organizations were unwilling to provide me with any staff information due to privacy concerns. Instead, the two outdoor adventure education organizations sent an email to their staff with a description of the research taken from the participant information letter and asked interested parties to contact me directly to schedule data collection. Once I had interested parties, I scheduled dates and times

with participants in collaboration with each site manager and, when later on site, I was free to ask other staff on site if they would like to participate and several (at Outdoor Skills Co-op) agreed to participate when I was on-site seeking volunteers. At the summer camp, male staff were scheduled to see me during their free period on a designated date. Once the staff arrived, I provided them with information about the study and asked if anyone would like to participate.

The participants, then, were all volunteers who were willing to speak to me about the topic of masculinity in outdoor education. Given the size of the two outdoor education organizations, presumably there were dozens, if not hundreds, of male-identifying staff who did not respond to the call for volunteers. The fact that the participants included here decided to participate could indicate a certain comfort with or awareness of the topic of masculinity that may not be representative of the general outdoor educator population.

The final group of participants consisted of 18 male-identifying outdoor education leaders, with varying levels of self-reported experience, from 0 to 20+ years (see Table 1). All participants but one were White and Anglophone. Ages of the participants varied, from 18 to 52 years old, meaning that they were representative of at least three generations.

Table 1. Participants

Pseudonym	Organization	Position	Age	Years of Experience
Elijah	Adventure Quest	Trip Leader	25	2
Marcus	Adventure Quest	Trip Leader	27	4
Roman	Adventure Quest	Trip Leader	40	1
Sebastian	Adventure Quest	Trip Leader	33	5+
Dan	Camp Laviron	Activity Leader	22	2
George	Camp Laviron	Counselor	19	1
John Marshall	Camp Laviron	Counselor	18	2
Liam	Camp Laviron	Trip Coordinator	23	8
Mason	Camp Laviron	Counselor	18	1
Tom	Camp Laviron	Activity Leader	18	2

Barry	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Leader	35	12
Bruce	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Manager	52	27
Gabriel	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Coordinator	31	10
Levon	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Coordinator	41	18
Mateo	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Coordinator	38	5
North	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Coordinator	30	8
Oliver	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Trip Leader	28	4
Zack	Outdoor Skills Co-op	Manager	31	10

All participants were middle or upper class. The participants, then, are consistent with the demographics of the field (Nicol, 2002a; Warren et al., 2018; Warren et al., 2014). For those participants not in secondary school at the time of data collection, I used the definition of middle class employed by Murray (2012) and Putnam (2015), which elides discussion of income and focuses on educational attainment. Within that definition, middle class encapsulates all those who have obtained a bachelor's degree, since such educational achievement signals potential earning power. While such a definition is problematic, as noted by Pressman (2015), I used it in my study in consideration of low remuneration in the outdoor education field, which would have implied participants were from a lower socio-economic class than they arguably were. (I will discuss this issue in detail in Chapter Seven on status).

I considered the participants from Camp Laviron, many of whom were in secondary school and therefore could not be accurately characterized by either their educational level or income, as upper-middle or upper-class due to their previous attendance as campers or their financial ability to take a relatively low-paying summer camp job while attending university (as discussed in Chapter Seven). This aligns with Newbery's (2003) assertion that outdoor education, and canoeing in particular, has been a middle-class leisure pursuit. That experience means they are likely from a demographic similar to another camp that has been researched (Cousineau & Roth, 2012) with many comparable qualities (e.g., location, accreditation, service

model). Further, Wall (2008) has described Camp Laviron as one of a group of camps that are understood to be networking environments for the elite of Canadian society, which offers a very clear marking of class.

Interviews

I employed a semi-structured interview format to allow flexibility in the discussions and allow unforeseen discussion topics arise (Creswell, 2012). I prepared interview questions ahead of time that helped me answer my research questions and get at issues raised in my literature review. Below is my list of initial questions:

1. Would you provide me with some background information about yourself, such as your age, nationality, family history, how much experience you have in outdoor education, and what roles you have held in the outdoor education field?

2. What are your preferred activities (outdoors or otherwise)?

3. What experiences led you to become an outdoor ed leader?

4. What does it mean to be an outdoor education leader?

5. What does it mean to be a man today?

6. When working in the outdoors, how does a man typically look and act? Is that the same as outside of OE or different?

7. How would you define your own masculinity? Is it in line with other definitions? (e.g., OE or wider cultural definitions?)

8. How did you develop your own ideas of what it means to be a man?

9. Do you feel that particular work environments, within outdoor education or in settings, have influenced your feelings of how to be a man? How so?

10. Would you tell me a story, positive or negative or contradictory, that was formative in creating your idea of what masculinity looks like in the outdoors?

11. Do you think that co-leaders would describe you as traditionally masculine? Why or why not?

12. Do you think that stereotypical masculinity is valued in outdoor education? Why or why not?

13. How do you think your style of masculinity affects the way you lead trips or facilitate programs?

14. Do you feel a different ethos exists on trips with mixed-gender leaders than all-male leaders? How, if at all, does your leadership change between each situation?

15. In your experience do participants react differently in the two situations? If so, how?

16. Do you think that male trip leaders have different skills or abilities than women?

17. A number of studies have been published recently that indicate that women leaders feel undervalued or undermined in outdoor education. Does this ring true in your own experience? If so, how might masculinity play a role in this undervaluing in outdoor education?

18. How have age and/or injuries shaped the way that you lead trips or see yourself?

19. How, if at all, can you as an outdoor educator contribute to boys' identity formation and/or to gender equity?

20. Is there anything else you would like to talk about related to masculinity in outdoor education?

In formulating these questions, I followed Yin's (2017) advice to pay particular attention to wording. For example, Yin (2017) states that "why" questions can cultivate defensiveness at

the outset, limiting the effectiveness of data collection. In contrast, "how" questions can be experienced as less confrontational and create more space for participants to describe their thoughts or experiences. I also carefully avoided mentioning the word "masculinity" at the outset. This omission was strategic in two separate but overlapping ways. First, based on my experiences in all-male educational domains, I can state with some confidence that the term masculinity is rarely used. Second, Brookes (2003) notes that outdoor education practitioners tend to be somewhat anti-intellectual, which I have also observed at times, so beginning with more colloquial language in the initial interview questions was intended to help ease into the more scholarly-worded questions later in the list. Further, Yin (2017) counsels that the researcher should initially seek to build a rapport with participants before diving into more potentially hard-hitting interview questions. A rapport-building strategy limits the participants' nervousness and establishes a baseline of trust and commonality between the researcher and the participant, often yielding richer responses.

Interviews were conducted one-on-one; that is, with only me and the participant present. Because I traveled to meet the participants to interview them *in situ*, I was often limited by the available spaces on site that afforded privacy and quiet. However, to the degree possible, I accommodated participant preference concerning the interview location. Given the variety of participating organizations the interview setting varied from individuals' offices to the main office porch to a nearby restaurant. One participant (Oliver) could not find time to be interviewed while on site, so I interviewed him later over the phone. All interviews were audio-recorded with permission of the participant, which aided me in producing accurate transcriptions.

Observations

I conducted interviews and observed participants mainly at the outdoor adventure

organizations' base camp sites during trip preparation and packing time and in the midst of the summer session at the camp. I acted as a non-participant observer. Collecting observational data while on backcountry trips was initially my preference, but I was not permitted to do so by any of the participating organizations. Even the most research-positive organizations balked at the suggestion that I might observe, as a participant or non-participant, trip leaders in a backcountry setting. The stated reason for their reticence is the likely impact that I, as an observer, would have on group dynamics. Cultivation of a positive group dynamic is one of the primary objectives of any backcountry program (Martin et al., 2017), so their reticence is understandable.

I was given permission to conduct observations by only two of the three organizations (Adventure Quest and Camp Laviron). Outdoor Skills Co-op refused to allow me to observe participants for undisclosed reasons. At the two organizations where I was allowed to make observations, I recorded field notes of participant interactions with their peers and, in some cases, their activity groups to better understand their practices and to assess the consistency between their interview responses and their actions. At Camp Laviron, where multiple participants were working at the same site at the same time, I was able to observe multiple participants at communal functions such as meal times in addition to individual observations.

I took on a non-participant observer role, which may actually have benefitted my research results in that Yin (2017) states that the effort to adequately maintain the participant role often becomes a distraction to the observer, detracting from the quality of data collected. I undertook direct observations by remaining as unobtrusive as possible, sitting in trip preparation or unoccupied areas to observe social interactions between staff peers as well as staff and their student groups. I observed each participant as much as schedules allowed to get as representative a sense as possible of their interactions with others. Because some observations were very brief, I

was mostly unable to ascertain with any certainty the social context within which they occurred (i.e., antecedent and resultant interactions or events). Therefore, these observations are understood to be merely snapshots. Even so, observations helped to provide some additional information regarding organizational or site culture, including patterns that appeared or particular individual actions that stood out (Skinner et al., 2000).

I took notes continuously during observations, consistent with a "narrative recording procedure" (Skinner et al., 2000, p. 29). Because my research was exploratory in nature, I deemed narrative recording appropriate because it enabled me to capture the variety of behaviours observed as opposed to more empirical recording methods that require predetermination of behaviours to be recorded (Skinner et al., 2000).

In addition to narrative observational notes, I also recorded decisions that I made during observations and how I experienced various situations. Such field notes assisted me in recording observation notes reliably across situations. Because my data collection stretched out over multiple months, I regularly re-read previous notes as reminders to help me remain consistent in my descriptions of participant behaviours.

Because of the inconsistency of observations permitted by the organization and by logistical constraints, the detailed comparison of participant statements and actions that I had hoped to document was rarely possible. Instead, observation and field note data were mostly used to supplement information obtained in interviews.

Artefacts

In the tradition of both ethnographic and case study research, I composed a detailed description of each site (Yin, 2017) and conducted detailed document analysis (Cohen & Court, 2003). I collected and reviewed artefacts like program documents, instructor evaluation forms,

and staff manuals that organizations were willing to share with me. In addition, I reviewed publicly available material on organization websites. This allowed me to gain a sense of the historical, cultural, and ecological contexts of my study.

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability are significant concerns for a researcher. These are most often associated with quantitative research (Stenbacka, 2001) and multiple procedures are typically used to increase validity and reliability separately. However, in qualitative research the two are thought to be largely interdependent, such that as validity increases, so too does reliability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In quantitative research, validity is dependent upon the measure employed yet in qualitative research validity is considered to be the trustworthiness of the data (Golafshani, 2003). Trustworthiness can be improved by triangulation, which refers to using multiple data sources in order to increase the likelihood of engaging in a rigorous examination of a context (Johnson, 1995). Per my data collection description above, I collected multiple sources of data in the form of interviews, observations, field notes, and organizational artefacts.

Prior the data collection, I assessed the effectiveness of my interview questions through a pilot interview with a PhD student in my cohort who is also an experienced outdoor educator. This pilot interview and the subsequent feedback allowed me to hone my questions and interviewing skills as recommended by both Creswell (2012) and Yin (2017); it also permitted me to improve my field note-taking skills. Once the interview questions were calibrated via the trial, the multiple methods of data collection helped to establish data triangulation and contribute to construct validity of my research by ensuring that methods measured what they were intended to measure. In addition, with greater practice with the research methods, I increased my ability to conduct data collection in a methodical and reliable manner (Yin, 2017).

Another method to improve construct validity during or immediately following data collection is to facilitate member checking (Cohen & Court, 2003). While still in the field, I transcribed interview and observation notes and provided an opportunity for each participant to comment on the accuracy of the interview text and add any clarifications as well as to reflect on and discuss my observation notes. Tilley (2016) states that the reflection process can also provide valuable additions to interview data by extending upon previous thinking. An example of a productive reflection procedure in outdoor education research is demonstrated in Davies et al. (2019) where one of their participants engaged in serious reflection on his sexism after reviewing his transcriptions and hearing the researchers' initial responses, which provided them with further data. Member checking is one method of improving internal validity (Yin, 2017) by verifying that the researcher has accurately captured both the spirit and the letter of the participants' words in the transcription. Another reason for doing member checking while still in the field is that outdoor educators, particularly those employed seasonally in professional guiding organizations, can be transient with employment contracts taking them to locations all across Canada, if not the world. Leaving member checking too long could have limited my ability to complete the process effectively, which is why I was keen to do it as soon as possible. Most member checking did happen in the field and I was fortunate that the five participants (Barry, Elijah, Liam, Mason, and Oliver) who could not check their transcripts and/or my observation notes in person immediately still were able to complete the process via email.

For case study research, Yin (2017) suggests multiple methods to increase reliability. Among his suggestions, the creation of an encrypted database of data was the most easily practicable. Storing all data in a timely and organized manner permits other researchers (in this case my supervisor) to inspect collected data. Timeliness is essential for both security and

research integrity, Yin (2017) asserts, and he recommends that interview and observation notes as well as document analysis be uploaded on a daily basis whenever possible. This recommendation dovetailed nicely with my attempts to complete rapid transcription and member checking and worked well given I often found myself wrapping up one interview and fairly soon after, shifting gears to conduct another interview or set of observations, which also drove home the necessity of saving documents immediately after transcription.

Coding and Analysis

How to code and interpret data is a crucial consideration. Both Creswell (2012) and Yin (2017) suggest that computer software is an efficient method for coding and is often employed in qualitative research. However, they caution that in order to use software for coding well, the researcher must generate codes that match the data well. In order to determine codes and, later, themes, Yin (2017) recommends that researchers "play with your data" (p. 167) by placing it in a variety of different arrays, arranging it into matrices of different or contrasting categories, and creating a visual display that may facilitate the coding procedure. Although some case study researchers derive themes from the theoretical propositions that guide their research, that strategy is more applicable in explanatory case studies that are framed by the theories that inform their justification (Yin, 2017). Given my exploratory-descriptive case study design, I employed an inductive strategy, deriving codes directly from the data.

Given my inductive approach and the need for constant note-making suggested by Yin (2017), the most utile method for code generation was the constant comparative method originally suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in their writing on grounded theory. According to Glaser (1992) the constant comparative method combines data coding and initial analysis to generate ideas or theories. The researcher collects an initial set of data and begins the process of

open coding by affixing an abstract yet categorical label that marks fragments of the data as

significant. If the same label is affixed to multiple fragments within the same data source, the

fragments assigned to the same category are compared to determine if new or disparate

information has been added to the category or is simply a repetition of information. This process

creates a summary of the data and permits initial codes and core concepts to be identified, with

researcher memos documenting the process.

   I informally completed the first phase of coding between data collection sessions,

selecting *in vivo* codes and detecting emerging themes that helped to generate potential follow-

up questions for subsequent interviews. Later, once data collection was complete, I loaded all

transcripts, observation notes, artefacts, and field notes into *Atlas.ti*. I then engaged in descriptive

coding that summarized the topics raised by the participants (Saldaña, 2016). Once I had

completed the first cycle of coding, I engaged in pattern coding for the second cycle to develop

initial themes by grouping similar codes. These grouped codes were collected under

compendious terms (Saldaña, 2016), which, after multiple rounds of reformulation, acted as the

titles for the analysis chapters.

   At this point in the analysis, different groups of participants (or, for my purposes,

participant data from different organizations) could be compared (Boeije, 2002). The verification

within and then between cases described in the constant comparative approach is similar to the

cross-case analysis technique advocated by Yin (2017). Cross-case analysis considers in-case

patterns then seeks to compare those between individual cases. Yin (2017) states that cross-case

analysis can spring from theoretical propositions or can be inductive. However, it must not

exclude data and must entertain conflicting data, known in case study terms as "rivals." Lastly, if

inductive analysis is used, current theory must be brought to bear at later points in the analysis by

way of proposing explanations for findings or suggesting future directions for research, which I will do in the chapters that follow.

Once the data has been analyzed, and conclusions or theories drawn from the research, the researcher's next step is to formulate a case study report. Before producing such a report, it is advisable to define an audience. According to Yin (2017), a report for an academic audience differs significantly from one produced for practitioners and policymakers in the industry. Because of the varying expectations of the two audiences—the academic community and outdoor education practitioners—I am producing two reports, one being this dissertation and the other an accessibly-written summary for the organizations and participants of my research and the wider outdoor education community. For my committee, the dissertation is presented as a linear-analytic report (Yin, 2017) that follows a progression of: statement of problem, review of literature, description of methods, thematic reporting and analysis of data (which I combined together), and conclusions and implications. The second report will be done after my dissertation defense and will be more functional, spelling out practical steps based on my analysis that could improve policy and practice in terms of gender equity in the field. Such practical reports are necessary as they constitute one aspect of reciprocity; that is, giving back to the population in which the research was conducted (Kovach, 2009; Tilley, 2016). I also will fulfill my duty of reciprocity by sharing my research findings with individuals and organizations in the outdoor education community through conference presentations and publications for both professional and academic audiences.

Ethics

Besides reciprocity, multiple other ethical considerations are important to recognize in my research. Before beginning my data collection, I submitted my research proposal to the

Research Ethics Board (REB) at Lakehead University and received approval shortly thereafter

(see Appendix A). Upon REB approval, I submitted a formal information letter (see Appendix B)

and proposal to the three organizations who had indicated tentative interest prior to REB

approval to ensure they were fully informed about the intent of the study, the data collection

procedures, and that they would indeed give me permission to approach some of their staff

members for possible participation. All three did indeed consent. I gave the organizations the

opportunity to remain anonymous unless they wished to identify themselves as a participating

organization or use the information in the report provided to them on their websites or in other

media (see the consent form in Appendix C). All chose to remain anonymous.

After getting organizational approval, I obtained free, informed, and ongoing consent

from the participants themselves. I remained aware when seeking consent that the approval of

the outdoor organization could represent a coercive influence on the participant as their

employer, which I attempted to mitigate by repeatedly making clear that they were under no

obligation to participate. Given that I collected data voluntarily from adult male participants from

a non-vulnerable population, the majority of risks to participants fell under the domains of

consent, privacy, and the related concern of stigmatization. These were identified in an

information letter in which I apprised participants of the purpose of the research, the risks and

benefits of participation, any perceived or determined conflicts of interest that I as the researcher

had, how they would be identified in the research report and the scope of its dissemination, my

and my supervisor's contact information to facilitate requests for information, appropriate

contacts at Lakehead University to whom they could report suspected ethical violations,

indications of what data were collected and their intended use, and a statement ensuring that

participants had not waived any legal rights by engaging in the research (see Appendix D).

Participants were given adequate time to consider whether they wished to consent to participate (see Appendix E) and each was specifically asked if he would like more time to consider participation before agreeing. In addition, the participants were advised at initial contact, in the letter as well as verbally before and after data collection, that they could withdraw from participation at any time up until member checking was complete. Another ethical concern is the need to code participant information to avoid identification. Coding also guards against consequences from institutions and possible stigmatization by the community should participants make critical statements. I asked participants to select their own pseudonym to use in the research report and assigned one for the few who did not choose one. I removed any identifying information that might make it easy to determine participants' identities.

Participants may have reaped benefits from participation. Although I did not provide incentives for participation, the opportunity for reflection may have been a reward in itself. Indeed, critical reflection to improve practice is a valued part of the outdoor education profession (Martin, et al., 2017) and is evident in Davies et al.'s (2019) study in which a male participant realized he needed to reflect on his sexism after reading his transcripts and the authors' first draft of their paper. As noted above, I will provide each participant a copy of the research report summary as well as an electronic copy of the full dissertation to those who requested it (and to any who may not have initially requested it but subsequently do). These documents may spur further critical reflection and may help the participants improve their facilitation skills through exposure to critical perspectives about masculinities, including their own enactments in the outdoor education context.

A final ethical consideration is data storage. During and after data collection, I stored all data on an encrypted drive on my computer. Once research has been completed, I will send my

supervisor a copy on an encrypted memory stick that she will have stored in the secure storage area in the Bora Laskin building on the Thunder Bay campus of the Faculty of Education for the requisite period of 5 years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Writing Conventions and Considerations

Before turning to my findings in the coming chapters, I want to share a few writing decisions I made for clarification. First, some participant quotations have been edited to improve readability by removing repeated words (e.g., "if…if"), pauses, or placeholder words such as "like" as recommended by Tilley (2016). I took great care to maintain participants' intended meaning and edits were only performed if they did not change the spirit of the response. Further, repetition and placeholder words were retained in certain quotes if they illustrated a point, such as in the section on participant hedging.

To more coherently and concisely report the insights gained through data collection, I elucidate here the terminology used in the following chapters. The organizations included in this research are diverse, representing a spectrum of providers within the outdoor education field. The interviewees held a variety of positions within these organizations, from camp counselor to outdoor education instructor to site or regional manager, with organization-specific titles for each (see Table 1, which also includes their years of experience). I grouped the various positions into a general title category (e.g., Manager, Instructor), which indicates their position in their organization's hierarchy.

Specific titles are withheld to protect anonymity as each organization had its own unique position titles, so here I pause to clarify the position titles I used:

Trip Leader: work almost exclusively in a backcountry context, leading wilderness excursions.

Activity Leader: facilitate specific on-site activities (e.g., challenge course, archery, sailing, etc.), often in the form of lessons to build skills.

Counselor: responsible for the care of students day-to-day and often also accompany them, with a trip leader, on a wilderness excursion.

Trip Coordinator: a broad position that involves many functions, the most common of which are selecting and hiring the instructor team, providing provisions, and coordinating or performing emergency evacuations from the backcountry.

Manager: oversee the Trip Coordinators on one site, perform all budgeting, coordinate established groups (e.g., a school group), manage enrolment, and oversee site operations and functionality.

In the next chapters, participants' roles are not mentioned unless it was helpful in describing their comments or necessary for analysis. Instead, multiple terms are used to refer to those who participated in the study in order to maintain their homogeneity as a single case (Yin, 2017), that is, the outdoor education field. The terms I have used to describe participants in more general terms include participants , instructors, or outdoor education (OE) leaders.

The people engaging in the programs facilitated by the organizations and participants are henceforth referred to as students. The OE leaders interviewed described those taking part in their programs variously as students, clients, campers, and participants. Rather than differentiate in each instance, which I feel would add confusion, I have chosen one term to encapsulate all of these. I have chosen the term "students" as it highlights the educational focus of the participating programs. However, in direct quotations, I leave the original wording used by the OE leader to maintain the fidelity of their statements.

Chapter Sequence Overview

The five chapters that follow weave together results and discussion to enable focus and to avoid repetition. Each chapter is broken into sections. The sections within each chapter begin with a presentation of the data, which is then compared with relevant literature. Therefore, multiple data/analysis cycles appear in each chapter. Each chapter ends with a summation that restates and integrates the insights. I end the dissertation with a concluding chapter that critically engages with and synthesizes these insights, offers recommendations for the organizations and the field as a whole, and points to future research directions.

Chapter Four: Perspectives on Outdoor Leadership

Although the focus of this research is OE leaders' understandings and enactments of masculinity in the outdoor education field, my initial questions asked participants to define the role of an outdoor educator. Knowing the ideas that the participants hold about the field more generally provides some context to the analysis of their responses concerning gender and masculinity. Their responses elucidate their perspectives on the current state of the field, with some common understanding of their role and some departures, which I compare to the outdoor education literature. The themes that emerged concerning the outdoor educator role are: the distinction between guiding versus outdoor education; balancing relational and technical skills; the gratification from and toll of personal connections; and the role of feedback and self-reflection. These themes are derived from the participants' understandings of their professional role and their ideas of what makes a successful outdoor educator.

Guiding Versus Outdoor Education

Outdoor education is a multifaceted and contested term and field (Dyment & Potter, 2015). As noted in the previous chapter, the participants worked for three different organizations that differ in terms of their location, processes, and objectives, and some of the participants have worked for a number of other organizations as well. The organizations in my study all provide self-powered backcountry excursions that entail some perceived risk and/or challenge for students, similar to the definition of outdoor adventure education provided by Ford (1986). An important way they differ is on the amount of pre- and post-excursion support and emphases on recreation, skill development, and character and environmental educational components; that they are diverse resonates with the broader definition of outdoor adventure education provided by Ewert and Sibthorp (2014). While there is breadth, the term outdoor education can still be

used as a catch-all term that encapsulates the variety of programs and practices offered by the three organizations.

Indeed, the participants described their work as primarily educational in nature. This approach appears to answer the call of Hattie et al. (1997) that OE leaders, "need to more fully appreciate that they are conducting an educational experience" (p. 77) as opposed to one that is purely recreational or commercial. In fact, three participants in my research took pains to distinguish between outdoor education and commercial guiding. They considered the focus of their work to be student development rather than simply offering an experience. For example, North chose his employer "to get back to the education side of things. That's what I want to do the most and that wasn't ... as much of an opportunity within the guiding field." North went on to describe what he sees as the difference between commercial guiding and outdoor education programs, noting that the former focuses primarily on student enjoyment. Facilitation of such programs is, he argues,

> certainly more focused on [OE leaders'] technical skills and just getting the objective done. And ... I guess ... in some ways that's not really outdoor ed, right? That's guiding. And I think there's certainly crossover there but ... it is sort of a different branch of the outdoor field.[1]

Marcus agreed with North, indicating that the priority of his organization, Adventure Quest, was education, which means in practice that the program's focus is on the *process* of the excursion like developing skills and character in students as opposed to the *objective* like ensuring clients see certain sights or arrive at a specified destination.

The focus on students' skill and character development was highlighted by participants from each organization. Mateo clarified that his organization stressed developing students'

---

[1] I am purposely departing from APA formatting guidelines by single-spacing block quotations in order to ease readability, which is particularly helpful for longer interview excerpts.

outdoor skills as well as leadership development that could enable them to continue being engaged with the organization, or others like it, after they are no longer students. As Mateo stated, "we're trying to teach people to be outdoor leaders. So, we're trying to, ideally, push them to be ... not just able to do these things but able to facilitate them or maybe teach them to other people." According to Zack, OE leaders also try to foster confidence and problem-solving abilities in their students, which is unlike what he sees as the work of a guide who "removes agency from students. And other components of … a learning experience." Overall, outdoor education is seen by participants to be more holistic in its approach with a bent toward personal development as opposed to simple enjoyment.

The distinction made by the participants between commercial guiding and outdoor education may seem trivial to the layperson. Both offer outdoor adventure experiences to clients and can therefore be easily conflated (Ford, 1986). However, the differences in aims and processes between a recreation service provider and an educational organization can be significant. Commercial outdoor providers have been criticized for offering "Adventure on a bun," (Loynes, 1998, p. 35); that is, providing a standardized experience to clients, which has also been referred to as the McDonaldization of outdoor experience (Loynes, 1998). Martin et al. (2017) observe that adventure tourism tasks guides to "fabricate feelings of intense emotion among clients while also paradoxically working to minimize any real potential harm from the experience" (p. 23). Such commercial activity focuses on development of activity-specific skills, overcoming challenges, and/or reaching an objective to promote a feeling of accomplishment in clients (Martin et al., 2017). The organization provides transportation, specialized equipment, a skilled guide, and on the spot training. These experiences are usually brief and thrill-based. An example of such an experience is ziplining.

Along the same lines as McDonalization, Beames and Varley (2013) applied Bryman's (2004) concept of Disneyization to commercial outdoor adventure. Disneyization, as Bryman defines it, states that complex practices are refined and simplified to be more palatable in the way that sometimes graphic or troubling fairy tales have been tempered to be more digestible by all audiences. The four major features of Disneyization are: the theming of experiences (such as on "leadership development" outdoor adventure trips); hybrid consumption, that is, paying and playing at the same time, meaning one can buy goods and services while participating in an activity (such as optional add-on experiences or buying souvenirs); merchandizing (such as the branded stickers, clothing, and equipment available at many outdoor recreation providers); and performative labour (such as acting in a certain manner or avoiding criticism of clients' actions to please the participants on an outdoor trip). Beames and Varley (2013) observed examples of all four features of Disneyization in a variety of outdoor recreation sites that they visited.

Outdoor education considers itself to be apart from adventure recreation and tourism. While outdoor education organizations do provide skill building and the opportunity for mastery of challenges, their approach also includes facilitated opportunities for interpersonal and intrapersonal development that is assumed to contribute to character-building and the ability of students to transfer the skills learned to other areas of their lives (Martin et al., 2017). Outdoor education organizations also typically seek to foster an appreciation for the natural environment (Priest & Gass, 2017). This contrasting of guiding versus outdoor education by some participants is, in effect, a shorthand for discussing aims and methods.

The contrast also illuminates the capitalist influence in the larger outdoor adventure field, which I argue is highly relevant and something I will continue to touch on throughout the remainder of the dissertation. Many influential outdoor education organizations can be classified

as commercial guiding programs (Martin et al., 2017) or at the least still feel that influence, which I will expand upon later especially given, as Connell (2005) states, capitalism contributes to hegemonic masculinity through valuing competition, hierarchy, and domination. For now, it is sufficient to note that there is a tension between the pursuit of profit via cost-effective replicability of an experience and the nurturance of student-centered outcomes in outdoor education. The value placed by participants on students' personal development and employing a process focus that considers the gains realized during the journey itself while ensuring students psychological and emotional safety (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Priest & Gass, 2017) means they situate themselves squarely in the outdoor education camp rather than the commercial guiding one.

Relational and Technical Skill Balance

Outdoor education requires a broader set of skills than commercial guiding. That said, both require a firm basis in the technical aspects of the experience. Likely due to the variety of locations in which I collected data, and the activity focus at each site, what constituted technical skills differed amongst participants. Those contracted in more mountainous locations saw skills specific to mountaineering and climbing as technical while those with kayaking and canoeing programs included paddling skills. Barry, Roman, Levon, and Liam all included campsite skills such as tent set-up or cooking on a camp stove in their technical skill definition. Staff at Camp Laviron also included camp-based recreational skills such as sailing, windsurfing, challenge courses, climbing, music, and ecology as more technical work. Interestingly, at Camp Laviron, many staff spent part of their day officially working as an activity instructor and another part officially working as a counselor, creating a stark division between technical and relational skills.

Bruce, who has over twenty years of experience at Outdoor Skills Co-op, stated, "when I came to take a … course as a student, it was to learn mountaineering skills, … that's what brought me here," which indicates the traditional prominence of technical skills in the outdoor field. Displays of such skills have garnered participants increased status as demonstrated by Sebastian's statement: "I do love showing off skills that I have from the wilderness." Despite the traditional technical skills fixation in the field, as noted in the literature review, there have been recent calls for increased attention to the importance of relational skills (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017). These calls appear to have been heeded by participants. For example, Barry noted the importance of balance in an instructor,

> these, like, technical pieces, you just have to know that stuff. If you don't, you either get discovered quickly that you don't and that's a problem, or you just don't thrive out there. But it also has this really unique other side ... the personal human side…. To have both those things are, I think, equally important, both the technical competence, but also this personal, humanistic competence. And having to do both those things really well at the same time, I think, [is] to be an effective outdoor leader.

Barry's statement neatly summarizes the feelings of all of the participants concerning the need to balance relational and technical aspects when instructing students.

As noted in the literature review, technical skills were, until recently, widely labeled as "hard" skills compared to the "soft" relational skills, an overtly gendered practice. However, some participants such as Roman did not see technical skills as explicitly gendered: "I think those skills are, just, needed. I think, though, that sometimes, from what I've seen, male instructors may lean more heavily on those [technical] skills...or may be more drawn to those skills." Other participants, however, not only recognized the ways in which skills were gendered, but overtly stated that traditional feminine skills are required in their teaching repertoire if they are to be effective teachers. For example, Elijah noted,

> I think it's different in this field because education traditionally has been a female ... a

> woman's job. Teaching has been a woman's job. And now that this has moved … into more of an educational and personal development program, it kind of makes sense that it's now ... a caring profession. In my opinion, it's a caring role. Like, traditionally, women have done those roles and it makes sense that we now see women, mostly, interested in this work. Especially when you learn that the hardest part of this job, again, is not the technical elements, it's not how to hike or how to paddle, like, it's how to deal with tough characters and tough conversations and emotions and stuff like that.

Elijah's statement clearly indicates that he agrees that both technical and relational skills are necessary to serve student needs and that he must take on traditionally feminine traits to adequately support his students in their personal growth.

Until recently, the emphasis on growth has largely rested on character development, achieved by overcoming a physical challenge. As Oliver stated, "back in the day this was just getting the shit beat out of you in the mountains" by the physical difficulty of the hike. Perhaps not surprisingly then, four of the participants explicitly stated, without prompting, that physical fitness and ability are necessary components of outdoor programming, and over half endorse intentional use of physical challenge and discomfort as methods to build character and confidence. Elijah stated, "I really believe in the idea of personal growth through personal challenge because ... that's exactly what happened to me." The pervasiveness of such a sentiment is understandable given that all participating organizations' literature contained quotes similar to the following from Kurt Hahn, a pioneer in outdoor education programming:

> Self-discovery is the end product of a great challenge mastered, when the mind commands the body to do the seemingly impossible, when courage and strength are summoned to extraordinary limits for the sake of something outside the self—a principle, an onerous task, another human life. (as quoted in Camp Laviron document)

Such discourse was readily reproduced by some participants. According to Bruce, physical challenge begets mental and emotional challenges:

> I think that [Outdoor Skills Co-op] courses are physically and mentally challenging experiences. We push people outside of their comfort zone and when people are pushed ... outside of your comfort zone, I think there's some foundational emotional responses

that can come out of that. That can ... sometimes be kind of ugly.

Bruce goes on to note that such responses must be addressed and reframed by instructors through interventions and debriefs to encourage learning. Bruce's assertions were observed in other participants' practice. For example, I noted how Roman planned two physically challenging days on a canoe trip followed by a rest day explicitly to provide fodder for personal reflection on group successes.

By contrast, Liam indicated that too much challenge and discomfort can be off-putting and discouraging for students. Tom, likewise, stated that he will encourage students if they choose to challenge themselves, but does not force them to do anything beyond their limits. Doing so can lead to unintended consequences, as noted by Oliver:

> And I think, in living that life that I've lived… definitely the tendency is pushing folks, students in particular, maybe a little past where they are comfortable. And, I think in most cases that's a good thing and in some cases it's gone poorly and almost ended in, like, there have been near-misses on courses.

In addition to the planned physical and intrapersonal exigencies built into outdoor education experiences, both students and leaders experience social challenges presented by living in novel, small groups. Such social situations are one reason North considered communication skills to be a priority on course. He asserted that OE leaders need to communicate effectively to plan and execute a course, but also to manage the interpersonal dynamics of the group. Barry similarly stated that when OE leaders appreciate and manage interpersonal relations, the group can work better and build a team mentality. However, maintaining group dynamics among the students can be challenging and requires a careful balancing act. As George notes, "we're treading a line of being their friend and being an authority figure…. So it's really hard to find that balance and move that line back and forth, when necessary."

Despite the participant using terms such as outdoor educator or instructor, most

participants seem to prefer not to think of themselves in a role as formal as that of a teacher. For example, Tom noted that the role of teacher carried certain connotations and limitations imposed by the school context and felt that learning in such a limited context was not enjoyable. Sebastian, when elaborating on the job of an outdoor educator, indicated a more hands-off, facilitative role:

> We're just there to provide, like, emergency support and make sure they get to the bus on time. Also guiding them through different ... emotional, psychological, and interpersonal problems, ... kind of like mediators. Yeah, I think ... it's never like you're just teaching *this*. I don't think you're a teacher, you're more of a mentor ... is the best way I could describe it.

Indeed, over 70% of the OE leaders interviewed indicated that their position involves presenting oneself not only as an instructor of activity-specific skills, but as a role model, a motivator, and facilitating processes and reflections upon experiences. (That 70% equates to 13 of the 18 participants and it is worth noting that three of the five who did not specifically mention these mentorship and process-oriented roles were now supervisors and no longer working directly with students in the field.)

Although not directly asked in an interview question, six of the respondents (Levon, Gabriel, Mason, Oliver, Mateo, and George) explicitly commented on the leadership style they most value. Gabriel, Mason, and Oliver stated that they focus on developing relationships with students, building trust, and lead with a more consultative or democratic style whereas Levon, Mateo, and George indicated that they take a more directive approach with students. Levon and Mateo both asserted, however, that directive behavior is situation-dependent and that they try to balance their leadership with less-directive and more relationship-focused styles. Gabriel indicated that he initially gained status in organizations by enacting a more directive leadership style, which he characterized as masculine. However, he also acknowledged that less directive

approaches have become more valued recently and so he has changed his method of leading

courses. George grew up valuing an authoritarian leadership style and had only recently observed

leaders using a more student-focused approach in his organization. He stated that such

observations were leading him to broaden his leadership style accordingly.

The participants all stated, in one way or the other, that they value both technical and

relational skills and employ, to varying degrees, a less-directive and more deliberative leadership

style. Zack, for one, argues that having such broad skill sets helps to foster trust and personal

bonds with students:

> If you have someone who's an outdoor professional who's more technically focused and
> is less focused on character development and emotional intelligence, social intelligence,
> the less you get out of the experience. The less you get: the less connection, the less
> education.

As noted in the literature review, technical skills and physical ability have long been foci

in the outdoor education field (Lugg, 2003; Warren et al., 2018). As feminist outdoor education

scholars such as Warren (1996, 2002) have made clear, prioritization of these elements forms

part of the gendered hidden curriculum in outdoor education, which serves in practice to devalue

women and to essentialize feminine enactments. The technical skill emphasis is likely a holdover

from the militaristic history of outdoor education (Warren & Loeffler, 2006). Still, calls for

increased attention to relational skills (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014) have been heeded as indicated

by the fact that all participants stated that they valued both technical and relationship skills. How

balanced the practice of both technical and relational skills are on the ground remains a question

for me, however, since I was not able to observe participants in the field.

Elijah's comment seems to resonate with Overholt and Ewert's (2015) assertion that men

are most challenged by the social-emotional aspects of outdoor education, perhaps limiting its

acceptance among male-socialized OE leaders. This may be particularly so given, as Warren et

al. (2018) state, technical skills are still prioritized in hiring and training. Promisingly, while some participants did not recognize the ways in which skills can be gendering, others explicitly noted relational skills have traditionally been seen as feminine and that these skills are necessary for effective outdoor education practice.

Similarly, a directive or assertive leadership style has been associated with masculinity (Gray, 2016; Gray et al., 2017; Humberstone, 2000; Newbery, 200; Overholt & Ewert, 2015; Wright & Gray, 2013) and has been the most highly valued leadership style (Gray et al., 2017; Warren et al., 2014) even in contexts with more nurturing expectations (Cousineau & Roth, 2012). If my participants are any indication, a shift may be underway, however. It seems that a directive leadership style has recently become less the default. Lately, greater importance has been given to the deployment of a variety of contextually appropriate leadership approaches, including more democratic and consultative methods that have been historically categorized as feminine (Gray et al., 2017; Humberstone, 2000; Overholt & Ewert, 2015). Such a shift is consistent with the recent findings of Davies et al. (2019) who also documented that organizations and OE leaders are working to incorporate more gender-balanced leadership styles.

Consistent with the outdoor education values described by Martin et al. (2017), physical challenge appears to have remained steady. Elijah's statement that he values challenge on outdoor education excursions because of his own experiences as a youth is consistent with Ewert and Sibthorp's (2014) assertion that achieving personal objectives and overcoming obstacles can lead to feelings of greater empowerment and resilience. Elijah's statement also demonstrates the ways in which cultural reproduction happens in outdoor education. Like the old adage that teachers often teach the way they were taught, it is no wonder that Elijah seeks to replicate his own formative experiences with his students. Enculturation to a field is part of the hidden

curriculum (Kennedy & Russell, 2020), including gendered expectations of physical strength and rugged outdoorsmanship that are reproduced by the focus on physical challenge.

Adding some nuance to the gendered nature of challenge discourse, however, is Bruce's statement that perceived risk can cause diverse reactions, including fear (physical, social, or emotional), irritability, and detachment that requires support from the OE leader. Bruce's statement suggests that the increasing attention to the psychological and emotional factors of challenge in professional literature (e.g., Overholt & Ewert, 2015; Priest & Gass, 2017) is impacting practice in the field. Indeed, instructors now are tasked with managing the optimal degree of challenge when planning course logistics to promote opportunities for personal growth and enjoyment (Dyment & Potter, 2015; Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017).

According to most of the participants and newer literature in the field, then, the role of outdoor educator requires offering some element of challenge and problem-solving situations that are guided and supported as needed by groups and individuals (Martin et al., 2017). Given the intimacy of the living situations, the remote settings, and consequent intensity of interactions, outdoor education leadership involves a certain balancing act of leadership styles, including incorporation of more stereotypically feminine approaches that develop trust and connection and allow leaders to support students.

The Gratification of Making Personal Connections

The OE leaders in this study are encouraged by their organizations to foster interpersonal bonds with students in order to be effective mentors and facilitators. As an Outdoor Skills Co-op policy document indicates, OE leaders must, "recognize exceptional student experiences begin with a safe learning environment and positive connections to instructors." This sentiment was echoed by ten of the participants interviewed, such as Dan who stated, "I like to get to know ...

where they're coming from [and] them as a person. So, yeah, getting to ... empathy, connection, ... connecting with the person … I try to get to know campers on a deeper level." By fostering close bonds, these participants feel they can act as a positive influence on students' lives. As Mason stated, "I want to be a part of their lives, in the sense where I help them grow up ... I teach them smaller life lessons that they will use throughout their whole life."

These personal connections seem to be more than simply valued professional practice, but provide participants with intrinsic gratification. For example, Oliver states that having deep conversations with students, "is medicine for me." Others, like Elijah here, note that the change they observe in students is the reward they reap from such work:

> I think that's the selfless part, but it's also selfish because outdoor educators are motivated by those good feelings they get when they see a student move from, you know, demonstrating a lot of self-doubt and self-pity and sometimes self-hate and frustration and discouragement to transforming into someone with a huge smile on their face, with their hands in the air, saying, like, "Fuck yeah! I did this!"

Elijah explained that such work is selfless because of the emotional and physical toll the work can take on OE leaders. Similarly, Barry conceives of outdoor education work as service, implying a sense of altruism given the emotional and physical costs to those facilitating the experience due to the intense 24-hour work schedule when on contract and the often seasonal schedule. Other participants see their work as a way to contribute to society. As Gabriel says, "I think the main thing for me is to use experiential learning to make better people in the world." Similarly, Elijah described his motivation thusly:

> From a philosophical perspective, so infrequently do we have a chance to meaningfully contribute to society, to know that we made a meaningful difference in anything in this big world. And, when you're out there in the field, with a small group of ten people, it's very easy to make a positive difference, it's very easy to contribute.

Dan also indicated that he felt he could contribute to students' perspectives. When asked to discuss how he thought he could contribute to boys' development, he stated:

> I think it is possible. It might take a couple of years. Especially with kids that are in, like, the inner city kids ... that are so much influenced by media that they see and ... their own subgroup culture that they're in. I'll use the example of Jane and Finch, once very crime-ridden, not the greatest neighbourhood to live in in Toronto, but I've had the experience of working with some of those students in an outdoor setting and, you know, just ... getting them into an outdoor setting and teaching them how to build a fire, teaching them how to canoe, or ... just made them realize the way that they live their life in the city does not need to be the way that they live life always.

