

DiVA

Institutional Repository of Stockholm University
<http://su.diva-portal.org>

This is an author produced version of a paper submitted to **Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning**

This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Author: Erik Backman

**Title: What frames teaching of *friluftsliv*?
- Analysing a pedagogic discourse within Swedish PE through framing and the pedagogic device**

Access to the published version may require subscription. Published with permission from: **Taylor & Francis Group**

What frames teaching of *friluftsliv*?

- **Analysing a pedagogic discourse within Swedish PE through framing and the pedagogic device**

Erik Backman

Stockholm University

Submitted to *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*.

Abstract

Research indicates that outdoor teaching practices within a Physical Education (PE) context are framed by several factors with the potential to weaken or strengthen PE teachers' control of pedagogic messages. Drawing on 12 qualitative interviews with PE teachers in compulsory schools in Sweden, the findings in this study suggest that factors claimed to control teachers' pedagogic communication of *friluftsliv* (Scandinavian equivalent to outdoor education) is based on the construction of a dominating pedagogic discourse for outdoor teaching in Swedish schools. Analysing the constitution of this discourse through Bernstein's theoretical concepts of framing and the pedagogic device, Swedish PE teachers and PE teacher education appear to reproduce *friluftsliv* as a teaching practice carried out in a remote wilderness setting involving specific equipment, financial resources and a certain amount of risk. In relation to these results, alternative ways to think of outdoor teaching in relation to the achievement of the national aims in Swedish PE are discussed.

Keywords

Friluftsliv; Physical Education; Bernstein; Framing; The pedagogic device

Introduction

Outdoor education holds a significant position in the Physical Education (PE) curriculum in many countries (Brooks, 2002; Bunting, 1989; Cooper, 2000; Zink & Boyes, 2006). Its value has been claimed on the basis of perspectives of social development (Quay et al., 2003), environmental awareness (Thomas, 2005) and equity (Humberstone, 1993). However, the implementation of the outdoor teaching within a PE context seems to be surrounded by difficulties (Brown, 2006). Formulations in curricula text documents, teachers' value orientations and factors of physical and organisational character such as available time, size of group, equipment and teaching environment have been proven to control and regulate teaching practices in PE (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000; Evans, 1997; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). This is also the case for outdoor education and its Scandinavian equivalent *friluftsliv* within PE (Beedie, 2000; Repp, 1993). In this paper, Swedish PE teachers' expressions of factors having an impact on teachers' control of the teaching in *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE will be analysed and discussed in relation to the constitution of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv*. The ambition is to illuminate how the dominating discourse for teaching *friluftsliv* in Swedish schools actually involves obstacles for achieving national aims regarding *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE.

The analysis in this paper is based on curriculum theory focusing the concepts of British educational sociologist Basil Bernstein. Bernstein's theory provides a theoretical framework for explaining how codes (i.e. regulating principles creating meaning) within school and education translates the distribution of power and principles of control into pedagogic communication (Bernstein, 2000). His empirical studies of the use of language within schools explain the reproduction of social and cultural variations through school and education. Bernstein's critical perspective on issues regarding equity within school and education has served as an inspiration for a significant part of curriculum theory research in general (Sadovnik, 1995) and for PE in particular (Evans et al., 2006; Macdonald et al., 1999). I will mainly use Bernstein's concepts of framing and pedagogic device in order to analyse how factors expressed to weaken teachers'

control of pedagogic communication, in this study *friluftsliv* in Swedish schools, are in fact constructions based on a dominating pedagogic discourse. Further, I will discuss alternative ways to think of outdoor teaching in relation to the achievement of national aims in Swedish PE. Illuminating this part of many PE teachers' daily work can perhaps contribute to a discussion about the conditions for the production of knowledge.

Definition of concepts

Two concepts are in need of definition in order to clarify the relation between the Swedish and the international context. First there is the Scandinavian concept *friluftsliv* which, from an educational perspective, can be said to have its international equivalent in outdoor education or adventure education. However, it has been claimed that *friluftsliv* lacks an exact English translation, based as it is on its specific relation to the Scandinavian tradition, culture and landscape (Faarlund, 1994; Repp, 1996; Sandell, 2001). Therefore *friluftsliv* is today a concept that recurs in English publications (see e.g. Henderson & Vikander, 2007). The official Swedish definition of *friluftsliv* reads "living outside in the nature- and culture-landscape for the purpose of well-being or to gain experience of our natural surroundings without the demands of competition" (Swedish Ministry of Environment 2003, my translation).

