AN EVALUATION OF THE
ONE AND ALL
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SAIL
TRAINING PROGRAM

By

Catherine Jane Rogers, BBSc

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Behavioural Science
with Honours**

School of Education

**Flinders University
Bedford Park, South Australia
November 2004**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate, without acknowledgement, any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Catherine Jane Rogers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

A qualitative approach using primarily participant observation was employed to evaluate the *One and All* Sail Training Programme. Data collection from the field was limited to one voyage only. This took place between the 5th and 11th of July 2004 and involved 24 participants, from 15 to 19 years of age, drawn from schools throughout South Australia. Data was collected from documentation provided by the Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia for the *One and All*, and participant observation, video recordings and participant interviews during the voyage.

Analysis identified how the Programme is implemented through guidance and facilitation in a safe environment, with the learning environment consistent with educational theories of humanism and constructivism. The Programme's objectives were met by way of personal and collective challenges that participants overcame through achieving their personal goals as well as those set by the Programme. This was consistent with psychological theories relating to the constructs of goal setting and self-esteem, and aided the development of maturity through self-discipline and a sensitivity towards others.

It was found that the Programme provided the framework for personal development through participant interaction with the sailing environment. Participants were responsible not only for themselves, but for the care and safety of others; thus the intensity of the interdependent community led to a strong social experience.

Key elements in the success of the Programme included the restricted physical environment and hence the inability to walk away, the development of the learning environment by the crew, and specifically the recruitment of crew through the volunteer association, thereby selecting for enthusiastic, committed people with the personality types most suited to facilitation and guidance.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an example of evaluation research (Patton, 1990). Its object is the *One and All* Youth Development Sail Training Program [sic] (hereafter referred to as "the Programme"). The Programme has not previously been evaluated. However, anecdotal evidence (Kuhl, n.d.[a]) from school principals, parents and students alike suggests it achieves some success in meeting its goals of participant personal development (see section 1.4 below). While there is much literature about Outward Bound[1] programmes in general, there have been few formal studies focused on sail training.

The Programme is one of self-discovery and personal development. It requires a group of youths to undertake a sailing voyage together in an unfamiliar environment where they must confront, individually and collectively, problems as they arise. Due to the nature of the experience, problems are immediate and solutions need to be found.

This chapter begins by outlining previous research and discussing the significance of this study, leading into a consideration of the historical context of the Programme. It concludes by listing the Programme's objectives and stating the research evaluation questions.

Chapter two considers qualitative social research, specifically evaluation research. It then presents the considerations prior to the voyage and introduces the participants. Following this, the procedures used for data collection and data analysis are presented, concluding with comments about the limitations and delimitations.

---

[1] Outward Bound is an international educational organisation that provides challenging wilderness experiences as courses of study. These experiences are intended to contribute to the self-discovery and personal growth of the participants. The courses include such activities as backpacking, rock climbing, canoeing, sailing, and cross-country skiing. A small group of people take a course together. Each person, working with the others, must solve various problems in an unfamiliar wilderness environment. Outward Bound believes that dealing with these problems increases a person's self-confidence, self-awareness, and appreciation of others. The first Outward Bound school was established in 1941. Kurt Hahn, a German educator, founded it as a survival programme for British sailors during World War II. Outward Bound has schools in more than 50 countries (Hattie et al., 1997).

Chapter three presents the results from the analysis and discusses these in light of relevant education theories. The main themes address the general research questions and include the ship environment, creating the learning environment and the personal challenges individuals face. Chapter four addresses the purpose of the research evaluation by assessing the effectiveness of the programme in meeting its objectives in light of the themes developed in chapter three and the psychological constructs of goal setting and self esteem. The thesis concludes with a summary, my reflections and recommendations for the *One and All* and future study.

1.1 Previous research

There have been a number of research papers produced in relation to Outward Bound programmes. Most, however, have been produced by the various associations themselves. As Hattie, March, Neill and Richards (1997) note in a review of this literature, "most papers read more like program [sic] advertisements than research" and while "some attempt [has been made] beyond anecdotal evidence, the analyses were rarely more than correlational" (p. 2).

In one such programme evaluation, Neill and Richards (1993) of the Australian Outward Bound Foundation employed a pre-test, post-test design assessing positive changes in life skills from the sail training programme on the barquentine *Leeuwin II*. The study comprised 197 participants (111 females and 86 males) over five voyages during 1993. There were eleven life skills measured using a questionnaire developed by the Foundation (including self-confidence, self-discipline, team building, leadership and stress management). Each of the life skill categories was found to be statistically significant during the voyage. However, the questionnaire seems to have been designed using leading and loaded questions, thus possibly influencing the

outcome. Also, the research was conducted by the Outward Bound Australia (OBA) Research Department and there was thus a potential conflict of interest.

An independent New Zealand study by Grocott (1999) in conjunction with the Spirit of Adventure Trust was a quantitative pre-test, post-test design evaluating self-esteem enhancement from a sail training programme. It sought to empirically assess the widely held assumption that youth development sail training programmes enhance self-esteem. One hundred and fifty-eight participants between 15 and 18 years of age completed measures of self-esteem on four occasions: three weeks prior to the voyage, on the first day of the voyage, the last day of the voyage, and three months after the voyage. Analysis revealed that, during the voyage, participants experienced increased levels of self-esteem, and, further, that increases were maintained over the three months following the voyage.

A study by Hattie et al. (1997) performed a meta-analysis[2] on adventure programmes in general. It is known as a major study in the adventure programme area; however, the focus was not on sail training. The meta-analysis was based on 1728 effect sizes, drawn from 151 unique samples from 96 quantitative studies. A diverse array of outcomes such as self-concept, locus of control, and leadership were examined. The researchers found that positive short-term outcomes were followed by a substantial increase in gains for each outcome well after the end of the programmes. Additionally, the longer the programme and the older the participants, the greater the gains received. Those outcomes with the greatest effects seemed to be underpinned by a theme of self-control; that is, the outcomes which related to self-regulation, a sense of responsibility and self-assurance. Additionally, effect sizes on leadership and personality components were also substantial.

---

[2] Meta-analysis is a statistical technique that enables the results from different studies to be combined into one numerical score (Bond & McConkey, 2001).

However, it is important to note that meta-analysis is based on the assumption that all the studies are equal. However, it tends to combine studies of variable quality. Thus any weaker studies might swamp the results provided by fewer, well-conducted studies (Wilson & Rachman, 1983, cited in Bond & McConkey, 2001). "Several authors have argued that simply to lump together all types of problems into a single analysis is a flawed strategy" (Bond & McConkey, p. 8.17).

1.2   Significance of the study

Missing from the sail training and adventure training literature is a qualitative study evaluating a sail training programme. Through an intensive rather than extensive (Sayer, 1992) [3] study of actual events and processes on board the Sail Training Vessel (STV) *One and All*, the effectiveness of the Programme in meeting its stated objectives will be assessed. With over 40,000 students participating in Outward Bound programs worldwide in 1994, Hattie et al. (1997) note that "…considerable resources of participants and staff, and associated time, personal energy, and finances are spent on these programs [sic]" (p. 44). Thus this research evaluation aims to make a significant contribution to the sail training and adventure training literature.

However, in relation specifically to the STV *One and All*, it is expected that the results of this evaluation will be useful in providing a rich qualitative description and understanding of the Programme that will benefit the Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia, Incorporated ("the Trust") for the *One and All* in refining its objectives and delivery for future voyages. A report taken from this thesis will be provided to the Trust, and it is envisaged that the Trust will provide the Education Department, the Attorney-General's Department, schools and youth groups with copies.

---

[3] Sayer (1992) makes clear distinctions between the two and notes that these distinctions do not equate to more or less rigorous inquiry. "Intensive…[is concerned with] how some causal process works out in a particular case or limited number of cases. Extensive...is concerned with discovering some of the common properties and general patterns of a population as a whole" (p. 242). Thus, intensive study produces "causal explanation of the production of certain objects or events, though not necessarily representative ones [and extensive study produces] descriptive representative generalizations, lacking in explanatory penetration" (p. 243).

1.3 The Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia, Inc for the *One and All*: a brief history

The ship "was conceived as a Sail Training Vessel by a group led by Doctor John Young" (Fenton, 2004, p. 7), who formed the *One and All* Sailing Ship Association of South Australia, Incorporated. The ship was originally owned by this association and then deeded to the Trust on the 15th December 1989 for the sole purpose of retaining the vessel for the people of the State of South Australia (Kuhl, n.d.[b]). Thus, as Captain Ian Kuhl, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Trust, states: "the Trust is the public custodian of the ship and ensures her maintenance and safe operation" (Kuhl, p. 3).

The Trust is supported by volunteers who are members of the *One and All* Sail Training Association (Kuhl, n.d.[b]) ("volunteer association"). There is a small fee for association membership. Members are sent newsletters informing them of the sailing programmes available and which programmes need further volunteers. They then have the opportunity of selecting voyages that match their own timetable with the requirements of the Trust for the *One and All*.

According to Rear Admiral Rothesay Swan, from the Australian Sail Training Association, the Programme is not strictly a sail training programme (Swan, n.d.). While the term "sail training" is an internationally accepted term, it is indeed a misnomer. True sail training "is the proper prerogative of the training sections of yacht clubs and commercial training organisations" (p. 1). The sail training referred to in the Programme and this thesis is not about the "training" of someone to sail, rather a journey of personal discovery through "adventure at sea under sail" (p. 2).

1.4   Programme objectives

Kuhl, (n.d.[b]) writes how the Programme provides a dynamic personal development experience, and how lifelong skills are learned through challenges and adventure at sea. He notes that a key element to the Programme is the restricted physical environment and the close proximity of people on the ship (Kuhl).

Kuhl, (n.d.[a]) states that the participants are responsible not only for themselves, but for the care and safety of others; thus the intensity of the interdependent community leads to a strong social experience. During an informal conversation, Kuhl commented that the relationship and work experiences were "twenty-four/seven". Further, he noted that meeting the challenges set by the ship environment is entirely dependent on the individual, which he believes develops a sense of achievement and self-worth (Kuhl, n.d.[b]). Kuhl, (n.d.[b]) emphasises that, to achieve this, a "learning" environment rather than a "teaching" environment needs to be created and maintained.

This dynamic interplay between components of the Programme, to which Kuhl alludes, started to emerge from my first discussions with him and from reading some of the early documents about the *One and All*. I considered humanist and constructivist approaches in education, which both focus on a learning environment. However, I was mindful not to impose the theories on my observations; rather, I explored those theories further in light of my observations upon my return from the voyage. This relationship between theories and practice is explored in sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.

The stated objectives of the Programme are to develop:

- Positive self-esteem by building self-confidence and a healthier respect for oneself;

- Sensitivity to others and the environment;

- Team skills through an awareness of the interdependent nature of a community;

- Maturity and a positive attitude through self-discipline, and the setting and achievement of goals (Kuhl, n.d.[a & b]).

These objectives were discussed with Kuhl in an initial meeting and were also contained in documentation about the *One and All* provided to me prior to the research voyage. Again, mindful not to impose the psychological theories relating to goal setting and self-esteem on my observations, I also explored those theories in light of the observations from the voyage. These are discussed in sections 4.4.2 and 4.5.

1.5   Research questions

In contrast to an experimental quantitative research, this evaluation sought to provide a rich picture through an intensive qualitative design. The object was to provide a description of the Programme, to identify the implementation process and the outcomes, and to analyse the effects on participants in relation to relevant theory.

Thus, the purpose of the research was to evaluate the Programme's effectiveness in meeting its objectives. As qualitative research is an emergent process, I began with some initial guiding questions. These were:

- How is the Programme implemented, that is:

  - Who is implementing it?

  - Is it a learning or teaching environment?

- Can the Programme implementation be understood within educational approaches, such as humanism and constructivism?

- What challenges are set by the ship environment and the Programme?

- What effect on participants do these challenges have in relation to the objectives?

CHAPTER II: METHOD: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION RESEARCH

This section outlines my research method. Following Patton (1990), I call the approach I have taken qualitative evaluation research. The chapter begins with a consideration of qualitative social research and evaluation research. It then covers considerations prior to setting sail, the participants on the voyage, and types of instruments used for data collection including participant observation, video recordings and interviewing. Following this is a discussion of data trustworthiness and then the data analysis. It concludes by discussing limitations and delimitations.

2.1   Qualitative social research

There are many different research methods for the social scientist to consider. Indeed, there has long been a debate on the relative value of different approaches in social sciences (Hoepfl, 1997). Hitchcock and Hughs (1989) comment that some argue that systematic inquiry for the social sciences must be the same as in the physical sciences if it is to be viewed as scientific. Yet Lorenz (1977), an advocate of qualitative research, believed that observation and description were fundamental to scientific discovery. He noted:

> Many scientists often express credulity and thinly disguised scorn when…one begins one's investigations by observing and describing, instead of confining oneself to experimental methods and the definition of concepts in a manner which is fashionably called "precise and scientific" (p. 19).

In a similar vein, Patton (1990) emphasises that the greatest strength of qualitative design is that it enables the researcher to look in great depth and detail at specific issues, analysing subjects' perspectives and experiences in context, without the constraints of predetermined categories. However, because this is usually achieved with a smaller number of people, one loses any ability to generalise to the population (Patton). Indeed, as Hoepfl (1997) explains, "qualitative methods can be

used to better understand any phenomenon about which little is yet known" (p. 2). In this instance, qualitative evaluation research was chosen because it was appropriate to its object, that is, examining how the Programme was implemented, and exploring the plethora of experiences and the interpretations of those experiences by participants. The focus was on investigation. Thus, eliminating variances and pursuing extensive generalisations were not the object.