That this sense of fulfillment also comes with a sacrifice is acknowledged by Priest and Gass (2017) who state that burnout in the field is a common problem for several reasons, including the physical and emotional wear and tear on OE leaders. Both Barry and Elijah reframed the toll of the work as an act of selflessness and as a way of contributing to society. I found it particularly intriguing that the notion of service was explicitly raised as an idea by the only two participants with military backgrounds. Service and sacrifice for others are also viewed as chivalric values, demonstrative of a traditional masculinity that increases one's status via valued work even with a cost to his health (Robertson & Shand, 2020). In addition, service and sacrifice are listed by Englar-Carlson and Kiselica (2013) in their theory of positive masculinity, a counseling approach that echoes men's rights advocates exhortation to stop demonizing men, which indicates a potentially more traditionalist viewpoint. That other respondents such as Gabriel saw their individual actions as OE leaders as a way to change the world might also be tied to the neoliberal emphasis on individuality. Further, in the case of Dan, who referenced the predominantly Black, "crime-ridden" neighbourhood in Toronto where he briefly ran some outdoor programs, such notions also can smack of White saviourism, revealing how White people sometimes feel they know "better" and thus should help non-White people become more like them (Hagerman, 2020).

Authenticity and Vulnerability

To foster meaningful connections with students, participants insisted that they must be

forthright and genuine in their interactions as leaders. "Authentic" and being one's "self" or "true self" were terms used by over half of the respondents. Their sentiments are neatly summarized by Mateo's statement that, "Generally, I try to be as authentic to who I am as possible.… I think that helps me build positive relationships with my students." Interestingly, and somewhat in contrast to his claims of authenticity, Mateo also indicated that he and his colleagues intentionally hid disagreements between the staff, as well as their positions in the staff hierarchy. Others, however, felt that permitting students to see their own challenges and struggles, and that leaders are not always correct in their decision-making, infinitely knowledgeable, nor in control of their emotions were useful strategies for being authentic and making connections. Such displays model social risk-taking through vulnerability. As Barry states,

> I think vulnerability is beautiful and necessary and it's part about being authentic. And if you're not… if you're never vulnerable or authentic then, my experience is … then you pretty quickly get discovered. Like, it's pretty fraudulent. Like, kids know and your teammates know.

Although at least two participants admitted that they sometimes struggle with enacting vulnerability because of their socialization to avoid appearing weak, it was mentioned by the majority of respondents as a trait they want to demonstrate.

Two participants indicated that their demonstration of vulnerability is selective and situation dependent. When discussing appreciation for showing vulnerability on course, Sebastian stated, "I can be really open about how I'm feeling ... [but] maybe after the fact. Like, if I get frustrated and stuff like that, I'll admit to it later." Barry agreed with Sebastian that emotional displays were inappropriate or unhelpful at certain moments on an expedition, particularly in emergency situations or events that could represent physical danger. He gave an example from a recent trip where his group had made a peak ascent when a storm started to approach. Though he was scared, he asserted that his duty was to project calm for the sake of the

students and lead them quickly to safety:

> Now's not the time to be vulnerable. Right now the kids need us to do this. And that's our charge. And later on tonight, when everything's ok, when everything's ... safe, maybe ... then I will be vulnerable. Then I will tell people that I was terrified. But, it's probably not the time to tell people in the middle of it.

Later in the interview, Barry also indicated that he sometimes planned his performances of vulnerability in order to display the balanced character of his leadership; that is, that he can be both directive, as in the storm situation, as well as caring:

> I'll do things, at times, just to achieve that. Like, I will be purposefully vulnerable, or I will share a story that I … think will … at least expose or touch upon that side of me, with the students, for that reason. And I'll have those conversations. Even on this last course, I had a conversation with one of my co-instructors, where I said, "Hey, I think I've been doing this stuff really well. I actually want to show the students this particular side as well. When do think … what do you think is a good opportunity?" And we just looked at our schedule and some of the activities we were doing in the next couple of days and I was, like, okay, I see a couple of spots where I can probably, you know, share that side … in the interest of role modelling that for students so that they're seeing both those pieces.

Modeling a balanced approach was important to Barry and he felt a professional obligation to exhibit vulnerability, particularly since he shared that he was typically perceived as a steady and stoic character. Barry indicated that his planning of vulnerable moments did not imply that such interactions were any less genuine when he said, "And I think you can be strategic and authentic at the same time. Those two things do not cancel each other out ... although sometimes I don't know if everyone understands that."

It seemed clear from the interview data that communicating vulnerability and appearing authentic were seen as professional values. However, indications of calculated vulnerability might lead to questions as to whether such instances are genuine disclosures or simply performances deployed to elicit desired student reactions and generate trust in order to accomplish educational objectives. Arguably, the concealment of conflict described by Mateo

demonstrates an ability to put duty ahead of personal issues and emotions. However, masking

emotions is also a hegemonic masculine trait (Connell, 2005) and likely an element of the

patriarchal hidden curriculum in outdoor education described by Newbery (2003). Further, trust

is required to cultivate critical reflection dialogue, a common desired student outcome (Shooter

& Norling, 2007) and authenticity helps to foster such trust and is described in Martin et al.

(2017) as an important element of leadership.

One aspect of authenticity, as noted by Barry, is vulnerability. Vulnerability has been a

trendy topic recently following the release of Dr. Bréné Brown's popular 2010 TED Talk (the

fourth most watched TED Talk, with 47 million views on the TED site and another 13 million on

YouTube at the time of writing) and subsequent book *Dare to Lead* (2018). In her book, Dr.

Brown posits that great leadership requires vulnerability to develop trust in teams as well as

avoid shaming since that hinders team performance. Vulnerability in men has also become a

widely discussed topic in popular media (e.g., Braddock, 2018; Kern, 2020; Sime, 2019;

Williams, 2019), likely in part because it is *en vogue* in leadership circles but also because of the

recent suicides of high profile men such as Anthony Bourdain and Avicii. Those unfortunate

events shone further light onto men's mental health issues due to societal expectations of

stoicism. I will discuss men's vulnerability and its relationship to hegemonic masculinity in

greater detail in both the Outdoor Organizations and Masculinity chapters coming later in this

dissertation. For now, suffice it to say that vulnerability and authenticity are hot topics in popular

culture and in leadership circles.

The uptake of vulnerability as an important facet of outdoor leadership could be why both

Sebastian and Barry are choosy about when they will display it, similar to deciding when to use a

directive or consultative leadership approach. This strategic use of vulnerability may indicate

that it is just another tool in an OE leader's arsenal, echoing Hobbs and Ewert's (2008) suggestion that students' perception of OE leaders' authenticity is important as it leads to more open and honest communication on the course. Similarly, selective authenticity and creating a veneer of a cohesive staff team is certainly useful from a practical standpoint. However, what happens when the facade of a happy and functional staff team does not actually exist, yet is presented to create a more pleasant student experience? Certainly, such a portrayal could be ascribed to professionalism, but it is contradictory to participants' claims of authenticity. It becomes a type of performative labour as described by Loynes (1998), which, alongside the commercial aspect of outdoor education, could point to a, capitalist-driven, Disneyized feel to programming, meaning that staff feel pressure to please students to garner positive feedback to help them secure more trips or contracts with the organization.

The performative nature of outdoor leadership could also result in certain gender performances being more rewarded. The literature points to the fact that women outdoor leaders walk a tightrope in terms of leadership style and physical presentation, given students have gendered expectations of their leaders (Jordan, 1992, 2018). If women outdoor leaders are perceived by students as too masculine, they are ignored, ridiculed, or have their sexuality questioned (Barnfield & Humberstone, 2008), which authors such as McClintock (1996) term "lesbian baiting" (p. 244), a practice that demonstrates the heterosexism in the field. Conversely, if women present as too feminine, they are sexualized or disregarded (Newbery, 2004), with attempts to redress the situation leading to scathing evaluations that negatively affect OE leader confidence and employability (Gray et al., 2020). Something similar may be true for male outdoor leaders in that presenting and performing in certain ways will garner more respect and/or render them more likeable to their clients, an idea I will explore further in the chapter on status.

Feedback and Self-Reflection

Structured dialogue, in the forms of feedback and reflection, are considered essential

aspects of the outdoor education experience (Dyment & Potter, 2015; Martin et al., 2017; Priest

& Gass, 2017). Reflection is a form of processing whereby one poses questions to oneself in

order to consider different viewpoints or brainstorm alternative actions. It is an intrapersonal

process but is most often facilitated in an outdoor education setting through a debrief session

during a break from, or at the end of, an activity (Martin et al., 2017). Feedback, a form of

dialogue that provides commentary by one or more stakeholders on one's observable actions and

behaviours with a view to providing suggestions for improvement, is often associated with, or an

impetus for, such processing. The acceptance by the receiver of feedback is significantly

improved when the recipient feels trust and/or a personal bond with the provider (Priest & Gass,

2017).

Both reflection and feedback are indeed integral elements in the outdoor education

programs in my study, as demonstrated by their codification in the organizational assessment and

evaluation forms received from both Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op. I also happened

to observe debriefs and feedback sessions on professional practice and program function at four

of the sites. While I was not formally part of these sessions, I was present when they took place

and recorded certain points in my field notes. All sessions involved some debrief of the program,

with supervisors and outdoor leaders providing feedback about multiple aspects of the course

(e.g., adequacy of equipment and supplies, specific student incidents and why and how decisions

were made about such incidents). Feedback also included information about the OE leader's

performance from supervisors with specific notes on ways the OE leader could improve, and, in

one case, written feedback sheets from students.

As my observations and artefacts demonstrated, feedback is typically provided in a 360-degree manner; that is, from supervisors and from students as well as peers. Indeed, participants indicated that they are expected to provide comments about their co-leader(s), program logistics and supply management, and, in some cases, the conduct of their supervisor. Mateo stated that feedback on one's performance is expected in the field and that OE leaders are generally grateful for notes on their practice. Levon added that a lack of defensiveness in receiving feedback is typical from OE leaders, even when receiving comments about areas for improvement.

Debrief and feedback sessions happen on an ongoing basis on excursions and co-leaders are tasked with checking in with each other to ensure that they are functioning well as a team and meeting the needs of the course and of the students (Martin et al., 2017). Martin et al. (2017) recommend that co-leaders debrief and provide feedback at least once daily to avoid unequal division of labour, competitiveness, personality conflict, and student group issues. Interestingly, given the centrality of the feedback and reflection processes, blind spots and missed opportunities were still noted by some of the participants. Some of these resulted from logistical and curricular demands, as described by North:

> Even just finding time [for check-ins with co-leaders], sometimes. When the course is going sideways, it's all we can do to keep this thing moving forward. Really hard to sit down and think, "Can we have a conversation?" And, it may not happen quickly.

Another factor that inhibited feedback delivery to co-leaders was interpersonal discomfort. Barry noted that delivering feedback to colleagues can be challenging even with extensive experience and training, "Yeah, like the social work every … it's all so interconnected that … it can be hard to have those conversations. Even when you have the language and the tools to try and address it." Such discomfort can lead to issues remaining unresolved between co-leaders past the end of the course, which can then sometimes require facilitated dialogue by a

supervisor. North, as a supervisor, described such lack of resolution within a staff team

sometimes resulting from social awkwardness inherent in the work situation:

> I'm certainly finding that there are things that don't get addressed 'til the debrief with me. And so, I think we try and have that language and it still isn't always getting done. It's hard to bring it up. It's hard to have a tough conversation with someone when you're about to sleep six inches from them for the next 24 days.

Gendered aspects of the challenges of providing and receiving feedback were not

considered by participants in any of their statements. Yet, interestingly, the one trip debrief I

overheard at Adventure Quest, and recorded in my field notes, is revealing. It involved two men

(the site supervisor and an instructor) and one woman (an instructor). When I arrived at the

office, they were entering the meeting room. I was waiting outside the site manager's office and

could initially hear the meeting going on inside the office as the door was not entirely closed.

Initial pleasantries were exchanged before the proper debrief began then phrases such as "So,

how was the trip?" indicated the tone had changed and the meeting became more professional.

At this point, the door was closed so the voices were muffled and I did not hear the substance of

the conversation, only the timbre of the voices. I was waiting outside for approximately 30

minutes for my participant whose arrival coincided fairly closely with the end of the debrief. I

noticed that although the men spoke at length, the woman instructor did not speak for the entirety

of the formal debrief. It was unclear to me whether the woman censored herself, could not find

an opening to speak, or was not asked for her opinion.

Despite concerns about delayed feedback and self-censorship, participants seemed to take

for granted that feedback from others was candid and fulsome, with nothing hidden or omitted.

Levon was the only participant to explicitly question whether feedback and debrief sessions he

has facilitated with his staff teams were entirely honest, stating that he had to assume that it was.

North and Barry also noted that providing feedback to peers or supervisors about performance

can be awkward, with some details only surfacing when debriefs are facilitated by a supervisor. Given that others did not address the topic of honesty in feedback at all, though feedback was a commonly raised topic in the interviews, one might infer that the straightforwardness of co-leaders is taken as a given. This assumption of candour likely represents a gendered blind spot in the feedback process. As Gray (2016) found, women outdoor leaders often doubt themselves or that the message will be accepted, so tend to self-censor. Such self-censorship is especially likely for women when attempting to report sexist comments, behaviour, gender bias, or microaggressions (Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Avery, 2015) as men often react with denial or anger to such accusations (Bell et al., 2018; Lipman, 2018).

According to participants, when feedback processes work well, it can be very impactful. Four of the respondents referenced specific formal or informal feedback they had received from supervisors, co-leaders, or students as having shaped their practice or thought process. Both Elijah and Gabriel noted that the tone of the feedback was important, mentioning that they had, at some point, found harsh wording of their assessments to be discomfiting. However, through reflection, each came to accept the critique as valid and useful. Therefore, feedback, even if initially spurring a defensive reaction from the recipient, may encourage critical reflection. In a departure from the general agreement about OE leaders' general openness to feedback, Oliver stated that he regularly received feedback from colleagues that he spent too much time talking with students, sometimes hampering the ability of the group to travel efficiently. He indicated that, since this feedback ran contrary to his values, he dismissed it and felt justified doing so. It must be stated that Oliver was the only participant to openly admit that he disregarded feedback.

However, during my observation of Elijah, another trip leader related detailed stories of having feedback disregarded while working with two previous colleagues at both Adventure

Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op. While working at Adventure Quest, she questioned the safety

of a male co-leader's decision in the backcountry, stating that Adventure Quest policy did not

permit the action her co-leader was proposing. In response, her co-leader called her a "zealot" for

her adherence to the organizational rules. While working for Outdoor Skills Co-op, she

questioned the organization's logistical support on her course during an end-of-course debrief

and was told outright by her supervisor that her assessment of the situation was wrong. Martin et

al. (2017) state that rejection of feedback can be a legitimate response as it is the awareness of

one's behaviour afforded by the feedback that is the goal of the process, although given this

observation, I am led to wonder if the acceptance or rejection of feedback has a gendered

element.

In general, however, acceptance of feedback resulting in action to change behavior is

assumed to be a norm in the field (Martin et al., 2017) and seems to coincide with a culture that

promotes personal development by adherence to the concept of "growth mindset." The growth

mindset is an educational concept developed and popularized by Carol Dweck (2006). It states

that one can choose to have a fixed mindset in which one's skills and attributes are understood as

innate and set in stone, or one can have a growth mindset in which it is assumed that abilities can

be cultivated with concerted effort. Within a culture that values a growth mindset, mistakes or

failures are viewed as learning opportunities if reflected upon and reframed.

Liam indicated that in his experience, some, but not all, outdoor education organizations

take a growth mindset approach. He stated:

> I'm lucky because [Camp Laviron] is an incredible place that allows for growth. So,
> they're very forgiving. You can make all sorts of mistakes, I know I have, and they'll
> still look past that to the person you can be and the person you are and help grow you
> towards that.

Mateo also viewed growth mindset as a concept that is widely accepted in outdoor education

culture. Levon argues that such a mindset is dependent upon feedback and reflection: "You become really good at things by trying hard, by not giving up, by having a growth mindset, by ... seeking coaching, having good self-awareness." The concept of growth mindset can be applied beyond individuals' practice to larger issues in the field, according to Zack who sees a need to make further progress on issues of social justice in the outdoor education field: "I think that there is a need now, more than ever, to have a growth mindset and grow our antennas around social justice, power dynamics and gender roles." Social justice considerations in outdoor education proposed by Martin et al. (2017) include: acknowledging the power of culture to shape assumptions and values, recognition of privilege, critical examination of the hidden curriculum including the valuing of technical over relational skills, and examination of the limited advancement opportunities for women.

The valuing of a growth mindset narrative in the outdoor field, dependent upon feedback and self-reflection, provides an opportunity. Feedback, though perhaps difficult to accept initially, may spur critical reflection and behavioural change, reminiscent of Britzman's (1998) notion of difficult knowledge wherein dissonance created by new information absorbed by the learner results in a stress reaction but can ultimately lead to a broader and more critical viewpoint. As noted in this section, feedback and self-reflection for personal growth are integral aspects of OE leaders' professional practice, a fact that offers promise for combatting hegemonic masculinity in the field.

Such promise is mitigated, however, by participants' acknowledgement that, in practice, giving feedback can be awkward and received feedback can be disregarded. Further, a gendered blind spot likely exists such that women OE leaders face considerably greater barriers to honestly reporting issues, specifically those related to gender bias or harassment. When added to

scholarship that indicates that only the most obvious and egregious acts of gendered harassment and sexism are acknowledged and more nuanced examples are ignored or dismissed (Gray et al., 2020), gender issues are likely being underreported by women leaders during feedback sessions. Even facilitated debriefs, when participants noted that some unreported issues can surface, may not be safe venues for such reports since the majority of supervisors to whom issues would be reported during debrief are male given the gender imbalance in leadership positions (Gray et al., 2017). Further, as demonstrated in the Adventure Quest debrief I overheard, men tend to dominate discussions thereby excluding women's participation (Lipman, 2018; Solnit, 2014). As well, Avery (2015) found that being outnumbered (such as in the debrief I noted with two men and one woman) limited women's willingness to speak up to gender harassment and sexist comments, which was supported by Elijah, who noted that male supervisors tend to believe feedback from other men more than from women, pointing to structural issues with reporting and the dearth of women in administrative and leaders.

Summary

In this chapter, I presented the OE leaders' understanding of their objectives and roles in outdoor education. Some participants described the difference between guides and outdoor educators, specifically highlighting the contrasting objectives and practices of commercial versus educational programs. Another theme that emerged was the need for balance between technical skills and relational skills, with participants indicating that the latter has recently become a focus in the field. Through use of relational skills, particularly vulnerability and authenticity, participants sought to create connections with their students, from which they derived a high degree of gratification. Lastly, participants stressed the importance of feedback and reflection, although some blind spots were identified concerning gendered impediments to candour and the

potential for men to refuse or dismiss feedback. In the next chapter, I turn to describing and

analyzing the specific contexts in which the participants are working given the important role

organizational culture can play on performances of masculinity.

Chapter Five: The Context and Influence of Outdoor Education Organizations

This chapter considers participants' perceptions of and perspectives on changes to gender diversity in outdoor education based on their experiences with the three participating outdoor education organizations as well as the field more generally. From there, the training, resourcing, cultural spaces, and practices of each organization will be examined as well as possible improvements to the organizations' current practices. The uptake by participants of organizational messaging and the extent to which they identify with their organization follows. Lastly, I will look at the forces that spur organizations to consider inclusivity in their programming.

Gender Diversity in Outdoor Education Organizations

Participants recognized the need to increase diversity in outdoor education, particularly in staffing that could, in turn, help attract a more diverse group of students. Liam indicated that inclusion has become a focus at many organizations he has worked for, or with which he is familiar. Rightly so, according to Bruce, who stated, "people need to see themselves in our instructional staff before they see themselves taking a course," referencing the need for both racial and gender diversity in staff.

Pinpointing gender diversity in the field, participants noted that women's presence in outdoor education has been increasing. Gabriel indicated that he personally has seen an increase in women students on his organization's courses. Bruce likewise stated that he was encouraged by the upturn in women's participation, but added, "we still skew well to the masculine side of the scale." Encouragingly, Tom has seen a growing number of women leaders of backcountry trips compared to when he was an outdoor education student just ten years ago. Further, Oliver, Elijah, and Sebastian all indicated that they have led a number of excursions with a woman co-

leader and Mateo stated that administrators are actively trying to staff instructor teams with at least one woman on them. However, Sebastian asserted that organizations have been "really struggling to get females on their staff,", and Roman made a similar statement, potentially indicating that an imbalance still exists.

In a similar trend, participants observed that there has been increasing representation of women in supervisory roles. Bruce mentioned that there is an ongoing effort to ameliorate the lack of women in middle and senior administrative posts at his organization. He now has multiple women colleagues at his level or above and said, "That wasn't the case when I first came to [site] 10 years ago, when all three of these seats were occupied by men." Marcus initially thought there were not very many women in leadership at his organization, but after considering the issue further and naming the two women in senior positions above him (one of whom is no longer with the organization), he changed his position and stated, "so, there is a good mix of men and women in the company in high positions." Dan said there has been a slow process of realization in the outdoor education field that women are more than capable of administrative leadership. He used the fact that a woman held the position of Director at Camp Laviron as an example that organizational leadership positions should not be gendered as masculine, and also asserted that he personally prefers a woman to a male administrator. Although women may be making strides in securing senior organizational leadership roles in the field, such progress was not evident across all sites. Of the five sites I visited, one had no women in middle or senior administration and in one's residential program half of the staff were female but the backcountry program's leadership was entirely male, revealing a gendered division of labour.

One outlier existed in the interviewees' descriptions of staff gender diversity. Elijah

posited that a glut of women trip leaders exists, and that male staff are now difficult to find. This

assertion was not backed up by my observations of his organization. When I visited, two of three

administrators were men and leadership teams on site were staffed with one man and one

woman. Further, having personally staffed outdoor excursions in that same city, I did not find a

dearth of male OE leaders. Perhaps Elijah's statement reflected something he had heard at other

organizations or had more to do with the type of male leaders available. Alternatively, perhaps

because the number of women staff is increasing, males perceive there to be a shortage of men.

Roman, though not in management, reported that he believes diversity of masculine

performances by male staff to be a hiring consideration, stating, "they attract and support and

hire very diverse individuals" at his organization. He also asserted that stereotypical masculine

norms are no longer seen as an asset at his organization and a more modern, self-reflective

masculinity is valued instead, sharing that Adventure Quest tries "to hire people who bring ...

umm ... not necessarily a traditional ... masculinity." He clarified what he meant by stating:

> Yes, I've seen some instructors who I think maybe favour the technical skills more and
> push that kind of traditional ... I don't know if it's traditional … but that ... to be a man
> you have to know how to build a fire and put up the tent, and really go to town on those
> technical skills, like building the perfect knot. And I think those are really important
> skills, obviously, in an outdoor setting. And I've seen other instructors who ... really
> push the ... nurture, ... the more introspective skills, ... who are brilliant at facilitating
> debriefs and really extracting ... the meaning, the learning from the course and tapping
> into the students' awareness and consciousness, or who they are, and really probing
> them to ask those questions about themselves.

Although outdoor education "prides itself on inclusion and social equity" (Gray et al.,

2017, p. 29), significant challenges remain to gender equity. Despite research that found that

more women are entering the outdoor education field (Gray, 2016), Allen-Craig et al. (2020)

warned that hiring schemes such as those described by Mateo that require inclusion of a woman

leader on all staff teams, may reflect a tokenistic approach that leaves institutional practices unchanged. Such an "add women and stir" strategy (Henderson, 1994) for hiring and trip allocation can devalue women and can contribute to the othering of women in organizations (Allen-Craig et al., 2020).

Despite demonstrated gains in the number of women outdoor leaders, men still occupy the majority of leadership positions (Bell et al., 2018; Gray et al., 2017). This ongoing imbalance is perhaps not surprising considering the militaristic (Martin et al., 2017) and male-dominated history of the outdoor education field (Gray, 2018). Hiring practices would likely, then, continue to favour men over women given that those who hire often look for employees that resemble themselves (Rivera, 2012; Stangl & Kane, 1991). Further, structural barriers exist to women's career development in outdoor education, such as a lack of benefits (Rao & Roberts, 2018), a lack of clear progression options (Warren et al., 2018) and the impacts of career interruption due to pregnancy and motherhood (Allin, 2004).

Some progress in hiring practices was demonstrated by Roman's statement that his organization was seeking men who display a less stereotypical masculinity. Such practices resonate with Allen-Craig et al.'s (2020) finding that some men in the field are indeed working to raise awareness of and address gender inequity. Their study also found that men's gender-inclusive practices can increase if men are given opportunities to engage in bias training and reflection (Allen-Craig et al., 2020). However, research on this topic is limited, so the representativeness of the Allen-Craig et al. (2020) study to the wider field is unknown.

Organizations' Gender Training, Policy, and Resourcing

All three participating organizations offered some training about gender issues to participants. For these efforts, they should be applauded. In the following section, I will describe

each organization's training as well as any policies and resourcing pertaining to gender that they provide. Most data regarding training regimes stems from artefacts willingly shared by organizations although it must be stated that the three organizations differed in their willingness or ability to share their resources. Therefore, where no resources were shared or participants did not explicitly mention specific training, policy, or resources in their interview responses, I operate under the assumption that no such elements existed at that organization. When participants mentioned a training, policy, or resource but provided no details, I simply noted its existence. If training was reported but with few details, I inferred that such training is presented in standard workshop format (i.e., facilitated by a trainer, with a slideshow, some examples, and perhaps some limited application exercises).

Any policy or resource document names have been changed for organizational anonymity. Although some organizations shared with me a wide variety of documents pertaining to their program (e.g., packing lists, media releases, staff evaluation forms, etc.), only those that specifically mention gender or sex will be touched on below, for the sake of brevity. Although the wording and structure of documents not referencing sex or gender may be informative concerning organizations' influence on instructors' and students' conceptions of masculinity, an intensive content or discourse analysis of artefacts is beyond the scope of this study.

For clarity, I first provide an overview of the training, policy, and resourcing offered by each organization separately here and then summarize in Table 2 below.

Adventure Quest

Annual training includes gender inclusivity focused on trans allyship that is facilitated by an outside provider. I was told by an administrator that the organization facilitated #MeToo presentations at outdoor education conferences, although no description was provided so I could

not ascertain what the presentation entailed or if any organization staff were in attendance at those conferences.

I was told by an administrator that guidance on gender inclusivity was included in the staff manual (that I was not given so could not review) and that a gender-focused "positive relationships" section would be forthcoming in the manual. The sites I visited typically had only one, single-occupant bathroom, so it is unclear whether the organization would have labelled them by sex or as gender-neutral had there been more than one. All administrative staff included email signatures that indicated their gender pronoun (e.g., John Smith, Site Manager (he/him)). At one site, a small 12" x 15" Pride flag was hung in the main meeting/gear preparation area.

Adventure Quest has sites around the world. It is also a hierarchical organization, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. A militarist influence persists in the language used to describe trip groups. Each site was multi-functional with combined office space, a gear preparation area, and meeting areas. Two Adventure Quest sites used industrial office spaces while the other was a rented house. All were largely clean, but showed heavy wear. Adventure Quest signs and marketing materials on the sites were a combination of printed banners, photos, posters, and hand-made photo collages. The organization posts a regular online newsletter that includes academic studies (some peer-reviewed, some not) relating to Adventure Quest initiatives or program effectiveness.

At one site (the same one that had the Pride flag flying), maps indicating various local First Nations' names were posted, though there was no accompanying information as to whether the maps represented the groups' current or historical territories. At another site, Roman asked whether a land acknowledgement script existed and was told that he could find it in the program manual.

Camp Laviron

A staff training week is facilitated at the beginning of each summer. Topics covered include sexual consent training (according to Mason) and anti-homophobia training (per the camp's website). On top of this all-staff training, separate training sessions occur for men and women staff to prepare them to deliver boys' and girls' workshop sessions for students. Though I was only given a brief description of the girls' sessions, it was my understanding that those workshops addressed similar concerns as those for the boys but that the content was specific to girls. For the men's training, masculinity sessions focus on resisting stereotypes associated with masculinity, specifically expectations of stoicism, toughness, and aggression. The sessions are framed as ways of increasing men's and boys' mental health and encouraging boys' vulnerability, resistance to stereotypes, and ability to connect with other boys and men. Although the planning document makes reference to promoting empathy for women and working to avoid hurting women, the overwhelming focus is on promoting "positive masculinity." Training session activities include watching and discussing films as well as facilitated discussions that encourage emotional disclosure. The men's training is conducted by a staff member who works for an international organization that provides similar programming for schools.

I was not given access to policies or staff manuals, but was provided access to the previous year's masculinity workshop scripts. The Director stated that the organization facilitates regular social mapping exercises on student cabin groups to help ensure social inclusion. The organization was very hierarchical, with the top tiers of the administration being full-time and/or longtime returning staff, while all other staff are seasonal. The camp is extremely well-organized with high expectations for adherence to established rules and routines. The ethos was one of professionalism as demonstrated by a very detailed activity planning sheet that was printed on

the back of a schedule I was provided for my visit, as well as the well-maintained site. The site

was extremely clean and all signage was carved or printed with the camp logo.

According to Mason and George, students were sex-segregated and, consequently, so

were staff for large parts of the day. Interestingly, at the entrance to the oldest boys' section,

signs had been erected proclaiming certain values such as "brotherhood." No such signage

existed for the oldest girls' group. Bathrooms were not assigned by gender, but neither were they

explicitly labelled as gender-neutral. Of the people with whom I interacted in person or

corresponded via email at the camp, none indicated their gender pronouns.

Unlike the other organizations, I did not observe any mention of First Nations' issues at

the site. However, on a large rock centrally located near the dining room, there was a painting of

two headdress-wearing figures and a teepee. This artwork could be seen as a reference to the

location of the camp, which is on a lake named for First Nations' iconography. Alternatively, it

may allude to the "back-to-nature" mythology that often incorporated romanticized First Nations

imagery, which was used by many similar camps in the twentieth century (Wall, 2008).

Outdoor Skills Co-op

Outdoor Skills Co-op offers optional women-only skills development courses and

masculinities seminars. The masculinities seminars were devised and facilitated by a manager at

one of their main sites. The activities included some emotional disclosure through work in

discussion circles. I cannot give specifics about the sessions since I did not observe them, but I

was told that they were facilitated discussion sessions that encouraged sharing of emotions via

prompt questions. These sessions also relied upon the book, *Man Up: Cracking the Code of

Modern Manhood* by Carlos Andrés Gómez (2012). The book is a memoir focusing mainly on

the need for men to become more vulnerable, emotionally expressive, and respectful of women,

specifically by avoiding sexual objectification. The book also contains a reader's guide to help

facilitate discussions. The use of the book in the seminar was relayed to me by Zack. In addition

to these courses and seminars, Levon related to me that staff meeting topics were distributed to

sites and included addressing sexual harassment and inclusion of visible minorities and members

of the LGBTQ communities on Outdoor Skills Co-op courses.

Feedback and evaluation forms included specific questions regarding leaders' ability to

cultivate an inclusive culture. There also were formal incident forms distributed to staff to report

non-inclusive behavior (based on race, culture, gender, sexuality, and class) on courses, and

these forms included footnotes that provided definitions of terms such as "microaggression." The

staff manual includes over two pages on gender bias, with points supported by at least ten

academic references. Specific topics addressed on these staff manual pages include: stereotypical

masculine and feminine traits, the perception of leadership styles as masculine or feminine (and

the assertion that the ideal leader uses a mix of both), and tips for busting sex-based stereotypes.

The organization was fairly large, and like Adventure Quest, international in scope. Its

structure is hierarchical with clearly defined roles and reporting structures. A militarist influence

persists in the language used to describe trip groups and in some job titles. Its promotional

materials and office decorations were professionally designed and printed. The buildings were

clean and neatly landscaped. At one site, flower baskets hung outside the main doors.

Inclusivity as an organizational value was quite evident. On site, bathrooms were labelled

as gender-neutral. In email signatures, and during introductions before staff pre-trip briefings,

staff indicated their gender pronouns. The sites all presented a generally progressive atmosphere.

As an example, land acknowledgements were posted in each office (all located in the United

States) with information about the local Indigenous groups and their relationship with the federal

government. Further, at one site a Transgender FAQ display was posted in the briefing area.

Table 2 below condenses the information about each organization to enable comparison.

As indicated, all participating organizations provided some degree of training about gender

identity and/or masculinity with the intention of critically examining gender norms and/or biases.

The use of such training by the outdoor education providers indicates the willingness of the

organizations to work towards gender equity and is a widely employed strategy, among

organizations wishing to promote inclusivity (Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development, 2014).

Table 2: Organizational Summaries

	Adventure Quest	Camp Laviron	Outdoor Skills Co-op
Training	- Gender inclusivity workshop - #MeToo conference presentations	- Masculinity workshops - Sexual consent training - Anti-homophobia training	- Women's skill courses - Masculinity course - Sexual harassment, diversity and inclusion awareness staff meeting topics
Policies and Resources	- Gender inclusivity section in staff manual - "Positive relationships" content to be added to staff manual - Academic articles commenting on organization's effectiveness	- Social mapping for inclusion - Detailed unit plan for masculinity workshops	- Specific questions on OE Leader feedback and evaluation forms about efforts to create an inclusive environment - Incident forms for breaches of inclusion policy - Gender bias and gendered leadership myth-busting sections in staff manual
Site and Culture	- Unisex bathrooms (by necessity) - Preferred pronouns in email signatures - Pride flag (at one site) - Land acknowledgement available at one site, maps	- Unisex bathrooms - Sex-segregated site - Extremely organized and efficient	- Gender-neutral bathrooms - Professional office space and marketing materials - Professional expectations of staff, including extensive reporting - Location-specific

	of local indigenous groups at another - Industrial office space - Site decorations were mix of professional and hand-made	- Professional expectations for staff - Professional signage	resources about colonial history - Transgender FAQ board

The efficacy of gender bias training to promote equity and inclusion has recently been questioned by Dobbin and Kalev (2018) who, citing multiple studies dating back to the 1930s, assert that such training is ineffective at best and counterproductive at worst. They state that training fails on multiple fronts. First, because training workshops are short, standalone, and/or infrequent, they often make little impression in the long term. Second, they can actually activate certain stereotypes by calling attention to them. Third, such workshops can cultivate undue confidence in attendees (i.e. because someone has attended the training, they may think they no longer have bias). Fourth, they can instigate backlash by attendees upset by the attempt to control their thoughts or actions. Having catalogued the potential shortfalls of anti-bias and inclusion training, Dobbin and Kalev (2018) provide some recommendations for strategies that can increase uptake of the training's message and limit backlash.

One recommended method to avoid resistance is to make such training voluntary (Dobbin & Kalev, 2018). The authors noted that mandatory training initiatives often incite anger or defensiveness, especially when legal arguments are introduced. Legal arguments, they assert, often lead participants to conclude that the organization has been coerced by the government or is trying to avoid a lawsuit. Though Outdoor Skills Co-op regularly introduced inclusion and diversity topics at mandatory staff meetings, it was the only participating organization that offered optional women-only skills courses and the masculinities workshop as professional development opportunities. Only one of the participants (name omitted for purposes of

anonymity) had engaged in the masculinities workshop and he intended to help facilitate a similar session for staff at his site. Having an insider staff member like this participant facilitate could also increase training effectiveness according to Legault et al. (2011) who found that when training initiatives originate from inside the organization, commitment to the message is greater. That Outdoor Skills Co-op and Camp Laviron developed their own training programs in-house from established staff members bodes well for acceptance of their message.

Another consideration affecting the adoption of the message of gender equity and inclusion training is whether the initiative is a standalone measure or part of a wider program to foster equity in the organization (Connell, 2006). Connell's (2006) study demonstrated that when equity becomes ingrained in an organization's culture, attempts to foster it became "one of the routine grounds for action" (p. 847) and the organizational culture becomes more professional. All three participating organizations adhered to these points to some degree. Adventure Quest makes some efforts to recognize colonial history by reciting a land acknowledgement and will soon implement a section on gendered "positive communication" in its manual to complement its gender inclusion training. Further, Adventure Quest had established offices and a highly centralized organizational structure, leading to some degree of professionalism. Camp Laviron, in addition to providing sexual consent training, has successfully embedded the masculinities workshops in its culture. According to the planning document, efforts to engage staff begin before the summer session and sessions are held regularly throughout the operating season. Camp Laviron was highly organized and Mason indicated that he was very aware that he must keep his interactions with women OE leaders professional. Most impressively, Outdoor Skills Co-op is engaged across the board in efforts to increase inclusivity. From the land acknowledgement posters to transgender FAQ displays to the elective gender issues professional

development courses and staff manual readings, the organization demonstrates a high degree of awareness of social issues and their offices exuded a professional character.

Connell (2006) also recommends framing gender equity as a public service issue in organizations that already see service as part of their mandate. All three organizations are involved in some manner in public service, and service to others is a stated value of both Outdoor Skills Co-op and Adventure Quest in their staff manuals and other resources. As mentioned in the previous chapter, participants such as Elijah and Gabriel interpreted their work as service to the community or as contributing to society, likely making the gender equity message that much easier to accept in training sessions.

Dobbin and Kalev (2018) also recommend promoting contact with members of disadvantaged groups to help those participating in equity and inclusion training to recognize the need for such efforts. Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op promote mixed-sex instructor groups, potentially increasing the exposure to, and empathy with, women in the industry concerning gender issues. In contrast, Camp Laviron facilitates a sex-segregated program that could limit the effectiveness of their efforts at fostering inclusion related to gender.

Finally, Dobbin and Kalev (2018) found that when senior managers or administrators, who work toward equity, mentor younger staff or new managers there is a greater likelihood that a focus on equity will be passed along. Camp Laviron accomplishes this mentorship particularly well as one session of their curriculum is specifically focused on mentors. Further, their staffing model, which encourages students to become staff members, contributes to the continuity of the message. In addition, as noted in their masculinities curriculum document, the management secures buy-in from new managers and staff members before the summer by contacting them and explaining the importance of the training and its centrality to the program.

It is clear that all participating organizations engage in attempts to increase gender equity via training, resourcing, and/or cultural support. However, there is room for improvement in all cases. For instance, Connell (2006) asserts that gender equity and inclusion training should include issues of power relations and how harassment affects women's identities and confidence. From the artefacts provided to me, I could see no evidence that such issues were included in training or resourcing, although they may have been mentioned during sessions at which I was not present. Adding content about power differentials would be beneficial since Powell (1986) found that men are significantly less likely to notice sexual or gendered harassment than women. This is particularly true since, as Lipman (2018) stated in her work looking at the technology sector, most sexism and harassment is no longer open and obvious in organisations, but instead takes the form of small slights and microaggressions. That is consistent with studies examining outdoor education leaders' experiences by Avery (2015) and Davies et al. (2019). Connell (2006) contends that gendered power dynamics may be built into the structures of an organization, thereby obfuscating them particularly in professions that have been traditionally dominated by men, which is the case for outdoor education (Gray, 2018).

To this point in the analysis, my assessment of gender training has focused on all three organizations, but I want to make one final point that pertains only to Camp Laviron. It is the only organization that offers sex-segregated workshops (a matter I discuss further in Chapter Eight) and its workshop on masculinity stereotypes and men's issues is for male staff only. From what I could see, it also appears that Camp Laviron has no other materials or resources on gender bias. Kaufman (2012b) worries that a narrow focus on masculinity and its impacts on men risks a devolution of discourse into gender essentialism and ignorance to wider discussions of gender equity, thus unwittingly bolstering hegemonic masculinity. Such was the case with men's circles

in the woods held by the mythopoetic men's movement, a folk movement that grew out of masculinity studies but focused on recapturing "essential" manliness (sometimes known as the "hairy man") that was seen to be lost due to the alleged feminizing influences of society (Connell, 2005; Kaufman, 2012b). Kaufman (2012b) thus suggests that inclusive masculinity programs should be tied and accountable to feminist theory or feminist organizations. I thus would suggest that Camp Laviron consider asking feminist outdoor researchers to vet their existing and future training plans and resource materials, or at the very least include the ideas and writing of feminist outdoor scholars like Gray (2016), Mitten (2018), and Warren (1996), among others.

Acceptance of Organizational Training and Norms

All three organizations' messages concerning masculinity and gender bias appear to have been received well. The impact of this gender bias and masculinity training on participants' understanding of their own masculinity is explored in more detail in Chapter Eight. In this section, I focus on participants' deployment of training and resource messages as revealed in their interview responses.

At Camp Laviron, the content seems to have been well absorbed by the staff members who were participants in my study, perhaps due to the frequency of the repetition of masculinity workshops for students and staff. George, a new staff member, indicated that his first sharing circle, in which he experienced his direct supervisor divulge very personal and emotional details, was very impactful for him. That, and the centrality of the masculinity program at the camp, inspired him to critically consider his own understanding of masculinity. Other Camp Laviron participants also provided specific evidence of their engagement with the masculinity sessions. Dan seemed to appropriate lines from *American Male* (Christophel & Rohrbaugh, 2016), a film

used in Camp Laviron's workshops that outlines stereotypically masculine interests and fashion

choices, to demonstrate his defiance of conventional masculine norms, saying: "I draw, I paint, I

wear pinks and purples and blues." Liam, similarly, openly paraphrased a line from the

masculinities workshop script: "to … pick a quote from [the masculinity workshop leader], ...

just because you can fend off the world with one arm doesn't mean you can't show a sensitive

emotional side on the other side." John Marshall also indicated he was enthusiastic about the

workshops, but did criticize the program for its sole focus on men and lack of engagement with

topics of women's issues and gender equity, which demonstrated well his critical engagement

with the content.

The participants at Outdoor Skills Co-op were likewise engaged by the organization's

training and resources. For instance, their stated desire for authenticity (described in the previous

chapter) may stem from a section in the staff manual that describes being authentic as one of the

four pillars of leadership. As well, Zack asserted that he viewed certain social justice efforts,

such as the cultural competency workshop, as important learning for those at the organization.

More specific to the topic of gender, he stated, "My work is where I've learned to examine

masculinity. 100 percent." Zack also owned a copy of *Man Up* by Carlos Andrés Gómez (2012),

the book used in the organization's masculinity seminar. Zack was not the only participant who

had specifically done informal reading about gender, and other participants also made reference

to reading about gender bias in the staff manual. Oliver stated that he thought OE leaders at his

organization erred toward the middle of the gender spectrum in their leadership, echoing the staff

manual that asserts that a combination of traditionally female process orientation and

traditionally male task orientation is the ideal leadership style for instructors. Barry, discussing

the inaccuracy of gendered traits, stated that there is more variation of traits within the sexes than

between them, echoing a graph displayed in the staff manual. Moreover, Barry even cited the page number of the staff manual when he referred to a research article about gendered leadership that, as he paraphrased it, indicates "people's expectations of leaders as male, female, whatever ... really have been, effectively the same since the mid-nineties."