The concept curriculum is vital for the work of Bernstein and is also used in this text in order to analyse the relation between formulations of learning aims and the teaching outcome. Therefore, it should be emphasised that in the Swedish context curriculum refers to the text document, stipulated by the government to manage school activity, while it has a wider meaning including also the teaching practice in English-speaking countries (Forsberg, 2007).

***Friluftsliv* and outdoor education within a PE context**

The Swedish National Agency of Education (SNAE) emphasises *friluftsliv* as a significant element within Swedish PE (SNAE, 2000), which is also

the case in other countries regarding outdoor education (Brooks, 2002; Bunting, 1989; Cooper, 2000; Zink & Boyes, 2006). Davies (1992) and Williams (1994) have questioned whether PE teachers are best suited to teach outdoor education in school, given that their main interest is often in physical activity and physical achievements. Their assumption is supported by studies on PE teachers' habituses and embodied preferences for sport (Green, 2000; Sparks, 1999). The focus on technical skills in outdoor education has also been criticized. This criticism rests on the idea that outdoor education has internal qualities promoting a holistic learning that involves social, personal and intellectual development. Therefore it is argued that, as an alternative to sport practices in PE, outdoor education should not be marginalised to mere skill development (Bunting, 1989; Humberstone, 1993). Development of technical skills also seems to be a significant part of teaching in outdoor education at tertiary level (Backman, 2008; Thomas, 2005). The expressions of pedagogic discourses for outdoor teaching are important to illuminate as it appears that they are dependent on the context in which they are implemented.

On a national level, Swedish compulsory school is governed by aims for the pupils to achieve. These are stipulated specifically for each school subject in grade 5 (11 years old) and grade 9 (15 years old). These aims are to be interpreted and made concrete by teachers into local syllabus documents for each school and subject. In the national Swedish PE curriculum there are two aims regarding *friluftsliv* (SNAE, 2000):

Grade 5 Pupils should have a basic knowledge of *friluftsliv*, as well as a familiarity with the principles of the Right of Public Access¹.

Grade 9 Pupils should be able to plan and carry out a field trip in the countryside during different seasons of the year.

In the latest national Swedish evaluation of PE, *friluftsliv* forms a limited part of the teaching content. The majority of the pupils express their lack of knowledge in *friluftsliv* (Quennerstedt et al., 2008). In a study by Lundvall

and Meckbach (2008), factors such as lack of time, size of groups, equipment, facilities and possibilities for outdoor teaching were considered limiting for PE teachers' ambition to reach the aims of the national Swedish PE curriculum. In a study of *friluftsliv* in the Norwegian school context, Repp (1993) claims that school staff and the individual teacher have a significant potential for action in relation to other factors regulating teaching, such as financial resources and where the school is situated. According to Beedie (2000) a lack of financial resources is often put forward as an obstacle for many pupils' participation in outdoor projects. He suggests that these difficulties can be reduced by the construction of outdoor programs not demanding technical equipment or having to be conducted in remote wilderness settings. Dyson and O'Sullivan (1998) emphasise interdisciplinary cooperation and integration as well as a shared responsibility and decision making as conditions for the implementation of outdoor projects in schools. Seen as a whole, research emphasises different factors to be of significance for the implementation of outdoor and PE teaching practices. It is difficult to decide whether there is one factor more important than any other. Since my interest in this paper is in what the claimed conditions for teaching *friluftsliv* can say of a specific pedagogic discourse, I have gone deeper into Bernstein's theory of pedagogic communication.