2.2 Evaluation research

Patton (1990) notes that the purpose of a programme is to intervene and provide a solution to a problem in society. The effectiveness of the solution or intervention is a "matter subject to study" (p. 155). Patton notes that when examination of the processes and outcomes of an intervention "is conducted systematically and empirically through careful data collection and thoughtful analysis, one is engaged in evaluation research" (p.11). Here, the emphasis is on "generating findings that are useful" (p. 11). This is different from traditional academic research where the emphasis is on contribution to theory, causal explanations and extensive generalisability.

However, Patton (1990) distinguishes levels of generalisability, noting the levels are dependent on the purpose and type of research and not limited to basic science, where the search is for fundamental patterns. One level is related to applied research findings, which are typically limited to a specific time, place and condition. Another is formative, where the focus is on a specific context, aiming to improve the human action. A third is summative, where the purpose is to examine a specific programme and the effectiveness of human action, to provide an overall judgement on whether the programme itself is effective or not within the limits of its context.

Thus, this research incorporates two levels of generalisability described by Patton (1990). It is formative in that it is specific to the Programme and the voyage undertaken. However, it is also summative because it aims "to seek patterns that cut across programmes…in a number of different places and…groups" (p. 156) by referring to literature in psychology and education, and the findings of previous research.

Consequently, in undertaking this research to include not only observations from a specific voyage but also an analysis of these observations in light of educational and psychological theories, a selection of tools were used to gather data. Hitchcock and Hughs (1989), Patton (1990), Hoepfl (1997), Merriam (1998), Burns (2000) and others focus on three main types: observation, interviews and document analysis. Under the umbrella of observation, video recording was also used in this study to gather data on the voyage and assist researcher recall during the process of data analysis.

2.3   Considerations prior to setting sail

In the following few sections I briefly outline the participants on the voyage and their recruitment, and then detail the data gathering techniques used. Firstly, however, I discuss considerations prior to sailing, including familiarising myself with the field setting, and strategising how I would approach the setting, initially relieve participant anxieties about the research and researcher, and the personality I would assume.

A pre-voyage visit to the sailing ship (one week prior to sailing) was undertaken to familiarise myself with the field setting and to note the layout, equipment and surroundings. I was able to meet some of the crew at this stage and introduce myself. On the day of departure I resolved to relieve any anxieties the participants might have had by not drawing attention to myself, and so did what others were doing (Burns,

2000). When I arrived on the wharf, I noted everyone standing around in separate groups with their families and friends, and did the same. I did not approach the crew on board the ship so as not to bring attention to myself; rather, I found a spot close to the other participants, but far enough away to be separate. The names of the participants were called out one by one as they boarded. At the end, the crew member asked if anyone had been missed, to which I said "yes", and gave my name. Although I had been listed as crew, I wanted to be included in the participant list and go aboard as one of them. I followed the instructions that were given to us and went below to the cabins to put my luggage on my bunk. We then came together as one group on the foredeck[4], waving to friends and family left behind as the ship moved away from the wharf.

Hitchcock and Hughs (1989) note that "the process of developing [good] field relationships becomes crucial to the [success] of the study" and that the researcher "must build up confidence, trust, and rapport with the subjects" (p. 64). Thus, when everyone was divided up into three groups, I went as one of the participants to a group, rather than floating among the three groups as the researcher. I saw this as my opportunity to briefly say what I was doing, thus, as Burns (2000) recommends, reassuring people that I was "there to observe and not to judge" (p. 406). I believed that becoming friendly with and being accepted by my group would create openings with the other two groups. I did not want to be seen as a "try-hard", to use the participants' language. The "personality" that I assumed had been planned prior to the voyage. I was quiet but open to chatting, friendly but not sycophantic, confident but not bombastic, and accepting and not judgemental. I waited for people to approach me when they felt comfortable.

---

[4] Foredeck: The section of the main deck between the centre deckhouse and bow (the forward part of a ship – the front point).

2.4 Participants

Twenty-four people ranging from 15 to 19 years of age participated in the Programme between the 5th and 11th of July 2004. The participants came from various schools and locations around South Australia. There was no targeted recruitment for the study[5]. Participant recruitment for voyages is managed by the *One and All* office. During the voyage, some participants commented that their school counsellor had suggested the voyage to them, some had read about it in the school bulletin and decided it would be something to do on their school holidays, while others commented that their parents had thought it a good thing for them to undertake.

2.5 Data collection

The primary technique for data collection in this evaluation was participant observation. In this section, this technique is discussed, then the application of the technique to observation in the field is outlined together with other instruments used: video recording and interviewing.

2.5.1 Participant observation

Having decided on an evaluation approach using observation, I needed to consider four possible techniques: (1) the researcher participating fully without informing the observed; (2) the researcher hidden or removed from interaction with the observed; (3) the researcher known to the observed, with participation secondary and data gathering primary; and (4) participant-as-observer, where the researcher participates fully (takes on the activities of the group and the responsibilities that lie with these activities) and is known to the observed (Burns, 2000). For the first few days I adopted the fourth technique to become fully involved as a participant and to enable the other participants to get to know me as one of their kind. Initially, I was allocated

---

[5] It was not known on which voyage the research would take place, and several voyage dates were available to the researcher. The voyage date for the study depended on approval from the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee, which was obtained.

to a watch group[6] and took on the responsibilities of that watch in the first few days. However, on the final four days, I moved more towards the third technique so as to observe the other watches and watch leaders, and also, to reduce the demands of being fully involved with my watch. This enabled me to move freely among the groups while video recording, coming back to the original watch for some duties.

Participant observation is an exceptional technique for studying patterns, particularly the organisation of and the relationships among people and events (Jorgensen, 1989; Burns, 2000). The advantage of using participant observation is that it uncovers meanings which people use in their everyday life to interact with and make sense of their environment (Jorgensen). According to Burns, participant observation is "... the primary technique used by [qualitative researchers] to gain access to data" (p. 405). Thus, data were gathered first-hand about how the group came together and managed life as an interconnected community. These are presented and discussed in the following chapter.

In participant observation it is essential that a detailed fieldwork journal is kept. As events occurred that appeared relevant to the main objectives of the Programme, I noted them down. This included, for example, the Watch Leader holding back comments to allow participants to work out a solution for themselves, and giving participants time to chat about their lives off the boat[7]. Salkind (2000) notes that "the major disadvantage [will be] that little planning goes into [the] recording" and it creates a large amount of data to intensively sift through during the analysis process. Hence, I followed a number of suggestions made by Hitchcock and Hughs (1989).

---

[6] The 24 participants are divided up into three groups, called watch groups. To allow the ship to be operated on a 24-hour basis, the day is divided into seven duty period called watches. Watches are generally four hours long with the exception of two, 2-hour "dog watches". By including these, the work program for each watch group moves forward by one watch period each day. This avoids each watch performing the same duties at the same time for every day of the voyage.

[7] Indicative of a learning not teaching environment, this also signifies self-esteem and team building opportunities for the participants; self-discipline for the Watch Leader. These are discussed in the following chapter.

Firstly, I took notes made up of abbreviations, keywords, phrases, diagrams and questions to follow up. Each day I wrote up these notes and anything else that would be an "aide-memoire" (Hitchcock & Hughs, 1989, p. 68). Secondly, when I could, I looked over what I had written and began classifying and organising the data into categories, and looked to discover the emergence of any themes or recurring features. Thirdly, these categories or themes were written on a separate page, and referred to and added to as further notes were taken. Hitchcock and Hughs note that doing this will alert the researcher to the amount and detail of the material collected in some areas and missing in others areas.

In this way, I realised on the second evening of field journal entry that I was missing data from other watch groups. Early on the third day, therefore, I arranged to leave my watch group and began to move in and around the other watches. I was thus relieved of strict adherence to watch duty in my group and enhanced my data collecting. By this time word had reached the other participants about who I was, and during quiet times on the night watches, many of the participants came to me and asked questions about what I was doing. I felt comfortable and relaxed with them due to my decision to let them approach me, that is, I was able to mirror their behaviour, and not impose my personal direction upon them. Thus I was not seen as an aloof stranger, rather, someone who was (or could be) "one of them". Hence I played the role of participant, researcher and observer.

The following ideas from Burns (2000) I found useful as a guide when collecting data throughout the voyage:

1. Who made up the setting in terms of participants and crew? How many people were there, and what were their characteristics?

2. What kinds of behaviour were set, encouraged, permitted, discouraged or prevented?

3. How did the participants react to the official purpose of the situation: with acceptance or rejection? What goals other than the official purpose did the participants pursue?

4. How did participants behave, and how did they manage their day? What were their qualities of behaviour (for example, intense, persistent, unusual, appropriate, determined)? What were the effects (for example, what behaviour did it evoke from others)? How did change originate and how was it managed? What rules or norms governed the social organisation?

5. In terms of frequency and duration, when did situations occur? Were they recurring or unique? What were the occasions that gave rise to such situations? How typical of situations in general were those situations observed?

I familiarised myself with these questions and used them to focus my observations. This grounded me and aided direction towards the research questions and my role as a researcher. That is, I did not go "native"[8] (Spradley 1979, cited in McCombs, 1998).

In relation to the participant observer being grounded, Hitchcock and Hughs note that the researcher needs tremendous stamina, both to be attentive and involved for long periods of time in the field, and then to spend many hours writing up field notes and observations. Indeed exhaustion did arise as an issue that I experienced on two occasions, firstly on the third day, and later on the last evening. Most people showed signs of tiredness and exhaustion on the first few days due to seasickness, the amount

---

[8] "The term 'native' is used to denote the people whose world one is seeking to understand, the native speaker who is a source of information" (McCombs, 1998, p. 5). However, the researcher needs to be aware of becoming too involved and not distinguishing their role as researcher (McCombs, 1998).

of new information that had to be absorbed, the 24-hour watch system, and the continual disturbance of sleep from tacking[9] calls and participants chatting in the cabin area. I was fortunate enough not to suffer seasickness but those who did were unable to eat or sleep, and I saw and heard from them that they felt dreadful. As well as the above, I had to stay up in the evening and write notes, so the few sleeping hours that were available were often taken up by field journal entries. Eventually, I had to ask for time to sleep because I had reached a point where I was aware of not being capable of observing properly nor thinking and focusing on writing my journal. After one good sleep, I was able to recover enough to continue through the rest of the voyage. However, it is worthy to note that age and fitness play an important part in stamina and meeting the demands on a participant observer. I noted the stamina of the youths was greater than mine and, consequently, they were more easily able to adapt to the demands of the ship environment, specifically, the lack of sleep.

2.5.2   Video recording

One of the tools I used to collect data was a hand-held video recorder. Initially, I used the video recorder minimally, taping the crew's introduction of themselves and the ship to the participants on the first day. I noticed participants appeared to pay little or no attention to the video recorder. This was good because I felt the participants were comfortable with the recorder. Hence, I filmed a number of scenes including participants going aloft[10], debriefs, the hand-over session, and later the management of the ship when the participants first sailed wholly on their own.

The video was also used to record the interviews towards the end of the voyage. I decided to do this because I believed it would be too difficult to write down points

---

[9] A manoeuvre to turn the ship's bow through the direction of the wind, to bring the wind onto the opposite side.

[10] Going aloft refers to when participants climb the rigging (the ropes, chains, and cables used to support and work the masts, yards, and sails on a ship) above the deck.

during the interview and maintain my focus. I also felt it would make participants uncomfortable saying things as I attempted to write and that the writing would be disruptive to the flow of the interview. Additionally, by using the recorder I did not have to decide at any particular moment what was important or relevant and possibly missing subtle cues; instead I was able to sift through the data during analysis. It also enabled me to transcribe the interviews at a later stage without having to rely on memory and abbreviated notes. I advised participants that I was using the recorder because I wanted to transcribe the interviews for the research. I also advised them that the recorder lens was not focused on them in case this made them nervous, and reminded them of my commitment to confidentiality[11]. Though participants had signed their initial consent form, I again asked for their consent at the time of recording and all agreed. This gave them a further option to put them at ease.

2.5.3 Interviewing

The literature on qualitative interviewing generally describes three types of interview: structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Hoepfl, 1997; Merriam, 1998; and Burns, 2000). A structured interview is a formal process where the questions have been predetermined and there is a fixed order. Merriam, for example, describes it as an oral form of a survey. A structured interview is usually inflexible, standardised, close-ended and predominantly used for quantitative analysis.

On the other hand, a semi-structured interview is one where predetermined questions are used as a guide for the researcher. They may not be delivered in exactly the same way each time with each interview (Burns, 2000). The questions can be organised under general topics allowing the interviewer to explore preconceived

---

[11] Participants had initially been made aware of confidentiality and video recording on the consent forms (see Appendix B) sent out prior to the voyage.

themes and ideas. However, this less structured approach provides a flexibility whereby deeper exploration of themes can take place and new ideas raised.

Finally, an unstructured interview is more like a conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee. It consists of open-ended questions, which provide a flexibility to explore issues and perceptions in great depth. In an unstructured interview the distinction between interviewer and interviewee becomes blurred. However, the interviewee is able to be redirected by the researcher should the conversation move away from the study objectives.