At Adventure Quest, Elijah may have been influenced by the gender inclusion training in the organization as he mentioned his support for a previous co-leader who identified as between the binary. Sebastian discussed the influence of the organizational practice of stating gender pronouns when introducing oneself on his awareness of Trans oppression. However, the absence of specific training concerning masculinity or gender bias was evident in the lack of common terms or references by participants from that organization. Roman described toxic masculinity as a societal issue and evaluated his own masculinity using Jungian archetypes. Marcus was critical of "Brads and Chads," a popular term online for stereotypically masculine young men. He also expressed disdain for men who are openly racist or sexist. Elijah, although stating that he displayed a more sensitive masculinity, also denounced "unfortunate feminist stereotypes" about men. These comments indicate a spectrum of understanding of masculinity and gender biases.

For participants from all three organizations, the acceptance of organizational training narratives seemed to coincide with admiration for their organization and identification with its aims and objectives. Liam indicated that he had worked for several organizations but found Camp Laviron to have the culture with which he could most identify. At Adventure Quest, Elijah could recount writings by an early leader of the outdoor education movement and stated that he had great regard for his organization, calling his hiring there "a milestone in my career." Similarly, Roman quoted Adventure Quest's core values in some of his responses. Mateo said he was proud to work at Outdoor Skills Co-op because other organizations looked up to them as a

model of practice. His admiration of the organization is interesting given his position at Outdoor Skills Co-op is only part-time and he also works at a forest school. Levon stated that the Outdoor Skills Co-op values were slightly different from his own, but had greatly informed his philosophy for the better. Further, Levon noted that he often wore Outdoor Skills Co-op merchandise when away from work and felt himself to be an ambassador for the organization.

In addition to differences in training and practices, participants at each organization adhered to specific dress and language norms. Gabriel explained that he had worked for Adventure Quest before arriving at Outdoor Skills Co-op and asserted that the two organizations had different styles of dress: "For me it's interesting to see, working [Adventure Quest] and working [Outdoor Skills Co-op], how people wear their clothes. Like, their stereotype is different." Mason also indicated that a staff uniform of sorts existed at Camp Laviron, which all staff wore on visitors' day but, it seems, otherwise did not. Language usage, too, differentiated the organizations. Outdoor Skills Co-op had very specific titles for their instructors based on their status in the organization and abbreviations that were peppered throughout all of their responses. Adventure Quest used multiple examples of military terminology in their programming. Likewise, participants from Camp Laviron used organization-specific terms to refer to the different student age groups, activities, and buildings.

Adherence to organizational norms is perhaps predictable in that eight of the 18 respondents had been a student of their organization before becoming an OE leader. Of the remaining ten participants, seven explicitly said they admired their organization. As well, seven of the 18 participants occupied administrative positions, indicating not only that they must like the organization sufficiently to want to continue working there but also that adherence to organizational norms may increase the likelihood of career advancement. For example, Gabriel

said that once he changed his leadership style to be consistent with that valued in his organization, his status grew rapidly. Barry, speaking about another organization, indicated that he received tacit and overt reinforcement, in the form of comments and promotions, when his practice was in line with his organization's values.

For those who had been students themselves at their organization, adherence to norms is not surprising. Wall (2008) found that allegiance and assimilation to one's outdoor education organization, specifically summer camps, rivalled that of universities and colleges and was an indicator of one's status and values. Identification with one's organization is more likely when employees, even those on contract, have intrinsic motivation (Rockmann & Ballinger, 2017), such as finding fulfillment in their work, something many participants stated (as discussed in the previous chapter). Such identification may result because the organization permits them to perform their valued function and obtain validation (Rockmann & Ballinger, 2017). Identification with one's organization is also more likely when employees see themselves as individuals whose creativity and autonomy are valued (Kim, 2020), as they often are in outdoor education (Martin et al., 2017). I will explore that idea more in Chapter Seven.

Finally, Kim et al. (2015) demonstrated that employees are more likely to retain and use training content when said content is presented as necessary for the organization's effectiveness or wellness. It could be argued that the trainings detailed above are viewed as integral to their organization's effectiveness. As Bruce noted, instructors do not reach students as well when they do not feel included, meaning excluded students likely would not return nor recommend the experience to a friend. The same could be said for the participants who felt allegiance to their organization and thus would be more likely be open to its messaging.

Origins of Organizational Change

As noted above, the participants generally embraced messages offered in organizational

trainings, policies, and resources. But the existence of such trainings begs the question: From

where did the will to affect these changes arise? This is an important question given the critiques

of the outdoor education field for the ways in which its gendered practices and structures have

persisted (Gray, 2018; Humberstone, 2000; Newbery, 2003, 2004). These indicate both how

easily it is to be enculturated into traditional gendered practices in outdoor education but also

that there is a growing desire for, and some evidence of, change. Where have these changes

come from?

According to artefact documents and personal communications with administrators at

Adventure Quest and Camp Laviron, training on gender issues was largely a top-down affair. For

Adventure Quest, the message from an administrator was that "we" implemented the trainings,

without attribution to a specific individual. At Camp Laviron, training sessions were largely

attributed (by Liam, John Marshall, and Mason) to an administrator who was subordinate to the

Director and Assistant Director. However, a discussion with the Director revealed that the

program had emerged from a longstanding effort to examine masculinity that was in place before

that particular administrator joined the program.

Mateo posited that the efforts at Outdoor Skills Co-op to include gender issues in

trainings, policies, and resources were also top-down:

> We have such a drive from our administration here at [Outdoor Skills Co-op] to be more
> open and inclusive of everyone. And all these courses. And I think that people are kind
> of tuning into that because they're like, well, I want to keep working here.

Levon, however, disagrees with that assertion. He claims that middle managers, when hired,

promote their own topics of interest inside the organization. His attribution of who led change

efforts is certainly true in the case of the masculinity workshop, which was sparked by an

individual manager (which I know because he reached out to me with a request for resources).

As someone in middle management himself, Levon sees himself as someone with the ability to

have broad impact on the organization through:

> people that I'm supervising, so it's like I have influence there. But I also [have] upward influence as well and can direct the year and I can talk to my colleagues and can figure out what we want to emphasize here.

North interpreted his role with the organization in a similar fashion but also noted that the

impacts were coming not just from the top or from middle management but also from instructors:

> I think a lot of it is maybe happening ... more at that of the middle level. Folks who are designing the curriculum and, kind of, in charge of the education pieces, I think they're the ones really driving it and it trickles down from there. But it's trickling down from the middle and also trickling up. I guess, spreading from the middle, with a pretty good push from instructors that feel passionately about it.

Levon elaborated on this more complex model of influence, indicating that he felt that the

inspiration for trainings, policy, and resources has been slightly more of a grassroots effort,

brought by outdoor leaders as they attain higher positions:

> People just move up through the ranks and bring through them with their ideas.... They become instructors, … they become more confident, ... they bring in their own things. And, it's a slow process and the reason that we have all of the things that we're talking about now is not because someone up top came in and said, "This is what we're going to talk about." It's because instructors had a passion or … supervisors, … people in my position, had a passion to ... to talk about this and make it happen.

Gabriel went further, attributing social justice efforts within Outdoor Skills Co-op not

only to staff but also to students:

> I think that was a change from bottom up, so I think it comes from the students talking that language and saying those things, instructors talking, then going to the [managerial] staff and go to the directors … I definitely think there's not a board decision because the board was predominantly White, male, usually…from rural places.

Gabriel continued, stating that change has been slow in the outdoor education field as a whole

because, "if you check out the organizations [they] are run by White, … hetero males." Gabriel's

suggestion was affirmed by North, who reported that certain members of the Outdoor Skills Co-

op directorship felt that the focus on social justice and gender issues had gone "too far":

> I think there are folks on the board that think we've swung too far in the direction of teaching inclusivity and have gotten away from our roots of teaching outdoor skills. And it's certainly not the entire board. That's not accurate, but there are certainly folks on the board that do feel that way and recognize the validity of it, but don't think that that's why people are signing up for [Outdoor Skills Co-op] courses, to be learning a "systems of oppression" class when they signed up for [a] mountaineering course and want to learn how to place pro and go climbing.

Oliver indicated some agreement with the sentiment attributed to some members of the

directorship. He stated that he felt some instructors were being placed on trips for which they

were unqualified from a technical skills perspective because of their communication skills or

inclusive facilitation abilities, though he stated he was nonetheless supportive of diversity and

inclusion efforts.

Another source of change, according to some participants, came from interacting with a

diverse population that can help introduce varied and novel ideas. Levon related that arrival in a

university setting more diverse than his hometown had been eye-opening for him: "just like

meeting new people and going to a different place, I think, there were some pretty pivotal

moments in there." Mason reported that a large fraction of the staff at Camp Laviron that year

had been international and their influence had changed the culture. Similarly, Levon and Mateo

mentioned how working at an international organization permits different points of view to be

shared and the opportunity to travel and gain novel experiences. Mateo stated that the variety of

perspectives derived from international staff is "one of the benefits of being such a large

organization." Levon said his organization was a "reputable organization that was worldwide and I got to just visit all … six of the continents."

Another way participants suggested different ideas can be brought to an organization is through an influx of young staff. Levon indicated that, due to significant yearly staff attrition, Outdoor Skills Co-op brings in many new instructors each year, "and all those bring in fresh, new ideas." He and Barry both noted that most instructional staff are younger, and those with many years of experience in the organization are few. In Levon's case, he noted that his age and experience could be seen as somewhat of a hindrance in terms of considering alternative structures or programs: "I am pretty entrenched and could represent an older generation," requiring him to learn new perspectives from colleagues who get promoted into management from the instructor pool. Gabriel agreed that there is a generational aspect to the move to inclusion and equity issues, and noted that this is happening society-wide. For outdoor education organizations to change in a significant way, he said, "the consumers have to change and I feel like there will be a chain reaction to change the big picture."

As these participants pointed out, the impetus for organizational change can come from many directions: not only from the top but also from middle managers, instructors, and students. Whatever the spark, organizations need to consider how they go about making the desired changes. If perceived as coercion, top-down initiatives can spur staff recalcitrance (Datnow et al., 2002). As Datnow et al. (2002) state, "reforms that have an inauthentic beginning surely will not be sustained" (p. 135), meaning that top-down training measures that are not viewed by staff as practically useful nor procedurally feasible will have little influence on the actual culture or instructional delivery. Larsen (2005) claimed that in order to have greater buy-in to training measures and cultural change initiatives, one must have support of multiple layers of

management. In this light, the Outdoor Skills Co-op model of training and integration of awareness of gender issues seems sustainable. That participants such as Bruce recognized the practical value to the organization and that there was integration of social issues on multiple fronts (e.g., policy and reporting, resources, optional training, seasonal meeting topics) satisfies one of Datnow et al.'s (2002) criteria for successful culture change: depth. Datnow et al.'s (2002) other factor for success is duration (i.e. whether the focus on inclusion is sustained in the long term). Because of the high attrition rate of OE leaders noted by Levon, a top-down implementation of change efforts by stable ownership or management could also help to reinforce the acceptance of training messages (Ertesvåg et al., 2010). In this way, all of the participating organizations are well placed to create lasting change within their cultures concerning equity and inclusion efforts.

The international staff base of some of the participating organizations is also promising in its potential to regularly inject novel ideas and perspectives. Ahearn (2001) found that increased cosmopolitanism heightens knowledge of social issues by expanding recognized possibilities. The influx of new, youthful staff may also be important to a change in organizational culture if older educators are less likely to enthusiastically adopt new approaches (Angelides, 2004). Risman (2018) found that youth today are more knowledgeable about gender bias and inequity and more accepting of gender transgression than previous generations. Whatever the source, interacting with others who possess divergent perspectives or experience can create dissonance and foster what Connell (1987) called "crisis tendencies" that make one critically reconsider perspectives in an effort to integrate new and divergent information.

Summary

In this chapter, I examined the hiring trends as well as the training and resourcing provided at the three organizations where participants worked. Participants described increasingly equitable hiring practices, resulting in at least one woman on each excursion team and elevated representation of women in supervisory roles. Following that, I discussed the training, resourcing, and culture of each of the base sites. I probed the efficacy of training methods, comparing them to recommendations in the literature for aiding acceptance of training messages such as: incorporation of equity and inclusivity into the organizational culture; encouragement of professionalism; highlighting organizations' public service orientation; promoting contact with marginalized groups; and staff mentorship. I also suggested adding explicit content about power relations in training and staff resources as well as ensuring that masculinities training is informed by feminist ideas.

I noted that participants indicated a high degree of adherence to their organisation's norms such as conventions of dress, terminology used, and application of training and resources. I wondered about the impetus for changes to organizations' hiring policies and training foci, and found that multiple sources were identified as having brought in new ideas, representing all levels of each organization. Further, international staff members and new young instructors were credited with importing new perspectives. In the next chapter, I turn my attention to participants' views on gender relations generally and in the outdoor education field specifically.

Chapter Six: Gender Relations

In this chapter, I focus on the participants' views on gender relations. The chapter begins with participants' awareness of multiple forms of oppression and power at play in interactions, the role of #MeToo in raising such awareness, and participants' confusion about appropriate communication and behaviours resulting from shifts in gender norms and how that affects their practice. The participants' notions of difference in leadership styles of men and women is then explored, followed by a look at how they perceived students' reactions to men and women leaders. The idea of the "rock star" woman guide is raised as is the oft-reported devaluation of women leaders and their experiences of such issues and the causes of such devaluation. I close with an analysis of the gendered language I observed during data collection.

Awareness of Oppressions

Whether overtly facilitated and supported by organizations or reflecting participants' own interests or generational norms, participants generally demonstrated a degree of awareness about multiple social issues. Although gender was the focus of this study and is considered more specifically in the next section, participants, raised a number of other social issues in their responses without prompting. For example, over and above the scripted land acknowledgements by Adventure Quest, Marcus indicated his awareness of race issues and colonialism by describing his experience teaching canoeing skills to students living on a First Nations reserve. He related stories about his White boss at the time using inappropriate racialized language and trying to overcharge Indigenous communities. As well, he indicated some awareness of the colonial power imbalance that led him to acquire traditionally Indigenous skills and lead lessons for Indigenous youth: "Here I am, a White dude, teaching Indigenous people an Indigenous cultural skill. Super awkward."

Levon repeatedly mentioned race in his interview. For example, he complained about the lack of diverse representation in outdoor media, noting "there will always be a picture of a White guy doing something—just pick up a climbing magazine! And I mean, heck, I even have Eminem, if I think about ... models, ... but ... name a Black climber." Another example was when he raised the problem of racial profiling and grappled with his White privilege: "I'm still benefitting from this privilege ... and if a cop doesn't follow a Black person around the store, does that harm me? No, not at all."

Other participants commented on issues of class or socioeconomic status, despite these topics not being explicitly raised in the interview questions. George, in discussing racial disparities, stated that "there's still huge issues with ... racism and inequality" as well as poverty, and went on to share that he typically volunteered for his mother's non-profit organization to teach music skills to disadvantaged youth in the summers. He asserted,

> as a privileged White, straight male I have a huge responsibility to recognize my privilege and take affirmative action. I think that's … shaped a lot of my actions around, ... I don't know ... I feel slightly guilty being here at camp, looking after a whole lot of privileged kids while people back home are in trouble.

Both Levon and Bruce critiqued the financial inaccessibility of outdoor education as a whole, noting course fees and low pay for OE professionals, asserting that further efforts to make it more inclusive were needed. Bruce stated: "It's a tough business that way, for attracting people who come from more challenging economic circumstances." In my interview with Bruce, I made a statement that the requisite gear to be an outdoor educator can also be prohibitively expensive, with which he readily agreed, stating, "Oh, exactly!" On that note, Levon commented that he intentionally dresses in old jeans when rock climbing rather than the latest, brand name outdoor clothing in order to model that technical apparel is not only unnecessary but exclusionary.

Liam noted that inclusion in general was a widespread concern in education, including outdoor education:

> summer camps are trying to be more inclusive. And be more accepting and more open. And … education institutions, as well. I went to [name of university] … and … they're really trying to be inclusive.

While he recognized that an increasing number of educational organizations, outdoor and otherwise, are working to become more inclusive, he also noted that these efforts are piecemeal and inconsistent across the field. From the larger context of his remarks in the interview, Liam's use of the word "inclusive" indicates that he understands it to mean being accepting and open to culturally and gender-diverse stakeholders. Such an approach to inclusion dovetails with Martin et al.'s (2017) notion of the term, which includes efforts to ensure that people of all backgrounds and abilities can participate in outdoor programs. Further, Liam's assertion that some institutions are focusing on issues of social justice is supported by North (2006) who indicated that education as a whole has recently worked to become more accessible and welcoming to those who are perceived as different or who are marginalized.

More specifically, the topic of inclusion has been on the radar in the outdoor education field for some time, as demonstrated by the addition in 1992 of the topic of social justice guidelines for ethical decision making developed by the Association of Experiential Education, an organization to which many outdoor professionals belong (AEE, 1992). How effective those guidelines were for improving awareness of social justice in practice can be questioned, however, since over 20 years later, Warren et al. (2014) felt the need to call for greater emphasis on social justice in outdoor education. More recent texts, such as Martin et al.'s (2017) textbook that includes sections on cultural competency and the Outdoor Skills Co-op staff manual, indicate an increasing awareness and perhaps heightened sense of urgency to heed this call.

Cultural competency, as Martin et al. (2017) describe it, includes respect for others' values and beliefs, recognition of one's privilege and assumptions, and awareness of cultural hegemony and that certain groups' norms dominate over others. Awareness of such issues allows OE leaders to better serve and support their students (Lange, 2011) by recognizing their diverse beliefs, behaviours, and needs (Martin et al., 2017).

A competing discourse concerning inclusion exists, however, that relates to the global, neoliberal economic climate in which these organizations operate. The neoliberal imperative stresses competition and marketization of every facet of existence, including outdoor experiences (Warner et al., 2020). Warner et al. (2020) detail the many ways the predominating neoliberal ideology shapes outdoor education culture and practice. Specifically of interest here is the desire, even by ostensibly non-profit organizations, to secure student fees and to ensure a continuing demand for the outdoor experience. In such a context, the desire to be inclusive and to draw in a more diverse set of students could also be seen as a method to increase the potential client pool of their outdoor educational programming. Boucher and Clark (2020) assert that organizations' diversity and inclusion narratives are often superficial and only work to increase the profit margins for those organizations.

Warren et al. (2014) remind us that outdoor education tends to be a White, middle- and upper-class pursuit that others and excludes non-Whites through both its culture and practice. Considering the increasing racial and sexual diversity of the North American population (Camarillo et al., 2020), that means that outdoor education organizations steeped in neoliberal values of competition and a desire for profit or financial largesse (Warner et al., 2020) are likely looking for methods to increase their potential student base as do so many other contemporary educational institutions (Connell, 2013). Indeed, many institutions and companies have begun to

market to more diverse communities, including outdoor leisure providers (Camarillo et al., 2020).

Crompton (2008) argues that such diversification is key to remaining relevant in today's society, and that in order to attract more diverse communities, organizations must reposition themselves to be seen as helping the community. According to Crompton, that could mean increasing economic prosperity, which in the outdoor education context might mean helping develop desired skill sets such as communication and leadership abilities, as well as addressing important social issues. Whatever the impetus, be it a desire to embrace social justice in outdoor education programming and practices, as advocated by Warren et al. (2014), or the neoliberal imperative to increase competitive standing in the market (Warner et al., 2020), inclusivity and diversity clearly have become watchwords in outdoor education. All organizations, through their training, their organizational literature, and their website contents, claimed to value these ideas and, as noted in Chapter 4, such ideas were also demonstrated in participants' interview responses.

"Changing Culture"

As noted above, the appreciation of difference and recognition of inequalities appears to be growing in outdoor education. Participants consistently alluded to what they called the "changing culture," both in outdoor education and the wider society, which they characterized as increasingly cognizant of social justice issues, particularly those pertaining to gender. For instance, Dan, when asked if stereotypical masculinity is valued in outdoor education, stated, "I don't think it is valued ... any more. I keep on saying 'any more' because there has been this giant shift in the culture." North also noted a recent uptick in discussions around gender issues at his organization, which had increased his own awareness: "I'd say like in the last three years my

knowledge and language around it ..., it's certainly broadened a lot, starting to work here." Barry,

likewise, noticed an intensification of discourse on the topic of gender, particularly related to

masculinity:

> I mean, even two years ago … the phrase toxic masculinity was kind of, like, fringe to me. Or, I would hear it on occasion and be like, "What does that even mean? What are you talking about?" And I think in the past couple years, just really, really tapping into what that means to me ... and other people, and our world and just how important a conversation that is to continue.

Gabriel attributed some of the cultural change to campaigns popularized via social media. He

shared:

> It's like, I open my Facebook, for example, that it's changed in the past years as movements like #MeToo, or "no is no" or those movements happen in … social media. It's like a social change, like from the Western culture, the whole American continent.

#MeToo is the most recent of a number of activist endeavours to call attention to sexual

assault and abuse by men. Before considering #MeToo directly, I want to mention some of the

organisations that fed the current movement. Originally formed by Michael Kaufman and Jack

Layton as a way for men to actively support feminist advocacy against spousal violence, the

White Ribbon Campaign was arguably the first major crusade in Canada to engage men in the

fight against sexual assault. It began in 1991 with the aim of creating "an education and

awareness-raising campaign focused on engaging men and boys to think about their own

attitudes and behaviour and to speak out to other men to challenge all forms of men's violence

against women" (Kauffman, 2012a, p. 428) and was soon active in over 60 countries. The White

Ribbon Campaign critiqued gendered socialization, such as the notion that masculine is assertive

and feminine is passive, as well as the role of the man as breadwinner (Kauffman, 2012b).

Later campaigns to raise awareness about sexual violence against women, such as the

Slutwalk protests, provided an example of the wide reach and influence afforded by social media

and laid the groundwork for later campaigns (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019). Although

Slutwalks as protests against blaming victims of sexual violence were widespread, they arguably

had limited long-term effectiveness in terms of concrete outcomes toward addressing gendered

harassment (Mendes & Ringrose, 2019), but they did help to popularize the use of Twitter

hashtags (e.g., #WhyWomenDontReport and #YesAllWomen) as a method of raising awareness

about rape culture.

Another awareness-raising campaign that arose highlighted violence against First Nations

and Indigenous women across North America. The Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women

(MMIW) movement works to highlight the prevalence of violence against Indigenous women

(Saramo, 2016). The REDress project, a traveling exhibition of disembodied red dresses meant to

symbolize the MMIW in Canada, was one effort to raise awareness through art. By inviting

women across the country to hang red dresses in outdoor spaces to indicate awareness and

support for a national investigation into MMIW, it garnered significant attention during the 2015

Canadian federal election (Saramo, 2016). Another campaign with the same aims took place via

social media. The hashtag #AmINext was a Twitter-based campaign to demand action from

Prime Minister Harper on the issue (Saramo, 2016). Both of the campaigns described above had

a significant impact given newly elected Prime Minister Trudeau announced an inquiry into

Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) in 2015, demonstrating the

effectiveness of such activism.

These previous efforts all laid the groundwork for the explosion of #MeToo. The MeToo

movement, although begun by activist Tarana Burke in 2006 to call attention to the

pervasiveness of sexual assault in African American communities, was later appropriated and

popularized in response to sexual assault allegations against Harvey Weinstein. On October 15,

2017, actor Alyssa Milano shared a tweet asking women who had been sexually harassed or assaulted to post #MeToo on their Twitter account in order to highlight the scope of the problem (Loney-Howes, 2019). Initially limited to North America, the hashtag quickly spread worldwide. Within the first 24 hours, the hashtag had been shared 500,000 times on Twitter and 12 million times on Facebook (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019). The immensity of women's response possibly resulted in a "moral shock" to the public consciousness (Jasper, 1997) by exposing the prevalence of sexual violence (PettyJohn et al., 2019). The result was that #MeToo generated far more "substantive and sustained global media coverage and public debate" (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019, p. 24) than previous campaigns. The popularity of the hashtag and its resultant discussions led to more people being willing to call out sexism and a greater recognition of the role of power imbalances in the work environment (Mendes & Ringrose, 2019), and may have contributed to the change of consciousness about gender inequity described by Allen-Craig et al. (2020) in outdoor education.

Most of the discussion was generated by women, with men remaining silent. Journalist Benjamin Law started the hashtag #HowIWillChange to engage men with the topic, garnering mixed reactions, from genuine introspection to hostile resistance (PettyJohn et al., 2019). The pervasiveness of the #MeToo hashtag, as well as the legal and reputational consequences to the Hollywood and TV stars implicated (e.g., Kevin Spacey, Louis C.K., Matt Lauer, Charlie Rose), were widely publicized and helped to spur an examination of toxic masculinity in popular culture (Mendes & Ringrose, 2019), as demonstrated in a now-famous Gillette "We Believe: The Best Men Can Be" commercial (Gillette, 2019). Such messages have appeared alongside the increased visibility of queer identities in popular media, challenging heteronormative ideology and raising awareness of LGBTQ+ issues (Greig & Holloway, 2012).

Conventional and social media are methods of public pedagogy (Giroux, 1994, 1998).

However, according to research conducted by Loney-Howes (2019), the lesson that many men

took from the celebrity harassment cases was that sexual assault resulted in punishment; the

deeper, more nuanced causes of gendered harassment and assault were never examined by the

media, leading to men's discomfiture (Loney-Howes, 2019) and, likely, women's continued

imperilment. The swift changes in awareness led to over half of men surveyed post-#MeToo

indicating that they were confused as to how to act around women at work (Pew Research

Centre, 2018).

Such confusion was also expressed by participants in my study. For example, Elijah

stated,

> It can be confusing, for me and for other young men who are like, "Ok, what do you
> want us to do, then?" Like, we know what behaviours you don't want to see in us. I
> agree. You know, being a violent, aggressive ... whining until I get my way, you
> know, choosing violence over compassion, the negative things that we've seen from
> a male-dominated world. Like, I'm on board. But, are you just saying that all men are
> evil or is there something meaningful that we can contribute and, if so, what is that?

Mason demonstrated similar confusion about how to interact with the woman co-leader on his

three-person team (two men, one woman) and indicated that he avoids joking and physical

contact with her partly due to his worry over issues of consent and a desire to be professional. He

admitted that his approach meant that the woman was treated differently than the male co-leader

and often left out of social interactions, but he could not see how the situation could change.

Another aspect of this dynamic, according to Mason, was simply the "natural" affinity he felt

with his male co-leader.

When asked, 13 of 18 respondents stated that there was a noticeable difference in

recreational and professional outdoor experiences with a woman present versus those with

another man. The reasons offered for the difference varied. Some, such as Tom, were vague:

"there's definitely a different vibe. But I wouldn't say that's bad. Yeah, there is a different vibe, though." Others noted that there were inherent physical differences that made all-male personal excursions more enjoyable. For example, Elijah said:

> I don't know if this is a ... nurture versus nature thing? I mean, I think part of it comes down to physiology. Like, I'm tall. Male physiology. I'm stronger, I can move much faster than a woman ... on skis, for example. On skis, on ski touring, I can move 50% faster than my girlfriend. So … that's just based on physiology and strength. So, if I go out with my three 6-foot-tall buds, like, we can crush it. We can go so much further, we can ... in terms of adrenaline pursuit, we can get more done. Sometimes it's great to go out with guys because you can do these things and men are generally a little bit less risk-averse, like will take bigger risks.

According to Gabriel, he often hears such comments that women are not as strong as men, made by both students and instructors. He continued, "And that's not one time, but many times, so it's like a common ... it's like a cultural thing, to think that women are weaker and not as competent as men."

Despite conveying egalitarian perceptions of gender overall, Dan asserted that women outdoor leaders are different to male leaders due to their natural awareness of risks: "They also have the better instincts, the better brain capacity, like, 'Hang on, we shouldn't be fighting over that rock in the water. Let's stop, because it's not safe.'" Sebastian stated that he thought women co-leaders brought an empathetic aspect to the instructor team that he could not:

> I always find that they're the more empathetic side. I find we usually end up matching up ... somehow. And each time, even if I've tried to be like, "I'm going to be the empathetic one, I'm going to try to figure out what these kids are feeling" and it just ... falls flat. I suck at it. It's always the females that are more empathetic, more understanding. And, I try to be. So, certain roles fall to them and certain roles fall to ... me in that regard. And I don't know if it's because of who I am as a person or if it's who I am as a man that's saying, like, "Ok, you're not empathetic." Maybe I'm just personally not empathetic, but they're usually better at it.

According to Bruce, the inherent differences between men and women create social complexity that does not exist in all-male excursion groups: "from my experience the

communication would be simpler because it's all one gender and it's easier to have more of a …

common language." Zack felt similarly, stating, "All-male trip leader teams can serve as an

affinity space in some ways where males can be open to connect in ways that they wouldn't

otherwise with a mixed-gender … team." However, Zack noted that the key difference when

working with a woman co-leader was the need to be aware of the power dynamic. He said, "With

a mixed-gender team of leaders you need to address gender roles and power dynamics more

directly."

This awareness of gender bias as a factor on an instructor team necessitated a change to

practice, requiring more mental energy, according to some participants. For example, Mateo

stated:

> I made more of an effort to … share the voice and empower my female co-leaders or female students and make sure that their opinions are being heard and the skills that they have to offer are being taught, you know?

Oliver felt the need to regularly evaluate his interactions:

> I feel like I'm often checking myself in my perspective and checking myself in social situations: how much I'm taking, how much space I'm opening up for folks. I think, because that's kind of a standard operating procedure for me today.

Elijah described the situation more bluntly: "There is definitely a difference. If anything, I notice

that when I'm ... working with women, I almost feel more obligated to ... sit down and shut up,

you know?" He added that he works to "just support my fellow leaders who are women to share

their voice and their perspective and, as well, to effectively demonstrate that we can share the

role equally."

Facilitating such sharing is an active consideration by some participants on trips, which

requires planning, initiative, and a willingness to break gendered norms by teaching non-

traditional skills. As described by Zack:

> If you have a mixed-gender … team then you're conscious about shifting traditional gender roles. I'll use a binary example because it's the easiest. You have a woman who is viewed in our society as less technical-focused or at least that's how … it gets that perception in outdoor education, with the femininity aligning with the more not-technical things we do and the human connection. And in a … team, being intentional about providing opportunity and showing, breaking, gender role of female not being technically competent so intentionally putting them into teaching technical classes to mix that up.

North concurred, indicating that division of curriculum required planning to disrupt gender conventions:

> On a technical course, trying to get each person on the instructor team to teach a technical skill within the first three days. And not cooking. Something, like some rope skill that is going to be taught or be used throughout. Making sure that that's being divvied up evenly or, even, potentially, having a female-identified instructor teaching the higher-level skill earlier on, to break down that perception with students.

Another element that can be planned, expressed only by Levon, is to ensure that gender issues are raised by the male OE leader:

> I actively work, when I'm with a female co-worker, to not have them address sexism and to specifically not … teach ... the initial gender and leadership classes. I would, not want them to be teaching, like, things that are, ... could typically be seen as, "the woman's problem."

It is notable here that all but one of the participants who described the need to "share the voice" and intentionally subvert the traditionally gendered curriculum worked at Outdoor Skills Co-op. It seemed a common narrative for this group of participants, potentially influenced by that organization's culture and resourcing described in the previous chapter.

Some women's preference for all-women excursions has been well established in outdoor education (Mitten, 2018; Overholt & Ewert, 2015) and recreation (Stoddart, 2011) as such environments are seen to eliminate competitive behaviours from men and create a shared sense of belonging in a masculinized environment (Gray, 2018). Interestingly, and in contrast with Overholt and Ewert's (2015) finding that men preferred mixed-sex trips, several of the

participants in my study described enjoying all-male staff teams due to presumed common experiences and understandings. Bird (1996) argued that all-male groups tended to maintain gender norms and thereby hegemonic masculinity by fostering stoicism, competition, and the othering of women. Hegemonic values such as a love of competition, which her participants claimed women found too intense and distasteful, can form the basis of shared understandings and identity construction. In her study, those who avoided hegemonic masculine performances curiously preferred heterosocial (i.e., mixed-sex) groups, perhaps because they disliked competition and other hegemonic performances that left them ostracized from all-male groups (Bird, 1996).

The ease and enjoyment of all-male staff teams expressed by some of my participants may potentiallyindicate a familiarity with, and affinity for, hegemonic masculine values. Alternatively, there may simply be comfort in familiar company with known behavioural expectations when the changing culture discussed by some participants creates confusion. Regardless, the stated ease in relating to other men may be one factor in the male-heavy gender imbalance found in outdoor organizations' senior leadership (Allin, 2003; Bell et al., 2018; Gray, et al., 2017), due to homologous reproduction, that is, hiring those who are similar to oneself (Loeffler, 1996). It could also be argued that men prefer homosocial groups because it allows them to step out of stereotypical gender roles, consistent with Meerts-Brandsma et al.'s (2020) contention that outdoor education excursions provide opportunities to remove oneself from prevailing norms and critically examine them. However, that idea runs contrary to Kimmel's (1995) widely supported assertion that men perform valued masculine characteristics not for women, but to secure status from other men. I will return to the notion that men's performances

of masculinity for other men in homosocial male groups often encourages, rather than disrupts, hegemonic masculine values in Chapter Eight

Somewhat related to the enjoyment of all-male staff groupings are Elijah's comments about his desire to "crush it." This comment may indicate he seeks an activity group of the same skill and strength, but his lack of consideration of other skilled and strong women besides his partner as potential activity mates demonstrates a gendering of the notion of strength. Further, this desire sets strength as the primary consideration, over and above relational considerations, reminiscent of the masculinist bent of outdoor education culture described by Newbery (2003, 2004).

Further, the views expressed by participants about recreating and/or working with women add support to the findings of Davies et al. (2019) that beliefs about men and women's inherent physical abilities persist in the outdoor education field as do perceptions of inter-gender communication limitations. These persistent essentialist statements are problematic in that they contribute to intentional and unintentional discrimination in the workplace (Coleman & Hong, 2008; Newbery, 2003). Such views are particularly deleterious in outdoor education as they contribute to the hidden curriculum that values traditionally masculine traits and abilities (Allen–Craig & Carpenter, 2018; Kennedy & Russell, 2020; Lugg, 2003; Mitten, 2018; Newbery, 2003, 2004; Weaver–Hightower, 2010). The idea that men are more risk-taking than woman, it should be noted, demonstrates identification with hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987) and ignores how men are socialized and rewarded for taking risks that succeed and are less often and less harshly penalized for taking risks that fail than are women (Fine, 2017). As well, it overlooks the daily risks that women take simply by venturing outside given the preponderance of harassment and violence against women by men in the city (Solnit, 2014) as well as fears of the same when

outdoors (Howard & Goldenberg, 2020). Lastly, such dismissal of risk is associated with individualism and hierarchical values (Kahan et al., 2007).

The perception that men are less empathetic and risk-averse is also troublesome and indicates one's belonging to an in-group that demonstrates similar values (Kahan et al., 2007). Zack and North both called men-only spaces "affinity groups." Yet affinity groups, as defined by Ellsworth (1989), are typically seen as informal groups composed of people with "shared oppressions, ideological analyses, or interests" (p. 317) and their formation is functional in that they create spaces for the constituents to oppose oppressive structures and historical cultural constructions by the weight of their collectively defined position. Invoking the idea of an affinity group implies either these participants perceived themselves as somehow oppressed or they do not have a firm understanding of the nomenclature, While Ellsworth (1989) notes that membership in such groups can be overlapping and contradictory, those within the group share a common experience that is defined by some trait or identification. In the current context, use of the term serves to separate men from women, emphasizing an essential divide that may permit othering rather than a shared humanity.

Further complicating the issue, some participants such as Elijah and Zack, hold some essentialist beliefs while at the same time recognizing the social construction of gender norms and the need to work to combat them. For example, numerous participants mentioned "sharing the voice" as one way they work to address the silencing of women. Certainly, silencing of women has been identified as problematic in mainstream culture for years (e.g., West & Zimmerman, 1987) as well as in the outdoor education community where men's domination of conversations and women's socially inscribed feelings of self-doubt in this male domain have been described by Warren et al. (2018).

Levon, in addition to intentionally presenting non-traditional skills, also worked to ensure that he teaches the aspects of curriculum that address overt sexism and more subtle gender bias rather than leaving it for a woman co-leader to do so. Such endeavours are in line with the efforts of some male outdoor leaders to address inequity in their professional practice (Allen-Craig et al., 2020) by removing the burden from women to discuss gender issues. Further, they dovetail with calls for male allyship in outdoor education (Edwards, 2006).

At the same time, participants' overtures to "empower" their women co-leaders can be viewed as problematic. Asserting that one can empower another is, in itself, a self-aggrandizing and potentially patronizing statement. Employing a discourse of empowerment implies generosity on the part of the speaker and often ignores structural inequalities and impediments to individuals' agency (Gore, 1993). The use of phrases such as "sharing the voice" indicates that the power of voice is bestowed by those who are kind or enlightened, potentially leaving the biases of those doing the sharing unexamined (Ellsworth, 1989). Further, the singular nature of "the voice" being shared implies that those who are being empowered all have similar perspectives and experiences (Cook-Sather, 2007). The alleged empowerment the participants are offering their women colleagues could represent simply a reformulation of masculinity that, in the face of changing social norms, still maintains a privileged masculine status and subtly supports the gender order, resonating with Matthews and Channon (2019) description of the boxers in their study.

Students' Gendered Expectations

Consistent with the discussion in Chapter Four on perspectives on outdoor leadership in which participants argued that there has been a shift in the field to an increased focus on relational skills, five male OE leaders sought to take on more of the affective load. They,

however, encountered resistance when doing so. For instance, in trying to take on a non-

stereotypical role to support a student, Marcus found it difficult to gain her confidence when

talking about a personal subject:

> I've never really been uncomfortable with talking with female participants about their period and everything. Like, it's just, very matter of fact. Like, it happens, it's natural, no big deal. But, participants can really have some really strong feelings because of embarrassment, especially when they're younger. I had a participant one time, she had ...she got her first period on trip and it was, ... it was me and another guy guiding and she had no idea what to do. And I was like, "What's wrong?" and it took me about 45 minutes to an hour to just coax it out of her. And I was like, "Oh, that's no problem!" I kind of knew ... or, had a good sense of what was going on but I just don't want to assume. So it took me a while to get it out of her. And then I was like, "Totally natural, totally normal" and I talked to her for another hour and explained things. And then I was like, "We have pads and everything to take care of it." Then I showed her what to do ... well, how to dispose of it properly and all that.... And I think once you break that boundary, it just takes more time, whereas there's a, ... with female participants and a female staff member, there's this inherent bond of, like ... sisterhood, my sister always describes it as. You know, like, we're all going through the same thing ... or, have gone through it, so it's not as big a deal. Whereas men don't go through periods so it's, like, we don't have that lived experience.

Likewise, Oliver had tried to take on a non-traditional role by delivering the feminine hygiene

component of a course curriculum in order to break down barriers around men talking about the

topic, but found that there was greater comfort between women participants and instructors when

dealing with that topic:

> And maybe it's the extent of it, just seeing someone who looks like you and clearly fits into this, like, census block that you fit into, or whatever. I think also, a lot of the kind of, like, unfortunately we're actively pushing against the signals actually but a lot of the really basic taking care of yourself things that we teach, really, on [Outdoor Skills Co-op] courses that like are different for guys and girls, I think it is kind of important. Just in a basic level of trust and comfort to have women on the team to talk to how to pee outside as a girl or like deal with periods on courses and manage that kind of stuff. There's a [pause], I'm in a [pause], I've been facilitating these workshops out here right now for incoming students. We've been using this term, "speed of trust"—like, what is the speed of trust in relationships. And, I think there's a quicker speed of trust for women talking to women about those particular issues than it would be for … a 17-year-old woman to ask me about how to manage a period on a course. You know? … and we're trying to push back against that.

Gabriel confirmed Oliver's notion of "speed of trust" indicating that female students find it more difficult to relating to male OE leaders:

> I think it's very hard, it creates a different layer for them, for the female students for example, to identify with the male instructors. And ... yeah, I think it's the thing that the instructors each think about … and approach the problem and how we're going to avoid or how they're going to facilitate that on the course.

Still, students' pre-conceived perceptions of male instructors may be constructive on courses according to some participants. For example, Barry indicated that he needs to act in a stereotypically masculine manner, such as being stoic and using directive leadership, because, "there is practical value to some of those traditional ideas. And people want to see it, people need to see it" in order to foster confidence and allow participants to better engage. According to Barry, OE leaders must, at least initially, align with students' expectations before trying to challenge gender norms. Elijah illuminated the irony of such a situation: "It's almost a paradox because in an attempt to break down gender stereotypes you almost have to adopt a stereotype."

According to participants, students do bring gendered assumptions about men and women OE leaders with them on outdoor programs. As Liam related about adult students, "they still very much assume gender roles." He then related a story about a woman OE leader he knows who received no credit for her extensive technical skills on a course but was praised by participants for cooking a great meal. Tom, talking about younger students, shared that he noticed when a woman co-leader was assigned to an excursion, the "boys were more relaxed" although he did not elaborate. Mason stated that male students assumed that woman OE leaders would take on nurturing, maternal roles and the students seemed to enjoy that dynamic.

Participants shared other issues they noticed concerning students' gendered expectations of OE Leaders. Zack reported that women leaders are not perceived as having the same authority:

This is going to be super broad ... but I think female [students] feel safer when there's a female on the instructor team. I think male [students], ... I think it's natural for everybody to push on authority at a point in the expedition and I think that males could have the opportunity to push a little bit more if there's not a male in the instructor team.

Mason voiced concern that students respond better to males because "when you need something to get done, males are seen more as, like ... respect to authority and stuff like that." And George, who had only been with his organization a short time, noticed the pattern:

I know that the female staff do struggle with boys crossing boundaries and not showing respect. And I think part of it definitely lies ...part of it comes from the fact that they don't feel threatened by them and their whole ..., [students] have prejudice.

George then added that the women staff feel pressure to provide the curriculum, but thinks "a lot of that pressure is coming from [them] feeling like they don't automatically get respect and they need to become friends with the kids and ... not disciplining them." According to George, by attempting a more passive approach, women instructors also lose respect, creating a no-win situation for them.

Barry also noticed students' gendered responses and shared what happened on his most recent trip before our interview:

We noticed certain students would listen a little bit differently to me versus how they would listen to our female … leader versus how they would listen to our third instructor. And we had very distinct personalities. And it was only a couple students that we really noticed this where ... if I said something, it would elicit either an immediate or a much quicker response on the part of a couple of students versus when the course leader, our female course leader, said something. And we tested it a couple times, because we kind of saw it and we were like, "Let's test this. We want to kind of see what's going on here." They just wouldn't respond to her as quickly. And it could be similar, the same, information .... And ultimately they still did whatever we requested, or they would ultimately do something with that information. But the response time and the way that they responded to each of us was different enough that it was like, "Wait a minute, there was clearly a difference in how they responded."

Barry and his co-leader worked together to confront the situation, calling it to the attention of the students. He indicated that the students were apologetic, though he was uncertain about the longer-term impacts of their intervention: "They basically apologized and … I don't know how much insight we helped create but ... maybe a little?" Regardless, Barry felt that such interventions as a team were necessary because "that doesn't become a learning moment for the students until you actually point it out to them."

