Editorial

John Quay

Welcome to volume 19 of the journal. With this volume we make the anticipated change in name from the *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* to the *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*.

The change acknowledges engagement with the international community of academics and others for whom the discourses of outdoor and environmental education are central. Outdoor education, as theorised and practised in Australia, is well known for its concern with environmental issues. However, while it could be argued that Australians were amongst the earliest to press this point, the scope of this interest has never been Australian alone. The change in name signals this fact, but it doesn't mean a major change in direction for the journal. There is no hard line drawn between various expressions of outdoor education, which is a broad church. In all of its guises, the influence of the "environment" in outdoor education is tangible, no matter how this term may be defined (nature, ecosystem, biosphere, wilderness, habitat, world, context, milieu, situation, location, etc.).

The international reach of the journal is reflected in the make-up of the Editorial Board, which is evolving over the next two issues. In this issue, the involvement of Australian and New Zealand academics is represented; in the next issue this list will grow to include a group of academics from other places who will help further the internationalisation of the journal. This international reach can also be gauged by the regular contributions made by academics and others from various countries. In this issue we have authors from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the UK writing about a diverse range of topics that offer some very interesting juxtapositions.

Shannon McNatty, in her paper "The Return Home: Transitioning From a 28-Day Remote Outdoor Education Programme," highlights the importance of understanding and working with transitioning to and from outdoor education programmes. Transfer of learning is not as straightforward or simple a notion as that portrayed in some areas of educational discourse. One reason for this is the complexity of transitions involved. In her research, McNatty draws on the example of a programme that takes girls from life at home and school in a major New Zealand city, to a remote campus for a month. The emphasis is on how the transitions involved afford educational opportunities that occur across contexts. This understanding is commonly acknowledged in therapeutic circumstances but not often in schooling.

For Will Dobud, the focus is therapeutic. In his paper "Exploring Adventure Therapy as an Early Intervention for Struggling Adolescents," Will highlights

the importance of the "therapeutic alliance" that stretches across contexts in order to support the "client." The juxtaposition with the paper from McNatty illuminates some of the overlaps in purpose involving educational and therapeutic programmes, whilst also drawing attention to the differences, especially those evident in the language used to speak of the two programmes.

Mark Hickman and Peter Stokes take us back to the workplace in their paper "Sights and Insights: Vocational Outdoor Students' Learning Through and About Reflective Practice in the Workplace." Their paper addresses the relevance of reflective practice in the professional learning of those training to be outdoor educators. Discussions concerning reflective practice have appeared regularly in outdoor education journals and conferences since at least the early 1980s. This paper shifts the focus, however, from participants, to staff and their training.

Two further papers in this issue provide another interesting juxtaposition, this time in relation to photographic technology and various research techniques used to analyse the data generated. Graham French in his paper "Going Pro: Point of View Cameras in Adventure Sports Research," investigates the pedagogical and research possibilities attendant to "point of view" cameras that record while mounted on the body or equipment of the participant, in this way offering their point of view. These cameras are commonplace now in various activities but their contributions to achieving the goals of research and education have received less attention.

Shift the clock back a century or so and we are dealing with a very different photographic technology: the pinhole camera. In their paper "Reflections on Using Pinhole Photography as a Pedagogical and Methodological Tool with Adolescents in Wild Nature," Teresa Socha, Tom Potter, Stephanie Potter, and Bob Jickling offer another take on "point of view" that requires a more considered and slow crafting of the view itself, as well as waiting for the photograph to be chemically developed. When presented together in this way in the journal, both of these papers themselves showcase the different points of view available methodologically in research associated with outdoor and environmental education.

I hope you enjoy this issue of the journal. Thank you very much to all involved in making it happen: authors, editorial group, and reviewers.

John Quay, Ph.D
Editor