Berk (2000) notes that the advantage of qualitative research is that it helps to understand the participants' views. While structured interviews can be a more efficient method and are used "when a high degree of control over the interview situations is required or [deemed] necessary" (Hitchcock & Hughs, 1989, p. 80) and when a large sample of individuals is available, they do not necessarily yield the same results as an unstructured one and, as such, are very inefficient at gathering deep knowledge of a situation. The unstructured interview has been criticised in that it "cannot be assumed to generalise beyond the people and settings in which the research was originally conducted" (Hammersley, 1992, cited in Berk, p. 54). However, this is not necessarily the case, as was discussed in section 2.2.

During the voyage, both unstructured and semi-structured interviews were used. Unstructured interviews were used predominantly when talking with the Captain and crew. Semi-structured interviews were used specifically for the participant interviews on the last two days of the voyage. Here, I created a set of questions as a guide (see Appendix A). These questions were specifically directed towards the objectives of the *One and All*; for example, "Do you think this Programme had an effect on your self-esteem?" Questions such as "In what way?" and "Can you elaborate on that?"

allowed for exploration of comments made by participants, and general questions were added if participants became restless; for example, "Did you know anyone when you came on?" or "How was it going aloft?"

Of course, not all interviews were the same. If participants were chatty, I took on that style with them, switching between semi-structured and explorative questions. If they showed signs of talking but were uncertain and holding back, I posed general questions for a while. I then asked set questions where appropriate and attempted more explorative questions where possible. For example, in one particular interview, the participant continually answered specific questions with a yes or no. However, I found she was quite happy to chat about her own experience about the voyage. I let her speak. Through the flow of our more informal unstructured conversation she came to answer many of the pre-set questions in her own time and way. In this way, listening skills and awareness of nonverbal communication were exercised while using mirroring[12] (reflective) and funnelling[13] (directional) techniques. As this example shows, unstructured interviews are more informative, enlightening and conducive to certain contexts than structured interviews and it was for this reason that the qualitative method was chosen for the evaluation of the Programme.

However, an issue concerning when and where to interview the participants arose during the voyage. At the beginning of the voyage I was unsure when to start interviewing. Around mid-voyage I did not feel that I had built up a strong enough rapport with the participants. I was also unsure where to interview them. The ship was such a small space and people were constantly everywhere. There was therefore no place to get away from others. After speaking with the Captain and crew about

---

[12] Where the interviewer repeats back the last couple of words, or briefly summarises what the respondent said (Burns, 2000).

[13] Where certain patterns or directions important to the study are questioned by the interviewer for the respondent to elaborate upon. Thus, the interview or conversation is channelled into selected areas that are discussed more fully (Burns, 2000).

this issue, it was decided that the Captain's cabin, where there was a door, offered

some privacy. The interviews were held on the last two days, by which time a sound

rapport and the excitement of heading home created ease during the interviewing

process. Most participants wanted to talk about their experience, but some were not

forthcoming with information and this was probably due to varying character types.

2.6   Data trustworthiness

The issue relating to the interviewing was more a participant observer management

issue. However, there was a methodological issue which related to data

trustworthiness, to which I now turn.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the trustworthiness[14] of a naturalistic

inquiry can never be labelled as unassailable, as is the case with conventional inquiry,

because naturalistic inquiry operates as an open system. However, certain techniques

can be used to demonstrate credible findings and interpretations. One such technique

used in this study was that of triangulation.

Triangulation is a technique based on the physical measurements used by

maritime navigators and surveyors (Burns, 2000), where two or more location

markers are used in relation to the standing position to pinpoint that position. For

qualitative design, the idea is to collect data using a variety of methods so as to be

able to cross-analyse. Burns notes that, in doing this, the qualitative researcher is able

to check in two ways. Firstly, the researcher can check the "consistency of findings

generated by different data-collection methods" (p. 419). Webb et al. (1966, cited in

Lincoln & Guba, 1985) conclude that triangulation makes data believable in that

"once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more measurement processes, the

uncertainty of its interpretations is greatly reduced" (p. 306). Lincoln and Guba,

---

[14] Lincoln and Guba (1985) establish the criteria appropriate to naturalistic inquiry in relation to the criteria used for the conventional paradigm.

Denzin (1989), and Merriam (1998) also advocate using triangulation, "combining…interviewing, document analysis, direct observation, and observer participation" (p. 234), to address issues of trustworthiness.

Secondly, the researcher can address issues of datum trustworthiness by checking "…the consistency of different data sources within the same method" (Burns, p. 419). These issues include whether participants are presenting a false or ideal self, or whether they tell the researcher what they think the researcher wants to hear, or whether they "lie, omit relevant data or misrepresent their claims" (Burns, 2000, p. 419). An example of this occurred during an interview where the participant commented initially on how he had not enjoyed the voyage very much. However, as the interview progressed he began to list things he had learned and spoke of how his confidence had grown through the experience. He concluded the interview saying he was planning to come back and do another voyage in the following holidays with a friend of his. His free-flowing conversation was thus not consistent with the initial answering of specific questions.

2.7 Data analysis

In the field, Jorgensen (1989) notes, "a general schema for coding frequently emerges" (p. 110). With this in mind, I noted general patterns that emerged in behaviours and implementation procedures. Thus, as I recorded and reflected, I could refer back to notes and recognise connections with emerging categories. Distinct patterns began to show, for example, the bonding process between participants, and between participants and crew. Further, I saw the bonding process falling into two categories: formal bonding through the sail training, and informal bonding during free time. Here, I recognised that bonding could be interpreted as a component of the team building and self-esteem objectives of the *One and All*.

There are several analytic strategies to use even as data are recorded in the field (Jorgensen, 1989; Hoepfl, 1997; Burns, 2000). According to Jorgensen (p. 108), the first is to "identify and label basic components". The second strategy directs the researcher to look for "patterns and relationships among facts". Jorgensen notes that this involves looking for "connections or relationships among particular pieces of information". Next, the researcher is to compare and contrast in order to establish whether data are similar to or different from other components. Finally, it is suggested the researcher ask different questions, or phrase them in different ways. This provides a cross-examination of data and assists with categorisation. It thus becomes part of triangulation, that is, part of the process to establish the trustworthiness (Denzin, 1989; Merriam, 1998; Burns, 2000) of the data. I then re-examined these categories to further look for links, or to see if several categories could fit together as one. Following Strauss and Corbin (1990), Hoepfl (1997) calls this "axial coding" (p. 6).

I followed Jorgensen's (1989) strategic approach to data analysis. After the initial analysis, conducted during the field trip, the data were left for three weeks so that I could distance myself from the experience. After this, a second analysis was conducted. This time I was able to analyse the data with a rested mind as the intensity of the experience, both emotionally and mentally, had dissipated, thus allowing a clearer perspective. The Captain did mention at the final debrief at the end of the voyage that we would all go home and sleep for a week, and that we would bombard our families with the many stories we had. I did find I needed personal space after being so closely involved with a group of people for that length of time. I also needed time to contemplate, make connections, sort and file in my mind the many facets of

the experience. Jorgensen notes this is a useful thing to do because the field experience is so intense.

This is not to suggest that data analysis and coding are straightforward. Hoepfl (1997) notes that the organisation of one's raw data "can be a daunting task" (p. 6). She counsels, much like Jorgensen (1989), that the "challenge is to place the raw data into logical, meaningful categories, to examine them in a holistic fashion" (p. 6). The challenge of coding the data was indeed a daunting task. I had seven and a half hours of video recordings and a ninety-minute audio tape to transcribe and my daily field notes to intensively sift through. The uncertainty of where to start and the best way of coding the data brought anxiety. Thus I resolved to start with my field notes as, in this study, data organisation (as mentioned) had begun during actual data gathering. I then carried this out with all the data transcribed from the video recordings and the audiotape. Conceptually, the process can be seen as piecing together a jigsaw puzzle whereby, according to Hoepfl, "the discrete categories identified in open coding are compared and combined in new ways as the researcher begins to assemble the 'big picture'" (p. 6). At this stage, Hoepfl contends, "the researcher must translate the conceptual model into the story line" (p. 6) so that the research report develops into a "rich, tightly woven account" (p. 6) of the reality it represents.

After coding the data into categories, I wrote the results. While names had been recorded during data collection to aid my memory, when writing the results, I decided to write "Participant" and "Watch Leader" instead of the person's name so as to maintain confidentiality. Pseudonyms were not used because the importance of the quotations lay in what had been said, not who had said it.

After having written the results, I again went through the data looking to further compare and combine the data into discrete categories. At this stage I used the cut

and paste method onto titled category sheets. I found this method an easier and more logical method with which to work. While this proved time consuming, it enabled me to cross-check for omissions and consistency.

2.8   Limitations and delimitations

Limitations of this qualitative evaluation research included time and length: because the study was for an honours thesis, only one voyage could be undertaken. This evaluation is therefore based on one example of the Programme implementation with school youths. The *One and All* is also involved with the juvenile justice system and community groups, with voyages focusing on "youths at risk". Consequently, any study that involved these latter groups could result in a different interpretation of the Programme. Although the crew mentioned that while participants differ on each voyage, the outcomes are the same, this is unable to be ascertained from this evaluation and may be an opportunity for future research.

The nature of qualitative research also introduces the problem of one researcher's interpretations (Anderson & Poole, 2001). In this study, interpretations could not be cross-analysed with interpretations from other researchers, so that triangulation using more than one researcher was not achieved. Thus interpretations can be challenged from a different perspective, or by results from a different voyage.

Other problems facing field researchers is the dilemma of knowing when to stop collecting data (Jorgensen, 1989; Anderson & Poole, 2001) and the amount of data collection that is achievable with just one researcher. That is, I was unable to be in all places on the ship at any one time, and was only able to observe certain watches at certain times. As mentioned in 2.5.1, due to exhaustion on two occasions, my data collecting was thwarted. Thus, allocation of rest time could have been included as part of my method procedure.

CHAPTER III: ON THE *ONE AND ALL*: EXPERIENCING AND

UNDERSTANDING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

In this chapter the results are presented and discussed within themes that emerged from the data analysis. Addressing many of the research questions, I firstly discuss the ship environment and the importance of the volunteer association in selecting crew who can create a learning environment, and thus implement the Programme effectively. Secondly, I explore the contents of the Volunteer Log Book (VLB) and Watch Leaders' Manual (WLM) in relation to guiding crew on how to develop the learning environment, with the emphasis being on leading by example and using open/leading questions. I then establish that the framework is consistent with Humanist and Constructivist approaches. Finally, I turn to the themes that emerged from the learning environment. The ship's environment created challenges, which required stamina to meet the demands of the 24-hour rotating watch system and manage seasickness, and the tolerance necessary when in such close and constant proximity to others. Meeting these challenges exposed our true selves which crew refer to as removing masks. This in turn created a reciprocal trust environment and, consequently, bonding.

3.1   Ship environment

The theme that emerged from the ship's environment was its importance in creating a learning environment as opposed to a teaching/training environment, without which the implementation and outcomes of the Programme would be quite different. In this section I discuss the advantages of the volunteer association to both the Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia Incorporated for the *One and All* ("the Trust") and the participants. I then discuss how the volunteer association, and the recruitment of crew

through the association, is fundamental to establishing the ship's environment, thus underpinning the development and maintenance of the learning environment.

3.1.1   The volunteer association

The Trust is supported by volunteers who are members of the volunteer association. The association has developed the VLB which acts as a guide to volunteers for implementing the Programme and emphasises that the ship was "built by the people of SA for the people of SA" (Fenton, 2004, p. 7). There is a real sense of the association through its volunteers providing a valuable service to South Australian people, particularly its youth. Hence, the focus is maintained throughout the VLB on what one is giving to the community and not on personal gain.

During the voyage, the crew informed participants about the volunteer association and any participants who showed interest were told of the possibility of volunteering for further voyages. Both the Trust and volunteers gain from this relationship. For the keen participant there is the possibility of further trips, and for the ship, staffing requirements are met; without this, the financial position of this not-for-profit operation would not be viable. The participants' first voyage is not necessarily their last and they have the opportunity of developing their association with the Programme. This is particularly advantageous for those who would not have the financial means for further trips. Another advantage to having the volunteer association is that the volunteers are involved by choice and thus participate with genuine enthusiasm and commitment. This important part of ship ethos is critical to the success of the Programme.

The volunteer association is an ideal recruitment ground for future paid crew, as those who show a genuine interest in the Programme philosophy are selected for. That is, those that are more suited to the learning environment will tend toward

establishing great friendships with the crew and participants, and develop the style successful in achieving the Programme objectives. From a social justice viewpoint, all socio-economic groups can access this opportunity, with the main prerequisite being enthusiasm and commitment to the *One and All*.

3.1.2 "I'm not looking for a brilliant sailor": selecting the crew

The Captain commented: "Selecting staff is not just based on sailing ability, as these skills can be learned. I am not looking for a brilliant sailor, rather I'm looking at personality types" [Conversation in galley[15]]. He said that he looked for people who got along well with and could relate to the participants. He gave the example of a person working for him who, while he was able to teach the participants the names of the various sails and the use of the lines[16], was hardly ever seen making contact with participants. Consequently, the participants did not bond with him, a factor that was important to achieving the Programme objectives, and as such, important in the recruitment of crew members.