It is clear from what participants shared that they made efforts to address gender issues in a variety of ways. Some buck gender stereotypes by attempting to help students with menstrual issues on trail. Botta and Fitzgerald (2020) reported that women appreciated tips and help from other women as menstrual issues go well beyond how to use and dispose of tampons and pads. Indeed, menstruation causes many complications for women in the backcountry (Botta & Fitzgerald, 2020) for which men likely do not have the experience to give support. Further, Botta and Fitzgerald (2020) described issues with "creepy" men who their participants said followed them or made unwanted advances on the flimsiest of pretences, which may hinder female students' trust of male OE leaders. There was also little reflection by some participants about women's personal histories and experiences with men, which for good reason may limit their trust in a variety of ways.

As noted by participants, women lose status in the eyes of students because they are immediately marked as different and less capable in what is seen as a masculine domain (Jordan, 2018). However, they are also devalued when they attempt to act in a gender atypical manner (Cousineau & Roth, 2012; Jordan, 2018; Warren et al., 2018) and are repeatedly tested by students before trust is given (Allin & Humberstone, 2006; Oakley et al., 2018). Cox (2017) found that women's physical appearance, due to their often smaller physical stature, creates the

perception in men that they are less physically capable. Such gendered assumptions are prevalent

in the outdoors (Howard & Goldenberg, 2020) and male leaders remain more valued and

respected in the outdoor context (Cousineau & Roth, 2012). Women also face heavy social

consequences for challenging gender bias (Bell et al., 2018), which according to Barry and

Elijah, is also true of men who are forced to enact a more traditional masculinity to meet

participant expectations before they can contradict norms. While that may be accurate, it is hard

to see that the consequences for men are as severe as they are for women.

Admiration for Women Leaders

It is encouraging to see that, as called for in Warren et al. (2018) and documented in

Davies et al. (2019), participants in my study want to stand up and be allies of their women

colleagues and want to challenge sexism when they see it. Marcus indicated that he does his best

to step in when he hears participants telling sexist jokes:

> I always take the opportunity to, whenever someone makes an inappropriate ... or what I
> deem an inappropriate joke, or a misogynist joke, I always shut it down and I explain,
> like, "You can be better than that" and explain how it's, like, you know, negative and
> how you're just contributing to this toxic culture.

Marcus, Barry, Bruce, Elijah, and Levon all explicitly stated that they have challenged students'

inappropriate language or use of gendered stereotypes, reporting that their actions were out of a

sense of general empathy and a desire to see people treated more equally, as well as out of

respect for their co-leaders.

Liam's statement neatly encapsulates most of the participants' feelings about the respect

shown to women co-leaders:

> In my experience, a lot of times the male is viewed as the leader of the trip. And I
> think that's wrong because I've met more competent women than men in this
> industry, so I think ...., yeah, I've met some really cool … women in this industry,
> that are just, like, I can't hold a candle to what their abilities are.

The participants' esteem for their women colleagues was evident throughout the interviews as it was for women's competence overall. As Barry notes, on outdoor education courses,

> I also see countless young women out there just ... thrive. Please excuse the language but, kick the boys' ass ... physically and with the skills retention and use. And it's not an opportunity to make light of it, you know? It's ..., when I see that happen, I don't pull the boy aside and go [chuckles as he acts out an imaginary scene], "See what just happened?" But they see it, they feel it. It normalizes ... it brings a sense of ... equity ... and understanding that doesn't always need to be pointed out. And sometimes, it does.

According to Barry, as women colleagues and students demonstrate their abilities, they disrupt some of the essentialist notions about men's inherent strength and technical skill. Men find it more difficult to have such experiences and challenge gender bias on all-male trips, however. As Mateo suggested, "It's definitely harder to erase that in an all-male course because you don't have that female rock star that's charging up the mountain when some of the other guys are just huffing and puffing." Similarly, Elijah thought that women on outdoor education courses taking a stand against gendered harassment provided powerful lessons to men:

> I think it's also a great levelling ground for genders because women, young women especially, bring huge value to the team in their ability to call out ... especially young men and their bullshit. I see that a lot and it's humbling for those young men.

Again, it is encouraging that some participants are working to confront sexism.

Their stated commitment resonates with that of the participants in Allen-Craig et al. (2020) and may indicate a growing willingness amongst male OE leaders to recognize and address sexism. As found by Cousineau and Roth (2012), exposure to strong women leaders can change students' perceptions of gender and leadership, permitting more non-traditional gender performances. However, it is disconcerting that combatting sexism and gender bias is still seen as most effective when affected by women leaders and students, indicating that challenging such issues remains largely women's work (Gray & Warren, 2018). Further, the participants'

comments demonstrated that there remains a need for women to outperform men to be seen as equals by some colleagues and participants, consistent with assertions by Allin and Humberstone (2006).

Warren (1996) described this as the "superwoman" phenomenon, whereby a woman OE leader must "carry the heaviest pack with a smile on her face" (p. 15). The requirement to constantly operate at such a high level is problematic in that it causes some women to push beyond their physical and psychological limits, resulting in burnout (Oakley et al., 2018), and becomes the expected standard for all women (Rogers & Rose, 2019; Warren et al., 2019).

Despite the respect such performances can garner women outdoor leaders, being highly competent and affecting a more valued, traditionally masculine, role can cause women OE leaders to face ridicule and devaluation from both men and women (Cousineau & Roth, 2012; Newbery, 2004). Further, standing up for oneself by calling out sexist comments or behavior can result in poor evaluations from participants (Gray et al., 2020). Condescension and denigration by participants are not the only issues faced by women outdoor leaders; women outdoor leaders have also described being devalued in a number of ways by male colleagues (Avery, 2015; Davies et al., 2019; Oakley et al., 2018), to which I turn my attention next.

Devaluation of Women Leaders

I told participants about studies that found women OE leaders' felt devalued by male colleagues and asked if such issues were consistent with what they had seen and heard. Participants all expressed support for that claim, but often could not identify examples from their own experience. When asked, Roman stated, "It's not anything that I've seen, but I could imagine that being the case." Barry was more reflective on the topic:

> Yeah.... I'm not surprised by those studies. I'm not surprised by those outcomes, based on what I've heard ... and seen with my own co-workers, at times ... or heard

their stories. It doesn't ring true in my own experience. And when I say that, when I've been in the field, when I've worked with female leaders—with women leaders—that is not the feedback that I've heard from them, seen from them, or experienced them expressing. And I'm still not surprised. And I don't know how to reconcile that.

Barry's expressed dissonance may have revealed a blind spot that led to further reflection. However, in that moment he continued by devising a possible explanation for the devaluation of women by his colleagues, "I mean, it's one of those things. Too .... [laughs], there's still the asshole factor. In every workplace, there are always going to be bad apples."

Also considering possible explanations, while Mateo acknowledged gender bias, he also described the potential for such issues to be born out of status-based conflicts or insecurities misattributed to gender:

It definitely still happens. It definitely still happens at [Outdoor Skills Co-op]. It's something that we're working on. And I think every case is a little bit different, you know? I think sometimes it's definitely a gender thing, but we also often will have an instructor that's worked dozens of courses paired up with someone who's working their first or second course. And if that experienced person is a male and the new person is a female there's gonna be a lot …whether it's intimidation, just a lot … it's very different. In those situations, it isn't necessarily a gender thing, it's more just like, you're new and this person's super experienced and it takes more for those instructors to present themselves in a way that is balanced and kind of unified—especially to the students—to empower that newer person.

Oliver indicated that he felt similarly, stating:

Are these things happening that are, like, part of the structural assumptions we all hold about gender in the world? For sure, yeah. And, I think that two things are also happening concurrently. I think that what [Outdoor Skills Co-op] does, tries, in leadership and value, is actually becoming less masculine. And I think that folks who see themselves as less valued at an organization like [Outdoor Skills Co-op] and [if] they're a woman, and ascribe that entirely to … not entirely, but in part, to being a woman, I think that is … could still be true. And is less true every day.

Oliver went on to say that although he sees himself as very progressive, he feels that viewing the world through a gendered lens simplifies the issue:

I guess I'm trying to say is that … does this situation happen all the time at [Outdoor Skills Co-op]? I actually think that women in general are, like, rapidly being more

validated at [Outdoor Skills Co-op], like, every day. And part of that is because people are, like, learning to see the world through gender. And, like, only seeing the world through a gender lens is, like, super-depressing and actually, like … not accurate … or not entirely accurate. And so, saying that, like, I don't feel validated at this organization because I'm a woman is, like, you know, that is a story that whoever said that is telling themselves and, you know, it's probably partially true and, like, it's actually not entirely true.

Elijah also felt that gender is only one factor in women's feelings of devaluation:

So, like, is that sexism or is that just the stresses of the job? And sometimes men and women have to give feedback to each other and, even if that feedback is perfectly relevant and legitimate, unfortunately until men and women are ... truly in a position of equal power ... women are going to be able to say that it was, ... it could have been, because they just want to demean me as women. I'm not saying that in every case. I'd say that's very rare, but I'm just recognizing that that is possible and I've had some pretty demeaning feedback coming my way from both men and women. I've had some very valid and legitimate feedback come back my way from both men and women. But I do notice it, mostly with an older guard, an older generation of men who were not raised with these discussions being had and around them, who will accidentally ... if not accidentally, just ignorantly, say or discuss things with women or ignore what they have to say in a way that really does showcase that they are not entirely aware of their biases, you know?

According to Elijah another factor that might be at play, then, is differences in generational awareness (which I discuss in Chapter Eight). Elijah stated that older male supervisors often asked inappropriate questions about subordinate women OE leaders' sexuality or would sexualize them in their absence. These supervisors also likely decide staff assignments, which can be another venue where bias is demonstrated. Similarly, Sebastian indicated that although women are in demand in hiring, they often receive less prestigious or challenging assignments:

I know companies have been really struggling to get females on their staff. So, offering jobs? I don't think that's been an issue, from ... my perspective anyways. I've been looked over by ... employers for a female, mostly because they needed a female to run the ..., co-lead with a male, which makes sense. Yeah. As far as setting them up on trips goes ..., I have seen it where some employers will probably pick a male to lead a harder trip and leave a female to lead an easier trip.

Interestingly, Elijah also admitted to feeling sexual tension with female staff members,

indicating a sexualization of them:

> As a guy who is incredibly attracted to capable, fit, strong, assertive, confident women, I'm surrounded by that every day in my work, right? And I think a lot of other men who work in this field feel the same. That's an interesting question there around, like, how do you balance that ... you know? I think it just is important to recognize that there's often some tension there between male-female pairs that are heterosexual.

Another institutional factor was suggested by John Marshall who stated that his organization

failed to adequately support two women who accused a male OE leader of sexual harassment. He

reported:

> The level of support that came from the institution wasn't adequate. And so, I don't know if that would be any different, you know, given that the genders were switched, but I [pause], I think that situations like that definitely make female staff feel undervalued. Rightfully so.

Despite some participants trying to come up with alternative explanations for women's

feelings of devaluation, most did agree that women could be devalued in the field even if they

had not personally witnessed it. Some participants indicated that they had received feedback

from women co-leaders that changed their thinking and practice. Sebastian related his

experience:

> That's why I check in, because I've had that happen before. I've said something and to me, in my head, in my context, it was nothing. Like, you'd say it to your buddies. And, to them that's, "It's small, it's slight but it's really bothering me." And I've been told, "It has been bothering me for the past two weeks." [Makes a shocked face] "Why didn't you say anything?!?" So, out of sensitivity to that I've been treading a little bit more lightly. But I don't think I've ever intentionally said anything or done anything where I'm like, "You're a female, I've got to do this for you."

Oliver also described his experience receiving feedback from a woman workshop leader:

> I've been … culpable? Is that the right use of that word? Whatever. I've done that in the past and I've gotten feedback and, like, it's been checked. I like to think of a particular instance where … we do these …instructor development courses, basically. And I was a student on this instructor development course. A male and female … team, two people. And, this woman was just like, "On this course so far

every technical question has been asked to Jake and not me. And I just want to name that. And it doesn't make me feel good." And I was like, "Shit. Yeah, I'll own that." It sounds like that is what your experience has been. And, I've definitely done that and … like, that's something that I need to check myself on, for sure.

Giving and receiving feedback, as detailed in Chapter Four, is a valued professional practice and can help to spur reflection and improvement. However, as also mentioned earlier, recipients can choose to accept or dismiss feedback. Elijah described his experience receiving feedback about feelings of devaluation:

> I've heard cases of other colleagues—female colleagues—who have felt that their voices weren't heard. And I've even heard that from a very young intern who said to me, "Oh, sometimes I feel like you just don't listen to what I have to say" and I was, ... I felt terrible. So, I realize maybe this is just a subconscious bias. Or, maybe I was just way too freaking busy and my intern is an intern. Sorry! I'm sorry, like, I could've done better. I acknowledge that, right?

Elijah used status as a reason he disregarded the feedback, given it was coming from an intern. But it is not the only example of a male colleague rejecting female colleagues' feedback, as Elijah well knows. Recall the stories related by the Adventure Quest staff member who related her story while I observed Elijah whose one set of feedback to a colleague resulted in her being called a zealot and another time when her supervisor flatly denied her suggestions for logistical improvement. As noted earlier, supervisors assume transparency in feedback and debriefs, but a women OE leader could be excused for learning to censor her feedback. I wonder how Elijah's intern felt about his comment that he doesn't listen to what she says?

The examples above are demonstrative of the findings of previous research that men in general (Flood, 2019), and male outdoor leaders specifically (Davies et al., 2019; Flood, 2019; Gray, 2018; Howard & Goldenberg, 2020), do not register sexism and gendered harassment unless it is very blunt and overt. The examples also indicated that these men's blinkered viewpoint may be due, as Flood (2019) asserts, to a disinterest in or even an unwillingness to

more closely examine their own assumptions, such as when the participants presume to know women's viewpoints. The nuance required for considering nested power dynamics seemed absent in most of the interviews. Further, despite the definition provided in the Outdoor Skills Co-op reporting sheets, the unintentional nature of microaggressions (Martin et al., 2017) seemed to elude the participants from that organization.

Although the participants seemed sympathetic to gendered devaluation of their women colleagues, some still looked for alternative explanations. Those responses seemed to echo the findings of Macomber (2012) that even very progressive men look to deflect blame to others concerning gendered bias or harassment. Further, the sexualization of women leaders described by Elijah is consistent with that detailed in Davies et al. (2019) who described women OE leaders flirting with supervisors in order to find a way to relate to them and avoid ostracism and devaluation. Elijah's sexual attraction to some of his co-workers also likely contributes to that dynamic. Further, his mention of heterosexual attraction, but omission of non-heterosexual attraction in staff pairings may indicate the assumption of heterosexual "naturalness" (Hearn, 2004, p. 61), illuminating the heteronormativity that others have critiqued in the field (Russell et al., 2002).

That Sebastian and Oliver accepted direct feedback provided by women OE leaders may be a signal of professional responsibility given the centrality of feedback to outdoor education practice (Martin et al., 2017). However, that women leaders need to provide such direct feedback and that topics of devaluation and gendered harassment must be raised at all is telling. It also ignores the fact that many forces silence women in outdoor education (Bell et al., 2018; Gray, 2016; Gray et al., 2020; Warren et al., 2018), so likely not everything that could be said is actually being said to participants, especially considering how feedback can be ignored.

Language Use

In the interviews and during the few times I was permitted to observe participants, I witnessed some overtly gendered, and in some cases misogynist, language. For example, as mentioned in Chapter Five, militaristic terminology remains entrenched in the culture of two of the three organizations, Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op. In addition, both Liam and George from Camp Laviron used the terms "hard skills" and "soft skills" that are clearly gendered terms (Jordan, 2018; Kennedy & Russell, 2020).

Other, more casual, examples of sexist language were present during data collection. For example, Elijah complained of some students' "bitching and whining" and Sebastian noted that he had been told to "stop being a bitch and tough it out." When I was observing Roman, he and his co-leader discussed how many paddles to prepare for their next trip group. Roman's co-leader suggested not bringing a spare paddle. When Roman asked what would happen if they lost one, his co-leader replied, "Someone will just have to sit princess," which, in local parlance, means to sit in the middle of a canoe without paddling. The gendering in this statement is evident. Added to these are the violent phrases peppered through Oliver and Elijah's statements such as "kill it" (Oliver) and "crush it" (Elijah). The use of such language may not be gendered but indicates a general inclination of their language that associates success with violence. These are just a few examples of language I found to be problematic. It also must be noted that, as a man, I am less likely to notice gendered language and probably only identified the most egregious examples, as per Flood (2019).

Sometimes the language used may not be offensive *per se*, but the tone or the circumstance in which a comment is made is condescending. While observing Marcus, I noted that he was quite opinionated on many subjects. While cleaning and performing maintenance on

camp stoves, he complained to the site manager, a woman, about the types of stoves used, the use of donated backpacks, and the organization of the gear storage area. He offered suggestions for how all of these could be improved despite the fact that he was a seasonal employee. The site manager took his comments good-naturedly and responded to each, explaining her reasons for each decision.

These examples resonate with some of the outdoor education literature. Avery (2015) noted that she received slights through gendered language and comments from men who were her friends and who she considers quite progressive. Sometimes the slights were well intended, but were nonetheless condescending. Botta and Fitzgerald (2020) found that men regularly gave women hikers unsolicited advice or criticized their choices, thinking they were "helping" them. These men seemed unaware of how their tone or language could offend, which is in accordance with the idea that microaggressions typically discriminate or devalue unintentionally (Martin et al., 2017). Such microaggressions wear on those who are targeted, affecting self-esteem and self-perception of ability (Jordan, 2018). Further, the impact of women being exposed to gendered speech can result in diminished motivation and a weakened sense of belonging (Koeser & Sczensy, 2014). In this way, the devaluation of women leaders by participants or colleagues continues, and can be supported by the very participants claiming to stand up to sexism in others.

Summary

Participants indicated an awareness of various social issues, including White privilege, colonialism, and classism, perhaps in part because of their organizations' focus on such topics. Gender equity, too, has recently become more of a focus at outdoor education organizations. Participants largely attributed the recent focus on social issues to shifts in the culture. Such cultural changes may partly be the result of online activism and protests such as the #MeToo

movement. However, the perceived changes left many of the participants confused as to their roles and responsibilities, perhaps indicating that gender expectations are currently in a liminal space. The liminality of gender was evinced by participants' concurrent assertions of essential differences of men and women co-leaders, while participants described efforts to "share the voice" and confront sexist behaviours. Moreover, the expectations of students play a role, sometimes pressuring participants to act in a more stereotypically gendered manner to gain trust or status before they can contravene or critique gender norms.

The inconsistencies and contradictions present in some of the comments above are striking. While claiming to be allies, participants may continue to unintentionally do harm. Men, rather than looking to deflect blame or find alternative explanations, need to proactively examine themselves (Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Warren et al., 2018). As it stands, despite the imbricated forces acting to devalue and silence women and the recurrent lack of a receptive audience in men, women are forced to raise issues, risking upset to colleagues or participants, with resultant negative career implications (Gray et al., 2020). It is little wonder that Gray (2018) reports that women in the field suffer from feminist fatigue from chronically raising these issues. As Weiler (2017) stated, "women … can resist domination and oppression and they, as well as men, negotiate social forces and possibilities in an attempt to meet their own needs" (p. 281). But, as discussed, they may also flirt or self-censor to get by. Men, in order to meet their own need to be seen as just or honest, may fail to recognize or dismiss claims that they perpetuate gender inequity and harassment.

That women's complaints about their treatment continues to be deflected by some indicates, in the end, that gender bias is not really believed to exist. In her book, *So You Want to Talk About Race?* Oluo (2018) argues that when People of Colour claim something is racist, then

it is. Repeated microaggressions condition victims so that they are more aware of slights due to race (Oluo, 2018) and thereby, to use Oliver's terminology, they see the world through that lens. The same is likely true of gender and all oppressions. On social media, hashtags such as #Ibelieveher (Loney-Howes, 2019) resonate with Oluo's (2018) assertion. All participants claim to respect their women colleagues, but until women's self-censorship and the factors that contribute to it are addressed, the use of such hashtags and other such rhetoric by men are merely platitudes.

Lastly, gendered language persists in outdoor education contexts as demonstrated by interview responses and in my observations of participants. Such language demonstrates the persistent patriarchal influence in outdoor education culture and the gendered hidden curriculum described by Warren et al. (2018), including how a desire to gain or maintain status in the outdoor education context may lead to adherence to social norms around lexical practices. In the next chapter, I delve into status and how the desire for it influences masculinity in outdoor education.

Chapter Seven: Self-Promotion and Securing Status

In this chapter, the various strategies employed by participants to signal their status are discussed. The first is the use of hedging and contradictions in speech when talking about awareness of, and agreement with, progressive gender discourse. Later, participants' claims to traditional means of status (e.g., sporting prowess, intelligence, positional authority) are examined. Finally, the outdoor education subculture and its perceived separateness from mainstream society is considered for the enhancements and drawbacks to status attainment.

Hedging and Contradictions

The participants' desire to be seen as equitable and progressive caused some of them to engage in semantic hedging (that is, limiting their commitment to a certain argument by use of words that qualify the comment) or to use tentative language during their interview responses. It was clear that the participants were at times carefully crafting their statements as they spoke, as demonstrated by Marcus' preface to one of his responses, "Not in the, like, the sense that, like [pause], let me think how I want to say this."

Such tentative statements were common enough that I noticed their presence in the interview statements early in the data collection process. Another example of such a response is Oliver's double disclaimer before commenting on his perception of his feminine presentation within his heterosexual relationship: "And, I don't know if it's worth saying or not, but, I, like [pause] and this isn't like entirely true, but I remember saying one time to her, like, 'Man, sometimes I just feel like a lesbian, like a gay woman.'" Oliver's use of "I don't know," his repeated deployment of "like", and his statement that "this isn't entirely true" are all examples of hedges. Further, the worry about appearing ignorant or making a misstatement was palpable in many responses, particularly in those participants employed at Adventure Quest and Outdoor

Skills Co-op. Levon's disclaimer before a response provides a neat example of hedging in action, "Yes [pause], and this is stereotypical and probably not correct ... or, like, might, kind of, fall in the face of, like, bias or stereotypes."

Another tactic employed within interviews was for a participant to make a statement and then backpedal by immediately contradicting himself. A good example follows Oliver's quote in the previous chapter about seeing events through a gendered lens:

> And so, saying that, like, I don't feel validated at this organization because I'm a woman is, like, you know, that is a story that whoever said that is telling themselves and, you know, it's probably partially true and, like, it's actually not entirely true.

By contradicting himself, Oliver supports the assertion of gendered devaluation and refutes it in the same breath. Similarly, Elijah, provided an example of how the devaluation women feel is attributed to gender rather than unequal status or inability to take ownership of poor performance, but he then abruptly reversed course:

> She just didn't do a good job, man! Sorry, like, she just didn't do that great of a job, from my perspective. In terms of someone who's been delivering these programs for a while, has seen, delivered, has worked with exceptional, experienced guides, she was just too young. She really had that level of responsibility, not enough life experience, in my opinion. She did a good enough job ... What am I saying? Right?

Another example of hedging was when Mason made a generalizing statement about gendered changes to students' preferences for physical activities as they age, then changed his narrative to one of personal choice: "Especially when they get older I feel like they gravitate towards less ... intensive physical activities for females than … for males, they gravitate toward exhilarating things. Depends on the person, though. It really does." Barry, ordinarily quite self-assured in his interview responses, undercut his own statement about the devaluation of some traditional enactments of masculinity with the following statement, "And, I don't have a great example of that. Some of that is [pause] is just what we choose to celebrate, you know? I'm not

sure where I'm going with that." Barry, recognizing aloud that he had no evidence to support his claim, quickly rethought his commitment to his argument.

The impulse to contradict oneself may result from the current popularity of gender as a topic in popular culture as detailed in the discussion of #MeToo in the previous chapter. However, these speech patterns may also be related to professional expectations. For example, during my observation of Roman, he and his male co-leader discussed the route for their upcoming trip. As noted in an earlier chapter, the two planned a route with physical challenge to encourage reflection. At one point, Roman's co-leader paused and remarked that perhaps they should re-think the distances traveled as the boys they were leading were in their early teens. Roman responded that he was not worried and continued by saying, "By that age…" but then he stopped abruptly and said, "I guess it depends on the group, though." Given the topic here was difficulty of the excursion rather than gender, it suggests that these speech patterns may also be related to actively reflecting on and responding to peer or professional expectations more generally.

Hedging is the use of certain speech patterns that soften utterances by indicating uncertainty or hesitancy (Dixon & Foster, 1997). Dixon and Foster (1997) state that the desire to be polite is the primary reason for the use of hedges in speech. According to the authors, two main types of politeness exist pertaining to the use of hedges. The first is "negative politeness" that, out of respect for the audience of the speech, is used to avoid giving offense. The other is "positive politeness" where speech is modified in order for the speaker to be accepted by the audience. The idea of positive politeness dovetails with the findings of Markkanen and Schroeder (1997) who found hedging to be a strategy to protect the speaker from negative

judgements by others. The use of hedges permits the speaker to avoid being held fully responsible for their statements because they were expressed tentatively or without conviction.

Contradictions in speech serve a similar function. The use of contradictions is another method to ingratiate oneself with the audience (Power, 2004). Power (2004) found that participants' contradictory responses are typically a mix of aspirational and actual beliefs, with a participant reciting phrases they have heard in line with what the participant thinks they should say alongside their actual thoughts. Another explanation for the use of contradictions is offered by Pugh (2014) who states that contradictions in interview data "can act as a signal for conflict between the culture people hold onto tightly and the culture they perceive around them" (p. 162). In the current research, participants are attempting to navigate a new, post-#MeToo social environment that may differ from their habitual thoughts or practices. The use of contradictions can be an attempt to negotiate a path out of the conflict between previous and actual cultural expectations. Pugh (2014) asserts that such language indicates the complexity of the human cognitive experience while adapting to new norms. In this case, the conflict may exist between organizational norms and those of wider society. Alternatively, they may reflect the conflict between progressive and traditionalist masculine norms currently afoot in society (Messerschmidt, 2019).

Since the rise of the #MeToo movement in 2017, there has been greater discussion of gender issues in popular media and culture (Cover, 2019). Participants noted that, consequently, gender, as a topic, is in *vogue* at the moment. Oliver stated:

> It does seem like gender is the focus today and it does seem like men have been systematically privileged. And so … yeah, it's … it's an identity crisis. Not a crisis, but it's an inflection point in male identity, I think, for sure, right now in American culture.

As Oliver noted, masculinity and male identity have received considerable coverage in the

media. The recent spotlight on gender was mentioned in the Camp Laviron masculinity

workshop script:

> You've probably seen media coverage about masculinity in the context of sexual
> assault and the #MeToo movement, or male-led violence like mass shootings. You
> might have also heard about male rates of depression and suicide, or different ways
> that boys and men themselves are struggling. These conversations are part of the
> motivation to take masculinity more seriously at camp. (Camp Laviron curriculum
> document)

At the same time as masculinity is questioned in the media, certain leaders, such as former U.S.

President Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro, the populist and controversial president of Brazil,

both of whom are known for their bombast, embrace a dominating and hegemonic masculinity

(Messerschmidt, 2019). Simultaneously, public figures like Jordan Peterson and Steven Pinker

are lamenting the loss of essentialized masculine qualities (Messerschmidt, 2019). The multiple

discourses may cause confusion, as expressed by Roman who noted that it was an area that

deserved further attention:

> And there was a lot of talk in the media about what it means to be a man today and,
> to be honest, I really didn't have much of a clue ... and I don't really know, but I
> thought, "Oh, if I could somehow have that opportunity to work with, sort of, young
> men, maybe we could explore that conversation, have that conversation.

As noted by Oliver, Roman, and reflected in the Camp Laviron curriculum document,

masculinity has been an increasingly visible topic in the past few years. Although masculinity

has been examined before in popular culture (see: Bly, 1990), previous considerations were

focused on recapturing a lost masculinity due to the feminizing influence of modern society

(Greig & Martino, 2012; Kemper, 1990; Kimmel, 1995) rather than critiquing hegemonic

masculine values. Recently, even advertisements have critiqued the concept of toxic masculinity

(e.g., Gillette, 2019) and a number of books have recently been published critically examining

the topic of masculinity (e.g., Oluo, 2020; Plank, 2019; Urwin, 2016). In addition, popular stars of stage and screen such as Terry Crews, Justin Baldoni, Lin Manuel Miranda, Billy Porter, Jaden Smith, and Michael Ian Black have all publicly criticized stereotypical notions of masculinity, garnering significant attention. The fame and status of these men may shield them from negative consequences of questioning gender norms. Alternatively, given the ubiquity of the topic, these men may actually gain status by speaking out as some male anti-violence advocates have, demonstrating a "pedestal effect" whereby male activists are valued more than their women colleagues (Messner et al., 2015). Further, as noted by Elliott (2020) and McCormack and Anderson (2014), a more "open," progressive masculinity is becoming more valued.

Therefore, while all the participants are advocates of gender equity, they may also be seeking status for themselves or their organization (which, by extension, if they identify highly with the organization, is also partially about themselves). Status as a motivator is supported by the hedging and contradictions in participant responses perhaps designed to reconcile their statements with increasingly popular conceptions of open and inclusive masculinities (Elliott, 2020; McCormack & Anderson, 2014). Alternatively, they could be increasing their status within the outdoor education subculture via the mechanism of the pedestal effect. Interestingly, hedging and contradiction also may help to serve this latter purpose given these speech patterns have been more associated with women's communication styles (Dixon & Foster, 1997), which may help male OE leaders be seen as having increasingly valued relational skills.

Cultural and Class-based Capital

In addition to making hedged and contradictory statements, some participants also contradicted their claims of progressivism by seeking status for traditionally male behaviours or

traits. For example, eight of the participants took pains to establish themselves as being, or having been, athletes. Zack demonstrated this theme by indicating that before he started working in outdoor education, he had been an extreme sports enthusiast: "I was kind of more interested in the extreme sports side of things as a young male." Also looking to his past was Barry, who stated: "I was also an athlete as a kid. I played basketball intensely for a long, long time." Roman indicated that he has always been physically active, but when younger, "I excelled at sports in school, I was a bit of a ... not quite a jock, but I was a bit of a ... a bro." Roman indicated that he remains physically active. He demonstrated his physique when performing an inventory of outdoor gear before his trip by taking off his shirt, itself an act of status and security. Levon also stated that he engaged in sports and other outdoor activities: "And so, there was this element of ... yeah, I was still playing baseball, playing soccer, like jock over here, but also, like fishing over here which is another place, and, like go on some hunting with my friends a little bit ... and doing those masculine outdoorsy things."

Tom also indicated that he loved playing sports such as hockey, but really enjoyed the physical challenge such as when he participated in Camp Laviron's selective marathon (30+ hour) canoe race the previous year:

> I like to push myself. I don't know if you've heard about [the canoe race] ... we do from here ... So, like, paddle from here to [name of other location] and back. So I did that. I really like to, now and when I was one of the older age campers, I like just pushing myself to see how far I can go.

Mason reported that he had only come to enjoy physical activities recently, but immediately excelled once engaged:

> As a young kid, I always loved the easy activities. But, as I've grown up, it's been more of a shift towards the more physically exerting ones where ... for example, my last year as a camper .... in the second month of camp, I just tried climbing once, like outdoor rock climbing, and I loved it. So, I got a high-class award in it. It took me a week ... when normally it takes a lot of people a long time.

A few of the participants also indicated that they were exceptional athletes. For example, Liam

stated that he loved sports and "played a lot of hockey and a lot of high-level hockey for a lot of

years" and practiced a few times with his university team. Liam was also keen to discuss his

strength and skill in the outdoors, saying, "I can portage really far and paddle really far ... a lot

farther than a lot of people I know and I have very good technical skills."

> For his part, Oliver stated that he had been an accomplished athlete for many years:

> I grew up playing soccer at a really high level and up until about age 13, I was … all in on soccer, it was nuts. Like, gonna go play on the national team, like gonna kill it. Like, one of the best players in [name of city], doing … all the things that you do when you think you're really good at something. I was doing all those things … in a place where soccer is also a pretty big deal, which was interesting and different to most of the country, actually. But, yeah, I just, like, it took a long time for me to hit puberty. And during, like, ages 12 to 15-ish, I went from being someone who identified a ton with athletic achievement and was being affirmed for that in a really, really intense way, to falling behind. And, from the traditional American athletes' mindset from which a lot of my coaches were in, like, my body wasn't what it was supposed to be. So, I became marginalized pretty quickly. And this is … it was a really fascinating, so I'm looking back at … whenever I had European coaches they didn't care that I was small and whenever I had American coaches in soccer they cared a lot that I was small. And so, that that's a whole 'nother thing, but about that time I was getting really frustrated with soccer and really fell out of love with it. And that's when I got really, I went like pretty all-in on skiing.

Oliver stated that his athletic ability in soccer translated well to skiing and that he has "always

been, kind of, right on the edge of skiing professionally in a bunch of different contexts. And,

like, doing videos." The devaluation of him by some of his American soccer coaches because of

his small stature and his high achievement in skiing has led to him to desire recognition for his

athletic abilities:

> And, I need to be affirmed for my athleticism. I need that to feel whole, I think, still. It's something I'm working through, but it does seem like something that's part of masculinity for me is being an exceptional athlete, despite not fitting the image of an American athlete.

George had likewise prioritized athletic achievement and enjoyed the status it afforded him at his boarding school. However, some recent injuries had curtailed his playing career:

> My injuries were very tough for me because … I shared a lot of my ... my masculinity and my self-confidence around my sport. And then, I had two operations on my shoulder and then I had a really severe concussion last year so I had to stop playing rugby … It was just a year ago I was playing high-level rugby and feeling as masculine as ever, so I ..., it's hard for me because I want, I feel like I want to display that toughness and stuff to everyone else, but I don't have too much to back it up with, not going on canoe trip, not able to play sport with all the guys.

Other participants indicated that they valued intelligence and critical thinking. Elijah claimed to have read a great deal on a variety of topics. For instance, he took pains to tell me that he had, "studied a lot of city planning and urban issues" while completing his undergraduate degree, had read "studies and stuff" about gender issues and climate change, and had also spent "way too much time studying the fate of the planet and human civilization." He also referenced Kurt Hahn's concept of the six declines. John Marshall, still in high school, stated his love of "academic stuff, like math and science" as well as music and theatre. When I was talking about why I was doing this research, Marcus told me that he had "read a lot of the studies on women in the outdoors" and that the dearth of studies about men in outdoor education motivated his participation in my research. Zack went a step further, equating critical thinking with masculinity: "I think what it means to be a man is to be ... a critical thinker."

Interestingly, two participants who claimed to have demonstrated exceptional achievement in sport also indicated a detachment from studiousness or intellectualism. Liam stated that he loved to read, but also related a story about his undergraduate experience, before he transferred to major in outdoor recreation when he felt that he was different from the other students in his classes. He complained to his father that, "My program sucks, all the kids in it are really quiet and bookish and not at all like me." Similarly, George reported a physical separation

between the athletes at his school and those more focused on academic achievement. He stated, "I was in the boarding houses where generally, where the sportsmen went, because they were at school until late and ... a lot of the more academic guys wanted to stay at home." George stated that the athletes tended to socialize at the boarding houses, a haven for the sportsmen. The domination of the boarding houses by the sportsmen provided a physical separation between those who are rewarded for physical skill and those who are more scholastically focused. The separation George indicated seems to signal a social divide between the two groups since he did not indicate there was any overlap. George continued, stating openly what traits were most valued:

> So, there was a big split at my school. I probably didn't get to see another aspect of how things worked because we were very … The boarding houses were where we went every break time, every open period. And they tended to be where all the jocks went and all the most … socially powerful people.

Despite the split indicated by some between the valuation of the physical and the intellectual, other participants highlighted their educational attainments and qualifications. As noted above, Oliver referenced his graduate degree from a prestigious university. Zack similarly proclaimed his master's degree and named professors with whom he had studied. Bruce reported that he had earned a philosophy degree and North offered that he had taught courses at his university during his undergraduate degree, and stated that recently, "I've also taught three courses now for [name of college]. So, I've been... back in the university world a little bit, the last couple years."

Participants also mentioned prestige positions at work, which may have been a bid to increase their masculine status in my eyes. Barry stated that he would soon be taking up a leadership position at an outdoor organization: "I'm working in a leadership position shortly in ... a human and social services company that supports people with developmental disabilities and builds programming to support them in their communities." Marcus accentuated his "lead"

instructional position at Adventure Quest and indicated that he had held managerial positions at summer camps and other organizations. Likewise, Sebastian shared that he was the Head Instructor at a local conservation authority. Levon noted that he had attained a nearly full-time position with his organization, which he considered "the pinnacle of the profession." Liam also emphasized the importance of his position when he stated, "I am in the position to impact a lot of young lives … in the course of my time." Like participants' involvement in sports, some referenced previous positions that gave them status. Elijah highlighted his earlier participation in a very selective cadets outdoor program that subsequently permitted him to take on a supervisory role. He also mentioned that he had recently quit a lucrative marketing career to pursue a teaching certification. Similarly, Roman stated that he had quit a prestigious finance career to become an outdoor education leader.

Some participants underscored the cachet conferred by their experience in the field. Barry observed, "I did the math earlier this summer because it just kind of interested me. I will hit 800 field days this summer." Levon indicated the weight his level of experience gives to his opinions in the outdoor world:

> I'm talking from the perspective of a person who has 400 weeks in the field and 20, almost 20, years of experience at [Outdoor Skills Co-op], so I can say these things ... that … I recognize that there's, like, a positional authority there, or power.

Interestingly, some participants commented on the compensatory effects of various status markers, providing a mechanism to offset failings in other traditionally masculine domains. George expressed his frustration at his loss of physical ability due to his injuries and stated that he thought he enacted a more authoritarian leadership style with his students than he would have previously in order to recapture lost status and respect. Nonetheless, George was sanguine about

his situation, seeing it as an opportunity to reframe his perspective and his masculine

performance:

> I think if I was still playing ... if I was still playing high-level sports and feeling really, really confident about my traditional masculinity I don't feel like there'd be too much need for me to accept the diverse ways of thinking about it. But I'm definitely, I've been really open and really eager to learn more about the masculinity that's displayed at camp and positive masculinity and all that.

George's comment indicates that he now looks for other ways to affirm himself and achieve

status within the Camp Laviron community. When asked if declining physical capacity due to

age and injury had made him think differently about leadership or masculinity, Mateo stated that

it was his managerial position and experience with the organization where he worked that made

him feel less status-conscious:

> I don't think the injuries have been as much of an issue as … I think … becoming more confident. I think when I was newer, I had this, like, lack of confidence and feeling like I needed to prove myself. Like, I'm young, I'm new in this industry, I need to show that I know what I'm doing. And I think over time I'm just kind of, like, I wouldn't be here if I didn't know what I was doing, you know? We're a well-known organization and you've paid a lot of money to be here and get instructors, and I think I'm kind of over that feeling like I need to make a first impression and show them that I know everything. So, I think it's easier for me to be quieter and more humble. And for me it's just feeling more secure in who I am.

Oliver shared that, for him, physical ability was one avenue to gain a sense of self-worth,

but so too was intelligence, both of which have gotten wrapped into his masculinity:

> I think that that all is wrapped up in this idea of being a man in America. And, I do see that as, like, a really big part of who I am, both, for the better and for worse. Like, there's a reason why, despite mostly staring at computer screens all day and reading philosophy, my Instagram is only rock climbing photos, you know? You would never know I was in grad school if you looked at my Instagram and it's because I need that social affirmation with athletic endeavors more than anything else to feel good about myself as a man in this world, or whatever. Yeah, and I think my two … my two biggest, … my two biggest, like, insecurities, I think, are both, … more masculine insecurities, like, athleticism and intelligence. And those two things … I've been working through for a long time and … I think that I need, like, external affirmation to feel … to feel whole with both of those things. Which is why, you know, I chose to, blow another $20,000 to get a degree from [Ivy League university] this past two years.

> Because, like, I like need that to feel … like whole. Whether masculine or not, it seems like, generally, those are masculine but … yeah. I think those are the two ways that masculinity presents as, like, insecurities that I like to get external affirmation for, to … to, like, feel like a good man.

Oliver stated that he felt physical and intellectual insecurity based on his previous experiences being devalued by soccer coaches and that fierce academic competition during his undergraduate degree had made him feel academically disparaged. He needed to demonstrate his worth in both domains in order to feel adequate as a man.

Attaining higher status is seen to be a universal human desire (Anderson et al., 2015) and striving for rank among colleagues and peers is one form of competition that can confer greater self-esteem. However, unless one is placed at the very top or very bottom of a hierarchy, it can be difficult to determine where one stands (Kemper, 1990). Sports and athletic prowess remove such uncertainty through competition, giving those who participate opportunities for dominance and eminence. They are also widely esteemed in society and considered valued masculine attributes, possession of which itself confers status by all social classes (Connell, 2005; Kehler, 2010; Kemper, 1990; Matthews & Channon, 2019). This is particularly true in the outdoor education context (Newbery, 2003), so it is easy to see why the participants highlighted their physical abilities in their interview responses.

As mentioned in the methods chapter, all but one of the participants are White, middle- and upper-class males. Their collective participation in sport is not surprising, then, as the more affluent are more likely to participate in sports generally, particularly those that involve greater financial investment in equipment and other related costs (Wilson, 2002). However, the participants did not indicate any involvement in "prole" sports; that is, those associated with the lower class such as bowling or auto racing (Wilson, 2002). Bourdieu (1978) suggested that the middle and upper classes often avoid contact sports. It may seem odd, then, that three of the

participants at Camp Laviron indicated participation in ice hockey (Liam and Tom) and rugby (George), both known to be hard-hitting sports. However, some research (Erickson, 1996; Gemar, 2020; Peterson, 1997) demonstrated that, although the middle and upper classes formerly practiced snobbery and disdain for activities they viewed as common, they now take the approach of being a "culture omnivore" (Wilson, 2002, p. 14).

The cultural omnivore has more varied and eclectic tastes, no longer limited to "highbrow" leisure, but able to engage with "middle brow" and some aspects of "lowbrow" tastes (Bryson, 1996; Wilson, 2002). By increasing the breadth of their interests, cultural omnivores increase their cultural capital and are more able to drift between multiple social networks. That said, cultural omnivores maintain their dislike of leisure forms most associated with the least educated and limit their association with such pursuits (Bryson, 1996; Wilson, 2002). Because of its physical aggression, Wilson (2002) contends that the ice hockey some participants play could constitute a "prole" sport. However, the associated expense (Wilson, 2002) as well as ice hockey's status as an emblem of normative Canadian Whiteness and heterosexual masculinity (Krebs, 2012) likely makes it more attractive to cultural omnivores. Rugby similarly signals a largely White middle- and upper-class nationalistic and colonialist masculinity for many commonwealth countries (Chandler & Nauright, 2013). Both ice hockey and rugby have become acceptable for the White, middle- or upper-class cultural omnivore and confer both cultural capital and masculine status.