Bernstein's curriculum theory

According to Bernstein, the educational system reproduces social inequalities through codes, in which children have different capacities to orientate themselves. These codes, i.e. regulating principles which create meaning, are due to whether categories of content are being surrounded by distinct or blurred boundaries and to what extent teachers and pupils have control over pedagogic communication (Bernstein, 2000, p. 3-24). For example, the educational system in the UK has a tradition of strong boundary maintenance, separating subjects and students, and of less strong control over what is communicated within subjects. Bernstein however, argues for more of integration between subjects in order to achieve more of equity in schools. His critique is directed towards the educational system's claimed ability to appear neutral in relation to the social hierarchies outside

school (Bernstein, 1971). This perspective has also been given attention within PE research (Evans et al., 2006). Although Bernstein's work is focused on explaining social inequalities, I use his concepts of framing and pedagogic device mainly for analysing what a pedagogic discourse for teaching *friluftsliv* can involve in terms of possibilities for pupils to achieve the aims in the national Swedish PE curriculum.

Framing

By framing Bernstein (1971) refers to "the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship" (p. 205). Where framing is strong, the teacher is in control over pedagogic communication and where framing is weak, the pupil has this control (Bernstein, 2000). Therefore framing is not a constant condition but a relational one. There are several factors that may have a framing relation on the teacher's control over what knowledge is transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship. For example, teacher education is likely to be of importance (Tinning, 2006) as well as the formulations in curriculum text documents (Evans, 1997). There are also studies highlighting factors of physical, organisational and institutional character (for example available teaching time; group constellation; financial resources; schools' location; etc.) as having a framing relation on the teaching outcome (Linde, 2006; Lundgren, 1972; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). Although my ambition is not to capture all perspectives on what might control pedagogic communication, it appears that framing is useful for understanding what teachers regard as being decisive for their implementation of teaching.

Pedagogic discourse

In his later work Bernstein has directed his attention from codes, or code modalities, into pedagogic discourses. He suggests that one should see codes as realisations of forms of discourses and he defines the pedagogic discourse as "the principle by which other discourses are appropriated and brought into a special relationship with each other..." (Bernstein, 2000, p. 32). In order to illuminate the fact that our pedagogic messages always involve values Bernstein argues that the pedagogic discourse is in fact build out of two discourses. The first one, the instructional discourse, is a

discourse regulating the rules which create various kinds of skills. This one is imbedded in, and dominated by, a regulating discourse, which create the rules of social order (ibid p. 31-35). Together, these two discourses create the pedagogic discourse. Inspired by Bernstein's approach, Macdonald et al. (1999) argues that teaching practices within PE teacher education (an instructional discourse) are strongly influenced by the field of sport and physical activity (a regulating discourse). Thereby follows that pedagogic messages of *friluftsliv* will always involve values produced outside a pedagogic context, perhaps from a greater field of outdoor and adventure practices.

Pedagogic device

For the purpose of understanding the process through which pedagogic discourses are produced, Bernstein offers the pedagogic device. He describes it as a system with "internal rules which regulate the pedagogic communication which the device makes possible" (Bernstein, 2000, p. 27). These rules are not neutral or ideologically free but relatively stable, and represent the meaning of dominant groups. Another, perhaps more concrete, description is given by Bernstein-interpreter Singh (2002) who suggests the pedagogic device to be an "ensemble of rules or procedures via which knowledge (intellectual, practical, expressive, official or local knowledge) is converted into classroom talk, curricula and online communication" (p. 573). The pedagogic device involves three levels of rules with the following internal relation: distributive rules produce recontextualising rules which in turn produce evaluative rules.

Distributive rules

The purpose of distributive rules is to regulate the relation between power, knowledge and consciousness to different social groups. This regulation is made through exploring the limits between what is experienced as thinkable and unthinkable. The thinkable options in *friluftsliv*-teaching are the options experienced as possible to choose. However, Bernstein argues that the gap between the thinkable and the unthinkable is of great significance since it regulates the notion of alternative options. For a teacher in *friluftsliv*, the unthinkable options could thereby constitute the teaching content that is "yet to be thought (of)" which could be "both beneficial and dangerous at

the same time” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 30). My idea is that framing relations involved in teaching *friluftsliv* can perhaps highlight both thinkable and unthinkable teaching alternatives. Besides regulating what is experienced as thinkable and unthinkable, the distributive rules also regulate who has the power to set these boundaries. For this purpose, “teacher’s curricular planning, textbook creation and adoption by educational institutions” has been suggested to be of significance (Au, 2008, p. 642).