In this study the crew became one with the participants. The Watch Leaders were always "hanging out" with their group, and other crew members were always on deck, thus accessible and approachable. It was not unusual to see the Captain in the galley doing a puzzle with the participants who were off duty, or just sitting there, sometimes talking with them. This gave the participants a sense that the Captain was approachable and broke down hierarchical barriers while maintaining respectfulness.

The Captain and crew had developed great friendships and this was observed by and extended to the participants. Likewise, the participants mirrored this environment and developed great friendships with each other and the crew. Among the more formal communications issued by the crew there was play as well. The crew used the

---

[15] Galley: ship's kitchen.

[16] Ropes.

language of the participants, and I recall at one general meeting, held every morning at nine on the aft deck[17] where it was always windy, the group was spread out and the Captain didn't want to shout. Trying to get them to come in close, he said: "Make like it's a mosh pit", at which everyone laughed and huddled in close.

There was no gruffness, irritability or harshness from the crew at any time. Rather, if participants did something that was not in their or the ship's best interest, a question was posed and everyone came together as a group and worked together for a solution among themselves with just a guiding word from the Watch Leader if they were struggling.

The Captain further stressed that the main objective of the Programme was not about sail training, but rather personal development and life skills. He claimed that, "by staffing from the volunteer association, you get young people who are enthusiastic and enjoy what they are doing". The crew were genuinely interested in the participants and showed great attention to all equally. I did not witness value judgements. For example, one participant in our group was getting on our nerves because he would stray from the group. However, I noted that our Watch Leader, instead of reprimanding him, realised his attention deficit and would refocus his attention by suggesting things for him to do that he was particularly interested in and were in line with the group focus. In leading by example, she showed us all how to manage someone in a team who was causing irritation. Another example came from an interview, where a participant, when asked whether he thought the Programme had helped him, emphasised the importance to him of being able to communicate with others without having to deal with racism, saying:

---

[17] The section of the main deck toward the stern (back end of ship).

P[18]: At school, like, I will just sit by myself, whereas here I have been able to join in and say what I think and it has been okay. There was no racism. [Conversation in the galley].

Most of the participants during interviews mentioned how accepting everyone was. The question about what participants got most from the voyage elicited the following responses:

P1: The experience. Making a lot of friends. No one rejected me. Other things I have been on I have been rejected.

P2: Team work, respect for others, not to make a big deal 'cause everyone is different and got their own way of doing things.

P3: To help each other out and cooperate. But also that we are individual and don't have to be a stereotype, but be yourself and people won't put you down for that—they will take you as you are. [Interviews]

During an interview with the Captain, he and I discussed other sail training vessels that operate differently to varying degrees. For example, one ship is run by ex-naval officers and is more controlled, operating strictly by rules. In comparison, the manuals provided by the *One and All* are guidelines for crew to develop and facilitate the learning experience.

3.2 Creating the learning environment: Humanism and Constructivism

In this section I discuss two manuals available to the crew that address the objectives to the Programme and creating a learning environment. The Volunteer Log Book (VLB) and the Watch Leaders' Manual (WLM). These manuals emphasise the importance of leading by example and using open/leading questions. This framework seemed to be consistent with Humanist and Constructivist approaches.

3.2.1 "Don't teach, allow them to learn": the Volunteer Log Book and the Watch Leaders' Manual

Two manuals are available to staff, the VLB and WLM, and all crew are familiar with them. These two manuals cover the aims and objectives of the sail training and

---

[18] P is an abbreviation for a participant who is being quoted. P1, P2, et cetera are used when a number of participants are quoted.

include the following: the Watch Leaders' role and priorities, briefing and debriefing aims, goal setting and leadership aims, teamwork and problem solving techniques, safety and emergency instructions, and sail handling information. It is noted in the WLM that the sail training "…is aimed at providing the relevant information required to run a safe and effective voyage" (Unknown, 2003, p. 3).

The VLB, as noted above, provides a framework for volunteer crew to develop and facilitate a learning environment. For example, in relation to sail training the emphasis is on learning rather than teaching:

> …don't teach—allow the trainees to learn; allow them to learn from their mistakes; don't expect anything. Never say you should know that; be ready to adjust to different learning abilities; watch the group dynamics; make a mental or written note for debriefs; it is important that the trainees can take home what they have learned about themselves. Watch out for metaphors—pushing oneself to sail the ship is no different to pushing oneself to complete a difficult task in everyday life; never be judgmental, but hold up mirrors to reflect behaviours which the trainee may be unaware of; challenges are an opportunity. (Fenton, 2004, p. 44)

This idea of metaphors was interesting, in that the Programme is aimed at participants inevitably drawing analogies between their life on board the ship with that on land. One example came from a participant during an interview. I asked whether her experience on ship could be related to other areas of her life, to which she replied:

> Yeh, like it can become metaphorical. Like the other day, the waves, you know how it was really rocky and everyone was having heaps more fun than they were in calm water, and that is like metaphorical, because when you are having a calm life it can be a bit boring, but when it is rocky, even though it is tough, it can be fun. [Interviews]

This example represents some of the more abstract analogies that were made by participants during the voyage. Another example came from a Watch Leader who commented on the metaphor of cogs in a wheel when relating the importance of working in a team. That is, if parts go amiss then the whole thing does not work as it

should, if at all. He made the analogy between the interconnectedness of the ship

environment and that of our lives off the ship with our families, school and society.

3.2.2   Leading by example: leadership and the crew

The crew did not ask anyone to do anything that they were not prepared to do

themselves. Leading by example is one of the "Notes on leadership" in the WLM:

"Leadership is not just about taking charge and making all the decisions. It includes:

setting an example for others to follow…encouraging others to work together"

(Unknown, 2003, p. 39).

  During the mid-voyage debrief the Watch Leader guided the participants to

reflect on the example set by the crew in relation to leadership, and the following

points were raised by the participants:

> WL[19] It's not like the leader is the focal point of the group or anything like
>   that, it's just the person that gives the team a focus.
> P1:   Like, so us as leaders, we need to make sure everyone is doing
>   everything together, so you don't have one person doing one thing
>   and another doing something different and then everything goes all
>   over the place.
> P2:   Yeh, a leader is still as equal as everyone else in the group, you know
>   what I mean?
> P3:   It's not like the leader is the boss and above everybody else.
> WL: It's more than that, isn't it? The team depends on the leader and the
>   leader depends on the team. So there is no real superiority. [Video
>   recording]

  Under the heading "Leading and teamwork…by example" in the WLM, there are

five points, three of which are: (1) "Seek help and information. Within your group

there is a massive amount of information"; (2) "Make things happen. Be energetic,

enthusiastic and decisive. A positive attitude will rub off onto your team"; (3) "Take

the first step. Don't leave the task to anyone else. Encourage the use of initiative

within the team. Don't just think about it…do it!" (Unknown, 2003, p. 40). It

became apparent during the voyage that participants were mimicking their Watch

---

[19] WL is an abbreviation for a Watch Leader who is being quoted.

Leaders' enthusiasm, and style of interaction within the team. This observation also emerged from the findings. One participant, when asked what skills in team building he had gained, commented:

> P: I think I have learned to communicate better with other people. And learned to help. Usually I stand back and let other people do it and now I'm kind of up there with them doing it, like stuff, like tying ropes.
>
> CR[20]: And why do you reckon that has changed?
>
> P: It's probably because we need to, you can't just have someone standing around doing bugger all, with the rest of them working. And it made me think, well, I should probably do that as well. [Interviews]

3.2.3   Finding their own way: open and leading questions

Participants were encouraged to ask questions, both of the crew and their team members, from the first day. Crew would not just give answers to questions but would encourage participants to think about what they were asking, guiding participants towards finding their own answers by coming together as a team. For example, the Captain spoke to the participants during the meeting for the handover:

> Your Watch Leaders will be on your watches and are a permanent part of your watch…they are not there to give you the answers. If you ask them a question they will probably answer it with a question. They are not going to hand it to you on a platter, this is an exercise for you guys, but they are there for you. Remember you can go and ask your team members, not just us. If you ask me a question I will answer it with a leading question. [Video recordings].

The effective use of open and leading questions was important throughout the learning process because it supported students in constructing their own knowledge. Questions were not a form of manipulation intended to see that participants arrived at the correct answer. Rather, questions were aimed at helping students to think about their thinking (metacognition) and encouraging the "process" of learning (Gabler & Schroeder, 2003).

---

[20] CR is an abbreviation for Cate Rogers, the author.

This idea of creating a learning rather than teaching environment by way of leading by example, and by open and leading questions, is fundamental to humanist and constructivist approaches. Upon my return from the voyage, these approaches were explored further.

3.2.4   Theoretical considerations: Humanism

Pestalozzi[21] advocated that the aim for "instruction of the young must in every aspect be [for them] to arrive at knowledge slowly, by [their] own experience, [which] is better than to learn by rote, in a hurry, facts that other people know" (cited in Lawrence, 1970, p. 194). The human mind is a developing structure. Montessori[22] believed that it was the educator's role to first "stimulate life—leaving it free to develop, to unfold…" (p. 326). Lawrence states that "the emphasis must be on the child learning, not on the teacher teaching" (p. 330) and cites Montessori as saying "our educational aim…must be to aid the spontaneous development of the mental, spiritual, and physical personality" (p. 331). Thus, Montessori's and Pestalozzi's educational philosophies related to the Programme's objectives. It was established in a summary of the objectives of the Programme that emphasis is placed on creating and maintaining a "learning" environment, rather than a "teaching" one. This was in line with the psychological theory of humanism; a theoretical and therapeutic system of psychology that emphasises particular human processes such as the uniqueness of the individual, the validity of subjective experience, freedom of choice (existentialism), and the tendency for each individual to strive to realise their potential (Tiggeman, 2002). The central elements of humanistic theories, according to Burger (1990, cited in Tiggeman, 2002), are the emphasis on personal responsibility, personal

---

[21] Pestalozzi (1746–1827): a pioneer of modern education whose ideas were based on child psychology (Lawrence, 1970).

[22] Montessori (1870–1952): an Italian educator who designed an educational system to aid children in the development of intelligence and independence through activities that involve exploration, repetition, abstraction, imagination, creativity and communication. This is consistent with the humanist philosophy (Lawrence, 1970).

growth, the here and now, and phenomenology (that is, the subjective approach to knowledge and understanding reality).

Carl Rogers, a prominent humanist in psychology, believed people reached their maximum potential by being able to exercise their free will. Those who were in discord with their environment were being controlled by it. He felt it was better not to direct people, but rather to "allow people the setting in which to discover their potential" (Bond & McConkey, 2001, p. 8.16). For Rogers, this gave people the scope to discover their own behaviour and motivation, and build confidence through making their own decisions in a safe environment. As Montesorri pointed out, liberty is not to be unlimited but within a safe framework and it is more productive to independent growth if we do not serve children habitually (Lawrence, 1970, p. 328). Creating a safe environment was paramount on the ship. Firstly, attention was directed to developing safety in a concrete sense in that safety procedures on board the ship were outlined within minutes of leaving the wharf. Secondly, the safe environment included a more abstract component through the development of trust among crew and participants by means of tasks that addressed the team building process.

The Programme was acted upon by the Captain working with the weather to sail the ship on a course to the abilities of the participants. He also aimed for a high level of motivation without causing excess stress, providing a safe environment from the experience of the sail training viewpoint, yet one that was seemingly dangerous from the inexperience of the participants' viewpoint. All crew including Watch Leaders were responsible for the safety of the participants and, by demonstrating good leadership and teamwork, created a positive and respectful atmosphere.

The Captain also spoke of safety during a meeting with the participants on our voyage:

> A couple of other things: the permanent Watch Leaders will assist you and be part of your watch, and they are my safety officers on board the ship, so we are going to let you go and do a fair bit, but if we think it is dangerous to either yourselves or the ship we will call stop. If they call stop, then stop and think about what might have happened, or what might be happening. [Video recording]

The humanistic approach is one of guidance rather than rules, and facilitation rather than control. Porter (2000) notes that "information is worth knowing when it helps students to understand their physical and social environment and themselves" (p.117). In this they learn respect and care for the world and its people. Two key objectives of the Programme corresponded with this: sensitivity to others and to the physical environment, and awareness of the interdependent nature of a community. Porter cites Fields and Boesser's (1998) findings that students learn more when they are given the opportunity for experimentation and reflection than when they are taught directly. Porter also notes Rogers' view that, in the process of learning, we want students to: "initiate their own actions and to take responsibility for their decisions; evaluate outcomes; know how to acquire useful knowledge; adapt flexibly to new situations, solve relevant problems and work cooperatively with others" (p. 118). It was observed that the crew guided participants to reflect on their achievements in relation to the participants' ability and effort rather than focusing on gaining an evaluation of demonstrated ability. The Programme has been designed this way so that participants may begin to understand that the process of learning is more important than the end product.