Other participants (Bruce, Dan, Elijah, Levon, Mason, Mateo, North, Oliver, Roman, Tom, and Zack) indicated that they participate in adventure sports such as rock climbing, skiing, mountaineering, and others (Fletcher, 2008). Multiple participants claimed to participate in a number of these sports, consistent with Fletcher's (2008) finding of a synergy between these

activities. Such adventure sports tend to be associated with educated, white-collar professionals, which Fletcher (2008) refers to as the professional middle class. Moreover, participation in these sports is a predominately a White endeavor and these activities have been criticized for drawing on a colonial notion of adventure and exploration (Braun, 2003; Coleman, 2002). Adventure sports are also thought to embody neoliberal values of individualism, competition, and self-improvement through challenge (Kusz, 2004; Simon, 2004).

Combined, the sports the participants mentioned tend to resonate with a White, heterosexual, classed, colonial, hegemonic masculinity (Atkinson & Kehler, 2010; Chandler & Nauright, 2013; Fletcher, 2008; Krebs, 2012). Further, middle- and upper-class participation in sports is viewed as a method to fashion future leaders, with a focus on individual excellence and strategic superiority (Kemper, 1990). The sports mentioned by the participants, then, also generate cultural capital that can later be transformed into economic capital through access to high-status social networks, which open doors to valued educational and employment options (Fletcher, 2008).

Liam and George both indicated a continuing devotion to sporting masculinity. Especially at younger ages, physical ability and sporting masculinity are most valued (Atkinson & Kehler, 2010) whereas for middle-class men who are finished schooling, career success, as a proxy for sport in its competition for status and dominance, becomes more of a personal focus and status marker (Kemper, 1990). However, Liam stated that his diagnosed ADHD had limited his academic achievement, so this avenue of gaining status via academic success had been significantly obstructed for him. For George, the physical separation of rugby players and more academic students represented a divergence of focus at George's school. He noted that he had focused on rugby, which provided higher status in that context at that time. However, George,

due to his injury, was looking for other outlets that could provide him masculine status and fulfillment. George's trajectory mimics that of Sparkes (1996) who played rugby in college, but had his career cut short through injury. Sparkes (1996) described his confusion of identity following the injury, and consequent exclusion from the sport. Following the injury, Sparkes (1996) bemoaned his physical "fragility" (p. 485) as a feminized position and described his use of academic success as a compensatory mechanism to try to reassert his authority and status, similar to George's statements. Though asked specifically, no other participants indicated that injury or physical limitation due to age had shaped the way they practiced outdoor leadership or thought about their masculinity, somewhat contradicting findings from Thorpe's (2010) study of masculinity in snowboard culture.

The loss of physical ability and consequent "fragility" (Sparkes, 1996. p. 485) can also be read through a heteronormative lens. George cannot participate in backcountry canoe trips due to his injury and must stay at the camp's base site, which is more comfortable (i.e. it has cabins, flushing toilets, and prepared food). Stoddart (2011) notes that the backcountry is perceived as masculine terrain and associated with adventure sports. Being separate from this context may feminize George and others who no longer go to the backcountry due to their organizational roles, encouraging them to reassert their sporting masculinity. However, Stoddart also suggests that adventure sports are heterosexualized due to their association with risk, and Waitt (2008) notes that certain spaces within an adventure sports activity can act as symbolic boundaries between heterosexual and non-heterosexual. In Waitt's research, skilled surfers who surf the larger waves are deemed heterosexual whereas those who surf the smaller whitewater waves are deemed as feminized and non-heterosexual. Similarly, Stoddart (2011) found that backcountry skiing was seen as more associated with White, heterosexual masculinity than skiing at resorts,

due to the skill, risk, and physicality required. Kidd and Mason (2019) argue that such skills and enjoyment of the backcountry is also heterosexualized in camp and outdoor education settings. These assertions dovetail with the findings of Barnfield and Humberstone (2008) who detail the pervasive heterosexism in the outdoor education field and how LGBTQ+ outdoor professionals engaged various strategies to avoid having their sexuality identified and being stigmatized as a result. Further, they found that outdoor professionals avoided challenging heterosexism as doing so can also result in devaluation by association with the LGBTQ+ community (Barnfield & Humberstone, 2008).

Both physical ability and intelligence are valued by the middle class as success in both demonstrates that one is a well-rounded individual (James, 2012), garnering one more cultural capital. In society more generally, however, possessing intelligence can label one as effete (Connell, 2005). Such remains the case in schools (Bergold et al., 2019), and Brookes (2003) contends that intellectuals were disdained as soft and weak by early founders of the outdoor education field, a feeling, he contends, that largely persists in the subculture. Within the middle and upper classes, however, intelligence can indicate earning power (Prokosch et al., 2009), providing opportunities for status and dominance although such dominance often takes a long time to surface (Kemper, 1990). The immediate status gained by physical ability is offset by what can be acquired over time as physical capacity dwindles, a balance that serves middle- and upper-class men well (Kemper, 1990).

Demonstrating a reversal of that compensatory function, Mateo seems to indicate that the high status and security of his position provides him the flexibility to depart from masculine norms. This dovetails with assertions that those with enough masculine status may be able to depart from masculine norms with little or no penalty (Connell, 2005; Kemper, 1990; Risman,

2018). Further, although physical toughness and strength are stereotypical masculine norms, notions of strength are mediated by class and can translate to physical, financial, or social influence (Courtenay, 2000; Kemper, 1990). As well, that middle-class men value personal achievement means that a commitment to work and organizational norms brings them positional status in their profession and recognition from peers (Whitehead, 2003). Therefore, adherence to organizational training and values about masculinity or gender equity may likewise afford OE leaders status.

That many participants lauded their own intelligence, positions of influence, and leadership also demonstrates an adherence to a stereotypically middle- and upper-class masculinity (Whitehead, 2003). In addition, the frequency of such statements is consistent with research findings that men self-promote more often than women (Exley & Kessler, 2019). Moreover, due to gender norms that valorize male self-confidence and punish self-effacement (Rudman, 1998), men receive social rewards for doing so (Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010). Accordingly, the participants demonstrate an adherence to gendered social norms through such enactments as well as the value placed on intelligence and physicality.

Middle-class men in the West tend to value logic, reason, ambition, adventurousness, and leadership (Whitehead, 2003), all of which have been celebrated by participants, in one or another form, in the preceding paragraphs and chapters. The values reported by Whitehead (2003) and Courtenay (2000) still seem to resonate (Ingram & Waller, 2014) and dovetail with participants' responses. However, Risman's (2018) research on young adults' views on gender found that they claim to favour more egalitarian gender roles and stated egalitarian attitudes, which may further enhance their status; that dovetails with the findings of Lilleaas (2007). Risman (2018) also found that the young adults in her research highly valued individualism

(Risman, 2018) due to their upbringing in a strongly neoliberal context, which is considered in the next section.

Uniqueness and Separation from the Mainstream

Participants made efforts to claim uniqueness in a variety of ways. As noted above, some claimed high achievements in sport, academia, or in their career. Other differentiated themselves in other ways. For example, Marcus claimed that at his university his program of study was unique to him, permitting him to double-major in history and outdoor recreation. When I asked if he continued with the double major throughout his time at university he responded, "Yeah, all the way through. I was the only person in my specific program." Elijah indicated that he socialized with a variety of people and was able to fit in seamlessly with all while not committing to any exclusively. He stated, "I kind of ... float ... I kind of consider myself a bit of shape-shifter in that way." Gabriel reported that a "curious" thing about him was that he had been groomed for the priesthood from a young age until his early teens. Zack claimed an unusual combination of technical and relational competencies as an outdoor leader, although he also admitted, "But maybe I just like to think I'm unique in that."

Uniqueness extended, for some participants, to a lack of knowledge or avoidance of popular culture. Levon stated that he did not have extensive pop cultural reference points because, "I did not grow up around television, like, I spent a fair amount of time outdoors." Likewise, Mateo noted that, "I'm not that great with popular culture." North, discussing media representations of masculinity noted, "I don't have TV, so I don't know exactly what the new shows are showing, but I'd imagine it probably hasn't changed a whole lot." Curiously, however, North also stated that Kanye West and Kim Kardashian's daughter's name was the inspiration for his pseudonym.

Further, several participants viewed themselves as non-conformists who defy conventional expectations and dislike institutional constraints, perhaps demonstrating a masculinity informed by neoliberal ideology and spurious notions of freedom similar to the frontier ethos (Kimmel, 1995). North indicated that he had gone against the grain after completing university: "When I graduated, [I] just looked for outdoor jobs. While everybody else was cutting their hair, and trimming their beard, and putting on a suit for interviews, I was doing the opposite. And ... then [I] moved into my truck." Liam stated that he was not interested in traditional teaching because of the limitations imposed: "I could never see myself working in, like, a high school or a middle school. Every day, sitting in a classroom, four walls, windows ... that kind of thing? Stifling for me." Marcus related a story of a teaching placement during his Bachelor of Education. He stated that his associate teacher had to take unplanned leave. Marcus described his conflict with the school's administrators over his intention to continue teaching his planned unit without support:

> And they were like, "Well, you don't know anything." I'm like, "Screw you. Yes, I do!" ... And I taught the unit and it was ... that's how it should be. Like, I was teaching. I did it my way, you know? I worked within the system but it was how I wanted to do it. It was really sweet.

Levon and Elijah also both stated that they like to defy conventional norms of dress when not working in an outdoor education context. Levon wears colourful hats that elicit comments when he is shopping. Elijah reported, "I have nothing wrong with partying in my leggings and wearing jewelry at a dance party. Like, I think it's fun to play dress up but only because I like to, kind of, challenge societal norms a little bit, when I'm comfortable and when I'm around people who are into that." For Liam, enrolling as a student in outdoor recreation was an act of defiance. When discussing his academic challenges at university with this father, Liam suggested a change of major, "And my slightly oppositional, defiant side was like, 'Outdoor Rec looks awesome.'"

Outdoor education is seen by some participants, such as Gabriel, as different or separate from mainstream society. Elijah agreed, stating, "I have so many great stories. The unfortunate thing is, it's really hard for regular people to relate." When asked if he thought outdoor education people were different from those he has met elsewhere, Mason replied, "Yes. One hundred percent … The typical camp person is more energetic, outgoing than the normal person." Liam and Levon both indicated that they thought people who work in outdoor education tend to be more open-minded about social issues than people working in other industries. Barry concurred, stating,

> I've had more than a few where I've talked about some of these topics, or some of the initiatives towards equity, that companies that I've worked for are doing and I'll share this with, you know, friends of mine that are architects, or engineers, or teachers. And, generally the response I'll get is something along the lines of, like, "Whoa, we're not doing anything like that!" Or, like, "Wow, that seems really strange!" … I do think the outdoor industry is on its own, in some ways. I don't know that to be one hundred percent true, but that's my sense.

George agreed with Barry's assessment and suggested that gender roles are more blurred in outdoor education culture, claiming, "It's much less black and white than it is in the outside world." Roman thought that those in outdoor education are more connected to nature:

> People who are actually actively involved in outdoor education, I think, are having different conversations. The general conversation seems to be ... how can we reconnect ourselves and … youth and adults to the natural world in order for them to appreciate it and to want to look after it and work with it?

Gabriel and Levon indicated that individual outdoor activities also have their own specific cultures. Gabriel noted that paddling and hiking are more relaxed, whereas mountaineering is an aggressive culture. Levon stated that climbers have their own specific culture, separate from the mainstream and unique within outdoor education or recreation. Elijah stated that, although he feels social media is a negative force, he recognizes he could easily gain status by sharing the

photos of his work in beautiful outdoor spaces, which is different from where his friends work. Such photos would demonstrate:

> "Look at my life and how awesome it is! Aren't you jealous?" Like, my life's amazing, man! From pictures? If I was to take a picture of every day and share it ... people would be like, "Holy fuck! [Elijah]'s life is the coolest thing! What am I doing with my life?"

Notably, two participants disagreed with the idea that outdoor education had separate values and culture from mainstream society. Dan, who was an undergraduate student majoring in outdoor recreation, does not perceive outdoor education as separate from mainstream society: "I always like to try to get people off the word of saying we're not in the 'real' world in a camp setting or an outdoor setting because we are. We're in the world, we're just not in the city centre." However, Dan does acknowledge that people may feel pressure to act differently when they leave the outdoor education context. Similarly, Oliver stated that his friendship group and peers at university all have a similar mindset to what he had experienced in outdoor education contexts; therefore, he does not see much of a difference.

Sebastian summed up the feelings of a majority of the respondents when he detailed some of the differences between the outdoor education culture and wider Western culture:

> I wouldn't ever go up to somebody and be like, "Hey. Sebastian. He/him." Like, what?!? But, then again, there's a lot of stuff that ... like on-trip behaviour that you don't use in the real world ... and I've come to terms with that as well. Like, you don't bring your hiking shoes to a business meeting.

Sebastian's comment on context-appropriate clothing draws focus to the outdoor education mode of dress. Liam stated that people in outdoor education dress for "more function than fashion" and stated that those who work in a city might consider outdoor educators' clothing choices odd. However, Zack noted that each occupation has its own mode of dress and that functional outdoor clothing is as specific to an outdoor leader as a suit is to a banker. Liam also stated that there was

pressure amongst outdoor educators to have certain gear and present in a certain subculturally valued way. In Chapter Five, Gabriel noted that different modes of dress exist at different outdoor organizations. However, when asked if there is a typical physical appearance of men working in outdoor education, many participants stated that people outside of the outdoor education community would indeed recognize the stereotype. Marcus stated that the idea of the lumberjack-like outdoorsman was outdated, but admitted that he had only just recently shaved his beard and often wore plaid.

Four participants indicated that there was no special look to outdoor educators and that there was great variation between individuals in outdoor education. It is worth noting here that every male outdoor educator I interviewed did indeed look very similar. All participants but Tom had slim, muscled builds, all wore their hair in the current "high-and-tight" fashion or had long hair (except two who had very short/shaved hair due to baldness or thinning hair), had stubble or a beard, wore a cotton or technical (i.e. sweat-wicking) t-shirt or collared shirt, and wore shorts or technical pants (except Elijah and Marcus who wore corduroys and jeans respectively). Some, like Bruce, acknowledged that there is an unofficial uniform in the outdoor education field, "I think I'm wearing it. Button front and Patagonia shorts and Patagonia shirt. I'm totally wearing the uniform, today! And a pair of Keen sandals!" Zack agreed, stating that there is a context-specific norm around appropriate dress in outdoor education, the same way that there is one in banking.

Twenty years ago, Humberstone (2000) asserted that outdoor education is a subculture, with specific values and practices that differentiates it from mainstream society as does its often-remote location, and I would argue that claim remains accurate. Wall (2008) found in her study of summer camps that a common view exists that people are "real" in an outdoor education

setting whereas those in an urban setting are artificial. Barnes (2003) agreed about the distinctiveness of outdoor education, claiming that the outdoor education community sees itself as separate from mainstream society and often critical of the predominating norms. Such a mistrust of mainstream culture is evinced in some of my participants' rejection of popular media. Oakley et al. (2018) also assert that the outdoor education field tends to encourage individualism and autonomy, a claim that mirrors the middle and upper-class focus on individual success (Kemper, 1990) that shaped the field and remains prominent (Warren et al., 2018).

Individualism is also a prominent norm espoused by youth, shaped as they were by the neoliberal context (Risman, 2018). This, Risman (2018) concluded, is a result of the predominant neoliberal culture in which today's youth have been raised that champions individual responsibility and individual expression. Ironically, the emphasis on individualism and challenging mainstream culture can lead to the creation of subcultures that have their own norms, and these can get wrapped up with capitalism. Payne and Wattchow (2008) state that the increasing commercial influence in outdoor education leads to highly marketed fashion and gear that is widely accepted by the field. That claim is supported by participants' responses to the stereotype of how male outdoor educators dress, particularly Bruce's brand-focused detailing of his "uniform" That reveal how consumption, in line with neoliberalism, helps to gain subcultural status. A contradiction arises here where a (neoliberal) ethic of choice is valued but the choices are limited to preferred suppliers that becomes a subcultural uniform that identifies wearers as apart from the mainstream. Reilly and Blanco (2019) argue that men use clothing to demonstrate their acquiescence to a notion of masculinity that is shared in specific local contexts but nonetheless informed by globalizing influences. Not writing about outdoor education specifically but mentioning other contexts like treeplanting and military survivalism that also involves

camping and working outdoors, Pini and Mayes (2019) assert that rural masculinities are defined in relation to, and apart from, urban masculinities.

The individualism and rejection of authority asserted by some participants could be read as demonstrating the masculine independence described by Kimmel (1995). Similarly, the preference for outdoor work instead of indoor classroom teaching could demonstrate a rejection of the feminized profession of teaching (Skelton, 2007), of indoor work that has been seen as feminized since the Industrial Revolution (Kimmel, 1995), or of non-conformity to patrimonial rules (Roediger, 1999). In some ways, participants' assertions of non-conformity contradict their adherence to the norms of the field (e.g., dress, professional practice) as well to organizations (e.g., organizational principals, training content). However, identification with the field and the organizations, all of which are large, established brands in outdoor education, may mitigate the loss of status some experienced by being an outdoor educator. As noted in the literature review, outdoor education struggles for legitimacy. Programs have been recently defunded in Ontario and beyond, there is debate whether outdoor education can correctly be called a profession (Dyment & Potter, 2015), and authors such as Brookes (2003) claim that the outdoor education culture is anti-intellectual. Other research reported that outdoor educators feel as though they are devalued compared to classroom teachers (Gunn, 2006; Thomas, 2001).

The perceived lower status of outdoor education was confirmed by multiple participants. Levon, when in school, saw outdoor education as a separate and nearly shameful part of his identity:

> I was in high school and my friends weren't doing this stuff. It was still ... definitely a part of my identity. Like, "Oh, Levon, are you becoming or a granola, or a crunchy or a hippie?" My friends would ask me that stuff. And, of course, I would vehemently deny it.

In a quote earlier in this chapter, Liam told his father that he wanted to switch his major to

outdoor education as an act of defiance. In response, Liam's father asked him why he was

hesitant to transfer if he would enjoy the program more. Liam answered, "Because that's an

absolute burner degree. Like, what am I going to do with that?!?'"

Elijah stated that his family and friends did not understand his career decision:

> I think it's really hard for people who don't do this work to understand why we do it. Most people would never even do one of these courses if they had to, you know? And so, they just don't understand why someone would do this for a job.

Marcus and Bruce likewise stated that their families did not understand their choice of work. As

Bruce said, when he told them of this career choice his family and friends asked, "Why on earth

would you do that?" Levon stated that outdoor education was never presented to him as a career

option. The opportunity to hike for a living was appealing even if the pay was low:

> I was flipping through a catalogue for ... a forestry program ... or a school with a forestry program … And I was like, "Adventure education? What's that?" And I was like, "Backpacking? I can get paid to go backpacking?" I didn't know how much it was that I'd get paid.

Bruce also mentioned the low pay in the outdoor education field:

> Outdoor education didn't turn out to be the money-maker I thought it was going to be [laughs]. I pretty much accepted that from the get-go. When you're living in the field and eating [Outdoor Skills Co-op] food, and if you're managing not to pay rent anywhere, or car payment, the money is okay once you gain a certain level of ... experience.

Elijah echoed this sentiment, stating, "it's not ... a high-earning career." He elaborated on the

situation, explaining that he would like to take a kayak certification course, but could not afford

to miss the days of work: "I'm broke-ass, man. Like, I'm so broke. It's like I'll guide whatever I

can. I don't really feel like I have the luxury of preference at this point in my life ... in my

career." Marcus agreed, indicating that he earned less than his partner:

> I'm in a relationship where my partner, she ... you know, she makes more money than me. She has a much better job than I do, like I work contracts and I'm trying to get into ... a school board or ... whatever. And it's, like ... like, really, she's the one taking care of me, which is kind of a total reversal of the established norms, I suppose you could say.

Liam stated that summer camps' financial model depended on paying young people little money. Fortunately, his family had taught him to focus more on the enjoyment and fulfillment gained from work than the monetary reward. Elijah shared a similar sentiment, but also noted finances were a necessary consideration:

> I do love working with [Adventure Quest]. [laughs] If they paid better, I'd stay here my whole life. I just don't have the budget for it. So, I've got to keep thinking about what's next but, for as long as I can keep working with this organization I will and contribute to them and keep that … good thing going.

The precariousness of outdoor education work and the transience of the lifestyle were also issues for some participants. Mateo noted that his work with Outdoor Skills Co-op is only part time: "I do also work for two other outdoor schools; [Outdoor Skills Co-op] is a part-time job for me." Levon reported that even his best contract as an instructor was part-time, "I was working 25 weeks a year in the field and 27 weeks off." Elijah indicated that the travel and time commitment took a toll on his relationships: "It can be stressful at times, heavily committing, away from home—if you have a home—for weeks, or at least days, at a time. Difficult to maintain stable ... you know, conventional friendships or intimate relationships." Gabriel has moved his base location multiple times; in the last two years he has been stationed "in Mexico, Patagonia, and now in the Northeast." North only recently secured a management position and was able to maintain a stable residence for part of the year:

> I really got my first home base two springs ago, in [National Park]. Before that, it was just the whole life was packed in the truck. And moving around every week, when I was doing outdoor ed, and every season to a different location. And, I guess, going to [ski resort town] for winters, I was kind of based out of there, but never more than three months.

Bruce stated that he longed to return to work as a backcountry instructor. When asked why he

had taken a management position, he replied:

> Life. I'm married with a 14-year-old daughter and a 95-year-old father … and just
> when I was working full-time in the field I would spend six months of the year in the
> backcountry and that would make it difficult to maintain a marriage. Let alone raise a
> child or care for an elderly father.

Bruce's experience reflects that of an older outdoor education leader who needed

financial stability and a regular schedule to maintain a family. In contrast, Elijah's situation

encapsulated the lifestyle of a young outdoor educator. Before our interview, he had traveled to

the base site and arrived late because he had missed a bus due to being slowed down by his

heavy backpack. Likely related, he also revealed during his introduction that he was

experiencing significant heel pain and had been diagnosed with plantar fasciitis. Elijah would

have liked to take time off to heal, but needed to keep working in order to maintain good

standing with his organization and acquire much-needed pay. Elijah indicated that he could "still

hike, it just hurts." Another instructor recommended a nearby physiotherapist but, due to the trip

preparation schedule, the contract nature of his employment, and his earlier stated "broke-ass"

financial status, Elijah did not have the time nor the money to get an appointment. Further,

Elijah's planned accommodation had fallen through. His friend, with whom Elijah had intended

to stay during the trip preparation period, had to cancel because his roommate did not want a

houseguest. Elijah ended up accepting an offer by the site manager to sleep on the office floor.

Managers and administrators indicated that they received higher pay and a more regular

schedule, though such roles could also be only part-time or seasonally contracted. That said, the

precarity and transience of the outdoor education leader role, as Levon suggested, is voluntary,

and is made possible by instructors' middle-class status:

It's completely different than the person who's transient because they're going from job to job ... which is the same ... like an itinerant worker could be. An [Outdoor Skills Co-op] instructor who's going from here, they're going to go down and pick up some work with the [Forest School], and then they're going to go over to Vancouver Island or work at [Adventure Quest], and then they're going to over to ... someplace in Texas and work on a ranch for the winter. Like, that's still transient work and 90, and, I would say that the vast majority of the time, those transient workers have a better safety net. You know? And they're driving in ... and they're doing their transient work in their Subarus or their white vans or their Tacomas, or whatever. And I ... without a doubt, am in that category, or was in that category. I'm not transient anymore. And so, I think that, there's that element of the outdoor education manliness: building out your car, building out your truck ... that's like a manly thing. [laughs]. Yeah, and so ... male or female, I think that ... and I think that it's different from the transient workers who follow and pick crops who are first ... maybe immigrants or first generation people who ... maybe do live in their truck but don't really have that safety net and ... when their truck breaks down, maybe they're not moving to their next job.

Outdoor education is not alone in the contract-based nature of its work. Over ten years ago, Stokes and Wyn (2007) noted that changes to the labour market meant that work, in general, was becoming more precarious and that trend shows no sign of abating. Lower earnings can imply devaluation. Young adults, therefore, have reframed their careers as a personal journey of fulfillment (Stokes & Wyn, 2007), consistent with participants' claims in Chapter Four.

Outdoor education is a young person's career (Martin et al., 2017). Almost 20 years ago, just under half (46%) of Australian outdoor educators surveyed stated that they did not plan to work in the outdoor education field for more than ten years (Thomas, 2001), and I would wager responses today in Canada would not be that different, based on my own observations and who the participants in my study are. All but one of the participants from the privately-owned Camp Laviron were full-time high school or university students, meaning that their OE Leader position was a summer job. Of the remaining participants at Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op, both of which are non-profit organizations, six held management positions and six were instructors. Of the instructors, one had accepted a management role with another organization,

one was a graduate student, and three were seeking permanent positions as teachers. That some

men consider leaving the field because of financial insecurity echoes concerns raised by women

outdoor leaders in Loeffler's (1996) study over two decades ago.

In his Australian survey, Thomas (2001) also found that nearly three-quarters (73%) of

OE leaders employed at private or not-for-profit organizations there made less than $46,000 per

annum. Those employed by schools made significantly more on average due to union-negotiated

wage grids. The same research found that OE leaders complained about a lack of professional

status, lack of benefits, and small hours-to-pay ratios (Thomas, 2001). Other issues raised by OE

leaders in that survey were that transience and separation from family also contributed to feelings

of disconnection (Thomas, 2001), which dovetail with Loeffler's (1996) earlier findings that

leaders were concerned about low pay and a transient lifestyle. All of these issues can truncate a

career in outdoor education (Gass, 1998), particularly for women (Loeffler, 1996), which may

exacerbate the gender imbalance in senior leadership roles at outdoor organizations. In another

study by Gunn (2006), OE leaders working in schools with a salaried income felt less stress,

although they still complained of long and irregular hours. Gunn (2006) also found that salaried

OE leaders' enthusiasm for their work counteracted feelings of burnout or thanklessness, which

dovetailed with Thomas' (2001) findings that salaried employees were significantly more

satisfied than contract workers. That six of the participants in my study held management

positions likely indicates not only their satisfaction with their organizations and with their

position in the field, but also that it provides a sense of status compared to contract employees. In

terms of masculinity, particularly for older participants like Bruce who have joined their

organization's management team, this may also signal a reframing of masculinity from more

physically-focused and homosocial competition for masculine status to that of responsible and

stable father or partner, which resonates with Thorpe's (2010) research on snowboarders' shifts in masculinity.

Transience, though described as difficult by some participants, may also provide a status boost for male outdoor educators. Independence and freedom were found to boost masculine status among southern rock music stars (Eastman, 2012) and snowboarders (Thorpe, 2010), potentially drawing from the North American frontiersman mythos (Kimmel, 1995). In addition, those with financial means can mediate any negative associations and even reframe such transience as a desired choice (Elliott, 2020). Further, any claims of devaluation may only be temporary. Fletcher (2008) found that the independence typical of those participating in outdoor adventure activities leads to periods of living ascetically, or with minimal comfort, which is packaged as part of the challenge of becoming proficient in the activity and with the adventure lifestyle, generally.

These individuals, typically from the middle and upper classes, can temporarily forego economic security, knowing that they have a financial safety net and the network and cultural capital they have gained will allow them to reclaim their class status at a later time (Fletcher, 2008). Entangled with this class privilege is what Roediger (1999), using a term coined by Dubois, calls the wages of Whiteness. These wages are the status earned by simply being a White person, a man in particular, in North America. Such privilege can make up for the low pay of work in the short term. In addition, during this time of transience, male outdoor leaders can enact a more physical and technical masculine identity, garnering further masculine status. Such reframing or compensatory practices may be particularly necessary in lower wage jobs understood to require caring as outdoor education is now conceived; that lower wage, caring-

focused jobs tend to be populated by women and therefore feminized is no coincidence (Edley, 2017).

Summary

In sum, the participants used many strategies to increase their perceived status. In their responses, they highlighted their physical, intellectual, and positional prominence. Participants also asserted their uniqueness and their separateness from mainstream society by their participation in the outdoor education subculture. Such a distinction from the dominant culture may be necessary to compensate for the devaluation of outdoor education and the dearth of financial rewards associated with employment as an OE leader. The identification of some participants with their organization may also serve as a compensatory mechanism against lost status as well as potentially helping them climb the organizational hierarchy to attain more reliable, even if part-time or seasonal, work. Transience, though an issue for some participants, may serve to increase their masculine status through associations with historically valued independence and individualism. The bolstering of status through bragging and consolidation of group membership (whether as outdoor educators, as members of their organization, or part of an affinity group of men as described in the previous chapter) is also an interesting strategy. Cohen (2003) noted that those with greater self-esteem and secure ties to an in-group are more likely to take on information that contradicts their previously held ideas. In this case, then, these men may be shoring up their status in compensation for considering alternative masculinities. In the next chapter, the last one that shares findings and discussion, I delve further into participants' current understandings of, and feelings about. shifting norms around masculinity.

Chapter Eight: Confused Expectations and Hybrid Masculinities

In this last chapter focused on findings and discussion, I examine the importance of role models and the influence of homosocial male groups, then move to consider how these influence participants' ideas of masculinity. Their current understandings of masculinity are explored as well as their feelings about a shifting gender landscape.

Role Models and Homosocial Groups

Participants, as noted in Chapter Four on outdoor leadership, stated that they gained a sense of fulfillment through their work as OE leaders. Part of that fulfillment seemed to be derived from the opportunity to act as a role model for their students. For example, Mateo, discussing how he always tries to model authenticity, stated: "I try to create … courses in a way that people can feel comfortable, like, being who they are genuinely. And I try to role model that myself." When asked how to foster gender equity on outdoor education courses, participants spoke about the need to demonstrate a "positive" masculinity, which for them included caring behaviour and vulnerability.

Liam tried to act as a masculine exemplar for his students: "I view my masculinity as something that's important and something that can be used to help inspire others in a positive manner." Oliver declared that demonstrating vulnerability and the ability to admit mistakes were important aspects of masculinity that he tried to role model for his students. North agreed, viewing the role modeling of alternative masculinity as more effective than a class on the topic of gender biases. Specifically, he valued:

> Being able to have vulnerability and open up to a group of other male-identified students and instructors. Yeah, and role modeling it, and still being able to do all the things that are typically masculine. But tying in these other pieces and showing them it's possible to do both, they're not mutually exclusive. I think that's the thing that, more so than the, like, specific classes helps, those can bring awareness.

Barry shared that he has become increasingly aware of "how important it is to role model balance, humility, and non-toxic masculinity to … young people. And that feels like a super-important charge." Elijah also felt that was important and that young male students were desperate for positive role models:

> I think it's very normal for the young men to gravitate towards me, often because a lot of the young men I work with lack a strong male role model, as I did as a young person. And you look at a man who's got admirable traits—not saying that I do, but I might have—...actually, I know for a fact, I've had young men find me on social media—and I'm not allowed to respond, legally—and they'll track me down and they'll say, "[Elijah]..."—it'll be months after— "... Like, I'm really missing everyone on the experience. I really hope I can do something again. You were, like ..." And it's sad. They'll say, "You were a father figure to me" and shit like that. And it's like, it's tough because they're coming from really tough circumstances and I was only with them for three weeks and I was the most important male role model they've ever had. And it's fucking sad, dude. It's really sad. And, so I just embraced that because I just know it's valuable for those young men, regardless of whether or not it's a ... it's the right thing, you know?

Not only are some of the students lacking engaged men in their lives but, according to Marcus, those who do often have negative ones, including in outdoor education settings. Marcus claimed that organizational culture can reproduce an unhealthy masculinity, cultivating staff who "treat people like assholes and then those kids grow up and then they, like, it's just this cycle of, like, this toxic culture." However, John Marshall felt that an outdoor education context can be the most impactful in cultivating a positive masculinity:

> It's not something, like, school, where you're on for a few hours a day and then you go home. I think this is the perfect type of environment for ... kids to be, like, shaped into responsible leaders. Yeah, I think it's the best place.

Gabriel stated that outdoor education instructors act as an authority figure and expert with whom students can identify:

> Students, they see outdoor educators or instructors as, like, their role models. So, they sort of want to follow. And it's way easier to follow someone that you identify with, compared with someone that you don't seem to identify with.

However, as noted earlier, students arrive to outdoor education courses toting cultural scripts, including those about gender essentialism. Barry sees it has his role as an outdoor leader to help question those assumptions because male students:

> They've been told a lot of times growing up that they're more physically capable, that they're stronger, that they can do these things that girls either can't do, or can't do as well. And, it was just, you know, a little [makes clicking sound] … prick into that, into that belief system that just isn't true. And so, that's, I think, one powerful way to use that experience intentionally, and to help boys appreciate the … reality … of their experience.

Roman agreed that essentialist and hegemonic ideologies are inculcated in young men. He related experiencing and witnessing such enculturation:

> I went to an all-boys high school, went to an all-boys summer camp for a number of years, and then I worked in finance, which is largely an all male-driven industry. And what I noticed somewhere along that way is that young men went from being, you know, very sensitive, open, supportive, passionate, considerate young men ... and then my experience was, through the machinations of university and ... you know, frosh week and ... just being in that environment and then going into finance, ... somewhere along the way we young men lost that sensitivity and kindness and compassion and became these, sort of, ego-driven [laughs] maniacs [laughs].

Liam also indicated that such influences can be problematic. He stated that the homosocial environments on males-only trips were similar to hockey locker rooms, which he called, "the worst of masculinity." As Liam said, "I don't think the way boys and men act in the woods, as guys, is any different from the way they act in hockey dressing rooms or locker rooms ... like, sport locker rooms in general." George stated that he has witnessed sex segregation on the same program site rapidly devolve into his students making sexist remarks:

> Because they're so far away from the girls no one's going to hear them. And I've been really shocked with some of the things that come out of the kids' mouths. Like, things that I wouldn't ... have ever said ... when I was that age. And I've had to really, ... myself and my co-counselor, have to really put our foot down on sexist behavior.

In all-male outdoor groups, due to the removal of dissenting viewpoints for up to weeks

or months, a spiraling effect can occur, according to participants. Liam shared his own

experience of all-male trips:

> And I think sometimes in ... not all the time … sometimes, in my experience, an all-male-led trip, or a same-gender trip has the propensity to get away from you, in terms of that stereotypical masculinity. In terms of it becoming a competition of hyper-masculinity, right? In terms of [affects a gruff voice] boys doing boy things, like guy stuff. I think it's easier to slip away from you, when it's that. And for that reason, I prefer, anymore, maybe it's because I'm not as used to it, but I prefer guiding trips with girls.

Mateo agreed, also asserting that it is the OE leader's role to diffuse or redirect such discussions:

> I think, a lot of times I have to steer the conversation in different directions because when there are no females around, especially with teenagers, the conversations can go south and get weird or, like, there can be a lot of stereotyping and sexualized conversation. A lot of things come up, I think, … when it's just one gender hanging out.

Levon stated that such dynamics on all-male trips are chronically problematic, but also that male

OE leaders are increasingly working to combat them:

> And I think it definitely exists, significantly in student land, ... more so than instructor land. I think it's like, "Oh, we're all a bunch of men here, a bunch of boys here, we'll be fine. We can go talk about masturbation, we can go talk about this stuff." It's like, "We can go talk about all of this and do all these things." It's like, "Well, sure, you can ... and ... we still need to talk about it in positive ways." Right? We can talk about what it means to be a man. But like, we can make sexist jokes, we're all men here, we can make sexist jokes. And so that, I think, extensively exists and I think that instructors work to stomp it out more.

Mateo stated that he considers discussions that get at these issues to be identity-forming

exercises and part of natural development to some degree:

> I think, when there's a lot of … when it's an all-male teenager course, because I think they're still trying to figure out, what it is to be a male or what it is to be a male in the outdoors.

Levon seemingly agreed with Mateo. He stated that what is termed toxic masculinity may just be

a natural part of development. He pointed to an example of "a 16-year-old boy who's there doing

push-ups with his shirt off, yelling, "Give me more, give me more!" ... I don't know if that's

toxic or just a bunch of 16-year-olds." Similarly, Sebastian claimed that hypermasculine displays

are part of the group formation process, or a sorting out of the group's social order. He claimed

that there is an "Alpha male battle that happens in most groups when they start forming for the

first time." Statements such as these by Mateo, Levon, and Sebastian imply a "boys will be

boys" attitude to social structure and that masculine norms continue to be esteemed if extreme

demonstrations gain one a higher social rank. On the other hand, Marcus disagreed with

statements that naturalize hypermasculine displays and sexist discussions, and expressed disgust

with those who engage in them. He seemed to think that students engaging in these behaviours

were irredeemable:

> I, honestly, hate working with all-male groups. Like, if they're, a reflective group of
> boys ... yeah, it's not terrible but if they're just a group of boys and they're just total
> bros, you know, what I would describe as a bunch of Brads and Chads ... and they're
> just like, "Yeah, I play hockey ... and, like, whatever." And it's just, instantly, I'm
> like, "I don't care. You are a caricature of who you should be ... or could be."

To sum up, participants asserted that positive role models and facilitators were necessary for

young men, and may be particularly valuable in single-sex environments as dynamics in such

groupings can quickly devolve into hypermasculine displays. Although some participants

abhorred hypermasculine displays, others saw them as simply part of the male identity formation

process.

Both Warren et al. (2018) and Mitten (2018) assert the importance of women role models

in outdoor education and the value of single-sex trips. While participants in my study see the

value of male role models, many of them shared concerns about male-only trips, which makes

for an interesting contrast. Although there have been repeated calls in the media to address the

"boy crisis" in education by hiring strong male role models who demonstrate and reproduce

traditional male traits (Martino, 2008b), Oakley et al. (2018) advocate men modelling

transgressive or alternative masculinities as part of their responsibility as educators. That all but

two of the participants claimed to be good role models for their students and aim to perform a

positive masculinity is encouraging then. Their willingness to be role models for other men

contrasts the findings of Allen-Craig et al. (2020) who, while examining how gender impacts

outdoor professionals' experience in the field, found that none of their male respondents

indicated such a willingness. Perhaps the reticence found in Allen-Craig et al. (2020) is because,

as Warren (2016) asserts, "men in the outdoors who resist dominant stereotypes are

marginalized" (p. 364).

Participants' recognition of the importance of role modeling positive masculinity may be

the result of professional or organizational expectations in the three organizations or perhaps

even in the outdoor culture more widely. According to Mitten (2009), OE leaders are aware of

the general importance of role modeling and expect that students are watching them for cues

about appropriate language and behaviour. A widely used textbook on outdoor leadership by

Martin et al. (2017) presents Kouzes and Posner's (2003) leadership model that touts modeling

of behaviours and values. Further, men's role as positive mentors in outdoor settings was

described as critical by Sibthorp et al. (2011) who encouraged men to form bonds with their

students in order to more effectively lead and teach them (see also Schumann et al., 2009). In the

participants' cases, role modeling is an expectation for OE leaders at Outdoor Skills Co-op as

outlined in their leadership manual. Effective role modeling is also an evaluation criterion

explicitly listed on instructor evaluation forms at Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op.

And the importance of role models is also the theme of one session of Camp Laviron's

masculinity training as outlined in a curriculum document. Such inculcation of role modeling into organizational programming is likely one of the reasons participants value it so highly.

However, role modeling is not a panacea and can be problematic. Mara (2012) asserts that advocating for the use of role models puts the burden of personal transformation on the educator, without consideration of the structural or institutional constructs that may impede change. The emphasis on an individual creating change through personal interactions dovetails with Risman's (2018) assertion that her young adult participants valued individual challenges to the status quo, eschewing more collectivist approaches.

Nonetheless, gender-transgressive role models may offset homosocial male influence. Messner et al. (2015) found that homosocial environments, such as fraternities, organized sports, and the military, magnify sexism and heteronormativity as well as reinforce male privilege. Consistent with this finding, Thorpe's (2010) exploration of snowboarding culture called groups of young men "fratriarchal" because of their desire to prove themselves to one another while excluding or devaluing women as well as older or less physically capable men. Such homosocial environments contribute to hypermasculine attitudes and behaviours (Anderson, 2008; Cover, 2015; Flood, 2008; Waterhouse-Watson, 2011). Perhaps overt hypermasculinity is why Overholt and Ewert (2015) found that although women enjoy single-sex outdoor groupings, men prefer mixed-sex groups, as Liam mentioned. Mixed-sex groupings may remove the imperative to engage in bravado and competition for social dominance that characterize hypermasculine behaviours (Bhana, 2012).

Hypermasculinity Disdained

As noted above**,** according to participants, hypermasculine displays are common in homosocial groups, particularly of teenage male students. However, participants indicated that

they also have experienced such displays by colleagues and find them discomfiting. Oliver stated

that, though he has only rarely experienced it, he dislikes working with men who display "super-

masculine" traits. As he says, he has "had troubles with more masculine men and working …

with more masculine men." Liam likewise explicitly expressed dislike for hypermasculine

cultures. Elijah asserted that ostentatious displays of strength or competitive attitude are not

welcome in outdoor education culture:

> If you come across as ... the classic macho dude, "Ooh, look at me, I'm strong, I can
> carry lots of stuff!" Like, who cares, man? It's not valuable. Like, "Look at how fast
> I can paddle!" Like, who cares? That's not valuable here.

Sebastian, however, offered that certain organizations (that he would not name) enable or reward

hypermasculinity so could be the source of the odd hypermasculine OE leader. Marcus agreed

and argued that boys and men contaminated by these cultures are problematic for outdoor

education because when they leave to work at other organizations, they bring their

hypermasculine attitudes and behaviours with them.

Instead of just being a problem of certain individual organizations, however, Roman

asserts that the problem is more widespread in society and is a result of layered influences.

Roman said, "I hear toxic masculinity and I get it. You see it. You see it in the behaviour of ...

men everywhere." Levon agreed that hypermasculine or sexist attitudes are pervasive and occur

across many contexts, but found the use of the term "toxic masculinity" problematic due to the

likelihood that it would be seen as essentializing, which would forestall productive dialogue. One

thing was clear, some participants obviously disliked hypermasculine displays, calling men who

enact them "jerks" (Barry), "assholes" (Liam), and "dicks" (Marcus). Dan stated that aggressive

and physically focused masculine performances are outdated. Oliver agreed, positing that, due to

societal shifts, men need to change, "otherwise you're just going to get left behind."

Being "left behind" functions in both a social and temporal sense. Twenty-three-year-old Liam framed the problem as a generational issue: "I really think the time for gender-stereotyped activities and ways of behaving are behind us. And that the hardest thing we have to do is to convince the older generations." He seemed to feel that older generations such as his father's hold on to stereotypically masculine and gender-biased behaviours. This assertion of generational differences is relevant in outdoor education given the profession generally skews younger, as discussed in the previous chapter. That means, as Barry asserted, that the number of older instructors is shrinking and the trend is for instructors to be younger, with new hires often being recent university graduates. Nonetheless, Mateo claimed that there is a mix of ages in the instructor pool: "We have instructors in their sixties who have been working here for decades, as well as people who are barely out of high school or college and very new to the career." In addition to their presence in the instructor population, as noted in an earlier chapter, men who are members of the Baby Boom and Generation X have often attained influential roles in outdoor organizations' hierarchies and therefore may hold a disproportionate amount of power in outdoor organizations.