Recontextualising rules

As mentioned, a recontextualised pedagogic discourse always involves values from outside the pedagogic field being converted into pedagogy. A pedagogic discourse in *friluftsliv* is thereby most likely a combination between skills considered valuable by PE teachers and PE teacher educators (an instructional discourse) and values produced on a field of *friluftsliv* outside the educational system (a regulative discourse). This process of recontextualisation produces social fields which, similar to Bourdieu’s concept of field (1993), involves a certain degree of autonomy. Here, Bernstein separates the official recontextualisation field (ORF) from the pedagogic recontextualisation field (PRF). The ORF is created and dominated by the state and its agents (i.e. the producers of national aims for *friluftsliv*) while the PRF consists of school teachers, colleges and departments of education (Bernstein, 2000, p. 31-33). There is a continuous tension and exchange between the ORF and the PRF concerning “all aspects of educational arrangements and practices, not least the rules of order of school subjects concerning content selection, relation, sequence and pace” (Fitz et al., 2006, p. 5). Depending on the influence of the ORF and the PRF, differing framing relations for *friluftsliv* teaching will cause the pedagogic device, and thereby the pedagogic discourse, to be expressed differently.

Evaluative rules

The evaluative rules constitute the specific discourse expressed on a classroom-level. It is the knowledge being communicated and acquired between teacher and pupils, i.e. the specific pedagogic discourse realised (Bernstein, 2000, p. 35-39). Through these three levels of rules, Bernstein (ibid) claims the pedagogic device to work as a symbolic regulator of

consciousness offering concepts to understand "the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic discourse" (p. 28). The pedagogic device is not only a tool for understanding how the pedagogic discourses in school are constituted but also for understanding who contributes to the production and maintenance of this discourse. The teaching in *friluftsliv* within a Swedish PE is a pedagogic discourse shaped by influences from several different areas. Some of the ones mentioned as having an influence on PE teachers' framing relation to teaching are: the value orientations of PE teachers and PE teacher educators; the values of *friluftsliv* produced outside the pedagogic field; the aims for learning expressed in the curriculum text documents; and physical, institutional and organisational factors involved in the teaching situation.

Based on this knowledge, my aim in this paper is to analyse how the pedagogic discourse for teaching *friluftsliv* in Swedish schools can influence the PE teachers' control of the teaching practice. Further, I will discuss alternative outdoor discourses in relation to the achievement of national aims for *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE. More specifically the following questions will be explored: 1. What is expressed as having influence on Swedish PE teachers' framing relation to the pedagogic communication of *friluftsliv*? 2. What pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE engenders these framing relations? 3. Who contribute to the production of the specific pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE? 4. How can the pedagogic device contribute to a discussion of the relationship between pedagogic discourses for *friluftsliv* and the fulfilment of aims for *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE?

Method

This study is based on qualitative interviews with Swedish PE teachers. If the study had been focused only on determined factors framing impact on teaching, a quantitative questionnaire would perhaps have been more suitable (see e.g. Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). However, based on my ambition to explore the pedagogic device in the production of *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE it has been of importance for me to let the respondents

talk openly about their experiences and for me to ask follow-up questions (Creswell, 2002, p. 54 & p. 145-146).

Sample selection

The sample consists of 12 PE teachers (seven men and five women) working at different compulsory schools in Sweden. The sample of PE teachers was selected from 47 schools participating in the SIH program 2007 (SIH is an acronym for “Skola-Idrott-Hälsa”, “School-Sport-Health”), a national Swedish evaluation where childrens’ and young people’s physical activity, physical ability, health, leisure habits and experiences of PE have been studied (for further description, see Larsson & Redelius, 2008). Initially, the criteria for the selection of PE teachers were based on their answer to the question as to whether they taught several (more than six from eight given alternatives) or few (less than two from eight given alternatives) activities in *friluftsliv*. The point of selecting these two groups of PE teachers was to include different views on the conditions regulating *friluftsliv* teaching, a strategy corresponding to what Creswell (2002, p. 194) and Cohen et al. (2000, p. 103-104) describe as purposeful or purposive sampling. However, there were difficulties in locating these two polarised groups based on the fact that only six PE teachers of the 47 participating in the SIH program 2007 fulfilled the criteria (three in each group). Therefore, the remaining six PE teachers in the sample were selected on the basis of their location (an even distribution throughout Sweden) and their gender (equal numbers of men and women).