3.2.5   Theoretical considerations: Constructivism

Constructivism asserts that new knowledge is constructed by individuals in reference to the environment and the learning context. Thus constructivism emphasises

"situating cognitive experiences in authentic activities" (Duffy & Jonassen, 1992, p.4). Field trips, experiments, group discussions and analysis of current events provide opportunities for students to practise skills that they would use in the real world. The Programme is one such field trip. During the mid-voyage debrief I was speaking with one of the Watch Leaders, who mentioned this point. When asked whether "the idea is to consolidate in participants' minds where they have come from so they can work out where they need to go", he replied:

> WL: Exactly. Changes have happened on the ship, like, they have learned all these things. But if they can say, yeh, this happened and that happened, they can acknowledge it more, and maybe carry it onto places outside the ship. It's all very well if we see the changes happen on the ship, but if they get back to the real world and they are back to normal, well then nothing's changed for them. [Video recording]

Kamii, Manning and Manning (1991) note that "individuals do not acquire knowledge by internalising it directly from the outside but by constructing it from the inside, in interaction with the environment" (p. 18). The basic tenet of constructivism is that all knowledge is rooted in constructs of the mind. Learning occurs when the mechanisms for learning and the individual's own unique version of the knowledge, experience, and aptitudes are brought together in a complex synthesis of ideas (Willis, 1995).

Constructivist methodology generally incorporates a strong social interaction component, with considerable attention given to group work and cooperative learning. The Programme creates an intense social experience for participants through the interconnected nature of the community in all areas of ship life. For constructivists, the complex nature of social relationships is just as important to the context of learning as the structural and procedural setting. Vygotsky (1978) puts forward the view that not only does social interaction play a fundamental role in the development

of cognition but that "the range of skills that can be developed with adult guidance or peer collaboration exceeds what can be attained alone" (Scheeprs, 2000, p. 1; Baylor, Samsonov & Smith, n.d.).

In one of the interviews a participant touched on the crew's method in relation to this when asked if he felt the crew gave the participants a lot of responsibility. He replied:

> P: Yes, and I think that was really good because if they didn't we wouldn't have learnt much, 'cause like if you asked, you know how we appointed the different trainees to do differing things? If, like, someone was to go and ask the adults they'd be like, no, go ask your team mates. So it was giving you more independence. [Interview]

The Programme is designed to create a learning environment and, as such, the ship can be seen as a classroom. One method used in the constructivist classroom to help students develop their own global understanding is inductive reasoning, or "the process of observing objects or events, recognising patterns, and making generalizations [sic] based on observation" (Gabler & Schroeder, 2003, p. 263). This was developed in the Programme through having participants observe initially what their Watch Leaders were showing them regarding to a task, and then as soon as possible having them do things for themselves. After activities, participants came together to discuss the task and, where possible, make analogies to other areas in life.

According to constructivism, with suitable support and questioning, students can formulate their own concepts and principles through group consensus or an individual decision-making process. Throughout the Programme it was observed that, instead of giving participants the answers, Watch Leaders encouraged them to think for themselves, solve problems and, where group process were in place, practise their communication and negotiation skills. In some instances a riddle was used instead of a leading question:

P: Like when we tacked and we had the mainsail, and [participant] was unaware and [WL] was saying right, we are missing something, and he didn't know what it was, so she said a little riddle with it: friction is our friend, but chaffing is our enemy, which we realised the topping lift[23] was right up against the mainsail so it was chaffing, but the sheets[24], all the sheets work off friction. [Interview]

To engage learning by creating motivation, Gabler and Schroeder (2003) suggest using activity sheets; peer-group learning techniques; directed, exploratory and reflective discussion; and interactive presentation. It was observed that each of these techniques was used by the crew. Following are examples presented in a general daily rundown of activity on board the ship.

3.2.6 Learning the ropes: a general daily rundown

Learning started immediately with an orientation of the ship's areas and emergency procedures, and being shown the ropes and sails along with their names. This introduced the nautical language that would be used throughout the Programme. It was understood that not everything would be remembered on the first occasion, and that the Watch Leader would reiterate the names and meanings as we proceeded. Once a task was completed, participants would come together and the Watch Leader would ask questions about what had just been done, with which lines. Each participant had the opportunity to say something or to stand back. In this way participants could contribute or not without losing face. By repetition of tasks such as tacking and grouping, together with discussing what had been done and why, learning was reinforced.

On the first day, participants were informed that it was expected they would put away things, such as plates, clothes and harnesses. This was promoted not only for the consideration of others in such a small community, but also as a safety concern

---

[23] Rope or wire rigging which supports a boom (a spar used to stretch out the foot of a sail) when the sail is not set.

[24] A rope or wire secured to the clew (bottom corner) of every sail to control its setting.

because a clear floor area was necessary for an evacuation in an emergency. During the general meeting the First Mate would bring things out that he had found lying around during the previous 24-hour period. Offending participants would have to own up to the items and then either sing a song or tell a joke. This was done with great spirit by all parties and created much light entertainment. It was an amusing way of making a point to the participants; had the crew handed out a punishment, it would have become a shaming exercise.

On the third day, participants were able to take a turn at being a trainee Watch Leader during tacking and on watch. At this point the participants did not know all the lines and nautical terms, but they did have an understanding of what they needed to do. The permanent Watch Leader ran through the task and began asking questions, requiring the participants to think about what they needed to do and how to fill in the gaps. The trainee Watch Leader then directed the group. The teams were given responsibility as soon as possible and this facilitated participants' thinking and consolidated the information they had been given.

After four days of learning the sails and lines, and practising tacking, the ship was anchored and a mid-voyage debrief ensued. Here the participants went across to the beach and were asked to spend a few moments by themselves. Some went up into the sand hills and others went walking along the beach. We were all craving our own space after the confinement of the ship, and it was an enjoyable experience. The mid-voyage debrief was about articulating what we had learned so far in order to establish what was needed to achieve the next goal, a successful "handover"[25].

I asked one participant about the responsibility given to them and he commented about the implementation style:

---

[25] Where the crew handed the ship over to the participants and a task was set for them to sail back to port.

P: Yeh, but they paced it really well…so we started just purely learning stuff without the burden of actually having to do it. And then they just slowly made us do more and more by ourselves. They timed it really well. When we thought we were comfortable doing something was the time when we did it. [Interview]

Games and activities were used to assess and reinforce learning. The VLB notes: "The Programme provides the structure for the exchange of information and ideas between the Watch Leaders and their watches, and through debriefs to correct and consolidate learning in all areas" (Fenton, 2004, p. 11). At a meeting in the galley to discuss the previous night's sail manoeuvres, questions were asked, such as which lines were used, and participants had to answer whether a line had to be pulled in or loosened off. This method helped to clarify where there was an uncertainty and removed misunderstandings, as well as aiding memory. Similarly, a photo of the ship in full sail was shown to us to pass time on one of our watches and we had to name each sail. Finally, a game was played where a line was called and the participants had to run to it and put their hand on it. Points were scored for each group. It was an exciting and entertaining game to reinforce learning, and everyone on board participated enthusiastically.

3.3   Nurturing the learning individual: personal challenges

Three of the most striking challenges on board were: the stamina to keep going when physically or mentally disinterested or exhausted, the tolerance required to be constantly in the company of others, and the ability to overcome seasickness. Consequently, these challenges meant that masks came off and true selves were exposed; thus we all found ourselves in a reciprocal trust situation.

3.3.1   Not walking away from a challenge: stamina and persistence

Kuhl, (n.d.[b]) notes that the key element of the participants' development is that "it is physically impossible for participants to walk away from a challenge" (p. 4) because

they are confined on a ship at sea. This is quite different to land-based Outward Bound programmes. It is noted in the VLB that: "most of the outcomes of sail training come from the ship sailing 24 hours a day, in almost any weather" (Fenton, 2004, p. 11). The Programme was designed for three watch groups, with around eight participants in each, working on a 24-hour roster throughout the voyage. Being able to manage this roster was part of learning about self-discipline, that is, the time management of sleep, general daily duties, and presenting for one's watch on time. The first few days acclimatising to this strange situation found many participants very tired, and nearly all participants commented on this at different times throughout the voyage.

3.3.2 Living with others: tolerance and respect

Another major challenge on board was the tolerance required to be constantly in the company of others. The Voyage Handbook notes: "Throughout your voyage you will be living in a very close-knit community" (Unknown, 1997, p. 5). A crew member commented on the limited physical space by noting that the sleeping cabin, the same size as an average family room, contained 24 bunks. This lack of room meant that each person had to be particularly aware of tidiness, as well as being quiet so as not to disturb those sleeping. In addition, there were only four showers and two toilets catering for 32 people, so cleanliness and restricted water use were necessary due to the limited water capacity of the ship. Thus respect for privacy, your own and others', required tolerance. One participant, when asked about whether they had gained a deeper respect for others, commented:

> P: …um, respect of privacy was really iffy sometimes. It was so easy to just fix really.
> CR: How would you have done that?

P: Maybe a bit more structure to it. Like, set out some definite rules, like if you're downstairs, you're sleeping, if you're upstairs, you're talking.
CR: The crew mentioned that at the beginning.
P: Yeh, but it wasn't enforced.
CR: No, it wasn't enforced, was it, so it just sort of ran amuck.
P: Yeh, a bit more discipline there would be good. [Interview]

Many participants were talking downstairs in the cabin area while others were trying to sleep. It was very frustrating, especially because we were so tired. A couple of times things were said, but the talking continued. It would have been easy for the crew to enforce this rule. However, this was left for the participants to sort out, and was part of the process of learning self-discipline and sensitivity towards others.

During an interview with one participant, we were commenting on the tolerance required on board and she mentioned how she had gained knowledge from the close proximity of people and how she could use elsewhere the tolerance she had developed:

P: When living close like that, you get to know how others want to be treated, like by observing them and how they react to what you do or say, and you can use that elsewhere. [Interview]

Another participant, when asked about whether the trip had had an effect on self-esteem, commented how the tolerance required to live in close proximity gave him confidence:

P: Yeh, a huge confidence booster, working with other people and living in close quarters with everyone.

Being able to manage the constant closeness of other people became a personal goal for some, and developing tolerance to overcome this irritation had a positive effect on self-esteem.

3.3.3 Seasickness and "the turnaround": overcoming adversity

Overcoming seasickness was something that nearly everyone needed to do and participants learned to manage it by following the example of the Watch Leaders and

other crew, as the participants saw they too were suffering. Crew did not complain or feel sorry for themselves; rather, everyone continued regardless. We were told that the best way to overcome it was to be on deck as much as possible and to keep ourselves active. During the first three days people became overtired and so felt dreadful. This, combined with seasickness, left many wondering what they had got themselves into and how they were going to get through the next four days. But then, miraculously, on the fourth day, everyone was in high spirits, chatting, laughing and working together. This "turnaround", as it is known, was astounding to witness.

I interviewed a boy who suffered quite severely from seasickness and asked him if the trip had had an effect on his self-esteem. He felt that on a scale of one to ten it had improved from four to about nine. Surprised, I asked him what he meant. He replied:

> P: Like at the start, I was worried about the seasickness and now I have
>   been able to get over it. I always get it. But I was able to work
>   through it so it has changed heaps.

When asked what he got most out of the voyage he replied:

> P: Getting over the seasickness. [Interview]

Many participants commented about getting over seasickness as a real achievement. I realised seasickness was another challenge that participants had to overcome and, in doing so, self-esteem was enhanced.

3.3.4   Removing masks

Taking off masks, as a Watch Leader put it, was critical to building trust and thus a catalyst to team building. He was commenting on how everyone wore masks in society but how, on this ship, eventually the masks had to come off. Here, there was nowhere to go and hide and you had to show your "true colours". Because of the

closeness and length of the voyage, it was impossible to keep a mask on for that entire period of time.

During the mid-voyage debrief the participants were commenting on how close they had become in just four days and the Watch Leader commented on the reason for that:

> WL: At school and stuff like that you can get away with not being
>   yourself, but out here, you are who you are, and you can't really
>   change that because you are with people all the time.
> Ps[26]: Yeh. [Video recording]

During the interviews the idea of masks emerged as well. Some participants expressed surprise at being accepted for their true selves. One such participant commented:

> P: I had to be myself this whole trip; you can't copy other people. I
>   never copy other people anyway, but like at school, you can copy
>   what the other person's opinions are and copy what other people are
>   doing, but here you can't; you gotta be yourself. I feel I'm a better
>   person because I feel like everyone liked me very much. Most people
>   liked me.

I also asked participants whether they had learned lots about other people:

> P1: Yeh, definitely. [laughing] You don't expect what you hear from
>   them. Like some people are really emotional but you wouldn't know
>   that from the outside.

I asked if she could elaborate on this and give me an example of something she had learned from others. Like many of the participants she was surprised by how in-depth conversations had been with other participants, and had learned that other teenagers were experiencing similar things to herself.

> P: Relationships, I suppose. Talking about them and how they felt at the
>   time and what they went through and everything. Or like family
>   stuff. It's really good to have talks with people, 'cause they are really
>   supportive and you listen to them and it is really good. [Interview]

---

[26] Ps is an abbreviation for a number of participants talking at the same time.

The participants had spent quite a bit of time on watches and down in the bunk area talking in-depth about their lives off the ship and listening to others. The removal of masks and allowing others to see you for who you truly are facilitated a quick and strong development of trust and friendships. During the interviews many expressed how great it had been to talk so openly and honestly with other teenagers about the many challenges they faced in their lives off the ship.

3.3.5   Trusting in yourself and others: the importance of community

Trust was developed from the personal challenges that participants had to face in the company of others, and the consequent removal of masks. However, it also developed from the responsibility that was given to participants by the crew. The Captain and crew commented that getting participants involved meant they felt a responsibility towards the ship. Hence, they took ownership of the ship and this ownership became important to them.