Bruce, who was 52 and the oldest participant, admitted to adhering to stereotypically masculine values. As well, Barry, who at 35 is the third oldest of the participants, said that certain traditionally masculine traits are still valuable. Barry also admitted that, with each passing year, he feels less and less able to relate to his students as his cultural references seem dated and his point of view differs dramatically from theirs. He stated that the generation gap is significant, but that he works hard to bridge it, seeing that as part of the duty of an outdoor leader.

Younger participants provided some examples of how they felt previous generations of men maintained archaic ideas. North noted his father's emotional unavailability: "My dad is certainly ... I never heard him talk about his emotions ever. He's pretty good at, when he and my mom were talking about something that was uncomfortable, reading the paper under the table." George provided an anecdote detailing how students at his school took action to rectify the antiquated social attitudes of older teachers: "A lot of the problems kind of revolved around the teachers ... so we set up workshops and seminars for teachers, run by professionals, not by us."

More specific to outdoor education, Elijah related a story about an older male supervisor:

> A 60-year old course director asking one of my co-guides about, "So, you're a lesbian but you don't seem very butch." Like, this is how he starts the conversation, right? Super, like, stuff that you're like, "Man, is this...? What makes you think this is okay to talk about as the boss?" And I don't probably ... I don't personally have huge issue with guys - older guys - making jokes about the women I work with because, in a way, it's a way that old guys bond. It's a way that men have bonded with each other for a long time, talking about the women they're attracted to, that they both find attractive. Like, maybe it's a negative, but it's just a reality of male culture, right?

Elijah wrote off this sexist and homophobic behaviour as a generation-specific communication method or attitude. A few participants, when talking about older men, even struck a pitying tone. The most pronounced of these was Liam, who said of his father's influence: "I don't blame the male role models in my life for it. I think it's the way they were raised and they don't know any better." I happened to record in my field notes an example of older men's stereotypical attitudes while I waited for Elijah at his base site. A male instructor in his 50s asked about my research topic and, upon hearing that it was about masculinity, opined that he had noticed while waiting in a car line up to board a ferry that, when in heterosexual couples, women were often driving rather than the men. This, he said, along with their proclivity for skinny jeans, demonstrated the effeminacy of today's young men.

While a couple of the older participants still value some aspects of traditional masculinity, all participants distanced themselves from hypermasculinity in one way or another. In this way, they mirrored the participants in Davies et al. (2019) study of gender attitudes in outdoor education. Separation from hypermasculinity, which is commonly equated with physical aggression and sexual assault, makes sense as such behaviours are largely disdained in current society (Cover, 2019). This distancing from the "other" can be problematic, however, as demonstrated Macomber's (2012) study of men's anti-violence advocates who blamed violent men for their conduct, but refused to reflect on their own behaviours. PettyJohn et al. (2019) assert that such a dissociation strategy, condemning extreme examples of masculinity, is a way to signal one's goodness by comparison. Hypermasculinity, Cover (2019) argues, draws disproportionate scrutiny given that it is not the predominant masculine ideal in current Western society. It may also function to distract from the methods of more moderate masculinities to support the gender hierarchy (Cover, 2019).

The scorn for the hypermasculine may also be classed since physical aggression is associated with the working class (Kemper, 1990; Wall, 2008). It is easily marked and pathologized whereas upper- and middle-class masculinity is less easily identifiable (Lindisfarnē & Neale, 2016). Use of the popular term "toxic masculinity," then, may be an easy method to "other" certain masculinities or to obscure the multiplicity of masculine enactments by constructing a toxic versus healthy masculinity dualism (Waling, 2019). Waling (2019) states that the toxic/healthy dichotomy reproduces gender inequity by limiting the discourse to a choice between only those two options. She notes that healthy masculinity is often a poorly defined concept and that toxic masculinity is treated as unified with no local, regional, or global differences in terms of causes and enactments (Waling, 2019).

Another method of othering is differentiating by age. The idea of the modern or egalitarian man is viewed as an improvement upon older macho or stereotypically masculine men (Aarseth & Olsen, 2008; Neuman et al., 2017; Szabo, 2014). The condemnation of older generations as regressive or out of touch is common, serving as a method of identity creation through separation from one's parents' generation (Ravn & Roberts, 2020). Such an identity-defining technique may have added weight given that today's youth are, overall, more aware of social justice issues due to the influence of social media and the resultant increased visibility of movements such as #MeToo and Black Lives Matter (Risman, 2018). Generational gaps were indeed found by Harris (1995) to be the strongest identified variable when analyzing different conceptions of masculinity. Further, As Messerschmidt (2019) notes, macho, stereotypical masculinities are displayed by political figures on the political right such as Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro, whereas Oliver asserted that most people in outdoor education are left-leaning and "Trump-hating." Perhaps, then, this othering occurs along political as well as class and generational lines.

Risman (2018), in her research on 116 youth in the midwestern United States, found that, aside from devoutly religious respondents, they were largely egalitarian and progressive concerning gender issues and willing to break gendered norms as it suited them. The malleability of gendered, particularly masculine, norms by young people is supported by the work of McCormack and Anderson (2014), who found an increased willingness to express physical affection to other young men and decrease in overt homophobia. Bruce, and to some degree, Barry, two of the oldest participants in my study, described themselves as traditionally masculine, though to differing degrees. The younger participants in my study seemed to fit well with Risman's (2018) findings about non-religious young adults generally not feeling as bound

by gender stereotypes, and actively pushing gendered boundaries, leading to an increasingly broad definition of gendered enactments.

Negative and Positive Examples of Masculinity

Consistent with participants' attempts to distance themselves from hypermasculinity that many of the younger participants associated with older men, when asked about influences on their own understandings of masculinity, some participants like Marcus stated that they most often observed negative examples of masculinity and saw those as something to avoid rather than emulate. Roman shared a similar tactic:

> I think a large part of ... what I think it means to be a man is based on experiences of what I think it *doesn't* mean to be a man. So, it's largely driven by ... less by this is an obvious example of what it means to be a man and more of ... oh, I don't think that's positive masculinity.

Roman went on to describe some negative ideas that he had observed and absorbed in the world of finance, indicating that he was actively trying to change his values and limit their influence on him. He stated that masculinity in that realm meant:

> Working hard and partying pretty hard ... and probably objectifying women and treating women, like how we would treat most things that we were working with ... sort of like a commodity. Everything was just commoditized and, you know, I think masculinity was, for us in that culture, ... it was defined as how much of any commodity you could have. That's what made you a man, having more of things, material things. And everything was kind of viewed that way ... if that makes sense?

Elijah, who grew up lacking regular contact with his father, searched for role models in male relatives and older male friends but often found them lacking. For example, he related a story about his uncle who was financially successful but absent of social, emotional, and romantic connections. Seeing his uncle as a negative role model, he stated:

> I kind of realized that wasn't ... that was not the kind of man I wanted to be. And, you know, I'd meet other men where I'd idolize them for a bit and then they'd reveal something to me and I'd be like, "Ooh, like, I don't want to be that kind of person."

In contrast, over half of the respondents mentioned positive role models who had significant bearing on their understanding of masculinity. Mason, Sebastian, and Tom each stated that their fathers were their most influential role model. Other participants spoke about OE leaders with whom they had interacted as students or professional mentors in outdoor education as important role models. For example, Dan's OE leader when he was at summer camp had a profound effect on him through his demonstration of caring and empathy:

> I was feeling homesick but I didn't show it ... very much—first night of trip, five-day trip—and another camper was, you know, was crying and told him that he was homesick. And the counsellor [did] just an awesome job of being like, "Yeah, it's hard, I know. Like, I'm homesick, too. I don't, you know, see my family much but it's okay, you can cry, you can talk to me." And he just showed real care for the camper, you know? And this counsellor, you know, was big, he played rugby, he played football, but also just showed the compassion and empathy, and it was a big turning point. I still remember, like I can picture it in my mind's eye of exactly where I was and what was happening and what was said... And I don't want to become him, but I want to have, like, a piece of that counsellor when I am dealing with campers that are homesick and show them compassion and empathy.

Barry recalled that, as a student, he was impressed by the self-assured nature of his OE leader:

> I remember the first few times they taught a class and there was such a command, such a confidence, such an unstated understanding. But then what really struck me over time was how often they would also then turn around and say, "I don't know" or "I will find out" … and just seemed totally comfortable doing that. There was no hiding, there was no, like, fumbling around, there was no making up answers. The confidence that they possess was just very secure… And that stood out over the entirety of that course. And I remember leaving the course going, "That's what that's supposed to look like."

Sebastian also highlighted the confidence of a superior and his willingness to listen as traits to be admired and emulated:

> I thought that was really cool, the fact that he was that confident in his own abilities that he didn't need to prove anything. Whereas I was, like, still pretty green in the idea but … he was still honouring what I was … saying.

Zack praised the ability of some male colleagues to critically examine gender roles and Liam looked to his two immediate supervisors as examples of caring masculinity:

> And these guys manage to handle, like, long-term relationships with incredible significant others and a stupidly long-hour day job, right? With just, like, constant problems. And yet they still work with kids and I'll still see [the Assistant Director] take the time out of his day to sit down with a little boy who's crying and to ... have that conversation, right?

Some participants stated that strong mothers, some of whom were single mothers, had been influential exemplars for them. Just being in a household led by his mother and sisters impacted Gabriel's understanding of masculinity and leadership:

> I had got up all my life, lived with my mum, my sisters [and] I learned … I have a very feminine approach of leadership, and always have. And I valued that a lot. Especially because my mum was my ... main role model when I grew up.

Although he valued his father's very traditional masculinity, Levon's mother was much more athletic and physically capable than his father, demonstrating independence and strength atypical for the conservative context in which he grew up:

> I think my mother actually ... any athletic ability I have, whether that's climbing, just my physical ability to move my body, does not come from my father. Yeah, she was much more athletic and continued with sports and is very active right now.

For Oliver, his mother's interesting academic career drew him to her as a role model, more so than his father:

> My mom's a total badass. She's a sociology PhD who does so much incredible work. And, in an interesting way, like, I think that … to a certain extent I looked up to my mom more than my dad growing up. And so, I think … the things about what it means to be a good person despite gender in the world, I think I learned from … I learned, more explicitly or, like, maybe more explicitly, looked up to my mom.

Mateo credited his sister for making a positive impression on him, especially given her experiences coming out as a young gay woman:

> I think it made me more aware of a lot of the stereotypes and prejudices that go along with not being in the mainstream and being more empathetic to people that identify differently, or just have different strengths and weaknesses, or appearances, or whatever it may be, than kind of your mainstream people.

Another influence on masculinity in culture that was noted by participants was media. Although several participants, as noted in Chapter Seven, avoid popular media, due to its ubiquity, its subtle influence on understandings of masculinity was mentioned. For example, John Marshall said, "I mean, obviously, the media portrayal of what it means to be a man has a big unconscious influence." Five other participants indicated that media portrayals of masculinity have an explicitly negative effect. Roman referenced older, mid-twentieth century media and its persistent effects on notions of gender:

> We have a, kind of, media-driven … vision of what it means to be a man. You know, the guy that goes to work, you know, brings home the paycheque, provides the security and stability and … literal food on the table for the … you know. There's those kind of Norman Rockwellian visions of what it means to be a man.

Similarly, Mateo asserted that the media portrays harmful stereotypes: "I think that there's a lot that's getting fed to kids through Hollywood or whatever else about, like, the classic stereotypical male representations." North likewise cited examples of male bravado in media that shape public perception of masculinity: "If you're talking about the portrayals in movies or media, it's like usually someone … seemingly like wanting to be the center of attention, being loud, being just, like, almost trying to be bigger than themselves." North followed this statement by noting that his own masculinity is the polar opposite of that depiction. Gabriel also made the point that such portrayals are not limited to mainstream media and noted how outdoor-focused films also perpetuate gendered stereotypes:

> The film festivals, like outdoor film festivals, and for me it was very clear to see… So, there was a bunch of films and the stereotype mountaineer films was, like, men doing very badass things, or women doing, like, beautiful things, not very tough or tough, but they approach the moves about, like, feelings and talk about life and the struggles and how harsh it was. And the males are more about how badass we are.

In contrast to the view that media presents negative gendered stereotypes, two participants felt that media could be a positive influence on masculinity. Elijah stated that some

comedians did a good job critiquing and lampooning stereotypes about gender. Oliver argued

that Kanye West, through his music, had questioned aspects of stereotypical masculinity:

> There is something about him as a pop culture icon despite a lot of the … a lot of stuff that, I mean … yeah, I feel like constant defender of this person. I don't want to do that right now but, like, yeah controversial figure. And that particular nugget of pop culture was super-important for me, I think, in … becoming an adult and understanding that it's okay to be a vulnerable male in the world.

And, as noted in Chapter Six, Gabriel believed social media had been a decisive factor in

generating awareness about the #MeToo movement and shifting public opinion. He added that

the popularity of the movement indicates a growing awareness of social issues that will hopefully

continue to drive the visibility of diverse perspectives in all media as well as in schools.

The points participants made at the beginning of the chapter concerning the importance

of role modeling to students likely also applies to their identification of role models as significant

factors in shaping their own understanding of masculinity. It is worth noting here that Barry and

Sebastian's admiration of their earlier OE leaders who built their confidence through challenge

resonates with a central aim of many outdoor education programs (Asfeldt et al., 2020),

indicating a way in which their sense of masculinity may be tied further to the field or their

organizations. According to both the organization documents and the professional literature, role

models need not be of the same gender. That, for men, is likely beneficial. As noted in Chapter

Five, men knowing and interacting often with members of a marginalized population (in this

case, women) can foster empathy and understanding (Dobbin & Kalev, 2018). Further, McGinn

et al. (2019) found that strong working mothers significantly affect the gender attitudes of their

sons, nurturing more egalitarian notions of gender in later life.

Related to media, over forty years ago, Bandura (1977) argued that role models and

media were important factors in social learning. That claim is consistent with Giroux's (1998)

assertion that media is indeed a form of education, what has come to be known as an example of public pedagogy. Specifically related to gender, media has been shown to shape public perception of gender (Willis-Chun, 2011), including by celebrating particular forms of stereotypical masculinity, that included "muscular, aggressive, and hyper-heterosexual masculinities" (Millington & Wilson, 2010b, p. 1669). That was something explicitly raised by five of the participants who stated that they felt that stereotypical masculinity was prevalent in media and had a negative impact on notions of masculinity. But, as noted by Lindisfarnē and Neale (2016), media stereotypes can also be classed portrayals. The authors use the example of Bruce Willis' character in the *Die Hard* franchise who is a subordinated man, clearly coded as working class. Such stereotypical media representations of masculinity were mocked and considered harmful by participants. As such, these stereotypes are an obvious "other" to the middle- and upper-class participants of my research, allowing them to distance themselves from such displays.

Contrasting these portrayals are media examples of potentially more open (Elliott, 2020) or healthy (Waling, 2019) masculinities, that display softer, more caring, and vulnerable traits. Oliver pointed to this when discussing Kanye West's music and public persona. Although he has often used violent and sexist themes in his music, Kanye West has also described his emotional vulnerabilities and publicly discussed his mental health issues (Bailey, 2014), and it is those latter topics that Oliver found specifically helpful. It must be noted, however, that West may demonstrate a more middle-class masculinity due to his upbringing by his mother, a university professor. Similarly, the alternative masculinity claimed by some musicians, as in Houston's (2012) study of indie rockers, may have looked different to what his participants described as Houston collected only interview data. This possible difference between word and deed was

illustrated by Dan who repeatedly stated that he valued caring and showed empathy towards his students yet during his interview at a camp activity site chosen by Dan, two different students came by asking for his help to find items they had left behind and he repeatedly, and with increasing exasperation, shooed them away.

As noted by participants, social media can be used to raise consciousness about gender issues, such as in the case of the #MeToo movement (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019). At the same time, social media is also a forum for circulation of anti-feminist and men's rights activist information. Interestingly, the phrase "Brads and Chads" used by Marcus originates from gaming and men's rights forums to refer to hypermasculine or alpha males (Nagle, 2015), indicating Marcus' potential exposure to such influences. The various examples above from popular media demonstrate the ideological spectrum of what is available that can subtly or overtly inform men's notions of masculinity and gender equity.

Confusion Over Masculinity and "The New Man"

When asked for their understanding of what it meant to be a man in outdoor education, several participants expressed confusion. Elijah explained that his confusion around what it means to be a man stems from the disparity between what his parents taught him and current, potentially still-shifting expectations, demonstrating a perceived generational divide. He stated:

> I don't personally feel attacked, but I recognize a lot of men are kind of confused about … what it means to be a man. I think about the things that some of our … you know, our baby boomer moms taught us to do, right? And now Millennial women say, "Don't dare do that." Like, it's a mixed message, you know? I don't know, my mom taught me I'm supposed to hold a door open for you, now I realize I'm not supposed to do that. You know, like, how many guys have probably had that same thought? And, okay, so I guess a man is, in some spheres, supposed to maintain those traditionalist approaches of being chivalrous and being the protector, being the provider. And in other spheres, in other cultures within our western society, those things are not embraced as much. Or, if they are, they're seen as fully capable of being done by women as they are by men, so I think there's a lot of men who

question, "Well, what is my role?" I think it's really … it's a really tough question for a lot of people.

Likewise, Marcus' response notes a cultural shift that, for him, leads to uncertainty:

I hate when people say, "Just be a man." It's like, what does that even mean? It's like, be ... like, I don't know what. I think you hear that statement a lot and I've always been, like, I used to think I knew what that meant, but as I got older, I don't know what that means anymore.

Roman also cites changing norms as a cause of confusion:

Ugh. Jeez. Yeah, that's a great question. I think it's …Yeah, I think it's kind of confusing. I think it's kind of confusing times for men. I think, you know, for a long time it was pretty clear … what it meant to be a man, you know, certainly in the west.

Bruce's response indicates that his perspective has been continually changing across his life. He says, "No idea, still figuring that out, 52 years into it. [laughs] And I think it changes over time."

Some participants said that being a man is just being themselves. Dan said that he acts as he was raised to act, but had difficulty articulating his meaning further:

I identify as male, my sexuality is straight ... but I don't, you know ... I mean, I don't know how a typical man is supposed to act, so I just act as ... the way I was brought up, the way I learnt to be. I draw, I paint, I wear pinks and purples and blues and ... People in the city would recognize me as someone from camp because I wear the same clothes, like my clothing options don't change from ... school to back home in [the city], to camp life, they're all the same clothes that I wear. So, I'm ... really not sure how to define my masculinity other than to say that I identify as male.

Gabriel took a similar tack, stating simply that to be a man means to have a penis. Regardless of such an indicator of sex, he said, one should act as they wish, without barriers.

John Marshall believes that masculinity in outdoor education today has room for a wider array of performances than it did previously:

Well, it's a weird response because, on one hand, like, you know, the stereotypical ideal of a man is someone, like, strong, muscular, kind of ... lumberjack ... that kind of thing. But, at least with my experience here ... I also think that there's more awareness today of, kind of, counteracting that stereotype. At least more than, like, 10 years ago, or whatever. So, I think ... I don't know ... I think the answer to that question is more broad today.

Barry stated that there were competing expectations to being a man in society, but that ultimately

he aimed to balance traditionally male traits with more traditionally feminine ones in his outdoor

education practice:

> I think to be a man today ... it feels especially tightrope walk-y ... if that makes any
> sense. It feels very tricky to balance, you know, and trying to maintain and appreciate
> ... and still be some traditional, I guess, masculine components and values and not
> throw them out completely but while still ..., while remembering and appreciating
> that anything taken to an extreme is not really helpful and ultimately pretty negative
> in the big picture. And so, balancing that with humility and balancing that with some
> other more traditionally feminine components and approaches and ... But I come
> back to the word humble a lot. It seems to be especially important.

To Sebastian, the balance that Barry described in his outdoor education practice includes

emotional literacy:

> I find it very rare where a guy is like "Ahh, I'm going to show these guys how it''s
> done" [who] try to be super-machismo. So, I don't think that there''s, like, a set
> parameter for how guys act. If anything, it''s a little bit more, like ... hipster, or,
> hippieish-dippie, like, touchy-feely type of stuff. Like, more in touch with your
> feelings.

Mason seemed aware of stereotypical performances of masculinity, which he associated with

meanness, but could not define what he valued. Instead he claimed that there was a broad

spectrum of possible enactments of masculinity:

> I don't think there''s necessarily one thing one could be. Like, you could, literally,
> like, being a man could mean so many different things. Like, you can be that person,
> you can be that alpha male role, but you can also be, like, anything else. You can be
> .... I don''t know ... what do people do in this world? So many things!

Such broad descriptions of masculinity were also described simply as being a good person. Tom

described his approach as, "I think being a stand up person ... is a good definition of what a man

should be." Marcus elaborated slightly and stated that doing one's job and supporting people are

good, although he didn't see those as gendered traits:

> You know, there's nothing wrong with the old stereotypes of, like ... you know, people, like, doing these labour intensive jobs and, like, you know, taking care of their families. I don''t think there's anything wrong with that. But, you know, it''s not because you're a man that you're doing that. It's just because that's what people do.

Dan described it as simply being respectful, "I guess there''d just be that ... you know, being the best person you can be and treating everyone with respect is the way to go." Indeed, respect and responsibility were often used by participants in describing what masculinity should represent. Sebastian described the way he enacted his masculinity as "being respectful, not just to, like, other females but also to … everybody."

Levon also echoed the theme of responsibility, but added that being a man also means being accountable for one's privilege:

> What does it mean? It means a lot of responsibility. I think it means that ... we have ... I think men have a ... it means that ... I don't know if this is answering the question but I think that men have a lot of responsibility to ... work to undo [laughs] the things that we have done.

Elijah also noted his privilege and stated that men should use it to support women:

> Thus, in a society where men and women need to work together to survive, men should be there to support women. And, I don't ... I see that very much so as, like, that is something that I feel called to do because I am in a position of privilege and I ... I have that power.

Levon, however, also articulated that being critical about privilege is challenging, specifically referencing having difficult conversations about race:

> It's hard to have conversations that ... like, show my ignorance. Like, I don't want to be ignorant. And so, it's hard. And I think ... some days, like, being a man today means having to face that stuff.

O'Neil et al. (1993) found that men's confusion about masculinity has been common for some time due to gender role shifts and clearly that is still the case if my participants are any indication. According to Risman (2018), the young adults in her study especially felt this

confusion because multiple narratives of masculinity exist concurrently. And, as noted earlier, confusion appears to have been recently heightened due to the influence of the #MeToo movement. Although the breadwinner ethic has largely been abandoned out of economic necessity, some traditional expectations persist (Risman, 2018). Most young men in her sample were proud to integrate traditionally feminine traits into their identity and were apologetic about their masculinity. Their worry about the stigma attached to hegemonic enactments may explain why they do not explicitly embrace male privilege (Risman, 2018).

That said, Western social hierarchy remains dominated by men (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), as does the outdoor education field (Gray, 2016). Therefore, the "good person" narrative may be both a dodge and also a highly masculinized ideal given masculine traits are the most esteemed in Western society (Connell, 2005). As well, the balanced masculinity advocated by Barry, or incorporation of caring behaviours or emotional displays, are equivalent to the "new man" discourse of a softer, less aggressive masculinity that began emerging in the 1990s (Buchbinder, 1997). The new man has financial capital and demonstrates this through self-care and grooming, is often suit-clad or well dressed, is cosmopolitan and therefore possesses cultural capital and an ostensibly progressive mindset, all of which distinguish him from a hypermasculine, working-class masculinity (Cover, 2019). The new man concept is focused on respect for women and repudiation of hypermasculinity and misogyny, but still often ignores the systemic influences that inculcate and bolster patriarchy (Flood, 2008).

Another aspect of the new man narrative shift includes a focus on "accountable masculinity" that dovetails with a stated progressivism that permits acknowledging privilege. Such a conception of masculinity is a distinctly White, upper middle-class ethic (Cover, 2019). The progressive and inclusive veneer of the new man has been cultivated in middle- and upper-

class outdoor education students since the middle of the twentieth century (Wall, 2008). The

expressed values of respecting and supporting women resemble a remodeled traditional protector

ethic as well as chivalric notions of traditional masculinity. Attempts to enact such values may

thus fall into the realm of benevolent sexism (Becker & Wright, 2011), which includes ostensibly

valuing women and wanting to protect them, yet the underlying gender essentialism is subtly

damaging as it supports a gender binary and hierarchy. That said, Barry's notion of balance

dovetails with Waling's (2019) argument that some traditionally masculine enactments can be

valuable and should not be thrown out. Waling (2019) cites the value of stoicism in emergency

situations, which is similar to the example given by Barry. Based on what my participants said

and the masculinities literature, there is little doubt that the recent shift to valuing traditionally

feminine traits has led to confusion and anxiety amongst many men.

Masculinity "Demonized"

The confusion about valued masculine enactments and the desire to hold on to some

traditional masculine traits led some participants to worry that masculinity had been demonized.

Bruce was supportive of equity initiatives but questioned, "sometimes I feel like I'm being

marginalized because I'm an older White man? Maybe. But, you know, do older White men

deserve that? Probably, most of the time. Yeah, you bet." Mateo expressed concern that certain

traditionally masculine traits in the backcountry, such as directive leadership, would be lost.

Oliver stated that he thought gender equity initiatives were beneficial and here to stay. That said,

he also expressed a concern that valuing of traditionally feminine relational skills in outdoor

education had gone too far:

> I think that's changing quite a lot. I think in a healthy way and in some ways it seems
> like an over-correction. And I think there is … I think there is value in this maybe
> more goal- driven, like, pointed … not militaristic, but, like … yeah, I guess, like,
> masculine orientation towards the team,

Barry expressed that he also felt the celebration of the feminine, of vulnerability and

communication skills, had come at the expense of masculine enactments like stoicism:

> We can celebrate both, we don't have to denigrate one or the other to prop the other
> up. And there are times that I've felt a little unsure about that in practice, where it
> seems like, okay, we need to spend time celebrating this and part of the celebration
> has to be a very slight, sly put down of that. And any time I feel that, I honestly
> bristle a little bit.

Liam expressed the need for open masculinity that embraces emotional expression but

also stated:

> Men and women are absolutely equal and I think that's so important. I worry
> sometimes that it will go both ways, right? Like, we can be so worried about
> inequality that we can actually create an inequality the other way.

Liam elaborated on this notion, providing an example of an experience he had with some women

in his undergraduate outdoor recreation classes:

> You know the people, right? It would just, like, turn into these sounding boards of
> these anti-masculine, like "This is how bad guys are. This is how awful they've been
> to me. Like, this is my terrible experiences with men, like, all men are awful" kind of
> thing. And, like, try as they might, it would consistently divulge [sic] into these kind
> of conversations. And it used to drive me nuts because I was like ... One, it helped
> me put a finger on what I didn't want to be, was a big help. So, part of it was helpful.
> Two, it sucked hearing, right? And like, but I .... parts of it I value, like I really value
> that discussion of gender in the outdoors, and parts of it I thought was unfair. And it
> was ... I would want to raise my opinion of, like, "Well, I don't think that's fair to
> pigeon-hole everybody with" or "What about the other side, too?" Right?

Liam went on to say that he felt that these discussions were shaped into a gender-bias narrative

when it wasn't always warranted. However, he also worried that to say anything contrary to that

narrative would make him sound bigoted or he would be judged to be part of the problem.

George felt similarly; although he enjoyed the masculinity sessions at his organization, he felt

that:

> There's a stigma that you can't celebrate your masculinity. In the same way that ...
> and I'm really, I think it's, honestly, a great thing that the girls are doing it but

there's a lot of the feminine - femininity is being celebrated on a daily basis and I'm all for it, but I don't think that men feel as safe here to celebrate their masculinity.

Roman likewise stated that he would like to "celebrate masculinity and not have to be ashamed of it. So I'm not exactly sure what it looks like." Elijah struggled with the same idea, claiming that masculine traits are not valued:

I think it's unfortunate because, again, it's one of those cases where men are kind of feeling a little demonized. Like, what is a good masculine trait? I don't ... society hasn't told me of any of them. Like, I'm not even sure if protecting's a good thing, it sounds almost too violent now. Like, I just don't know, man. I struggle with that one.

Bruce stated that the students at his organization also often felt that male privilege and gender bias were highlighted too much in the curriculum, leading male students to feel vilified: "I've certainly seen that in some of our evaluations from students, you know, '[Outdoor Skills Co-op] should stop being sexist against males.'"

Elijah also felt that, despite his best efforts to try to be an ally, he sometimes felt demeaned. He asserted that some of his female students hated him just because he was a man: "And there's also a lot of hate. I mean, I've worked with young women who fucking hate me because I'm a man. They just hate me." He continued on, stating that he was aware that the women who disliked him on sight may have suffered some trauma or other issues in their past, but noted that such knowledge did not make leading a multi-day hike with that person easier. Elijah disliked being judged as a male and he disliked the essentialist beliefs that would not allow him to lead a trip with another male OE leader:

Insurance companies and everyone else who sets legal .... you know, lawyers, they look at history, they look at precedents. According to the precedents, men are dangerous. So, I understand why it's in the policies and procedures, but it sure doesn't make men feel very good, you know? It, definitely, is unfortunate.

Paradoxically, Elijah's dislike of being pigeon-holed because of essentialist beliefs exists in tension with his essentialist beliefs about women's risk tolerance and physical capabilities as detailed in Chapter Six.

Flood (2019) argues that claims that critiques of norms have gone too far is a common response "by members of a dominant group who feel threatened by challenges to their privileges" (p. 528). Such a backlash is the result of changes in gender norms that produce anxiety and cause men to cling to stereotypical or traditional notions (Pompper, 2010). Defiant reactions, Pompper asserts, are most pronounced among young White men such as the younger men in my study. The desire to clap back comes from a place of anxiety (Flood, 2019) and feeds resistance to calls for men to address their own behaviour (Flood, 2019). The claims of White male suffering, such as those made by Elijah, are a common trope that represents an attempt to reinstate White male privilege by lamentation of its loss (Savran, 1998).

Eight (less than half) of the participants raised the topic of race when discussing masculinity and/or its demonization. This could be due to the "naturalness" (Roediger, 1999, p. 19) of their identity as males in the predominately White domain of outdoor education (Nicol, 2002b; Warren et al., 2014, 2018). However, it is notable that five of the eight participants who did discuss race (mostly by describing their own racial identity as White) worked at Outdoor Skills Co-op, which Gabriel indicated was looking to replace their White male leadership. These participants remarking on race may be due to the increased awareness of such social issues, as raised in the previous chapter. However, participants may have highlighted their race because of the possible changes in Outdoor Skills Co-op that specifically target the White male leadership. As Roediger (1999) states, Whiteness is highlighted when it is questioned. That said, the participants' backlash statements also include claims about the need for change. This could

represent participants' desire to distance themselves from older, stereotypical masculinities or it may represent a way forward, given that it is a tempered backlash, less reactionary than that to the first waves of feminism (Elliott, 2020).

Although backlash-type comments were made by multiple participants at both Adventure Quest and Outdoor Skills Co-op, it was noticeable that Liam was the only participant at Camp Laviron who explicitly voiced a worry about demonization. Further, and perhaps most crucially, the impetus for his feelings were based on conversations at his university rather than at camp. The training regime at Camp Laviron promotes what Elliott (2020) describes as an open masculinity, encouraging caring and emotional expression in addition to traditional male performances. The absence of backlash by most Camp Laviron participants is likely attributable to the fact that little critique of masculine traits (beyond cartoonish or toxic traits that permit othering) or explorations of gender bias are offered in that training, leaving the male staff safe in their privilege. The varying reactions from the participants, then, likely highlight the degrees of effectiveness of the organizations' gender bias training and resourcing. It is also notable that, although the field as a whole values personal challenge in the outdoors for its capacity to cultivate character and spur personal growth (as detailed in Chapter Four), that narrative is rarely applied by the participants in confronting their own biases as demonstrated by their claims of demonization.

Summary

Altogether, the participants reported negative masculine role models abound and indicate the need for alternative masculine role models, something recommended by Oakley et al. (2018) and Kennedy and Russell (2020). Such role models may be especially helpful in all-male groups given the tendency for interactions to devolve into sexist comments and behaviours. The reported

exaggerated masculine enactments by young students in those groups may indicate a search for

identity and social status. Such stereotypical or hypermasculine performances are reviled by

participants and viewed as outdated. Judgements of hypermasculinity as "other" illuminate how

participants seem to distance themselves from working-class or older, macho masculine

enactments, perhaps indicative of a move towards a hybrid masculinity (Bridges & Pascoe,

2014). However, amidst a changing gender landscape many of the participants also expressed

confusion about what it means to be a man and worries about being demonized, which is not an

unexpected reaction when faced with a perceived loss of privilege. Such confusion is not new

and has been relatively common throughout the 19th and 20th centuries during times of social,

political, and economic change or uncertainty (Greig & Martino, 2012).

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

In this last chapter, I want to return to my research questions and consider each in turn as a way to synthesize the points raised in the previous five chapters. Although Connell's (2005) theory of hegemonic masculinity provided the theoretical framework for this study, some recent amendments to the theory are also applied. Enloe's (2007) feminist curiosity, which asks how contextual factors (e.g., politics, economic policies, organizational structures) interact with gender, will also be applied, though to a lesser extent. Embedded in this discussion are recommendations for practice for both OE leaders and organizations. I conclude by discussing the limitations of my study, which alongside key findings and analysis, point to possibilities for future research.

How Do Male Outdoor Educators Understand and Experience Masculinity?

The majority of participants found it difficult to articulate their ideas of masculinity or what it means to be a man. Many expressed confusion, citing changes to gender norms, particularly following the #MeToo movement in 2017 and 2018. The perceived cultural and normative changes resulted in many of the participants distancing themselves from masculinity or manhood, reminiscent of many of the participants in Risman (2018) who worked to avoid association with male privilege and the stigma attached to hegemonic enactments. Such confusion has been recurrent in 19th and 20th century North American culture (Greig & Martino, 2012), seeming to indicate the chimeric nature of masculinity.

The dynamic expectations and current appreciation for stereotypically feminine traits in outdoor education left some participants feeling as though changes to professional practice and critiques of masculinity had gone too far. Some participants felt that masculinity had been stigmatized, and that feeling may have been a factor in many describing their masculinity as

simply trying to be a "good person." What it means to be a good person was informed by various

negative influences who they did not want to emulate as well as positive role models, including

(in three cases) women. It is an interesting finding that all but three participants explicitly stated

that they were trying to be role models for others, implying that they considered themselves

examples of positive masculinity or a good person. That the participants were confused amid

changing norms while simultaneously wanting to role model masculinity is reminiscent of a

study by Vrooman (2007) that found that young Boy Scouts of America staff members

reproduced hegemonic masculinity while still determining their own ideas of what it meant to be

a man. Vrooman's (2007) participants used organizational touchstones and traditions to guide

themselves while simultaneously formulating an idea of manhood and attempting to model

masculinity for their students. A similarly concurrent formulation and demonstration of

masculinity may be occurring in my study, with the perceived "changing culture" leading to my

participants' reliance on organizational values and role models.

Demonstrated in both their choice of positive role models' and in their assessment of

students' actions, the participants made clear that they found hypermasculine displays distasteful.

The disdain expressed for such enactments may be the result of social changes or possibly the

results of othering, either through class or age, which serves to distance participants from "bad"

men (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). With the exception of outdoor education that targets low SES or

"at risk" youth and has a remedial goal, typical outdoor activities are overwhelmingly middle

and upper-class pursuits. In contrast, aggressiveness and physicality are often attributed to the

working class and, from a middle-class perspective, are associated with indecorous behaviour

(Kemper, 1990; Roberts, 2018). Age was also a factor in distancing, with older men seen to be,

and some older participants admitting to feeling, out of touch in the changing genderscape. Also

related to age, younger male students of participants were portrayed by some as simply immature and therefore not yet able to mitigate their innate tendency to posture for social acceptance, revealing how gender essentialism remained in play.

Another way that participants separated themselves from hegemonic masculinity was to tout their intelligence and capacity for critical thinking as well as their desire to promote a progressive mindset and gender equity. Such statements could be seen as an effort to increase their status given the current focus on social issues in the media (Cover, 2019) and in outdoor organizations (Martin et al., 2017), though participants did seem to express a genuine desire to act as advocates for gender equity and more inclusive masculine norms. Their motivations for presenting themselves as supporters of equity were often nebulous, however, as were some of their statements. While most participants described how they embraced a relational leadership style typically associated with women and others described how they challenged hegemonic masculine norms through how they dressed or otherwise performed gender, most participants also bragged about stereotypically masculine status markers, such as athletic prowess. Similarly, in one breath they would assert their allyship and in another question changes to norms and practices, describe essentialized traits of men and women, and claim that they, or men in general, have been demonized. Such contradictions and resistance to, or even bitterness towards, changing gender norms and practices is not unusual, according to Connell (2006), even among those committed to gender equality. The participants thus may not be as different from other males as they might like to believe.

How Do Participants' Ideas about Masculinity Influence their Practice in the Field?

The desire to foster gender equity and the dislike of hypermasculinity potentially contributes to many participants' embracing the field's current focus on relational skills. Some

participants expressed a willingness to perform non-traditional gendered tasks such as leading

cooking workshops, teaching about feminine hygiene in the backcountry, and leading lessons on

the organization's gender bias curriculum. Another method of performing non-traditional

masculinity was to incorporate expressions of authenticity and vulnerability into their practice.

Further, multiple participants reported that they actively worked to curb overt sexism when

demonstrated by students and some recognized students' more subtle devaluations of their

women co-leaders and worked to address it. These actions are consistent with recent studies

(Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Davies et al., 2019) that found that some men are working to curb

sexist language and take on non-traditional roles when leading a group. Many of the participants

seem to be trying to lead inclusively, as advocated by Humbert et al. (2019), as a way to foster

gender equity in outdoor education practice. Further, simply through awareness and efforts to

limit overt sexist language and notice more subtle devaluation of their women co-leaders, some

of the participants seem to be attempting to answer the call put forth by Mitten et al. (2018)

asking men to work to redress the gender inequity in outdoor education.

Participants' degree of critical awareness about masculinity and gender bias seemed

heavily linked to the policies, training, and resourcing provided by their organizations. Not only

did many participants express an allegiance to their organization but, in some cases, participants

directly quoted or alluded to organizational resources or training materials in their responses.

Such digestion and endorsement of organizational culture indicates a strong influence on the

participants' views and professed practices. This organizational clout may indicate a leverage

point for consideration of masculine enactment and gender equity in the field.

Organizational culture seemed to exert a significant influence not only on participants'

viewpoints but also their style of dress and language use. Gendered and militaristic language

persists in these organizations. Like the lack of awareness of more subtle devaluations, use of gendered language demonstrates the gendered hidden curriculum described by Warren et al. (2019) that persists and quietly supports inequity (Jordan, 2018).

Another issue that quietly supports inequity was the participants' descriptions of all-male instructor groups as affinity groups. The preference for working with a male colleague was attributed to such varied reasons as easier communication and fewer worries about gender dynamics, needing to share voice, and physical capabilities. The notion of a male affinity group or of a "brotherhood" (as posted at Camp Laviron), especially based on communication skills and physical ability, may demonstrate persistent beliefs in gender-specific essentialist traits (Eliot, 2010; Newbery, 2003).

Similarly, although receiving feedback was highly valued as a professional practice by many of the participants (either explicitly stated in interviews or as I observed *in situ*), it was notable that participants had not seriously considered that women instructors might self-censor when providing feedback about gender issues. In the one instance the issue was brought up, the participant stated that he had to assume that all instructors were holding nothing back. Contradicting that perspective was the admission made by multiple participants that providing feedback to a colleague in the field is awkward. Another issue with the assumption of candour was the idea, as noted by Martin et al. (2017), that once received, feedback still can be dismissed. Although some participants demonstrated an admirable ability to change their thought processes and, they asserted, their practices following critical feedback about subtle devaluation of their colleagues, others demonstrated a willingness to disregard feedback about devaluation and attribute the issue to a source other than gender.

The issues outlined in this section indicate that, although male outdoor leaders may have begun to amend their practices to adhere to organizational trainings and policies, to confront overt sexism, and to notice more subtle devaluations, a gap between awareness and practice nonetheless exists. Perhaps that is due to the disconnect between the formal training environment and the informal outdoor setting, which is a wider issue in the field identified by Breunig and Rylander (2015). As one potential remedy, Breunig and Rylander suggest a greater focus on development of self-awareness and recognition of biases in the outdoor education field.

How Might Outdoor Education Leaders' Practice Challenge and/or Reinforce Hegemonic Masculinity?

In this section, I discuss not only the practices described by the participants, but also their stated opinions. It seems particularly appropriate to do so given the importance placed by participants on being "authentic" and presenting their "true self" in the field. Such assertions presumably indicate that they would be sharing their opinions, unfettered, to students and co-leaders or, at a minimum, subtly acting upon them.

Participants' awareness of social issues generally, and related to gender equity specifically, is a promising finding. This awareness was informed by their employing organization as well as other influences such as role models, university courses or programs, and social movements like #MeToo. The fact that participants were all critical, to some degree, of stereotypical masculinity, speaks to the increased visibility of gender issues in mainstream society (Cover, 2019) and to the increasing focus on equity issues in outdoor education (e.g., Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017) that their organizations have adopted. The recognition of such issues, in addition to their reported efforts to confront their students' blatantly sexist language and actions, perhaps indicates uptake of Warren et al.'s (2018)

recommendation that increased support and empowerment of women is needed to address gender equity in outdoor education. However, organizational efforts towards inclusion should also be viewed with some skepticism. The neoliberal turn to inclusion and diversity initiatives also can be viewed as a method to attract new clientele (Connell, 2013) and increase profits (Boucher & Clark, 2020) while maintaining the White, patriarchal, masculine domination of the field (Crompton, 2008). That said, by engaging in such actions to increase equity, the participants role model their allyship, empathy, and appreciation of gender equity as well as consideration of alternative viewpoints and gender enactments that may be reproduced in their students.

In addition, most participants indicated that they believe outdoor education culture is separate from, and slightly resistant to, mainstream society, echoing earlier assertions to that effect by Barnes (2003) and Humberstone (2000). That provides support for the hope Humberstone (2000) expressed 20 years ago that outdoor education could represent a space for transgression of gendered norms, which could support a counterhegemonic movement. Further, given the participants' assertions of the importance of role modeling in the subculture, both as a professional value and as an individual method of performing alternative masculinities, it is possible that more progressive attitudes and practices related to gender will continue to grow in the field and be reproduced in future students.