Collection of data

The interviews were carried out during three weeks in May and June 2008 in an isolated room at each school. The interviews lasted between 45 and 70 minutes, and were carried out as a private conversation. The ambition was to create a sense of an ordinary conversation in order to avoid making the respondents feel questioned about their teaching (Bourdieu, 1999 et al., p. 607-626). After approval, all the interviews were recorded as MP3 files. An interview guide was used as support, and the questions can be described as semi-standardised and semi-structured. The purpose was to combine the exploration of a number of subject areas with a certain amount of freedom in the succession and the extent of the questions (Patton, 2002, p. 339-348).

All the interviews were carried out and analysed in accordance with ethical guidelines concerning informed approval, confidentiality, consequences and the role of the researcher (Kvale, 1996, p. 109-123). The names in the result of the study are pseudonyms and since the interviews were carried out in Swedish, the quotes presented are translated by the author.

Transcription and analysis

The interviews were all transcribed verbatim during February and March 2009. Apart from the themes discussed in this article, the interviews consisted of other question areas, such as the respondents' background, assessment of knowledge in *friluftsliv* and pupils' experiences of *friluftsliv*. Using a deductive approach and starting from Bernstein's theories, I have asked myself questions such as: "What do the respondents say about their control of the teaching in *friluftsliv*?" and "What ways of reasoning about *friluftsliv* constitute the expressed teaching in *friluftsliv*?" During processes of convergence and divergence, I have discerned patterns in the interviews (Patton, 2002, p. 462-466). The themes and concepts used to formulate, analyse and discuss the questions in this article have thus appeared in the analyses of the respondents' statements and were not used as specific questions (Kvale, 1996, p. 176-209).

The framing of teaching in *friluftsliv*

During the interviews it became obvious that there are a number of factors that may influence the teacher's control of the teaching in *friluftsliv*. I have tried to divide these into different themes.

Formulations in curricular text documents

The respondents expressed the teaching in *friluftsliv* to be insufficient in relation to its position in the national Swedish PE curriculum and they also took self-assumed responsibility for this situation. The following statement support research indicating that *friluftsliv* is marginalised in Swedish PE (Quennerstedt, et al., 2008).

Jeanette: When we talk about it like this, it appears how trifling our teaching in *friluftsliv* really is... I think it is depressing... Now you've given me heaps of bad conscience!

Kristina: I see it as a weakness that we don't teach more of it (*friluftsliv*, my note)... I don't think we're unique in that sense but... it's a weakness.

The respondents also expressed difficulties with interpreting the aims for *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum. There was a call for these aims to be made more distinct and explicit. The significant responsibility for interpreting formulations in the curriculum following the decentralised management of the Swedish school was not considered a valuable option among the respondents.

Kerstin: I would want the aims to be more explicit... what do they mean, what content am I supposed to teach and how am I supposed to make the assessment?

Klas: ... and then one might ask what 'a basic knowledge in *friluftsliv*' really means, that formulation is way too vague!

The statements indicate that the lack of explicitness in the national Swedish PE curriculum are claimed to be a factor weakening the PE teachers' control of the teaching in *friluftsliv*. It appears as if the ORF does not live up to the expectations from the PRF with regards to making the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* more explicit and intelligible (Bernstein, 2000, p. 31-33).

Time, equipment and finances

Linde suggests that physical, institutional and organisational factors such as time, equipment, economy, facilities and the school's location may have a framing influence on teachers control of pedagogic communication (2006, p. 15). This idea is applied in studies of the regulation of Swedish PE teaching and was also expressed by my respondents (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008, p. 354-355). Class hours and time framed by schedules

were put forward as factors with potential to weaken teachers' control of outdoor teaching (Bernstein, 1971, p. 205). A permanent impression was also the different conditions in schools regarding equipment and material for *friluftsliv*.

Bengt: It's impossible to teach *friluftsliv* in 60 minutes! You've just got started and then they have to get back in again. The limited time and the schedule are the main obstacles.

Peter: ... we have gear such as army tents, spirit stoves and big chests with pots, barbecue bars, paraffin lamps, knives, axes, spades, saws... I don't think many schools have that kind of gear. We have a lot of skates too, 50 pairs of them.