The Captain pointed out that, due to the increased risks in today's world, parents had to be very protective. "So youth doesn't get that sense of self and doesn't get the chance to show themselves what they are capable of, that they can rely on themselves" [Conversation in galley]. Learning to trust in yourself and others is what sail training aims to develop. During the mid-voyage debrief the Watch Leader guided the participants in articulating the skills that could come about through trust, using the Captain as an example. Participants were asked what the qualities of a good captain were, to which their replies included the following:

> Ps: People skills. Communication. Leadership skills. But not dominating. It would be easy to be intimidating as captain. Going around and telling everyone what to do. Being too strict. You can still be a friend. The trust would be in there too, wouldn't it?
>
> WL: You'll notice, is the Captain always going around the deck, always stressing about what is going on?

P1: No, he's laid back.
WL: Why can he relax?
P2: Because he gives us his trust.
WL: Do you trust one another?
Ps: Yes, absolutely. [Video recording]

Upon reflection, it occurred to me that the reason why the Captain could give his trust to people was because he trusted in himself and his own ability. This related to what he had been saying earlier about learning how to trust in yourself, and what he was trying to achieve through the Programme for the participants.

All of the participants thought having responsibility was good. They all commented how they felt secure with the responsibility and felt good about themselves because it meant that the crew trusted them. Trust appeared in many aspects of the Programme and emerged as a key component to the participants achieving and feeling good about themselves. The idea of trust was not articulated; rather, a general feeling of trust developed. No one was watching over you or telling you how to do something, but you always knew that someone was around if you needed help or couldn't work it out for yourself. So the crew trusted us and we could trust in them. In the interviews participants referred to the feeling of trust. One commented:

P: They gave us a lot of responsibility, but I don't think they gave us too much. Like if anything is going to go wrong we all knew that they are going to help us out. When the pin snapped they just stepped in and said this is not your fault, and they just took over and fixed it.

Another participant, responding to a question about responsibility, said:

P: I think it shows that they trust you and it makes you feel good, like, that they trust you enough to take over the ship. [Interview]

The close proximity, tolerance of others, and seasickness meant the necessity of taking masks off and trusting in one another. Consequently, a sensitivity towards participants began to be developed. One of the crew

commented about the complexity of our world and that these types of courses

were necessary to counter the often insensitive individualistic focus of our

society, where people were not learning to do things as a community.

CHAPTER IV: ASSESSING THE PROGRAMME'S SUCCESS:

RETURNING TO THE OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the Programme's effectiveness in meeting its objectives. Hence, in light of the previous themes, I now turn to addressing the objectives of the Programme: the development of a sensitivity towards others and the environment, team skills, maturity through self-discipline and goal setting, and positive self-esteem.

4.1   Sensitivity to others

Sensitivity was a by-product of the closeness of the people on the ship and their consequent interaction. It was developed through the team building process necessary for the participants to be able to sail the ship, as well as through the personal bonding occurring during their free time. Participants were encouraged to help one another and reminded that not everyone was able to do everything and that we all had different qualities to bring to activities and tasks. Thus Watch Leaders led by example, being able to recognise and focus individual abilities, and in this way match participant characteristics to areas of interest on the ship. During the interviews I enquired about the development of sensitivity towards others by asking participants whether they had gained a deeper understanding of and respect for other people. One participant spoke of his nervousness about the trainee Captain during the handover:

> P: Yeh…for example, I didn't know [the trainee Captain] at all, so at first I was edgy and I didn't know how he would go, but after a while I could see he was really trying and putting in lots of effort trying to get the job done and make everything work, and so my respect for him gained. He was doing a good job and he was putting in all that he could. He was asking everyone for advice and giving advice when we needed it, and so my respect for him really gained. [Interview]

The Captain addressed sensitivity to others while speaking with the trainee

Captain and gave him some words of wisdom, which, taken in light of the above

comment, the trainee Captain used in his approach. The Captain said:

> Remember to treat others the way you would like to be treated. If you want to be
> shouted at, shout at them; if you don't want to be shouted at, then don't shout at
> them. They are not your servants, so they will rebel if you do that, but they are
> there to serve you, to get the ship happening. [Video recording]

While sensitivity towards others was encouraged, there were times when

participants irritated others and did not seem to understand social cues. I observed

that, if participants "got off track", then other participants would move away from

them either physically or socially. Then, if the participant became involved again, the

other participants would re-incorporate them into the group. One participant

commented on how ostracism was sometimes used as a socialisation technique by

participants when this was the case:

> P: I thought that people who were going to be on here were real tossers
> and stuff, but it turned out they were good and we all got along. Like
> there were a couple of people who got on your nerves, but you dealt
> with that and moved on.

When asked how his watch dealt with participants who got on their nerves,

he responded:

> P: I don't know, really. Ignore them in a way if they put out the stupid
> stuff, but let them in a little bit if they are going to be serious, then
> that's when you socialise with them. [Interview]

These examples represent the way in which participants were watching and

learning from different social interactions on the ship.

4.2   Sensitivity to the environment

Environmental awareness was introduced in the duties performed to keep the ship

clean. For example, when cleaning the decks we were asked to pick up plastic and

other non-biodegradable objects so they couldn't be washed off over the side during

the deck hosing. There were bins in the galley and the disposal of rubbish was explained as soon as we were on board. One bin was for biodegradable waste such as food, which was tossed overboard as we got further out for the fish to feed on. Cardboard was torn into smaller pieces and also went overboard with food scraps, and grey and black water was put overboard 30 kilometres out in line with international pollution regulations. Plastics had boiling water poured in them, which caused shrinkage and were stored along with all else to be taken ashore at the end of our trip.

During the interviews, many of the participants talked about separating the rubbish and the water conservation when I asked what they had learned about the environment. Examples of responses were:

P1:   Well, I was shocked at the amount of garbage we had compared to at home.
P2:   You learn to be water-wise.
P3:   I thought they would just tip everything into the sea like straight away, instead of saving everything. [Interview]

While sensitivity towards the environment was covered in more concrete ways as above, an abstract component of it emerged. An analogy arose between the consequences of actions in dealing with the natural environment, and the consequences of our actions in our constructed environments off the ship. During the interviews, it became apparent that participants were aware of both concrete and abstract components when reflecting on the environment. One noted:

P: It's hard to work with, because you don't know what it is going to be. It's different, really different.

Another stated a preference for the ship environment to that on land and when asked why replied:

P: Like you are in control and if you break down you ain't goin' to walk somewhere, you've always got challenges. Which is good. [For example], if you're walking from one end of the ship to the other, you have to do it without falling over. [Interview]

Other comments recognised the calming effect of being on water:

P1:   Being up on deck and watching the waves and watching the coast go by, I thought that was great.

P2:   I liked the calm motion and the scenery. [Interviews].

The ship environment, while intense in many ways, was also very cathartic, and offered opportunities for reflection.

4.3   Team building

Team building was a major focus of the Programme and everything on board the ship and about the Programme was geared to bring the participants together. Participants came to recognise that they did not need to know everything, rather, each person in the team contributed in different ways and that by coming together they could achieve goals and overcome challenges. The personal bonding and group team building was a fundamental contributor to meeting the Programme objectives, specifically because participants learned from one another.

Each person in each group was given a number from one to eight on day one, and every time participants met they had to "number off", which was quite often. Here two things were addressed. The first was safety, as the Watch Leader had to know the whereabouts of participants at all times. The second was team building. It meant everyone was aware of everyone else's whereabouts.

Other than the obvious teamwork necessary on deck to deal with lines and sails, there were many activities geared to get participants to work together. The 24-hour rotating watch system, the sleeping arrangements, even the table settings in the galley, all relied on group coordination. There were three groups that worked together, slept in the same area in the cabins, and ate together. There were four tables in the galley, but the cook organised the participants to set and eat at two tables at a time. This reduced the work (that is, only two tables needed cleaning, not four) and it also brought the participants together to discuss what they were doing, forming bonds.

Otherwise the participants would have sat all over the place. The Captain relayed a story about three participants who were huddled together at the table talking about the task of getting a sail down. He said, "They think they are working out how to do the task, but what is really going on is team building". [Conversation in galley]

Again, the work in the kitchen area required everyone to do galley duty. A rotating roster was set up for the three meal times. One person from each group made up the team for each meal. This created an opportunity to connect with other members of other groups, and gave support to the cook, thus showing consideration for others and developing self-discipline. One of the participants commented that they now had a greater understanding of what their mothers did at home and would help out more in future.

The sleeping arrangements in the cabin were such that the members of each watch slept in the same vicinity. This meant that when we went down to wake up the next watch we would not disturb the watch that did not need to be woken. It also served to keep a watch together and increase interaction.

When asked about teamwork during the interviews, the participants were very aware that the ship could not function without it.

P1: Well, because we made such close friendships, we knew we had to help each other out all the time and make things easier for each other, so we always, if someone was in trouble, we would chip in. If say we were like, sweating and tailing[27], you knew, that if the sweater was struggling, you would quickly go in and give him a hand. Getting that extra energy and getting in to help was all bonding and teamwork.

Asked whether teamwork experiences could be related to other areas of life, the participant reflected:

P1: Yeh, if you work in a team you can do most things. You don't just have to do things by yourself. [Interview]

---

[27] Sweating refers to hauling on the lines, and tailing refers to easing the lines.

When I asked another participant what team skills had been learnt on the voyage, he showed some insight by replying:

P2: There are contradictory things, like when you are working the sail, someone always has to be hauling and someone needs to be easing. So it has really got to be done in unison, so like if the person is not easing and you are trying to haul, you don't get anywhere, so you really have to work together to get that to work smoothly. It's like bringing around the yards[28] to square them up, you've got to have your portside[29] easing, so your starboard[30] can haul. Same as raising the gaff[31] for the mainsail, because there is one at the throat and one at the peak, they need to go up together, unlike yesterday how we had it… [Interview]

At the beach debrief a couple of items about team building were highlighted by the Watch Leader in preparing the participants for the handover:

WL: What is the most important thing, say, when a tack is happening or something like that?
P1: Communication.
WL: Right. What would you do if, say, a person was stressing on a preventer[32] and about to be pulled overboard?
Ps: Go help him.
WL: So you've always got to be looking because, once again, when the handover happens, not everyone is going to know, not even the Watch Leaders are going to know everything, so you've always got to be looking for that thing that might need to be done. [Video recording]

During the handover, the Captain reiterated several times to different groups the importance of a team focus, reminding them of the collective skills within the team:

[Trainee] Watch Leaders, remember that you don't have to know everything, you don't have to know where every sail is, where every line is. Remember that you've got your trainee crew that have been with you for the last week as well, and they have been working with you. So remember, your role as a Watch Leader is really to organise them. You don't have to know everything, you've got to work together as a team, your watch needs to work together. [Video recording]

---

[28] A spar mounted across the mast to carry square sails.

[29] When facing the bow, everything left of the centreline.

[30] When facing the bow, everything right of the centreline.

[31] A spar attached to a mast.

[32] The line attached to the boom sail.

The crew did not elect participants to positions for the handover; rather, within the learning environment, the participants had to elect their own Captain, navigation officers and Watch Leaders. Tasks throughout the voyage aided in giving participants insight as to the best suited of their peers for each position; for example, the practice at being trainee Watch Leader, the navigation exercises, and the sail and line exercises. The trust and friendships that had developed also gave participants insight into those whom they felt were best suited.

4.4   Maturity

According to the objectives of the Programme, maturity is thought to be developed through self-discipline and goal setting. This section discusses my observations and participant comments.

4.4.1   Self-discipline

When I spoke to participants about self-discipline, almost all of them brought up "the sleep thing". The pattern of sleep on the ship was different to the familiar patterns participants had at home. To adjust to the new pattern of broken sleep and a 24-hour rotating watch system, personal effort was required as no one else, such as a parent, was there to monitor them. Participants realised they needed to learn the skill of time management, which required self-discipline. When I asked participants about what in the Programme specifically dealt with self-discipline, comments included:

> P1: Sleep! They don't say when you have to sleep or when you have to eat, like all the basic things that normally you are told to do by someone. There is no one here to do that, so you have to learn that you need these things and that you have to be in control of yourself for a whole week.
> P2: Time management was probably my biggest: when to sleep, when to get up, how long to spend on each job, how long to spend eating, just sorting out the schedule because it is everything. It goes all day and all night, so you've got to manage it really well.
> P3: Well, the most basic one would be getting up, like I'm just not used to getting up so early and going to bed and getting up so much. But I felt that I coped with that very well. [Interviews]

Cleaning the ship, a drudgery but a necessary part of the ship's maintenance, also led participants to focus on self-discipline. Some were more enthusiastic than others. Daily the deck had to be scrubbed, the brass polished, and cabins, toilet, shower and galley cleaned.

During a conversation, the Captain mentioned that all the crew did was provide a mechanism by which participants could personally develop; it was still up to participants to get the most out of the system. "If they don't do something it doesn't get done. If it doesn't get done, the ship doesn't sail." During interviews participants responded to my question addressing self-discipline with comments such as:

P1:   You need a lot of self-discipline to be on the ship. Like to be there on time, to not slack off, to do your bit, because if you don't do your bit then someone else has to, so it just doesn't make it any fun. You've got to pull your weight.