The sense of community and belonging in the outdoor education subculture could also permit resistance to mainstream hegemonic forms of masculinity, similar to that documented in research on Jewish boys' masculinity (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012). That said, despite participants' assertions of subcultural separateness from the mainstream, the outdoor education community does not exist in a vacuum and, as discussed above, participants may not be as different from other males as they would like to believe. Outside influences clearly impact the

field and individual leaders. As just a few examples from this study, take the acceptance of Bréné Brown's (2012) vulnerability narrative and Oliver naming Kanye West as a masculine influence and North choosing his pseudonym based on the name of Kanye West's first child. As discussed by participants in relation to the negative and positive influences of media, the impact of mainstream culture can be mixed, which is further exemplified by two participants touting Kanye West who represents male vulnerability but also misogyny and violence (Bailey, 2014).

The data also indicate that aspects of stereotypical masculinity have been challenged and sometimes even disrupted in the outdoor education field. That said, there remain problematic aspects of these OE leaders' masculinity that reinforce gender inequity. Based on interview responses and observations, I would argue that the type of masculinity most prevalent amongst the participants reflects Bridges and Pascoe's (2014) concept of hybrid masculinity. As described in detail in the literature review, hybrid masculinity is a form of masculinity, often practiced by privileged White men such as the participants, that appears progressive and inclusive, demonstrating non-stereotypical traits, such as vulnerability and concern for social issues, but which nonetheless subtly maintains the hegemonic masculine paradigm (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). Participants' critique of gender norms and avowed commitment to gender equity, while simultaneously devaluing some groups of men as well as essentializing, othering, and devaluing women, is a prime example of hybrid masculinity.

Further, participants' valuing of vulnerability and caring masculinities dovetails with the current popularity of such notions in the mainstream media as demonstrated by recent advertisements (Gillette, 2019), books (Brown, 2012; Oluo, 2020; Plank, 2019; Urwin, 2016), and film (Siebel Newsom, 2015). In addition, such valuing may serve another, perhaps unconscious purpose for participants seeing how careers in the care sector are fast growing and

men are increasingly taking up such work (Henderson, 2012), necessitating a rethinking of masculine norms to accommodate this economic imperative. Further, issues of gender bias and equity are embedded in their outdoor education organization's training and literature so embracing a more caring and vulnerable masculine presentation and professional practice enables participants to enhance their social status as well as their potential for upward mobility within their organization, as demonstrated in a study by Huppatz and Goodwin (2013). In addition, those espousing progressive values and social equity may escape censure in a "call-out" culture (Moran, 2020), further securing their place in the hierarchy.

Despite claims of progressivism, many of the participants valued stereotypically male traits such as stoicism, confidence, risk-taking, directive leadership, and physical strength and skill. In most cases, they did so while also making statements that worked to distance themselves from stereotypical masculinity as discussed above. Indeed, they sought to portray themselves as progressive, caring, intelligent men who are respectful and responsible, arguably the currently dominant form of masculinity in the west (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014; Elliott, 2020). Several took pains to distinguish themselves from men who enact hypermasculinity and hold more conservative notions of gender. As detailed in Chapter Eight, an analysis of who these other men are imagined to be illuminates distinctions that have classed, raced, heteronormative, and age dimensions. By heaping judgement upon "other" men who typically hold lower status, participants can maintain their (superior) place in the hierarchy and support the hegemonic masculine structure espoused by Connell (2005). Another example of such othering was the middle-class, male primary teacher in Martino's (2008a) study who enacted an alternative masculinity to simultaneously be a role model and to mark himself as more progressive and intelligent in a predominantly working-class school community. As noted in the literature

review, Messerschmidt (2019) differentiates between dominant and hegemonic masculinities, asserting hegemonic masculine enactments need not be consistent or frequent to do the work of maintaining patriarchy. So, while the participants may transgress gender norms in some ways and "share the voice" with women co-leaders, they may also occasionally do or say things that essentialize, other, or devalue women, thereby maintaining women's subordination.

The use of persistent gendered language, as demonstrated in Chapter Six, is one example of microaggressions that devalue women in general, and in outdoor education specifically as noted by Jordan (2018). Essentialist views professed by some participants about the genders (e.g., men's physical strength and logic, women's relational capacity and risk aversion) is another method of maintaining the gender hierarchy, especially considering the greater prestige afforded to masculine traits in society as a whole, and within the male-created and dominated outdoor education field (Newbery, 2003). Lastly, although two participants accepted feedback from women and tried to change their practice accordingly, two admitted to dismissing feedback and four sought alternative explanations for women colleagues' claims of being devalued. Actions such as these indicate that women's concerns are subordinated and dismissed as biased, in line with Martino's research (2008b). In addition, the expectation of candour from women during feedback sessions ignores the many social impediments to women engaging in free and open dialogue (Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Avery, 2015; Bell et al., 2018; Lipman, 2018), particularly the risks associated with critiquing male co-leaders or supervisors.

Participants' statements were all mediated by a number of factors. First, there seemed to be clear linkages between participants' awareness of gender issues and the degree and content of training, policy, and resourcing furnished by their employing organizations. Second, within any given organization, no responses to interviews were uniform, and that variation within

organizations indicates that other factors also had influence on participants' concepts of masculinity. Sources of variation that came up included media and the wider culture generally, non-traditional role models (particularly working mothers), generational differences, degree of ability to self-reflect, and their perception of student expectations.

Returning to Enloe's (2007) notion of feminist curiosity presented in the theoretical framework of this research, I posed a number of questions in Chapter Three that I wanted to keep in mind as I analyzed my findings. Enloe's questions about how social expectations and economic forces shape gender relations are relevant here. In particular, I raised questions in the literature review about the neoliberal economic imperative and its assertion that all humans are individuals who are personally responsible for their own circumstance regardless of context and wider social forces (Chomsky, 1999; Risman, 2018). That imperative seems particularly relevant when I considered the implications of the often contract-based and transient nature of private or non-profit outdoor education work. On the one hand, that means that the field is mostly occupied by younger and middle or upper-class folks who can afford to take low-paying seasonal work. On the other, perhaps the stakes are not quite so high in these positions and there is more room for independence, including diverse gender performances.

One way in which the economic imperative might impact participants' gender performance is the use of student evaluations in performance reviews. Given some participants discussed how they sometimes initially perform a stereotypical masculinity to meet student expectations, so too some might avoid controversial topics out of fear of poor evaluations and the resultant impacts on their future employment prospects. Still, Bruce's statement that some students claimed that his organization, Outdoor Skills Co-op, is "sexist against men", which has been dismissed by others in his organization as recalcitrance, makes it seem that may be less of a

problem at his site. However, the embedded masculinist structure and gendered hidden curriculum of outdoor education remains a concern (Warren et al., 2019) since multiple participants at Outdoor Skills Co-op stated that the greater focus on gender and other equity issues is spurring backlash among some within the upper echelons of the organization.

Another aspect of the neoliberal emphasis on individualism related to participants sharing various strategies they used to address gender equity. These included addressing overt expressions of sexism, sharing voice, tackling gender-specific topics, and engaging students and fostering trust to more effectively role model a positive masculinity. What is striking is the individualist character of participants' work for gender equity. Like many of the young adults in Risman's (2018) study, and possibly influenced by the "rugged individualism" narrative in outdoor education (Kimmel, 1995; Straker, 2018) that is linked with White colonialist masculinity (Deloria, 1998; Kimmel, 1995), participants omitted mention of collective activism, such as petitioning their employers for changes to policies and practices or forming coherent and lasting activist groups to address pervasive social norms, and instead worked alone to address sexism and role model a masculinity they felt would promote gender equity. As argued by Risman (2018), such a solitary approach to creating change may be the product of the neoliberal ideology of individualism currently predominant in Western thought. Further, neoliberalism is cited by Connell (2005) and Messerschmidt (2019) as a system that supports, and is supported by, hegemonic masculinity.

Another question that occurs to me, emanating from Enloe's (2007) feminist curiosity, is the issue of performative labour. Some participants indicated that they needed to enact a more stereotypical masculinity to accommodate student expectations and to engender trust. Embodying a more stereotypical masculinity to engage students, however, offers a troubling

hidden curriculum for students and may inadvertently alienate some women co-leaders. In addition, as noted in Messerschmidt (2019), hegemonic masculinity need not be consistently enacted in order to maintain the gender hierarchy. Therefore, brief enactments of stereotypical masculinity to engage students may not only devalue women co-leaders but support gender hierarchy.

Overall, it seems that the participants were doing their best to critique and resist hegemonic masculinity and support gender equity. Still, even though the outdoor education field as a whole promotes reflection and feedback (Ewert & Sibthorp, 2014; Martin et al., 2017), the naïve expectation of candour and other barriers such as curriculum and logistical demands were not recognized and deserve participants' attention. At the same time, given the complexity of human interactions and motivations, any efforts to critique hegemonic masculinity and contribute to equity are likely to be variable and inconstant. Although there remains a great deal of work to do to acknowledge the gendered hidden curriculum and hegemonic masculine influence in the outdoor education field, as a number of scholars have noted (Allen-Craig et al., 2020; Davies et al., 2019; Gray et al., 2020; Kennedy & Russell, 2020), there now seems to be more willingness to consider these issues. The participants certainly exemplified such a change, if in differing degrees.

Finally, as noted earlier, the persistence of certain hegemonic masculine traits indicates a hybrid masculinity (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). Such persistence in participants' responses and behaviours despite their acknowledgement of societal attitudes and norms may also be attributable to the Bourdieuian (1989) notion of *habitus*; that is, the collective pattern of thoughts and behaviour that result from exposure to certain contextual norms. Exposure, over time, renders certain ideas and behaviours to be seen as common sense and so can become instinctive.

While Bourdieu (1989) asserts that humans have a degree of agency and the ability to question and step outside of established norms, he also acknowledged that those patterns of thought that are cultivated in childhood are the most durable and transportable across new and different situations (Bourdieu, 1977). Therefore, even if someone wishes to enact different values than those formed earlier in life, they will often unconsciously default to their instinctive position. I would argue that this may be the case for many of the participants who want to promote gender equity, yet still default to essentialist notions of gender and uncritical assumptions about individual agency.

Bourdieu (1977) does state that changes to conscious and unconscious perspectives are possible. The longer one engages in new cultural fields or operates in contexts with different norms, the greater the impact of the new expectations on conscious thought and unconscious dispositions. However, witnessing and intellectually knowing about the new expectations is not enough to inculcate them on a deep level, to enact change to the *habitus*; one must practice the changes and put them into action in social life (Bourdieu, 1977). Therefore, the more time male outdoor leaders spend witnessing and talking about changes to gender norms, the greater the subconscious change to gender beliefs and actions are likely to be. Further, the more they can put these new values into action, such as accepting critical feedback from women co-leaders and actively reflecting on their behaviours, the more ingrained such notions may become. Alternatively, uncritical and continued exposure to the hybrid masculinities demonstrated by the participants could further reify gender inequity.

I would argue that the notion of *habitus* not only enables deeper understanding of the dynamics of social change but also shows the great potential for organizational policies, training, and resources to make a significant impact over time. Outdoor education organizations should

continue to promote gender equity and non-traditional gender performances, including a questioning of heteronormativity. In addition, providing opportunities to openly discuss barriers that exist, such as resistance to women's feedback, and ways of moving around such barriers, such as enacting (or perhaps role-playing) self-critical reflection and acceptance of feedback as part of training sessions, year on year, could have a great impact in the field. This is doubly so when reproduced by OE leaders who act as role models for their students.

In sum, my study has revealed that there have been promising shifts in the field given the ways in which my participants are working to disrupt hegemonic masculinity and sexist practices in the field. Some impediments and blind spots exist as demonstrated by the majority of participants enacting a race- and class-informed hybrid masculinity that is ostensibly progressive and equity-promoting, but simultaneously supports the hegemonic gender structure. The influence of the outdoor organisations' values on their employees provides one leverage point for further change and should be embraced by administrators. In addition, consideration should be given in the outdoor education field as to how leaders can act collectively to promote gender equity rather than employing an individualistic approach.

Limitations

While appropriate for a doctoral dissertation, the limitations of my study are many. The limited number of participants (18), although representing three well-respected outdoor organizations across multiple sites, means that the results of this study are not necessarily generalizable (Yin, 2013) although I imagine some readers may see resonance with their own experiences in different contexts. Also hindering the applicability of the results to cases beyond my study is that all three organizations demonstrated evidence that they value and promote gender equity via training, policy, and resourcing. Although interest in gender issues recently has

been evinced in the field (Davies et al., 2019; Gray et al., 2020), these equity efforts may not be representative of the field as a whole.

Further, data was collected from volunteers rather than a random sampling of male OE leaders. Those who volunteered expressed interest in the topic of masculinity and some, it was clear, felt well informed and confident in their knowledge of the topic. This level of interest in gender issues may not be the norm in the male OE leader population. Indeed, it is telling that the majority of male OE leaders I approached declined to be involved when offered the opportunity. Therefore, my participants may be the most progressive members of the field or those who felt the most educated about the topic of masculinity, and likely are not representative of the field as a whole. The results should thus be considered with this possible selection bias in mind and conclusions drawn from this work treated with caution.

The limited observation time available was also an issue that impacts the trustworthiness of the study. As noted in Chapter Three, one of the organizations (Outdoor Skills Co-op) did not permit me to conduct observations and two of the three organizations (Adventure Quest and Camp Laviron) only permitted me to observe participants on their sites, and the timeline for data collection provided by one (Camp Laviron) limited my observation opportunity to one day for all six participants from that organization. As well, one participant from Adventure Quest volunteered to participate only after his last active day of work for the season, meaning I could not observe him in practice. The limited observational data limited my ability to triangulate the data that would increase the study's validity, so I had limited opportunity to see how well participant rhetoric and reality matched. The stipulation that observations take place only at the base camp site also means that the participants' actions in the backcountry might be quite different from what they described.

One ethical consideration arose at Camp Laviron that I also think is important to mention. The camp administrators scheduled their staff to meet me at the office so that I could describe my research and give them the opportunity to decide whether or not they would like to participate. Though I repeated to each participant at least three times that they were free not to participate and could withdraw at any time, it is possible that a lingering coercive effect from the organization remained. This is especially true given participants' overall allegiance to their organizations. Perhaps wanting to portray their organizations or themselves in a good light may have changed the participants' responses. Another issue may be the social desirability response bias whereby a participant attempts to give the expected response to interviewer questions to please the interviewer (Gupta & Thornton, 2002)

A final limitation relates to my personal standpoint as a researcher. In addition to being a cis-gender, White, heterosexual, middle-class, able-bodied male, I am also a relative insider in the outdoor education culture. Despite my best efforts to use theory to critically engage with the data, it is likely that I too have blind spots that limited my analysis. While my supervisor and committee helped me identify and address my biases, the effectiveness of such efforts is likely limited given my level of engagement with the data compared to theirs.

Recommendations for Future Research

My participants were male OE leaders working across multiple sites. Barnes (2003) claims that each outdoor education site has its own unique culture and norms and, as noted earlier in this chapter, there were varying perspectives on masculinity at each site. Because only one perspective was collected at each site, that of male-identifying outdoor leaders, it would be interesting to learn the perspectives of staff who are female-identifying or gender-diverse, and how those might resonate with and differ from my participants. It would also be fascinating to

hear the perspectives of multiple co-leaders and students on the same trip. My original hope to conduct observations would also be useful to provide more insights into how perspectives on masculinity and gender equity get embodied in practice. Ethnographic research at specific site(s) would be one way to approach such research and could be very illuminating.

My analysis indicates that the training, policy, and resourcing of the different organizations were likely significant influences on the participants' understandings and practices of masculinity and gender equity, but my evidence is far from conclusive. Future studies could more closely examine the relationship between male co-leaders' understandings of masculinity and gender equity and the training regimes of different organizations as well as factors that affect the uptake and implementation of specific training, policy, or resources.

Lastly, all but one of the OE leaders in my study were White and all were middle class. A study of non-White OE leaders' understandings of masculinity would likely produce a valuable understanding of how race and class intersect with conceptions of masculinity within the field.

Final Thoughts

Throughout my research journey, I learned many lessons about myself and complexified my own viewpoints. In addition, I became aware of the current state of outdoor education, at least as represented by the participating organizations. In what follows, I detail my main take-aways from the process and my hopes for the future of the outdoor education field.

By reading to support my literature review, I became aware not only of the incompleteness of my viewpoint, but also of my humanness. To state that everyone has a unique viewpoint is, on the surface, a rather trite statement. However, realizing just how differently others can experience quotidian interactions by reading others' perspectives (e.g., Gray, 2016; Warren et al., 2018) was extremely eye-opening and led to a great deal of introspection and self-

critique, consistent with suggestions by Breunig and Rylander (2015). Through increased

reflection on my own actions and interactions, and by critiquing the observation and interview

data of my participants, I became aware of the force of Bourdieuian (1977) *habitus*. *Habitus* can

help to explain the gap between knowledge and action. For example, I was aware of gendered

language but still find changing the way that I spoke to eliminate gendered phrases, particularly

conventional phrases and idioms, challenging, particularly when I was tired or stressed.

Similarly, avoiding raced and gendered behaviours, including those that would gain me status,

requires constant vigilance. In my conversation with Barry, we discussed the messiness of being

human: the imperfection, the inconsistency, and the contextuality of our interactions. Awareness

of my own humanness allowed me to keep trying to correct my own behaviours but avoid

despair when I faltered. Like everyone, I am a work in progress, even at 42 years old, and this

gives me empathy for my participants' and peers' confusion and struggles. And it is this empathy

that gives me hope for the outdoor education field.

Reading Humberstone (2000), and being marinated in the field's discourse, I conceived

of outdoor education sites and excursions as separate and apart from mainstream culture.

Although outdoor education may be a unique subculture, it is absolutely tethered to, and

influenced by, popular culture. While communicating with outdoor organizations and interacting

with outdoor educators on site, I observed many efforts to make outdoor education more

inclusive. The awareness of social issues is slowly but surely being incorporated into outdoor

education practice. The social justice awareness is fueled, in part, by the increasingly high profile

of social activism (e.g., #MeToo, Black Lives Matter, Idle No More). The pervasiveness of the

social justice messages in popular culture seem to be filtering into outdoor education, through

not only staff but also students. Perhaps social justice messaging now is being reproduced in ways that earlier, and persistent, problematic gendered messaging was and is.

It was encouraging to see men's heightened focus on gender issues, especially compared to what I was reading in the outdoor education literature (e.g., Gray, 2016). Hopefully this is indeed a trend given Allen-Craig et al. (2020) and Davies et al. (2019) have noted a similar shift. It is my sincere wish that feminist perspectives will increasingly make their way into outdoor education training and resourcing, and that includes those focused on masculinity. Further, I hope that men in outdoor education will continue to improve their self-awareness and acknowledge their privilege, as advocated by Breunig and Rylander (2015). Doing so can help disrupt hegemonic masculinity, essentialist, and sexist discourses and practices that still shape the field.

References

Aarseth, H., & Olsen, B. M. (2008). Food and masculinity in dual-career couples. *Journal of Gender Studies, 17*(4), 277-287.

Acker, S. (2000). In/out/side: Positioning the researcher in feminist qualitative research. *Resources for Feminist Research, 28*(1), 189-208.

Addis, M., & Cohane, G. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *61*(6), 633-647.

Ahearn, L. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*, 109-137.

Allen-Craig, S., & Carpenter, C. (2018). Outdoor education: Threaded pathways to belonging. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 55-73). Palgrave Macmillan.

Allen-Craig, S., Gray, T., Charles, R., Socha, T., Cosgriff, M., Mitten, D., & Loeffler, T. A. (2020). Together we have impact: Exploring gendered experiences in outdoor leadership. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership*, *12*(1), 121-139.

Allin, L. (2003). Women's reflections on a career in outdoor education. In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. C. Richards-Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: Critical explorations of relations between individuals, "others" and the environment* (pp. 229-239). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Allin, L. (2004). Climbing Mount Everest: Women, career and family in outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *8*(2), 64-71.

Allin, L., & Humberstone, B. (2006). Exploring careership in outdoor education and the lives of women outdoor educators. *Sport, Education, and Society, 11*(2), 135-153.

Altman, D. (1972). *Homosexual: Oppression and liberation*. Angus and Robertson.

Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. *Men and Masculinities*, *10*(5), 604-620.

Anderson, C., Hildreth, J., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(3), 574–601.

Angelides, P. (2004). Generation division in Cyprus education? Different attitudes to education from younger and older teachers. *Educational Review, 56*(1), 65-76.

Apple, M. (2017). Cultural politics and the text. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & M. Baltodano (eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (3rd ed.) (pp. 79-94). Routledge.

Asfeldt, M., Purc-Stephenson, R., Rawleigh, M., & Thackeray, S. (2020). Outdoor education in Canada: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 1-13.

Association for Experiential Education (AEE). (1992). *Ethical guidelines of the Therapeutic Adventure Professional Group (TAPG)*. Association for Experiential Education.

Atkinson, M., & Kehler, M. (2010). Boys, gyms, locker rooms and heterotopia. In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken* (pp. 73-90). Peter Lang.

Avery, M. E. (2015). *The gendering of outdoor recreation: Women's experiences on their path to leadership* [Doctoral dissertation, Texas State University].

Avery, M. E., Norton, C. L., & Tucker, A. (2018). Blazing a trail ... together: The need for mentoring and collaboration amongst women in outdoor leadership. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 801-813). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bailey, J. (2014). *The cultural impact of Kanye West.* Springer.

Ball, S. (2012). Performativity, commodification and commitment: An I-spy guide to the neoliberal university. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *60*(1), 17-28.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.

Barnes, P. (2003). Outdoor leaders as cultural phenomena. In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. C. Richards-Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: Critical explorations of relations between individuals, "others" and the environment* (pp. 241-250). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Barnfield, D., & Humberstone, B. (2008). Speaking out: Perspectives of gay and lesbian practitioners in outdoor education in the UK. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *8*(1), 31-42.

BBC (2020, June 5). Ahmaud Arbery: What do we know about the case? *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52623151

Beames, S., & Varley, P. (2013). Eat, play, shop: The Disneyization of adventure. In S. Taylor, P. Varley, & T. Johnston (Eds.), *Adventure tourism: Meanings, experience and learning* (pp. 77-84). Routledge.

Beasley, C. (2019). Feminism and men/masculinities scholarship: Connections, disjunctions, and possibilities. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 30-40). Routledge.

Becker, J., & Wright, S. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101,* 62-77.

Bell, A., & Russell, C. (2000). Beyond human, beyond words: Anthropocentrism, critical pedagogy, and the poststructuralist turn. *Canadian Journal of Education, 25(3)*, 188-203.

Bell, M., Cosgriff, M., Lynch, P., & Zink, R. (2018). Nourishing terrains? Troubling terrains? Women's outdoor work in Aotearoa New Zealand. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 199-215). Palgrave Macmillan.

Benayon, M. (2012). "Raise them Jewish, raise them proud!": Gay Jewish fathers in contemprorary Israeli and Canadian Jewish society. In C. Greig & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 878-977). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Bergold, S., Kasper, D., Wendt, H., & Steinmayr, R. (2019). Being bullied at school: The case of high-achieving boys. *Social Psychology of Education, 16*(2) 1-24.

Bhana, D. (2012). "Little boys": The significance of early childhood in the making of masculinities. In C. Greig & W. Martino (Eds.) *Canadian men and masculinities (*pp. 173-191)*. Canadian Scholars' Press.

Biesta, G. (2005). Against learning. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, *25*(1), 54-66.

Biesta, G., & Miedema, S. (2002). Instruction or pedagogy? The need for a transformative conception of education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(2), 173-181.

Bird, S. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society, 10*(2), 120-132.

Birrell, C. (2018). Eyes wide shut: A history of blindness towards the feminine in outdoor education in Australia. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 473-488). Palgrave Macmillan.

Blenkinsop, S., Piersol, L., & Sitka-Sage, M. D. D. (2018). Boys being boys: Eco-double consciousness, splash violence, and environmental education. *Journal of Environmental Education*, *49*(4), 350-356.

Bly, R. (1990). *Iron John: A book about men*. Addison-Wesley.

Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity*, *36*(4), 391-409.

Botta, R., & Fitzgerald, L. (2020). Gendered experiences in the backcountry. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership*, *12*(1), 27-40.

Boucher, D., & Clark, C. (2020). After postmodernism: Working woke in the neoliberal era. In M. Peters, M. Tesar, L. Jackson, & T. Besley (Eds.), *What comes after postmodernism in educational theory?* (pp. 128-131). Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. *Social Science Information, 17*(6), 819-840.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 14-25.

Braddock, K. (2018, November 23). The vulnerability industry: How male mental health became big business. *Esquire.* Retrieved from https://www.esquire.com/uk/life/a25291131/how-male-mental-health-became-big-business/

Braun, B. (2003). "On the raggedy edge of risk": Articulations of race and nature after biology. In D.S. Moore, J. Kosek, & A. Pandian (Eds.), *Race, nature, and the politics of difference* (pp. 175–203). Duke University Press.

Breines, I., Connell, R., & Eide, I. (2000). *Male roles, masculinities and violence: A culture of peace perspective*. UNESCO.

Breunig, M. C., O'Connell, T. S., Todd, S., Anderson, L., & Young, A. (2010). The impact of outdoor pursuits on college students' perceived sense of community. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *42*(4), 551-572.

Breunig, M., & Russell, C. (2020). Long-term impacts of two secondary school environmental studies programs on environmental behaviour: The shadows of patriarchy and neoliberalism. *Environmental Education Research, 26*(5), 701-715.

Breunig, M., & Rylander, E. (2015). Beyond training for tolerance in outdoor experiential education. In B. Humberstone, H. Prince, & K. Henderson (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of outdoor studies* (pp. 168-177). Routledge.

Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2014). Hybrid masculinities: New directions in the sociology of men and masculinities. *Sociology Compass*, *8*(3), 246-258.

Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. State University of New York Press.

Brookes, A. (2003). What is this "we" business? Or "I am sorry, Brookes, you are not one of us". In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. Richards–Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: critical explorations of relations between individuals, 'others' and the environment* (pp. 382-383). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead.* Gotham.

Brown, M., & Beames, S. (2017). Adventure education: Redux. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *17*(4), 294-306.

Bryman, A. (2004). *The Disneyization of society*. Sage.

Bryson, B. (1996). "Anything but heavy metal": Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review,* 61, 884-899.

Buchbinder, D. (1997). *Performance anxieties: Re-producing masculinity.* Allen & Unwin.

Budgeon, S. (2014). The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities and social change. *Sociology*, *48*(2), 317-334.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Camarillo, L., Stodolska, M., & Shinew, K. (2020). Marketing recreation services in the changing landscape of race and ethnic relations. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, *38*(1), 50-66.

Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, *14*(5), 551-604.

Chandler, T., & Nauright, J. (2013). Introduction: Manhood, rugby, and identity. In T. Chandler, & J. Nauright, (Eds.), *Making men: Rugby and masculine identity* (pp.1-13). Routledge.

Chodorow, N. J. (2014). *Femininities, masculinities, sexualities: Freud and beyond*. University Press of Kentucky.

Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people*. Severn Stories Press.

Christensen, A. D., & Jensen, S. Q. (2014). Combining hegemonic masculinity and intersectionality. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, *9*(1), 60-75.

Christie, B. (2018). Telling my story: Being female in outdoor education in higher education. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 259-272). Palgrave Macmillan.

Christophel, W., (Producer) & Rohrbaugh, M. (Director). (2016). *American male* [Motion Picture]. MTV.

Clark, S. (2015). Running into trouble: Constructions of danger and risk in girls' access to outdoor space and physical activity. *Sport, Education, and Society, 20*(8), 1012-1028.

Cockburn, C. (1983). *Brothers: Male dominance and technological change*. Pluto.

Cohen, G. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 85*(5*),* 808-822.

Cohen, A., & Court, D. (2003). Ethnography and case study: A comparative analysis. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *7*(3), 283-288.

Coleman, A. (2002). The unbearable whiteness of skiing. In J. Bloom & M. Willard (Eds.), *Sports matters* (pp. 141-168). New York University Press.

Coleman, J., & Hong, Y. (2008). Beyond nature and nurture: The influence of lay gender theories on self-stereotyping, *Self and Identity, 7*(1), 34-53.

Connell, R. W. (1979). The concept of role and what to do with it. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, *15*(3), 7-17.

Connell, R. (1982). Class, patriarchy, and Sartre's theory of practice. *Theory and Society*, *11*(3), 305-320.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. (1990). *An iron man: The body and some contradictions of hegemonic masculinity.* In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives* (pp. 141-149). Human Kinetics.

Connell, R. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Polity Press.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities (2nd ed.)*. University of California Press.

Connell, R. (2006). Glass ceilings or gendered institutions? Mapping the gender regimes of public sector worksites. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(6), 837-849.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*, *54*(2), 99-112.

Connell, R. (2009). Good teachers on dangerous ground: Towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalism. *Critical Studies in Education*, *50*(3), 213-229.

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, *19*(6), 829-859.

Connellan, J., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Batki, A., & Ahluwalia, J. (2000). Sex differences in human neonatal social perception. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *23*(1), 113-118.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Resisting the impositional potential of student voice work: Lessons for liberatory educational research from poststructuralist feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*(3), 389-403.

Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, *50*(10), 1385-1401.

Cousineau, L., & Roth, J. (2012). Pervasive patriarchal leadership ideology in seasonal residential summer camp staff. *Leadership*, *8*(4), 421-440.

Cover, R. (2015). *Vulnerability and exposure: Footballer scandals, masculine identity and ethics*. Apollo Books.

Cover, R. (2019). Understanding anger: Ethical responsiveness and the cultural production of celebrity masculinities. In B. Fileborn & D. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *#MeToo and the politics of social change* (pp. 670-704). Palgrave Macmillan.

Cox, N. (2017). *Dear Mr. Hiker Man: Negotiating gender in a masculinized American wilderness* [Master's thesis, Oregon State University]. http://hdl.handle.net/1794/22703

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Crompton, J. (2008). Evolution and implications of a paradigm shift in the marketing of leisure services in the USA. *Leisure Studies, 27*, 181-205.

Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, H. (2002). *Extending educational reform*. Routledge.

Davidson, L. (2003). Adventure, meaning, and identity: An historical case study from New Zealand. In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. C. Richards-Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: Critical explorations of relations between individuals, "others" and the environment* (pp. 337-349). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Davies, R., Potter, T. G., & Gray, T. (2019). Diverse perspectives: gender and leadership in the outdoor education workplace. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, *22*(3), 217-235.

Davis, J. (2019). Black faces, black spaces: Rethinking African American underrepresentation in wildland spaces and outdoor recreation. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, *2*(1), 89-109.

Deloria, P. (1998). *Playing Indian*. Yale University Press.

Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and*

Society, 30(3), 337-361.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Vintage Books.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. Free Press.

Dixon, J., & Foster, D. (1997). Gender and hedging: From sex differences to situated

practice. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *26*(1), 89-107.

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2018). Why doesn't anti-bias training work? *Anthropology Now, 10*,

48-55.

Dubreil Karpa, S. (2018). Justice for all: Women in outdoor education. In T. Gray & D. Mitten

(Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 351-

360). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success.* Ballantine Books.

Dyment, J., & Potter, T. (2015). Is outdoor education a discipline? Provocations and

possibilities. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *15*(3), 193-208.

Eastman, J. (2012). Rebel manhood: The hegemonic masculinity of the Southern rock music

revival. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *41*(2), 189-219.

Eaude, T. (2011). Compliance or innovation? Enhanced professionalism as the route to

improving learning and teaching. *Education Review*, *24*(1), 49-57.

Edley, N. (2017). *Men and masculinity: The basics.* Routledge.

Edwards, K. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model.

NASPA Journal, *43*(4), 39-60.

Eliot, L. (2010). *Pink brain, blue brain*. Oneworld.

Elliott, K. (2020). *Young men navigating contemporary masculinities.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297-325.

Englar-Carlson, M., & Kiselica, M. S. (2013). Affirming the strengths in men: A positive masculinity approach to assisting male clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 91*(4), 399-409.

Enloe, C. (2007). Crafting a global "feminist curiosity" to make sense of globalized militarism: Tallying impacts, exposing causes. In *Globalization and militarism: Feminists make the link* (pp. 1-18). Rowman & Littlefield.

Erickson, B. (1996). Culture, class, and connections. *American Journal of Sociology,* 102, 217-251.

Ertesvåg, S. K., Roland, P., Vaaland, G. S., Størksen, S., & Veland, J. (2010). The challenge of continuation: Schools' continuation of the Respect program. *Journal of Educational Change*, *11*(4), 323-344.

Evetts, J. (2018). Professionalism in turbulent times: Changes, challenges and opportunities. *Sociologia, Problemas et Práticas*, *88*, 43-59.

Ewert, A., & Sibthorp, R. J. (2014). *Outdoor adventure education: Foundations, theory and research*. Human Kinetics.

Exley, C., & Kessler, J. B. (2019). *The gender gap in self-promotion*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Farrell, W. (1974). *The liberated man: Freeing men and their relationships with women*. Random House

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2008). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men*. Basic.

Fileborn, B., & Loney-Howes, D. (2019). Mapping the emergence of #MeToo. In B. Fileborn & D. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *#MeToo and the politics of social change* (pp. 37-75). Palgrave Macmillan.

Fine, C. (2010). *Delusions of gender: How our minds, society, and neurosexism create difference*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Fine, C. (2017). *Testosterone rex: Myths of sex, science, and society*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Finney, C. (2014). *Black faces, white spaces: Reimagining the relationship of African Americans to the great outdoors*. University of North Carolina Press.

Fleming, P. J., Lee, J. L., & Dworkin, S. L. (2014). "Real men don't": Constructions of masculinity and inadvertent harm in public health interventions. *American Journal of Public Health*, *104*(6), 1029-1035.

Fletcher, R. (2008). Living on the edge: The appeal of risk sports for the professional middle class. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *25*(3), 310-330.

Flood, M. (2008). Men, sex, and homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities*, *10*(3), 339-359.

Flood, M. (2019). Men and #MeToo: Mapping men's responses to anti-violence advocacy. In B. Fileborn & D. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *#MeToo and the politics of social change* (pp. 635-669). Palgrave Macmillan.

Foley, M., Frew, M., & McGillivray, D. (2003). Rough comfort, consuming adventure on the "edge." In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. C. Richards-Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: Critical explorations of relations between individuals, "others" and the environment* (pp. 149-160). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Ford, P. (1981). *Principles and practices of outdoor/environmental education*. Wiley and Sons.

Ford, P. (1986). *Outdoor education: Definition and philosophy*. ERIC Digest.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction, volume I*. (Robert Hurley., Trans.). Vintage.

Frank, B., Kehler, M., Lovell, T., & Davison, K. (2003). A tangle of trouble: Boys, masculinity and schooling-future directions. *Educational Review*, *55*(2), 119-133.

Freud, S. (1961). The infantile genital organization (An interpolation into the theory of sexuality). In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, volume XIX (1923-1925): The ego and the id and other works* (pp. 139-146). Vintage.

Galdas, P. M., Cheater, F., & Marshall, P. (2005). Men and health help-seeking behaviour: Literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *49*(6), 616-623.

Gass, M. (1998). If our future is so bright, how do we take care of it? *Journeys, 3*(4), 14-20.

Gemar, A. (2020). Sport as culture: Social class, styles of cultural consumption and sports participation in Canada. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *55*(2), 186-208.

Gillette (2019, January 13). *We believe: The best men can be* [Video]. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koPmuEyP3a0.

Giroux, H. A. (1994). *Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture*. Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1998). *Channel surfing: Racism, the media, and the deconstruction of today's youth*. St. Martin's Griffin.

Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory: Emergence vs. forcing.* Sociology Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Aldine.

Gneezy, U., Leonard, K.L., & List, J. (2009). Gender differences in competition: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society. *Econometrica*, 77(5),1637-1664.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the social order*. Allen Lane.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, *8*(4), 597-606.

Good, G. E., & Wood, P. K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression, and help seeking: Do college men face double jeopardy? *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *74*(1), 70-75.

Gomez, C.A. (2012). *Man up: Cracking the code of modern manhood.* Gotham.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. Routledge.

Gough, A. (2013). Researching differently: Generating a gender agenda for research in environmental education. In R. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 375-383). Routledge.

Gray, T. (2016). The "F" word: Feminism in outdoor education. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education, 19(2),* 25-41.

Gray, T. (2018). Thirty years on, and has the gendered landscape changed in outdoor learning? In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 35-54). Palgrave Macmillan.

Gray, T., Allen-Craig, S., & Carpenter, C. (2017). Selective hearing: The unrecognised contribution of women to the outdoor profession. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, *20*(1), 25-34.

Gray, T., & Mitten, D. (2018). Nourishing terrains: Women's contributions to outdoor learning. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 3-17). Palgrave Macmillan.

Gray, T., Mitten, D., Potter, T., & Kennedy, J. (2020). Reflective insights toward gender-inclusive outdoor leadership. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership*, *12*(1), 102-120.

Greig, C. (2012). Boys' underachievement in school in historical perspective: Exploring masculinity and schooling in the postwar era, 1945-1960. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 400-451). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Greig, C., & Holloway, S. (2012). Canadian manhood(s). In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 452-522). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Greig, C., & Martino, G. (2012). Masculinity in post-industrial and neoliberal times. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 16-78). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Gunn, T. (2006). Some outdoor educators' experiences of outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *10*(1), 29-37.

Gupta, S., & Thornton, B. (2002). Circumventing social desirability response bias in personal interview surveys. *American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences*, *22*(3/4), 369-383.

Hagerman, M. (2020). *White kids: Growing up with privilege in a racially divided America*. New York University Press.

Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Vintage.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinities*. Duke University Press.

Haluza-Delay, R., & Dyment, J. E. (2003). A toolkit for gender-inclusive wilderness leadership. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *74*(7), 28-32.

Harris, I. (1995). *Messages men hear: Constructing masculinities.* Routledge.

Hattie, J., Marsh, H., Neill, J., & Richards, G. (1997). Adventure education and Outward Bound: Out-of-class experiences that make a lasting difference. *Review of Educational Research, 67*, 43-87.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012). "What's next for masculinity?" Reflexive directions for theory and research on masculinity and education. *Gender and Education*, *24*(6), 577-592.

Hearn, J. (1997). The implications of critical studies on men. *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, *5*(1), 48-60.

Hearn, J. (1998). Theorizing men and men's theorizing: Varieties of discursive practices in men's theorizing of men. *Theory and Society*, *27*(6), 781-816.

Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, *5*(1), 49-72.

Hearn, J. (2015). Men's health and well-being: The case against a separate field. *International Journal of Men's Health*, *14*(3), 301-314.

Hearn, J., & Howson, R. (2019). The institutionalization of (critical) studies on men and masculinities: Geopolitical perspectives. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 17- 30). Routledge.

Henderson, K. (1994). Broadening an understanding of women, gender, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *26*(1), 1-7.

Henderson, R. (2012). Industry employment and output projections to 2020. *Monthly Labor Review, 1*, 65-83.

Henderson, K., & Gibson, H. (2013). An integrative review of women, gender, and leisure: Increasing complexities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *45(2), 115*-135.

Henson, K., & Rogers, J. K. (2001). "Why Marcia you've changed!" Male clerical temporary workers doing masculinity in a feminized occupation. *Gender and Society*, *15*(2), 218-238.

Hickcox, A. (2018). White environmental subjectivity and the politics of belonging. *Social & Cultural Geography, 19*(4), 496-519.

Hickman, M., & Stokes, P. (2016). Beyond learning by doing: An exploration of critical incidents in outdoor leadership education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *16*(1), 63-77.

Hobbs, W., & Ewert, A. (2008). Having the right stuff: Investigating what makes a highly effective outdoor leader. In *Abstracts from the Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Ninth Biennial Research Symposium* (pp. 30-32). Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

hooks, b. (2004). *The will to change: Men, masculinity, and love*. Atria.

Houston, T. (2012). The homosocial construction of alternative masculinities: Men in indie rock bands. *Journal of Men's Studies*, *20*(2), 158-175.

Howard, I., & Goldenberg, M. (2020). Women thru-hiker experiences on the Pacific Crest Trail: Gender influences, factors of success, and personal outcomes. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership, 12*(1), 141-161.

Hultman, M. (2017). Exploring industrial, ecomodern and ecological masculinities. In S. MacGregor (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of gender and environment* (pp. 239-252). Routledge.

Humberstone, B. (2000). The "outdoor industry" as social and educational phenomena: Gender and outdoor adventure/education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *1*(1), 21-35.

Humbert, A. L., Kelan, E., & van den Brink, M. (2019). The perils of gender beliefs for men leaders as change agents for gender equality. *European Management Review*, *16*(4), 1143-1157.

Huppatz, K., & Goodwin, K. (2013). Masculinised jobs, feminised jobs and men's 'gender capital' experiences: Understanding occupational segregation in Australia. *Journal of Sociology, 49*(2/3), 291-308.

Hyde, J. (2007). New directions in the study of gender similarities and differences. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(5*),* 259-263.

Ingram, N., & Waller, R. (2014). Degrees of masculinity: Working and middle class undergraduate students' constructions of masculine identities. In S. Roberts (Ed.), *Debating modern masculinities: Change, continuity, crisis?* (pp. 35-51). Palgrave Pivot.

James, C. (2012). Class, race, and schooling in the performance of black male athleticism. In C. Greig & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 538-583). Canadian Scholars' Press.

James, J., & Williams, T. (2017). School-based experiential outdoor education: A neglected necessity. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *40*(1), 58-71.

Jansen, S., & Sabo, B. (1994). The sport-war metaphor: Hegemonic masculinity, the Persian-Gulf war, and the new world order. *Sociology of Sport Journal 11*(1), 1-17.

Jasper, J. (1997). *The art of moral protest: Culture, biography, and creativity in social movements*. University of Chicago Press.

Jefferson, T. (2002). Subordinating hegemonic masculinity. *Theoretical Criminology*, *6*, 63-88.

Johnson, S. D. (1995). Will our research hold up under scrutiny? *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, *32*(3), 3-6.

Jordan, D. (1992). Effective leadership for girls and women in outdoor recreation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *63*(2), 61–64.

Jordan, D. (2018). Ongoing challenges for women as outdoor leaders. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 217-233). Palgrave Macmillan.

Joseph, J. (2012). An intersectional analysis of black sporting masculinities. In J. Joseph, S. Darnell, & Y. Nakamura (Eds.) *Race and sport in Canada: Intersecting inequalities* (pp. 237-263). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Joyce, K. (2016). Out here, no one can hear you scream: The dangerous culture of male entitlement and sexual hostility hiding within America's national parks and forests. *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://highline.huffingtonpost.com/articles/en/park-rangers/

Kahan, D. M., Braman, D., Gastil, J., Slovic, P., & Mertz, C. K. (2007). Culture and identity - protective cognition: Explaining the white-male effect in risk perception. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, *4*(3), 465-505.

Katz, J. (2014). Engaging men in prevention of violence against women. In H. Johnson, B. Fisher, & V. Jaquier, (Eds.) *Critical issues on violence against women: International perspectives and promising strategies* (pp. 233-243). Routledge.