The equipment for PE teaching might be viewed as one expression of PE teachers' value orientations and can be put in relation to the elements emphasised in the curriculum text document (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000). Several of the respondents also emphasised the restrictive effect on *friluftsliv* teaching of a national Swedish regulation requiring that all school activities be free of charge.

Klas: How far it is to the forest? Well, I'd say about 30 kilometres. It is pretty far... and then there are all the costs. We have to take them (the pupils, my note) by bus there and back. Somehow it feels like money controls everything in school today.

Tom: It's a pity! Okay, it might be that all the pupils can't afford it but on the other hand, many of them never get the chance to go away. But now there's a resolution in the municipality that school should be free of charge. Before this, we always used to have three or four buses going on ski trips.

It appears as if the development towards reduced financial resources makes a part of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* visible (Bernstein, 2000, p. 31-35). The idea that outdoor education requires technical equipment and financial resources is questioned by Beedie (2000) who argues for more

urban outdoor teaching. An outdoor practice not located far away from civilisation, without technical equipment, naturally becomes more accessible and inclusive for teachers and pupils.

Location of the school and risks

The respondents expressed thoughts regarding the location of schools in relation to nature. Although they thought that *friluftsliv* is more difficult to teach in big cities, several of the respondents considered nature to be easy of access.

Sara: Now the pupils can choose whether they want to ski or skate right here next to the school. In fact some of them manage both in the same lesson, which is great! There is a guy helping us make the ski tracks here.

Klas: Unfortunately, I think it depends on where you are located. Imagine if you're at a school right in the middle of Stockholm, Malmö or Göteborg, (the three largest cities in Sweden, my note) then it's quite far to go to the forest regions.

Friluftsliv was also associated with a certain amount of risk and the respondents demonstrated different attitudes towards risks in the teaching. Some thought of them as limiting teaching while other thought that risks are a part of *friluftsliv*.

Kristina: Today I would never take pupils out on a canoe trip... no, never. If something happens you can just say 'bye bye'. In fact, *friluftsliv* is just a big warning sign.

Peter: It's impossible to eliminate all risks, because then there would be nothing left! I think that many people need risks... to have that tickling feeling. The kids need to be challenged in life and not always to be on the safe side. For example, if you're in a canoe; okay, you can fall into the water... but so what, then we'll have to deal with that if it happens.

Risk and safety as a barrier for outdoor teaching are also to be found in a large quantitative survey of outdoor teachers in the UK (Waite, 2009). However, my results indicate that, depending on PE teachers' attitude, on one hand, towards the setting of the school in relation to 'nature' and, on the other, towards risk and safety, it can obviously be considered both to weaken (as in the former case of Kristina and Klas) and to strengthen (as in the former case of Peter and Sara) PE teachers' control of teaching *friluftsliv* (Bernstein, 2000).

A common project?

As we have seen, an issue involved in outdoor teaching is whether the responsibility for the planning, organisation and realisation of teaching should be solely on PE teachers or a project involving all teachers in the school (Davies, 1992; Williams, 1994). Despite the position of *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum, it is not obvious who is responsible for the special days traditionally dedicated to *friluftsliv* (in Sweden "*friluftsliv*-days" are an established phenomenon) and whether these days include teaching.

Sara: Someone has to be the convener and it has always been up to us as PE teachers, but the involvement of other teachers depends on how busy they are. Teachers in natural science have been involved before... well, in fact all the other teachers have too, but especially natural science since you come across issues of nature and stuff like that.

From the PE teachers' point of view, *friluftsliv* requires cooperation between subject teachers and a shared responsibility to be realised. This is also the conclusion in studies of outdoor projects in the US (Dyson & O'Sullivan, 1998). Although the teaching in *friluftsliv* is claimed to be vaguely formulated in the national Swedish PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000), the respondents seem to have an idea of the requirements involved with teaching *friluftsliv*. It is a teaching practice demanding time, equipment, financial resources and is to be carried out in nature, a nature regarded as close by some and distant by others. This teaching also involves risks for pupils as well as teachers. Behind the description of factors framing the

teaching in *friluftsliv* in this study, of which most of them are claimed to weaken teachers' control, there is a certain kind of *friluftsliv* concealed. In the words of Bernstein, this is a pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* (Bernstein, 2000, p. 31-35). In the following, the constitution and recontextualisation of this discourse will be dealt with.