P2:   You had to look after your own stuff, you had to get up when you were meant to. And you had to organise your groups to get ready and [the crew] just advised you. It's not like your mum who is going to hold your hand and that kind of thing. [Interviews]

4.4.2   Goal setting

Setting achievable goals influences self-esteem (Reeve, 2004). This is associated with another of the Programme's key objectives: maturity and a positive attitude through self-discipline. Goals generate motivation by focusing people's attention. A number of studies have found that, generally, people with goals outperform people without goals (Locke & Latham, 1990). However, goals do not always enhance performance; rather, it is the type of goals set (difficulty and specificity[33]) that influences performance (Locke & Latham, 1990). The reason for enhanced performance appears to be a motivational one in that difficult goals energise the performer (that is, increase effort and persistence) and specific goals direct the course of action (that is, focus attention toward the task and away from distractions) (Earley,

---

[33] Specificity refers to how clearly a goal is defined.

Wojnaroski & Prest, 1987, cited in Reeve). Goals therefore tell the performer where to concentrate and what to do (Klein, Whitener & Illgen, 1990; Latham, Mitchell & Dossett, 1978, cited in Reeve; Locke & Latham, 1990). The following findings are consistent with the literature.

Participants set personal goals, both before they embarked and during the voyage. For example, a Watch Leader mentioned that two of her group had set the goal to learn all their lines and had achieved this goal (goal specificity). I mentioned above one participant whose goal was to overcome seasickness, and this too was achieved (goal difficulty as well as specificity). There were also the main goals set by the ship's Programme, such as going aloft (goal difficulty) and the handover (goal specificity). I asked participants whether goals had helped their performance or influenced their persistence:

> P1: Yeh, setting goals does help your performance because you know where you are going and you know what you've got to do.
> P2: It helped me make more clearer decisions and you keep telling yourself that that is my goal, so I'm going to try and get it.
> P3: I am notorious for mentally dozing off when people are speaking, because once I get the picture I can't really concentrate anymore. But having the goal of wanting to learn more about the ship, I decided that that wasn't going to happen any more and so it has helped me to concentrate. [Interviews]

During the beach debrief, which was designed to reflect upon the first three days of the voyage, discuss any issues, and prepare for the handover, goal setting was addressed by the Watch Leader. Participants commented on goals they had set for themselves, in the roles they thought they would like to take on, such as Captain, navigator and Watch Leader. Participants also commented on what they wanted to achieve as a group, and what was necessary to achieve it:

> P1: Getting back to port safely and all that.
> P2: If we all take control and no one tells us what to do and we all do it, and we all work as a team. The feeling we would get, that would be great.

WL: So what are you going to have to do as a team in order to make this handover a success?
P1: Work together.
P2: Help each other out.
P3: Back each other up. [Video recording]

As part of the Programme, the Captain addressed the trainee crew regarding the handover. Here, attention was drawn to the tasks necessary to achieve the main goal of the handover task: sailing the ship back to port. The Captain's comments were:

You guys are going to be sailing the ship, under loose supervision from the ship's crew and officers, and your role is to get from point A to point B. In itself it is not really hard, except there are a few tasks you've got to do along the way. You've got to sail the ship to reach three of the six points and the trainee Captain and crew will make the decision on that. So it is not just a simple sail around the corner. It is a 24-hour task so we will be sailing overnight and we won't be going into anchorage until between fifteen hundred and seventeen hundred hours tomorrow. It is not a motoring exercise, it is a sailing exercise. Engines will only be started in the case of an emergency. [Video recording]

As Berk (2000) says, self-esteem develops from the judgements we make about our own worth by achieving goals we set, and from associated feelings including the judgements we make in relation to others, that is, social comparisons. Thus, the goal setting encouraged throughout the Programme, and the environment that was created for participants to achieve these goals, along with the intense social interaction of the community, appeared to be the way in which self-esteem was enhanced in participants.

4.5   Self-esteem

Our self-concept is defined by the set of attributes, abilities, attitudes and values that we gather about ourselves (Berk, 2000). Self-esteem is a component of self-concept. Berk notes that we make judgements (through goal achievement and social comparisons) by way of attributions, that is, explanations for the causes of behaviour. There are two broad categories: external and environmental causes; and internal, psychological causes such as ability and effort (Berk). How we attribute achievement

affects whether we will become competent learners, who persist with challenging tasks, or else give up easily when goals are not immediately achieved. Those who take an "industrious, persistent approach to learning" (Berk, p. 454) are classified as "mastery-oriented". These attributional styles affect the goals that are set in learning situations: learning goals or performance goals. Learning goals focus on the journey, that is, increasing ability through effort. Performance goals focus on the end result, that is, obtaining positive evaluation and avoiding negative evaluation of ability (Berk). As mentioned, the Programme has been designed as a learning environment and, therefore, geared to develop mastery-orientation through learning goals.

An example of this occurred on the first day when all participants were required to go aloft. Participants had to climb the rigging on the windward side to the top of the foremast and then climb down the other side. For some this was a terrifying experience and I had difficulty with it myself. The focus of this task was placed on learning from the experience and the personal journey that was undertaken by participants in achieving the goal. The focus was not on gaining a positive evaluation about the performance from either the crew or other participants. After the task, the watch came together to talk about their journey. One participant was unable to go aloft, having come back down before reaching the top. The Watch Leader commented on the effort the participant had put in, considering the challenge the task had posed, saying:

> WL: The fact that you tried, you probably got the most out of the climb, because the people like [another participant], who has done a reasonable amount of climbing, found it easier. [Video recording]

Another participant, during interviews, commented on how achieving the goal of climbing over the mast had had an effect on her self-esteem:

> P: Oh, yeh, [sighing] because I hate heights, I'm scared of heights. And that was like a big big thing for me, 'cause I did it, and when I got down I was

shaking and was heaps scared. But I felt heaps good that I actually did it. [Video recording]

Going aloft was just one of the challenging tasks on the voyage and was done within a couple of hours of being on board. The crew's management of the task, and their empathy and encouragement at the debrief, set the scene for a participant's experience during the voyage.

A sense of security was established on board the ship, which also aided participants' confidence. Participants understood that nothing would be asked of them that they were unable to achieve, and were confident the crew would support them should they need it. For example, at the meeting for the trainee crew the Captain established this sense of security and addressed the concept of self-esteem in relation to attributions:

> If something was to happen or there was a sudden blow or gale that wasn't expected, [the First Mate] and I will take over. That won't be anything to do with your abilities, it will be about the safety of the vessel, which is paramount. [Video recording]

During the interviews I asked participants what they felt they had gained most from the voyage. Participants consistently spoke of their sense of achievement and how good it made them feel. Some relayed stories of different tasks they had achieved, such as going aloft, tacking and the handover. Others spoke of personal achievements, such as getting over seasickness, overcoming fear of heights, being socially accepted, being able to get up at different times during the night, and making it through the week. Examples of what some participants said:

> P1: I love learning about the ship and learning about how we tack and use the sails. When you're sitting around on board it is not really that interesting, but when you got to do something and when we were about to tack it made you feel really good.
>
> CR: Yeh, like one of the tacks, we were doing it and I looked up and we were suddenly facing the other way and I thought, gee, how did that happen so quickly.

P1:   Yeh, you really feel like you've achieved something. You think, I did that and it worked!

P2:   The fact that I can wake up during the night and actually do something. And that you can do anything you want when you put your mind to it.

P3:   You learn how to deal with different situations and different people. You've gotta, like, have patience and gotta, like, really take in everything to actually get something out of it. It gave me a bit more confidence as well, to, like, try new things, so I'm not afraid so much anymore. Like, it's not that hard, you can do it. It's just how you feel about it, I suppose.

P4:   It [the voyage] makes you, like, stronger, yourself. I mean, you accept challenges and you do them, like getting up early, do this, do that, climb the mast, get wet.

P5:   The responsibility was really good, because you set another goal, and when they gave us that responsibility, it made you feel really good, it made me feel heaps good, so that you felt like I'm in charge and I've got to do this right. And when I do, it gave me a lot of satisfaction.

P6:   I've come to know myself a bit better. I've found out I can do things that I didn't think I can do. Like climb the top of the mast—I'm usually scared of heights. I don't really like heights. And yesterday I went up the top and I was sitting on the lower beams up the top and I wasn't scared or anything. Yeh, so I reckon I feel pretty good about myself.

P7:   I overcame my fear of heights and made new friends, because I didn't know anyone when I came on here.

P8:   Yeh, when I came on board I was a bit cocky, because I had been on boats before, and I thought, I don't get seasick and I'm not afraid of heights. And then I started to get a bit queasy. I found out that it was because I ate too much, so I don't eat as much now. And like climbing to the top, I can do it, but getting to the top and it was swaying around, I was [clenching teeth] nervous. But now I know I can do those things, I found out I can overcome certain things. Like, the seasickness, I overcame it by working out ways I can deal with it. And like claustrophobia, I can't stay in the bunks too long, so I have just stayed up a bit later, wait until I am as tired as hell, then conk out and get back up again and walk around. [Interviews]

During my recording of the handover I was astonished at how confident the participants were. They were excited about the task they were about to take on. Having worked through the necessary components of the handover during the mid-voyage debrief, and having met with the crew to listen to the nature of the task, participants grouped together to work out their plan and discuss what each person needed to do as an individual and as a team member to make the handover a success. I noted the following:

CR: The crew is all around, as I'm showing you. But the participants are doing the whole thing themselves. The crew are just standing there. If they need

them, they are there. Full support. These guys don't even seem at all nervous; they are feeling very confident. Just before, someone said, ask [WL], we don't know what to do. And one of the participants turned around and said, yes we do, we've just got to think about it. They are really keen to make it happen for themselves. [Video recording]

These comments demonstrate that individuals gained a sense of personal achievement and self-worth by meeting the challenges on board, and learned the value of teamwork and participation in meeting both the physical and personal challenges the Programme presented. These findings were consistent with those reported in previous research, including enhanced self-esteem (Grocott, 1999), self-confidence (Neill & Richards, 1993), and self-concept (Hattie et al., 1997).

CHAPTER V: DRAWING IT ALL TOGETHER: SUMMARY, REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

This thesis provides an in-depth description and rich picture of the *One and All* Sail Training Programme. It identifies how the Programme is implemented through guidance and facilitation in a safe environment, specifically so that a learning environment is developed that is consistent with the educational theories of humanism and constructivism. Further, it shows that the *One and All* crew's philosophy of enabling participants to learn from one another and their own mistakes, leading by example, allowing participants to find their own way by using open and leading questions, and coming together as a team to find solutions, is fundamental to the development of the humanist and constructivist environment. In this way participants are given the scope to discover their own potential. The thesis establishes that recruitment through the volunteer association of both the paid crew and the volunteers who manage the voyages is critical to developing and maintaining the learning environment within which the Programme is implemented. Both the Trust and participants gain from the relationship with the volunteer association. Participants are able to become involved with further voyages as volunteers, and the Trust is able to meet staffing requirements. It also means that paid staff have trained as volunteers initially, and that both paid crew and volunteers are participating because they are genuinely interested and enthusiastic about sailing and the Programme. Participants are advantaged by this relationship because they are surrounded by and learning from people who are passionate about the ship's purpose in providing a valuable contribution to youth development.

The purpose of the thesis was to evaluate the Programme's effectiveness in meeting its objectives. Objectives were met by way of personal and collective challenges that participants overcame through achieving their personal goals as well as those set by the Programme, such as climbing aloft (individual challenge), and the handover and sailing the ship back to port (team challenge). This was consistent with psychological theories relating to the constructs of goal setting and self-esteem, and aided the development of maturity through self-discipline and a sensitivity towards others.

I found that the Programme did provide a dynamic personal development experience through interaction with the sailing environment, including management of seasickness, tiredness and the close proximity of others. Lifelong skills were learned through the challenges of the Programme, including sensitivity towards others, team building, goal setting and self-discipline. Participants were responsible not only for themselves, but for the care and safety of others; thus the intensity of the interdependent community did lead to a strong social experience. The challenges set by the ship environment were entirely dependent on the individual's motivation and behaviour, and meeting these challenges and the goals set by the Programme developed a sense of achievement, which enhanced self-esteem.

Key elements in the success of the Programme included the restricted physical environment and hence the inability to walk away, the facilitation of the learning environment by the crew, and specifically the recruitment of crew through the volunteer association, thereby selecting for enthusiastic, committed people with the personality types most suited to facilitation and guidance, not hierarchy and control.

In some final thoughts about constructivism and the Programme, the idea that individuals best acquire knowledge by constructing it in interaction with their environment (Kamii, Manning & Manning, 1991) was supported. Thus, when the mechanisms for learning and the individual's own unique version of the knowledge,

experience, and aptitudes are brought together in a complex synthesis of ideas, learning occurs (Willis, 1995). Hence the outcome is the development of the "big picture", where people are given a better understanding of the complexities of humanity, rather than just a simple acquisition of knowledge alone (Sprague & Dede, 1999).

5.2   My reflections

Kuhl, (n.d.[b]) notes, and has stressed to me in an informal conversation, that sail training is a by-product of the Programme. The Programme itself is geared to self-awareness and personal development.

After writing my results, I recognised that some essential ingredient of the trip was missing from my discussion. There was something special about the Programme's formula that produced an effect on the participants. The essence of the Programme came down to one catalytic moment and it was connected to what the crew referred to as "the turnaround", generally occurring around day three. It was at this point that two events collided: participants overcame their seasickness and the excitement of planning the handover kicked in.