Kaufman, M. (2012a). The day the white ribbon campaign changed the game: A new direction in working to engage men and boys. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 540-620). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kaufman, M. (2012b). *The time has come: Why men must join the gender equality revolution*. Counterpoint.

Kehler, M. (2010). Negotiating masculinities in PE classrooms: Boys, body image and "want[ing] to be in good shape". In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken* (pp. 153-175). Peter Lang.

Kehler, M., & Atkinson, M. (2010). *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken.* Peter Lang.

Kemper, T. D. (1990). *Social structure and testosterone: Explorations of the socio-bio-social chain*. Rutgers University Press.

Kennedy, J., & Russell, C. (2020). Hegemonic masculinity in outdoor education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 1-10.

Kern, M. (2020, June 29). Why vulnerability will be a key trait for leaders post-COVID-19. *Fast Company*. https://www.fastcompany.com/90521972/why-vulnerability-will-be-a-key-trait-for-leaders-post-covid-19

Kessler, S., Ashenden, D., Connell, R., & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Ockers and disco-maniacs*. Inner City Education Center.

Kiaw, Y. (2012). *Fostering transformative learning: A phenomenological study into the lived experience of reflection and transformation in adventure education* [Doctoral dissertation, Monash University].

Kidd, K., & Mason, D. (2019). Camping out: An Introduction. In K. Kidd & D. Mason (Eds.) *Queer as camp: Essays on summer, style, and sexuality* (pp.1-24). Fordham University Press.

Kim, N. (2020). Linking individuation and organizational identification: Mediation through psychological safety. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *160*(2), 216-235.

Kim, S., Hahn, H., & Lee, J. (2015). Organizational attitudes as precursors to training performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *26*(4), 409-429.

Kimmel, M. (1987). Men's responses to feminism at the turn of the century. *Gender & Society*, *1*(3), 261-283.

Kimmel, M. (1995). *Manhood in America*. Free Press.

Kimmel, M. (2013). *Angry white men*. Type Media Center.

Kirk, D. (2010). The "masculinity vortex" of school physical education: Beyond the myth of hyper-masculinity. In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken* (pp. 51-72). Peter Lang.

Koeser, S., & Sczensy, S. (2014). Promoting gender-fair language: The impact of arguments on language use, attitudes, and cognitions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *33*(5), 548-560.

Komarovsky, M., & Philips, J. (1962). *Blue-collar marriage*. Yale University Press.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2003). *The five practices of exemplary leadership: When leaders are at their best.* Jossey-Bass.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.

Krebs, A. (2012). Hockey and the reproduction of colonialism in Canada. In J. Joseph, S. Darnell, & Y. Nakamura (Eds.) *Race and sport in Canada: Intersecting inequalities* (pp. 81-106). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kusz, K. (2004). Extreme America: The cultural politics of extreme sports in 1990s America. In B. Wheaton (Ed.), *Understanding lifestyle sports* (pp. 197-213). Routledge.

Labaree, D. (2003). The peculiar problems of preparing educational researchers. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(4), 13-22.

Laberge, S., & Albert, M. (1999). Conceptions of masculinity and of gender transgressions in sport among adolescent boys: Hegemony, contestation, and social class dynamic. *Men and Masculinities*, *1*(3), 243-267.

Lange, E. (2011). *Perceived cultural competence levels among challenge course facilitators* [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro].

Langlois, K. (2017). Hostile environment. *Outside Magazine*. Retrieved from https://www.outsideonline.com/2277166/hostile-environment

Larsen, T. (2005). *Evaluating principals' and teachers' implementation of second step* [Doctoral thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen].

Leeb, R. T., & Rejskind, F. G. (2004). Here's looking at you, kid! A longitudinal study of perceived gender differences in mutual gaze behavior in young infants. *Sex Roles*, *50*(1/2), 1-14.

Legault, L., Gutsell, J., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science*, *22*(12), 1472-1477.

Lilleaas, U. (2007). Masculinities, sport, and emotions. *Men and Masculinities*, *10*(1), 39-53.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Lindisfarnē, N., & Neale, J. (2016). Masculinities and the lived experience of neoliberalism. In A. Cornwall, F. Karioris, & N. Lindisfarnē (Eds.). *Masculinities under neoliberalism* (pp. 29-51). Zed.

Lingard, B., & Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging feminisms pro-feminism, backlashes and schooling.* Open University Press.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lipman, J. (2018). *That's what she said: What men need to know (and women need to tell them) about working together*. William Morrow.

Loeffler, T. A. (1996). The current status of women's employment in outdoor leadership. In L. H. McAvoy, A. L. Stringer, D. M. Bialeschki, & A. B. Young (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Research Symposium Proceedings: Third research symposium proceedings* (pp. 107–115). Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Loomis, E. (2017). Masculinity, work, and the industrial forest in the US Pacific Northwest. *RCC Perspectives*, *4*, 37-44.

Loney-Howes, R. (2019). The politics of the personal: The evolution of anti-rap activism from second-wave femisim to #MeToo. In B. Fileborn & D. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *#MeToo and the politics of social change* (pp. 77-109), Palgrave Macmillan.

Lorber, J. (2018). Paradoxes of gender redux: Multiple genders and the persistence of the binary. In J. Messerschmidt, P. Yancey Martin, M. Messner, & R. Connell (Eds.), *Gender reckonings* (pp. 254-274). New York University Press.

Lowan-Trudeau, G. (2019). From reticence to resistance: Understanding educators' engagement with indigenous environmental issues in Canada. *Environmental Education Research, 25*(1), 62-74.

Loynes, C. (1998). Adventure in a bun. *Journal of Experiential Education, 21*(1), 35-39.

Lugg, A. (1998). Directions in outdoor education curriculum. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, *4*(1), 25-32.

Lugg, A. (2003). Women's experiences in outdoor education: Still trying to be "one of the boys"? In B. Humberstone, H. Brown, & K. C. Richards-Beale (Eds.), *Whose journeys? The outdoors and adventure as social and cultural phenomena: Critical explorations of relations between individuals, "others" and the environment* (pp. 33-47). Institute for Outdoor Learning.

Lugg, A. (2018). Becoming relational in outdoor education: Not just women's work. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 319-333). Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Open University Press.

Macleod, D. (2004). *Building character in the American boy: The Boy Scouts, YMCA, and their forerunners, 1870-1920*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Macomber, K. (2012). *Men as allies: Mobilizing men to end violence against women*. North Caroline State University Press.

Mara, D. (2012). Reformulating masculinities: Renegotiating masculinities after a spinal cord injury. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 978-1027). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Markkanen, R., & Schroeder, H. (1997). *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts.* Walter de Gruyter.

Martin, B., Breunig, M., Wagstaff, M., & Goldenberg, M. (2017). *Outdoor leadership*. Human Kinetics.

Martin, P. (1999). Critical outdoor education and nature as friend. In C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 463-471). Venture.

Martin, S., Maney, S., & Mitten, D. (2018). Messages about women through representation in adventure education texts and journals. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 293-306). Palgrave Macmillan.

Martino, W. (2008a). Male teachers as role models: Addressing issues of masculinity, pedagogy and the re-masculinization of schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *38*(2), 189-223.

Martino, W. (2008b). The lure of hegemonic masculinity: Investigating the dynamics of gender relations in two male elementary school teachers' lives. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *21*(6), 575-603.

Martino, W., & Frank, B. (2006). The tyranny of surveillance: Male teachers and the policing of masculinities in a single sex school. *Gender and Education*, *18*(1), 17-33.

Martino, W., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2012). "Failing boys" and the question of what counts as evidence. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 628-672). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Matthews, C., & Channon, A. (2019). The "male preserve" thesis, sporting culture, and men's power. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 371-382). Routledge.

McCaughtry, N., & Tischler, A. (2010). Marginalized boys speak out: Insights from school physical education for the obesity crisis. In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken* (pp. 177-200). Peter Lang.

McClintock, M. (1996). Lesbian baiting hurts all women. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's voices in experiential education* (pp. 241-250). Kendall Hunt.

McCormack, M., & Anderson, E. (2014). The influence of declining homophobia on men's gender in the United States: An argument for the study of homohysteria. *Sex Roles*, *71*(3/4), 109-120.

McGinn, K., Ruiz Castro, M., & Lingo, E. (2019). Learning from mum: Cross-national evidence linking maternal employment and adult children's outcomes. *Work, Employment and Society*, *33*(3), 374-400.

McLaren, P. (2017). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 56-78). Routledge.

McNiel, J., Harris, D., & Fondren, K. (2012). Women and the wild: Gender socialization in wilderness recreation advertising. *Gender Issues*, *29*, 39-55.

Meerts-Brandsma, L., Lackey, N., & Warner, R. (2020). Unpacking systems of privilege: The opportunity of critical reflection in outdoor adventure education. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 318-329.

Mendes, K., & Ringrose, J. (2019). Digital feminist activism: #MeToo and the everyday experiences of challenging rape culture. In B. Fileborn & D. Loney-Howes (Eds.), *#MeToo and the politics of social change* (pp. 112-146), Palgrave Macmillan.

Messerschmidt, J. (2019). Hidden in plain sight: On the omnipresence of hegemonic masculinities. *Masculinities Journal*, *12*, 14-29.

Messerschmidt, J., & Messner, M. (2018). Hegemonic, nonhegemonic, and "new" masculinities. In J. Messerschmidt, P. Yancey Martin, M. Messner, & R. Connell (Eds.), *Gender reckonings* (pp. 35-56). New York University Press.

Messerschmidt, J. (2019). Hidden in plain sight: On the omnipresence of hegemonic masculinities. *Masculinities Journal*, *12*, 14-29.

Messner, M., Greenberg, M., & Peretz, T. (2015). *Some men: Feminist allies and the movement to end violence against women.* Oxford University Press.

Meyer, E. (2017). A feminist reframing of bullying and harassment: Transforming schools through critical pedagogy. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 448-460). Routledge.

Miller, A., MacDougall, J., Tarnopolsky, M., & Sale, D. (1993). Gender differences in strength and muscle fiber characteristics. *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, *66*(3), 254-262.

Millington, B., & Wilson, B. (2010a). Consuming media, constructing masculinities: A study of youth audiences and physical education in "reflexively modern" times. In M. Kehler & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Boys' bodies: Speaking the unspoken* (pp. 91-111). Peter Lang.

Millington, B., & Wilson, B. (2010b). Context masculinities: Media consumption, physical education, and youth identities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *53*(11), 1669-1688.

Mitten, D. (2009). Setting the stage: How to get the group norms you want. In B. Stremba & C. Bisson (Eds.), *Teaching adventure education theory* (pp. 289-300). Human Kinetics.

Mitten, D. (2018). Let's meet at the picnic table at midnight. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 18-34). Palgrave Macmillan.

Mitten, D., Gray, T., Allen-Craig, S., Loeffler, T. A., & Carpenter, C. (2018). The invisibility cloak: Women's contributions to outdoor and environmental education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *49*(4), 318-327.

Mohanram, R. (1999). *Black body: Women, colonialism, and space*. University of Minnesota Press.

Moran, M. (2020). (Un)troubling identity politics: A cultural materialist intervention. *European Journal of Social Theory, 23*(2), 258-277.

Moss-Racusin, C., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Disruptions in women's self-promotion: The backlash avoidance model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *34*(2), 186-202.

Murray, C. (2012). *Coming apart: The state of white America, 1960-2010*. Crown Forum.

Musa, G., Higham, J., & Thompson-Carr, A. (2015). *Mountaineering tourism*. Routledge.

Nagel, J. (1998). Masculinity and nationalism: Gender and sexuality in the making of nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *21*(2), 242-269.

Nagle, A. (2015). Contemporary online anti-feminist movements [Doctoral dissertation, Dublin City University].

Nash, A., & Grossi, G. (2007). Picking Barbie™'s brain: Inherent sex differences in scientific ability? *Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought*, *2*(1), 1-24.

Neuman, N., Gottzén, L., & Fjellström, C. (2017). Narratives of progress: Cooking and gender equality among Swedish men. *Journal of Gender Studies, 26*(2), 151-163.

Newbery, L. (2003). Will any/body carry that canoe? A geography of the body, ability, and gender. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *8*, 204-216.

Newbery, L. (2004). Hegemonic gender identity and Outward Bound: Resistance and re-inscription? *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, *13*(1), 36-48.

Newburn, T., & Stanko, E. A. (1994). *Just boys doing business? Men, masculinities, and crime*. Routledge.

Nicholas, J. (2012). Representing the modern man: Beauty, culture, and masculinity in early twentieth-century Canada. In C. Greig, & W. Martino (Eds.), *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 178-249). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Nichols, S., & Parsons, J. (2011). Dewey's dream of democracy for teachers. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, *8*(1), 47-54.

Nicol, R. (2002a). Outdoor education: Research topic or universal value? Part one. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *2*(1), 29-41.

Nicol, R. (2002b). Outdoor education: Research topic or universal value? Part two. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *2*(2), 85-99.

Nicol, R. (2003). Outdoor education: Research topic or universal value? Part three. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *3*(1), 11-27.

Noor, P. (2020, May 31). Being Black while in nature: "You're an endangered species." *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/may/31/being-black-while-in-nature-youre-an-endangered-species

North, C. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of "social justice" in Education. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 507-535.

Oakley, J., Potter, S., & Socha, T. (2018). Mirrored tensions: A mother–daughter introspection on gendered experiences in outdoor recreation. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 375-389). Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Neil, J. M., Egan, J., Owen, S. V., & Murry, V. M. (1993). The gender role journey measure: Scale development and psychometric evaluation. *Sex Roles, 28(1)*, 167-185.

O'Neill, R. (2015). Whither critical masculinity studies? Notes on inclusive masculinity theory, postfeminism, and sexual politics. *Men and Masculinities*, *18*(1), 100-120.

Oluo, I. (2018). *So you want to talk about race.* Seal Press.

Oluo, I. (2020). *Mediocre: The dangerous legacy of white male America*. Seal Press.

Oransky, M., & Marecek, J. (2009). "I'm not going to be a girl": Masculinity and emotions in boys' friendships and peer groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *24*(2), 218-241.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2014). *Women, government, and policy making in OECD countries: Fostering diversity for inclusive growth*. OECD.

Overholt, J., & Ewert, A. (2015). Gender matters: Exploring the process of developing resilience through outdoor adventure. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *38*(1), 41-55.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage.

Payne, P., & Wattchow, B. (2008). Slow pedagogy and placing education in post-traditional outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *12*(1), 25-38.

Pedder, D., & Opfer, V. (2013). Professional learning orientations: Patterns of dissonance and alignment between teachers' values and practices. *Research Papers in Education*, *28*(5), 539-570.

Peterson, R. (1997). The rise and fall of highbrow snobbery as a status marker. *Poetics,* 25(2–3), 75-92.

PettyJohn, M., Muzzey, F., Maas, M., & McCauley, H. (2019). #HowIWillChange: Engaging men and boys in the #MeToo movement. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 20*(4), 612-622.

Pew Research Centre. (2018). *Sexual harassment at work in the era of #MeToo*. Pew Research Centre.

Pini, B., & Mayes, R. (2019). Rural masculinities. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 301-310). Routledge.

Plank, L. (2019). *For the love of men: A new vision for mindful masculinity*. St. Martin's Press.

Plato (380 B.C.E./2000). *The republic*. Dover.

Pleck, J. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. MIT Press.

Pompper, D. (2010). Masculinities, the metrosexual, and media images: Across dimensions of age and ethnicity. *Sex Roles*, *63*(9/10), 682-696.

Potter, T., & Dyment, J. (2016). Is outdoor education a discipline? Insights, gaps and future directions. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, *16*(2), 146-159.

Powell, G. (1986). Effects of sex role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 14*, 9-19.

Power, E. (2004). Toward understanding in postmodern interview analysis: Interpreting the contradictory remarks of a research participant. *Qualitative Health Research*, *14*(6), 858-865.

Pressman, S. (2015). *Defining and measuring the middle class*. American Institute for Economic Research.

Priest, S. (1986). Redefining outdoor education: A matter of many relationships. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *17*(3), 13-15.

Priest, S., & Gass, M. (2017). *Effective leadership in adventure programming (3rd ed.)*. Human Kinetics.

Prokosch, M., Coss, R., Scheib, J., & Blozis, S. (2009). Intelligence and mate choice: Intelligent men are always appealing. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *30*(1), 11-20.

Pryor, A. (2018). Following the currents of mighty women past and present. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 169-229). Palgrave Macmillan.

Pugh, A. J. (2014). The divining rod of talk: Emotions, contradictions and the limits of research. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, *2*(1), 159-163.

Putnam, R. (2015). *Our kids: The American dream in crisis*. Simon & Schuster.

Putney, C. (2003). *Muscular Christianity: Manhood and sports in protestant America, 1880-1920*. Harvard University Press.

Raible, J., & Irizarry, J. G. (2017). In A. Darder, R. Torres, & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 461-475). Routledge.

Rao, T., & Roberts, N. (2018). Voices of women of colour: Dreaming of an inclusive outdoor leadership environment**.** In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 815-835). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ravn, S., & Roberts, S. (2020). Young masculinities: Masculinities in youth studies. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 182-191). Routledge.

Reichert, M., & Hawley, R. (2010). *Reaching boys, teaching boys: Strategies that work and why*. John Wiley and Sons.

Reilly, A., & Blanco, J. (2019). Masculinities in fashion and dress. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 393-403). Routledge.

Rhode, D. (1990). Feminist critical theories. *Stanford Law Review*, *42*, 617-638.

Riley, K. (2018). (Re)turning to the sacred trails: (Re)storying connections to more-than-human worlds in outdoor education. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 569-581). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rippon, G. (2019). *Gender and our brains: How new neuroscience explodes the myths of the male and female minds.* Random House Canada.

Risman, B. (2018). *Where the Millennials will take us: A new generation wrestles with the gender structure.* Oxford University Press.

Rivera, L. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(6), 999-1022.

Roberts, S. (2018). *Young working-class men in transition*. Routledge.

Robertson, S., & Shand, T. (2020). Men, health and medicalization: An overview. In L. Gottzén, U. Mellström, & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies* (pp. 359-370). Routledge.

Rockmann, K., & Ballinger, G. (2017). Intrinsic motivation and organizational identification among on-demand workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(9), 1305-1316.

Roediger, D. R. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Verso.

Rogers, E., & Rose, J. (2019). A critical examination of women's gendered experiences in outdoor leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education, 42*(1), 1-14.

Root, E. (2010). This land is our land? This land is your land: The decolonizing journeys of White outdoor environmental educators. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *15*, 103-119.

Rousseau, J. J. (1763/1979). *Emile: Or on education* (M. Wu, Trans.). Basic Books.

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629-645.

Russell, C., Cameron, E., Socha, T., & McNinch, H. (2013). "Fatties cause global warming": Fat pedagogy and environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *18*, 27-45.

Russell, C., Sarick, T., & Kennelly, J. (2002). Queering environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 7*(1), 54-66.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd Edition). Sage.

Saramo, S. (2016). Unsettling spaces: Grassroots responses to Canada's missing and murdered Indigenous women during the Harper government years. *Comparative American Studies An International Journal*, *14*(3/4), 204-220.

Saul, R. (2015). War games. In. N. Taber (Ed.) *Gendered militarism in Canada: Learning conformity and resistance* (pp. 209-227). University of Alberta Press.

Sauvé, L. (2005). Currents in environmental education: Mapping a complex and evolving pedagogical field. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, *10*, 11-37.

Savran, D. (1998). *Taking it like a man*. Princeton University Press.

Schindel, A., & Tolbert, S. (2017). Critical caring for people and place. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *48*(1), 26-34.

Schofield, T., Connell, R., Walker, L., Wood, J., & Butland, D. L. (2000). Understanding men's health and illness: A gender-relations approach to policy, research, and practice. *Journal of American College Health*, *48*(6), 247-256.

Schumann, S. A., Paisley, K., Sibthorp, J., & Gookin, J. (2009). Instructor influences on student learning at NOLS. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership*, *1*(1), 3-18.

Seidman, S. (1994). Introduction. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *The postmodern turn: New perspectives on social theory* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge University Press.

Shooter, W., & Norling, J. (2007). Effective leadership through displays of trustworthiness and immediacy. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke, 2*(2), 43-56.

Shooter, W., & Norling, J. C. (2007). Effective outdoor leadership through displays of trustworthiness and immediacy. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education: Ko Tane Mahuta Pupuke*, *2*(2), 43-56.

Sibthorp, J., Furman, N., Paisley, K., Gookin, J., & Schumann, S. (2011). Mechanisms of learning transfer in adventure education: Qualitative results from the NOLS transfer survey. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *34*(2), 109-126.

Siebel Newsom, J. (Director). (2015). *The mask you live in* [film]. The Representation Project.

Sime, C. (2019, March 27). Could a little vulnerability be the key to better leadership? *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/carleysime/2019/03/27/could-a-little-vulnerability-be-the-key-to-better-leadership/#72688a3e783e

Simon, J. (2004). Edgework and insurance in risk societies: Some notes on Victorian lawyers and mountaineers. In S. Lyng (Ed.), *Edgework* (pp. 203-226). Routledge.

Skelton, C. (2001). *Schooling the boys: Masculinities and primary education: Educating boys, learning gender.* Open University Press.

Skelton, C. (2007). Gender, policy and initial teacher education. *Gender and Education*, *19*(6), 677-690.

Skinner, C. H., Rhymer, K. N., & McDaniel, E. C. (2000). Naturalistic direct observation in educational settings. In E. Shapiro & T. Kratochwill (Eds.), *Conducting school-based assessments of child and adolescent behavior* (pp. 21-54). Guildford Press.

Slater, P. E. (1955). Role differentiation in small groups. *American Sociological Review*, *20*(3), 300-310.

Smith, A. (2016). *Feminist outdoor leadership: Challenging hegemonic masculinity through outdoor education* (Publication No. 242) [Master's thesis, Portland State University].

Smith, J. (2007). "Ye've got to 'ave balls to play this game sir!" Boys, peers and fears: The negative influence of school-based "cultural accomplices" in constructing hegemonic

masculinities. *Gender and Education*, *19*(2), 179-198.

Smith, T. (2011). Rousseau and Pestalozzi. In T. Smith & C. Knapp (Eds.), *Sourcebook of experiential education*. Routledge.

Sparkes, A. C. (1996). The fatal flaw: A narrative of the fragile body-self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *2*(4), 463-494.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan.

Solnit, R. (2014). *Men explain things to me*. Haymarket.

Stangl, J., & Kane, M. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *8*(1), 47-60.

Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision, 39*(7), 551-555.

Stevenson, R., Wals, A., Dillon, J., & Brody, M. (2013). Introduction: An orientation to environmental education and the Handbook. In R. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 1-8). Routledge.

Stoddart, M. C. (2011). Constructing masculinized sportscapes: Skiing, gender and nature in British Columbia, Canada. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *46*(1), 108-124.

Stokes, H., & Wyn, J. (2007). Constructing identities and making careers: Young people's perspectives on work and learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 25(5), 495-511.

Straker, J. (2018). Women's voices in the outdoors. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning.* (pp. 95-107). Palgrave Macmillan.

Subašić, E., Hardacre, S., Elton, B., Branscombe, N., Ryan, M., & Reynolds, K. (2018). "We for she": Mobilising men and women to act in solidarity for gender equality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(5), 707-724.

Szabo, M. (2014). "I'm a real catch": The blurring of alternative and hegemonic masculinities in men's talk about home cooking. *Women's Studies International Forum, 44*, 228-235.

Tarrant, A. (2018). Care in an age of austerity: Men's care responsibilities in low-income families. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, *12*(1), 34-48.

Tellis, W. M. (1997). Application of a case study methodology. *Qualitative Report*, *3*(3), 1-19.

Thomas, G. (2001). Thriving in the outdoor education profession: Learning from Australian practitioners. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *6*(1), 13-24.

Thorpe, H. (2010). Bourdieu, gender reflexivity, and physical culture: A case of masculinities in the snowboarding field. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *34*(2), 176-214.

Tilley, S. (2016). *Doing respectful research. Power, privilege and passion.* Fernwood Press.

Urwin, J. (2016). *Man up: Surviving modern masculinity*. Icon.

Van Anders, S. M. (2013). Beyond masculinity: Testosterone, gender/sex, and human social behavior in a comparative context. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, *34*(3), 198-210.

Vrooman, P. (2007). *Passing masculinities at Boy Scout camp* [Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University].

Wagstaff, M., & Attarian, A. (2009). *Technical skills for adventure programming: A curriculum guide*. Human Kinetics.

Waling, A. (2019). Problematising "toxic" and "healthy" masculinity for addressing gender inequalities. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *34*(101), 362-375.

Wall, S. (2008). Making modern childhood, the natural way: Psychology, mental hygiene, and progressive education at Ontario summer camps, 1920-1955. *Historical Studies in Education*, *20*(2), 73-110.

Warner, R. P., Meerts-Brandsma, L., & Rose, J. (2020). Neoliberal ideologies in outdoor adventure education: Barriers to social justice and strategies for change. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 38*(3), 77-92.

Warren, K. (1996). Women's outdoor adventures: Myth and reality. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's voices in experiential education* (pp. 10–17). Kendall Hunt.

Warren, K. (2002). Preparing the next generation: Social justice in outdoor leadership education and training. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *25*(1), 231-238.

Warren, K. (2016). Gender in outdoor studies. In B. Humberstone, H. Prince, & K. Henderson (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of outdoor studies* (pp. 360-368).: Routledge.

Warren, K., & Breunig, M. (2019). Inclusion and social justice in outdoor education. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of teacher education*. Springer.

Warren, K., & Loeffler, T. A. (2006). Factors that influence women's technical skills development. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership, 6*(2), 107-120.

Warren, K., Mitten, D., D'Amore, C., & Lotz, E. (2019). The gendered hidden curriculum of adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *42*(2), 140-154.

Warren, K., Risinger, S., & Loeffler, T. A. (2018). Challenges faced by women outdoor leaders. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 247-258). Palgrave Macmillan.

Warren, K., Roberts, N., Breunig, M., & Alvarez, M. (2014). Social justice in outdoor experiential education: A state of knowledge review. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *37*(1), 89-103.

Waterhouse-Watson, D. (2011). (Un)reasonable doubt: A "narrative immunity" for footballers against sexual assault allegations. *Journal of Media Culture*, *14*(1).

Weaver-Hightower, M. (2010). Oatmeal facials and sock wrestling: The perils and promises of extra-curricular strategies for "fixing" boys' education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *31*(5), 683-697.

Weiler, K. (2017). Feminist analysis of gender and schooling. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & M. Baltodano (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 196-215). Routledge.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*(2), 125-151.

Wheaton, B. (2000). "New lads"? Masculinities and the "new sport" participant. *Men and Masculinities*, *2*(4), 434-456.

White, J., Drew, S., & Hay, T. (2009). Ethnography versus case study-positioning research and researchers. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(1), 18-27.

Whitehead, J. (2003). Masculinity, motivation and academic success: A paradox. *Teacher Development*, *7*(2), 287-309.

Whittington, A. (2018). Changing girls' lives one programme at a time. In T. Gray & D. Mitten (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of women and outdoor learning* (pp. 661-671). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wigglesworth, J. (2019, January 7). What's in a name? Sexism in rock climbing route names. *Engaging Sports*. Retrieved from https://thesocietypages.org/engagingsports/2019/01/07/whats-in-a-name- sexism-in-rock-climbing-route-names/

Williams, R. (2019, June 8). Why the best leaders view vulnerability as a strength. *Medium.com*. https://medium.com/@raybwilliams/why-the-best-leaders-view-vulnerability-as-a-strength-6a4a7e27d461

Willis, J. W., Jost, M., & Nilakanta, R. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches*. Sage.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Saxon House.

Willis-Chun, C. (2011). Strategic rhetoric in news coverage of the Columbine and Virginia Tech massacres. In, M. Lacy & K. Ono (Eds.) *Critical rhetorics of race* (pp. 47-65). New York University Press.

Wilson, T. C. (2002). The paradox of social class and sports involvement: The roles of cultural and economic capital. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *37*(1), 5-16.

Wise, A. (2018). Readers hate bad women's gear as much as we do. *Outside Magazine*. Retrieved from: https://www.outsideonline.com/2282016/women-want-better-gear

Wright, M., & Gray, T. (2013). The hidden turmoil: Females achieving longevity in the outdoor learning profession. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education, 16*(2), 12–23.

Wurdinger, S. D. (1997). *Philosophical issues in adventure education*. Kendall Hunt.

Yin, R. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.)*. Sage.

Yin, R. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*. Sage.

Zeiger, H. (2005). *Get off my honor: The assault on the Boy Scouts of America*. Broadman & Holman.

Zell, E., Krizan, Z., & Teeter, S. (2015). Evaluating gender similarities and differences using metasynthesis. *American Psychologist*, *70*(1), 10-20.

Appendix A: Ethics Approval Letter

![Lakehead University logo]

June 12, 2019

Principal Investigator: Dr. Constance Russell
Student: **Jason Kennedy**
Faculty of Education
Lakehead University
955 Oliver Road
Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1

Dear Dr. Russell and Mr. Kennedy:

Re: Romeo File No: 1467236
Granting Agency: N/A
Agency Reference #: N/A

On behalf of the Research Ethics Board, I am pleased to grant ethical approval to your research project titled, "Male Outdoor Educators' Perspectives on Masculinity".

Ethics approval is valid until June 12, 2020. Please submit a Request for Renewal to the Office of Research Services via the Romeo Research Portal by May 12, 2020 if your research involving human participants will continue for longer than one year. A Final Report must be submitted promptly upon completion of the project. Access the Romeo Research Portal by logging into myInfo at:

https://erpwp.lakeheadu.ca/

During the course of the study, any modifications to the protocol or forms must not be initiated without prior written approval from the REB. You must promptly notify the REB of any adverse events that may occur.

Best wishes for a successful research project.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lori Chambers
Chair, Research Ethics Board

/sm

Appendix B: Organization Letter of Information

 Faculty of Education

Letter of Information

Title of Study: Male Outdoor Educators' Perspectives on Masculinity

Dear [Potential Participating Organization]:

PURPOSE
The purpose of this letter is to follow up on our earlier conversations. I thank you for indicating your potential willingness to allow me to conduct research and now would like to formally invite [Organization] to participate in this project. I am providing you with this official documentation of the research that I will be conducting for my PhD dissertation in the Faculty of Education at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Ontario to ensure that all relevant information has been shared and that you agree that I can proceed to visit your site and approach staff in your organization about possible participation in my research. As you know, I am studying the experiences and perspectives of men working in the outdoor education field and I feel that members of your organization are examples of the type of outdoor education professionals that could provide exceptional insights into the culture of the field.

WHAT IS REQUESTED OF THE ORGANIZATION?
I would like permission to visit your organization at a mutually agreeable time, to approach particular male outdoor education staff to request their participation in this study and, if they agree, to observe and interview them. Potential participating staff will be assured that their participation is entirely voluntary and that their decision to participate or not will have no impact on their employment status.

WHAT INFORMATION WILL BE COLLECTED?
I will visit your site to observe the interactions of participating male outdoor education staff in your organization as they go about their professional activities. I will not participate in any activities and will attempt to be as unobtrusive as possible while collecting data.

I will conduct one-on-one interviews with participating male staff. I will be asking for personal data such as age, nationality, and experience in outdoor education programming as well as a number of questions related to their experience as a man working in outdoor education. All interviews will be audio-recorded and conducted and transcribed by myself.

I also will be looking at public materials related to your organization such as websites and brochures as well any other program materials you wish to share with me that might be relevant to my research.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATION?
Your organization's participation in my research is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw your organization's support at any time. I will provide you with a consent form that makes clear that your rights include: the right to not participate; to anonymity and confidentiality should you wish it; and to having safeguards in place to ensure security of data. Further, your decision to participate or not will not affect my academic status. Throughout the course of the research project, I will inform you of any information that may impact your decision to continue or withdraw from participation.

Any member of your staff who meets my criteria and elects to participate will be provided with an additional information letter that makes clear that his rights include: the right to not participate; to withdraw at any time during the data collection phase and to have any collected data related to him removed from the study; to anonymity and confidentiality; and to having safeguards in place to ensure security of data.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS AND BENEFITS TO PARTICIPATION?
There is no foreseeable harm or risks to your organization. Should a staff participant make a comment that is critical of your organization, another staff member, or the outdoor education community as a whole, please know that this will not be directly attributed to them or to your organization and your anonymity will be maintained.

The risk to staff participants are no greater than those they might encounter in everyday life although there is a very small amount of psychological risk if an interview question triggers a painful memory. I will have contact information for external support (e.g., local counsellor) that I can give to any participant if they feel they need to talk to a professional. I am keenly aware of my responsibility to all who agree to participate in my study and I will take steps to assure that they are accurately represented in my research. All participants will be given the opportunity to review the transcripts of interviews and discuss field observations, if desired, to ensure that these accurately reflect their perspectives.

In terms of benefits, the staff members at your organization will not be paid to participate in this research, but they may find it beneficial to reflect on their ideas about gender and how it impacts their practice and their relationships with other staff and clients. If you would like, you will be given a copy of the research summary and my full dissertation, which will provide an opportunity for your organization to learn more about men's experiences and perspectives in the field.

HOW WILL MY ORGANIZATION'S CONFIDENTIALITY BE MAINTAINED?
To ensure anonymity, all data gathered through this research will be kept confidential and pseudonyms for organizations will be used in my dissertation and any associated writing or presentations unless you explicitly indicate in the consent form that you want your organization to be named. Staff members who participate will not be identifiable in my dissertation or any associated writing or presentations. Interviews will be conducted in private locations away from all other staff members to ensure that all is being done to protect the confidentiality of participants. Only my supervisor, Dr. Connie Russell, and I will have access to the raw data.

WHAT WILL DATA COLLECTED BE USED FOR:
The results of this research will be used in my PhD dissertations, in presentations at academic or professional conferences or to outdoor organizations, or in written articles for academic and professional audiences.

WHERE WILL DATA BE STORED?
At the end of my research, transcripts and field notes will be submitted to my supervisor on an external hard drive so that it can be securely stored in the Faculty of Education's data storage area in Thunder Bay for 5 years after which it will be destroyed as per Lakehead University's policy.

HOW CAN I RECEIVE A COPY OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS?
The results of this research will be used in my dissertation as well as in conference presentations and written articles. You may request an executive summary of my dissertation or an electronic copy of the full thesis by indicating so on the consent form, and I will email one or both to you.

WHAT IF THE ORGANIZATION WANTS TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY?
Your organization may withdraw at any time from the study at any time up until the point that participating staff members have approved their final interview transcripts and have had an opportunity to discuss my observation notes. If you do want to withdraw, you can do so by contacting me or my supervisor (see contact information below).

RESEARCHER CONTACT INFORMATION
If at any time, you have any questions or concerns regarding the research please feel free to contact me by email, jkenne10@lakeheadu.ca, or by telephone at 416-239-7394. You also may contact my supervisor, Dr. Connie Russell by email, crussell@lakeheadu.ca, or by telephone, 807-343-8049.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to work with your organization. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jay Kennedy, PhD student
Faculty of Education, Lakehead University

RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD REVIEW AND APPROVAL:
This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Lakehead University Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions related to the ethics of the research and would like to speak to someone outside of the research team, please contact Sue Wright at the Research Ethics Board at 807-343-8283 *or* research@lakeheadu.ca.

Appendix C: Organization Consent Form

![Lakehead University logo] Faculty of Education

Consent Form

Title of Study: Male Outdoor Educators' Perspectives on Masculinity

I agree to the following:

- ✓ I have read and understand the information contained in the Information Letter
- ✓ I agree to allow staff who meet criteria for participation to be approached by Jay Kennedy to see if they would like to participate
- ✓ No staff will be coerced to participate nor will their decision to participate or not impact their employment in any way
- ✓ I understand the risks and benefits of the study
- ✓ That I am a volunteer and can withdraw from the study at any time
- ✓ That the data will be securely stored at in the secure storage area in the Faculty of Education in Thunder Bay for a minimum period of 5 years following completion of the research project
- ✓ I understand that the research findings will be made available to me upon request
- ✓ The organization will remain anonymous unless I indicate otherwise below
- ✓ All of my questions have been answered

By consenting to participate, I have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm.

I, _____ (your name), on behalf of _____ (name of organization), waive confidentiality and want the organization to be named in transcripts, field notes, the dissertation and related publications and presentations: Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide your contact email if you would like a copy of:
   1) the research summary: Yes ☐ No ☐
   2) the full dissertation: Yes ☐ No ☐

_____
Email

_____   _____
(Print Name)   (Print Organization

_____   _____

Appendix D: Participant Letter of Information

Lakehead UNIVERSITY   Faculty of Education

Letter of Information

Dear Potential Participant:

My name is Jay Kennedy, I am a PhD student in the Faculty of Education at Lakehead University. I am studying the experiences and perspectives of men working in the outdoor education field and I am inviting you to participate in my study. The title of my study is: Masculinities Performed by Outdoor Educators.

Your organization has given me permission to approach you, but taking part in this study is voluntary. Before you decide whether or not you would like to participate, please read this letter carefully to understand what is involved. After you have read the letter, please ask me any questions you may have.

PURPOSE
Academic research related to gender and outdoor education has largely focused on women's experiences. In this study I want to know how men working in the field understand their masculinity, how it may have been impacted by working in outdoor education, and how it may influence their practice in professional settings.

WHAT INFORMATION WILL BE COLLECTED?
I will collect data through one-on-one interviews with men working in outdoor education and through observations of these men as they go about their professional activities. In the interviews, I will be asking for personal data such as age, nationality, and experience in outdoor education programming as well as a number of questions related to your experience as a man working in outdoor education. I also will be looking at public materials of the organizations that have agreed to host my research such as websites, brochures, or program materials.

WHAT IS REQUESTED OF ME AS A PARTICIPANT?
We will arrange to meet for an interview at a convenient time for you in a quiet, private place that is comfortable for you. I will ask you a series of questions about your experience as a man working in outdoor education. Each interview will take approximately 45 minutes. With your permission, interviews will be audio-recorded on to ensure the accuracy of the data transcription.

If possible, I would also like to observe you for a mutually agreeable amount of time (for example, 8 hours) while you interact with peers and perhaps with trip members. I will observe from a distance so that I will not be in your way but will be close enough to hear what is going on. I will take notes in a notebook or on a laptop or in a notebook.

Once interview transcriptions are complete, I will give you the opportunity to review them to verify that they are accurate and I will make changes to them at your request. I will also provide

you with an overview of my observations and ask you if those seem accurate to you and give you an opportunity to discuss these if you would like.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT?
Please be assured that you are under no obligation to participate. You are free to withdraw at any time. I have been assured by your organization that your decision to participate will not affect your employment.

I will provide you with a consent form that makes clear that your rights include: the right to not participate; to privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality; and to having safeguards in place to ensure security of data. Further, your decision to participate or not will not affect my academic status. Throughout the course of the research project, I will inform you of any information that may impact your decision to continue or withdraw from participation.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS AND BENEFITS?
There is no foreseeable harm or risks to participants greater than those they might encounter in everyday life although there is a very small amount of psychological risk if an interview question triggers a painful memory. I will have contact information for external support (e.g., local counsellor) that I can give to you if you feel you need to talk to a professional. I will be asking you for your experiences and perspectives on being a man working in outdoor education. Should you make a comment that is critical of your employer, another staff member, or the outdoor education community as a whole, please know that this will not be directly attributed to you and that you I will maintain your confidentiality and anonymity.

In terms of benefits, you may appreciate the opportunity to share and critically reflect on your experiences and perspectives. If you would like, you will be given a copy of the research summary and my full dissertation, which will provide an opportunity to learn about other men's experiences and perspectives.

HOW WILL MY CONFIDENTIALITY BE MAINTAINED?
To ensure anonymity of the organizations and all participants, all data gathered will be kept confidential and pseudonyms will be used. You will have an opportunity to select your own pseudonym if desired. The only people who will have access to the raw data are me and my supervisor, Connie Russell.

WHAT WILL MY DATA BE USED FOR:
The results of this research will be used in my PhD dissertations, in presentations at academic or professional conferences or to outdoor organizations, or in written articles for academic and professional audiences. You will not be identified in any of these.

WHERE WILL MY DATA BE STORED?
At the end of my research, transcripts and field notes will be submitted to my supervisor on an external hard drive so that it can be securely stored in the Faculty of Education's data storage area in Thunder Bay for 5 years after which it will be destroyed as per Lakehead University's policy.

HOW CAN I RECEIVE A COPY OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS?
You may request a research summary or an electronic copy of the full dissertation by indicating so on the consent form, and I will email one or both to you.

WHAT IF I WANT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY?
You may withdraw at any time from the study described here at any time up until the point that you approve the final interview transcript and have had an opportunity to discuss the observation notes. If you do want to withdraw, you can do so by contacting me or my supervisor (see contact information below).

RESEARCHER CONTACT INFORMATION:
If at any time you have questions or concerns regarding the research, please feel free to contact me in person when I am on site or by email at jkenne10@lakeheadu.ca or by telephone at: 416-239-7394. You may also contact my supervisor, Dr. Connie Russell by email at crussell@lakeheadu.ca or by telephone at 807-343-8049.

Sincerely,

Jay Kennedy, PhD student
Faculty of Education, Lakehead University

RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD REVIEW AND APPROVAL:
This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Lakehead University Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions related to the ethics of the research and would like to speak to someone outside of the research team, please contact Sue Wright at the Research Ethics Board at 807-343-8283 or research@lakeheadu.ca.

Appendix E: Participant Consent Form

![Lakehead University logo]
Faculty of Education

Consent Form

Masculinities Performed by Outdoor Educators

MY CONSENT:

I agree to the following:

- ✓ I have read and understand the information contained in the Information Letter
- ✓ I agree to participate
- ✓ I understand the risks and benefits to the study
- ✓ That I am a volunteer and can withdraw from the study at any time and may choose not to answer any question
- ✓ That the data will be securely stored at in the secure storage area in the Faculty of Education in Thunder Bay for a minimum period of 5 years following completion of the research project
- ✓ I understand that the research findings will be made available to me upon request
- ✓ I will remain anonymous
- ✓ All of my questions have been answered

By consenting to participate, I have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm.

I consent to audio-recording of the interview:

Yes ⬜ No ⬜

I consent to having my professional practice observed by the researcher for a mutually agreeable amount of time:

Yes ⬜ No ⬜

_____   _____   _____

Name (Printed)   Signature   Date

Please provide your contact email if you would like a copy of:

   1) the research summary: Yes ⬜ No ⬜
   2) the full dissertation: Yes ⬜ No ⬜

_____

Email

Please sign and return this form to the researcher, Jay Kennedy. A copy of this consent form will also be provided to the supervisor, Dr. Connie Russell. For further information concerning the completion of this form, please contact:

Jay Kennedy, PhD Student, Faculty of Education, Lakehead University
Phone: 416-239-7394; Email: jkenne10@lakeheadu.ca
And/or
Dr. Connie Russell, Professor, Faculty of Education, Lakehead University
Phone: 807-343-8049; Email: crussell@lakeheadu.ca