I remembered feeling exhausted on day three. I spoke to one of the assistants and my Watch Leader, saying that I just had to get some sleep. As a participant observer I was involved in the same sail training as other participants, which meant standing the 6–8pm watch on the first day, the 4–8am, 12pm–4pm and 8pm–12am watches on the second day, the 8–12am, 8am–12pm, 6–8pm watches on the third day, and the 12am–4am watch on the fourth day, when we had to get up at 6am to go across to the beach for the debrief session. In between the watches we were up and down throughout the night to carry out tacking, which caused broken sleep, and we all had to be up for the daily general meeting at 9am and cleaning at 10am. I had to observe and take notes

and video clips at the same time and in the evening I would write up the day's notes. The participants, much younger than I, were also affected by the intense learning of those first few days, the unfamiliar environment (both the ship and new people), seasickness and tiredness.

I noted that on my bunk someone previously had etched "get me off this ship", and I remember feeling the same way in those first couple of days. I began to ask myself what I had got myself into and how I could get through it. I wrote in my diary: "I am concerned about a few things: what happens to those kids who hate it? You cannot walk away, so psychologically, what effect does this have? How do you overcome the feeling of entrapment?" One participant mentioned during an interview that one of his feelings was, "How am I going to make it through the week?" and he had set this as a personal goal.

I concluded that exhaustion, seasickness, entrapment and recovery form the catalyst for the "mind-shift" that occurs in participants. There is no escape, no personal space, and you need to make the best of the strange situation. Effort must be made. In the words of one participant, "If you don't put in, someone else will have to do extra to cover your bit." And from the Captain: "If nothing gets done, then the ship doesn't sail."

For each person, then, the sailing trip is a personal and private journey. The crew do not teach this part of the experience, but are purely guides. It is this personal journey that is the empowering component of the Programme and turns around the participant's mood in the last four days.

The phrase, "I feel like I can do (or overcome) anything now", was a common theme during the interviews. It is this "overcoming" that gives participants the feeling of euphoria that parents, guardians, principals and teachers have previously noted.

When our ship sailed toward the wharf, the participants were lined up along the yards of the sails, yelling and waving with excitement, overcome with the sense of achievement. The voyage became a life-changing moment and one that would be reflected on for many years to come.

The captain commented: "When the participants get back no one else will understand what they experienced unless they have done it." The trip is about stretching oneself and pushing oneself past personal limits, going beyond habitual boundaries that have been unconsciously set. It is about confronting fears with a group of people (your team and new friends you've made) who are doing the same thing in their own way, and who are supporting you emotionally in a physically safe environment that the crew and the Programme set up. It is about reaching a new level emotionally and mentally.

5.3 Recommendations

To date, adventure programmes such as sail training programmes have been seen as extracurricular self-development courses. Historically, the life skills and self-development provided by such programmes were once the responsibility of parents. However, since the introduction of mass schooling there has been a movement toward the expectation that schools will educate children in these areas. Yet the demands on teachers implementing the curriculum and the number of children in classrooms stretch teachers' resources and their ability to focus on each child's self-development. It has, in itself, become a specialist area of education. I recommend that programmes such as the *One and All* Youth Development Sail Training Programme be removed from extracurricular electives and become a compulsory component of an individual's education. It is my belief that society stands to gain in the long term from youths who have had the opportunity to develop team skills through an awareness of the

interdependent nature of a community, maturity and a positive attitude through self-discipline, enhanced self-esteem through the setting of achievable goals, and an overall healthier respect for oneself and sensitivity towards others and the environment.

This study was carried out on a single seven-day voyage with school youths from several secondary schools in South Australia. The *One and All* also takes voyages involving "youths at risk" (section 2.8). Thus, a future qualitative evaluation of the effectiveness of the Programme in relation to errant youths would offer further knowledge and understanding in this area. In addition, a comparison between differing groups on the *One and All* using a quantitative pre-test post-test design would be useful in establishing the effectiveness of the Programme for those groups. An example would be the analysis of variables such as age groups and voyage lengths. Hattie et al. (1997) note in their study that the age of participants and the length of the programme have an effect on outcome. They found that the longer the programme and the older the participants, the greater the gains received. It may be that there is an optimum age and voyage length.

Moreover, as there are a number of other sail training programmes in Australia and New Zealand, further investigation could focus on comparisons between these programmes. Here a qualitative evaluation could be used to gain an in-depth understanding of the differences between programmes and the effects this difference has on participants. For example, one could look at the authoritarian versus authoritative approach in teaching styles. This would test the finding of this study that developing a learning environment was effective in achieving desired outcomes.

As noted earlier, the volunteer association was found to be a key element to the Programme. Specifically it gives participants an opportunity to become further

involved with the Programme, and provides both paid and volunteer staff for the voyages. Those participants who choose to become volunteers are enthusiastic about sail training and are able to approach it as a future career opportunity, or as contributing to the community and the youth of South Australia. A certain personality type seems to be attracted to the volunteer association and to be important to the facilitation of the learning environment. Thus the Trust and the volunteer association seem to have a synergy advantageous to the Programme. A study that combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches could investigate this relationship, specifically the effect a volunteer's characteristics has on the implementation of the Programme, and what personality characteristics are conducive to facilitating a learning environment.

APPENDIX A

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- Do you feel this trip has had an effect on your self-esteem?
- In what way?
- On a scale of one to ten, with one being lower self-esteem and ten being higher self-esteem, how would you rate your self-esteem before the voyage and now?
- Have you learned team skills while you have been on the voyage?
- What team skills have you learned?
- Did you gain an understanding and respect for others on the voyage?
- In what way?
- Did you gain a deeper respect for yourself?
- Did you learn anything about the environment?
- What specifically about the Programme deals with self-discipline?
- Did you set goals on the voyage as a team?
- How about personal goals?
- Have you used goal setting before?
- Did the goal setting improve your performance?
- Did you know anyone prior the voyage?
- Did you make new friends?
- Do you think you will keep in contact with them?
- What did you get most out of the voyage?
- Do you feel that anything needed changing, or that anything was inappropriate?
- Did you feel that they gave you a lot of responsibility?
- Did you like that, or did you feel it was too much?
- Was there anything that you would like to add?

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH
- For participants under 18 years of age -

I….., being the parent/guardian of …………………………………….who is under of 18 years of age, hereby give consent for him/her to participate as requested in the Letter of Introduction for the research project on the evaluation of the One and All Sail Training Programme.

1. I have read the information provided.

2. Details of procedures and any risks have been explained to my satisfaction.

3. I allow the use of photography, audio and/or video recordings and agree to information I give in interviews being recorded on audio and video tape.

4. I am aware that I should retain a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for future reference.

5. I understand that my child:
   - Will not directly benefit from taking part in this research.
   - Will be free to withdraw from the project at any time and be free to decline to answer particular questions.
   - Will not be identified in any thesis, report on publication. While the information gained in this study will be published, as explained, individual information will remain confidential.
   - Whether participating or not, or withdrawing after participating, will have no effect on the service and training received through the One and All Programme.
   - Whether participating or not, or withdraw after participating, will have no effect on their progress in the One and All Programme.
   - May ask that the interviews or observations be stopped at any time, and may withdraw at any time from the research without disadvantage.

6. I have had the opportunity to discuss taking part in this research with a family member or friend.

Parent / Guardian signature ………………………….Date……………………

I have read and understand the information contained in the Letter of Introduction and the above. I agree to participate as requested in the Letter of Introduction for the research project on the evaluation of the One and All Sail Training Programme.

Participant's signature…………………………………Date…………………...

I certify that I have explained the study to the volunteer and consider that she/he understands what is involved and freely consents to participation.

Researchers Name: Catherine Rogers

Researcher's signature………………………………..Date…………………….

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH
- For participants over 18 years of age -

I …...

being over the age of 18 years hereby consent to participate as requested in the Letter of Introduction for the research project on the evaluation of the One and All Sail Training Programme.

1. I have read the information provided.

2. Details of procedures and any risks have been explained to my satisfaction.

3. I allow the use of photography, audio and/or video recordings and agree to information I give in interviews being recorded on audio and video tape.

4. I am aware that I should retain a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for future reference.

5. I understand that:
    - I may not directly benefit from taking part in this research.
    - I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and am free to decline to answer particular questions.
    - While the information gained in this study will be published as explained, I will not be identified, and individual information will remain confidential.
    - Whether I participate or not, or withdrawing after participating, will have no effect on the service and training I receive through the One and All Programme.
    - Whether I participate or not, or withdrawing after participating, will have no effect on my progress in the One and All Programme.
    - I may ask that the interviews or observations be stopped at any time, and that I may withdraw at any time from the research without disadvantage.

6. I have had the opportunity to discuss taking part in this research with a family member or friend.

Participant's signature……………………………………Date…………………...

I certify that I have explained the study to the volunteer and consider that she/he understands what is involved and freely consents to participation.

Researcher's name: Catherine Rogers

Researcher's signature……………………………..Date……………………

REFERENCE LIST

Anderson, J. and Poole, M. (2001) Assignment and thesis writing. 4th ed. John Wiley & Sons Australia. Milton, Queensland.

Baylor, D., Samsonov, P. and Smith, N. (Eds.) (no date) 'Constructivism' Ch4 in A collaborative class investigation into telecommunication in education. Accessed 06/09/04: http://www.iste.org/L&L/archive/vol27/no1/feature/

Berk, L.E. (2000) Child development. 5th ed. Allyn & Bacon. Needham Heights,. Massachusetts.

Bond, N.W. and McConkey, K.M. (2001) Psychological science: an introduction. McGraw Hill Book Company. Roseville, New South Wales.

Burns, R.B. (2000) Introduction to research methods. 4th ed. Pearson Education Australia. Frenchs Forest, New South Wales.

Denzin, N.K. (1989) The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Duffy, T. M. and Jonassen, D. H. (Eds.) (1992) Constructivism and the technology of instruction. Lawrence Erlbaum. London.

Fenton, D. (Ed.) (2004) *One & All* sail training association volunteer logbook. Sail Training Association. Adelaide, South Australia.

Gabler, I. C. and Schroeder, M. (2003). Constructivist methods for the secondary classroom: engaged minds. Pearson Education. New York.

Grocott, A.C. (1999) Thesis submitted for Degree of Master of Arts. University of Otago, Dunedin.

Hattie, J., Marsh, H.W., Neill, J.T. and Richards, G.E. (1997) Adventure education and Outward Bound. Review of educational research. Washington, DC.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughs, D. (1989) Research and the teacher. Routledge. London.

Hoepfl, M.D. (1997) Choosing qualitative research: a primer for technology education researchers. Journal of technology education. V9(1) on-line. Accessed 09/08/04: http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/hoepfl.html

Jorgensen, D.L. (1989) Participant observation: a methodology for human studies. Sage Publications Inc. California.

Kamii, C., Manning, M., and Manning, G. (1991) Early literacy: a constructivist foundation for whole language. National Education Association Professional Library. Washington, DC.

Kuhl, I. (no date[a]) Select committee on the juvenile justice system. Submission from the Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia Incorporated. Port Adelaide, South Australia.

Kuhl, I. (no date[b]) Education and *One and All*. Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia Incorporated. Port Adelaide, South Australia

Lawrence, E. (1970) The origins and growth of modern education. Penguin Books Ltd. Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Locke , E.A. and Latham, G.P. (1990) A theory of goal setting and task performance. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) Naturalistic inquiry. Sage Publications Inc. Newbury Park.

Lorenz, K. (1977) Behind the mirror: a search for a natural history of human knowledge. Methuen & Co Ltd. London.

McCombs, G. (1998) The keys to the kingdom have been distributed: an organizational analysis of an academic computing center. Library Trends. V46(4), p.681(18).

Merriam, S.B. (1998) Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Jossey-Bass Inc. San Francisco.

Neill, J.T. and Richards, G.E. (1993) A research evaluation of the developmental outcomes of sail training ship *Leeuwin*. Australian Outward Bound Foundation. Canberra, Australian Capital Territory.

Patton, M.Q. (1990) Qualitative evaluation methods. 2nd ed. Sage Publications Inc. California.

Porter, L. (2000) Student behaviour: theory and practice for teachers. 2nd ed. Allen & Unwin. St Leonards, New South Wales.

Reeve, J. (2004) Understanding motivation and emotion. 4th ed. John Wiley & Sons Inc. New York.

Salkind, N.J. (2000) Exploring research. 4th ed. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Sayer, A. (1992) Method in social science: a realist approach. 2nd ed. Routledge. London.

Scheeprs, D. (2000). Explorations in learning and instruction: social development theory (L. Vygotsky). Accessed 10/09/04: http://tip.psychology.org/vygotsky.html

Sprague, D. and Dede, C. (1999) Constructivism in the classroom. Accessed 06/09/04: http://www.qeced.net/ed/construct/construct1.htm

Swan, R. (no date) Sail training in tall ships: Memo to all state sail training associations and operators of tall ships. Australian Sail Training Association (Incorporated). Crows Nest, New South Wales.

Tiggeman (2002) Lecture notes: personality and social psychology. Psychology Department. Flinders University. Bedford Park, South Australia.

Unknown (2003) Watch leaders' manual for the sail training ship *One and All*. Sail Training Association. Port Adelaide, South Australia.

Unknown (1997) One and All voyage handbook. Taken from original handbook, edited by Walter, D.R.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) Mind in society. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Willis, J. (1995) A recursive, reflective model based on constructivist interpretist theory. Educational technology. V33(10), pp.15–20.