The production of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* – the pedagogic device

The pedagogic discourse, perceived by the factors framing the teaching in *friluftsliv*, requires financial resources and equipment and involves both cooperation and risk-taking. *Friluftsliv* also requires experiences of nature, but not from any kind of nature whatever but from one that is distant and untouched by civilisation. From the distributive rules in the pedagogic device, it follows that this would appear to be the thinkable teaching in *friluftsliv*. From this follows that the unthinkable alternative in the process of producing the pedagogic discourse of *friluftsliv* would be a pedagogic discourse practiced in an urban environment without financial resources or technical equipment (Bernstein, 2000, p. 28-30). This notion of unthinkable *friluftsliv* was also confirmed by the respondents.

Interviewer: Would it be possible to teach *friluftsliv* out here in this park?

Carl: No, I don't think so... not with all the noise from cars and students driving around down here... but I think it would be more peaceful up there in the woods.

Interviewer: If the forest and the lake weren't as close to the school as it is here, would it be possible to teach *friluftsliv* in a park somewhere?

Lars: (Silence) It's always possible to do something and you could call it *friluftsliv* but... it's definitely not the same feeling. You don't breathe the same air, you don't hear the twitter of the birds. Maybe there will be a bus passing. Of course, it's better than nothing but you can't compare it.

In the process of identifying contributors to the distribution and recontextualisation of pedagogic discourses in schools, former studies confirm teacher education in general (Singh, 2008) and PE teacher education in particular (Tinning, 2006) to have a significant role in this matter. Judging from the experiences of their education in *friluftsliv* during PETE, several of the respondents meant this to be challenging and exciting for the moment but irrelevant to their daily teaching today.

Tom: Why don't they adjust the education to the conditions in the school instead of... well I mean, now you get to ski for a week in the mountains! It's really fun while you are there but it's far from reality! I would have wanted more of how to work with *friluftsliv* in a small school instead of sleeping in snow caves and all that!

Karin: Perhaps the aim was a bit too high sometimes... I mean every time we had *friluftsliv* we went far away. Not to mention the skiing trips which cost a lot... it's not too often you do those things in school. The money doesn't exist and it's not that kind of organisation. I think some of the things we did were good, but we should have had more of 'what can we do in this little woods 50 meters from the school'.

The pedagogic discourse made visible through the description of factors framing the teaching in *friluftsliv* has similarities with the kind of exclusive outdoor teaching the respondents have experienced during PE teacher education. It has been questioned what tools students are provided with for transforming an exclusive outdoor teaching experienced during PE teacher education (including a remote wilderness setting and demands of technical equipment) into more ordinary and urban school conditions when working as PE teachers (Backman, 2008). It appears as if this transformation never occurs but that the exclusive pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* is produced and maintained, partly during PE teacher education, and will then constitute the notion of *friluftsliv* when PE teachers are to teach in an ordinary school contexts.

Conclusions

This study indicates that the formulations made within the ORF do not necessarily have a causal impact on the PRF (Bernstein, 2000, p. 31-33). According to Linde (2006) “curriculum text documents do not have the capacity to manage all things but are expressions for compromises and agreed principles in order to reach a desirable development” (p. 48, my translation). It appears as if the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* is difficult to realise within a school context due to the impact of framing relations surrounding the teaching practice. As suggested by Fitz et al. (2006) “both cooperation and conflict of greater or lesser intensity exists between official and pedagogic agents” (p. 5). A certain amount of tension and struggle within and between the PRF and the ORF will most likely benefit the teaching practice. This study indicates that while the expectation from the PRF for more explicit aims for *friluftsliv* is unfulfilled, the PRF’s will (re)produce its own pedagogic discourse, a discourse involving values from outdoor practices outside the pedagogic context. The degree of explicitness in the aims formulated in the ORF can therefore be argued to be of significance for the implemented teaching. However, one purpose of broad formulations such as “pupils should have a basic knowledge of *friluftsliv*” (SNAE, 2000) is also to increase the possibility of an adaptation to local school contexts and to encourage PE teachers to intensify studies of their own discipline. Therefore, the PRF’s call for more explicit and concrete aims could also result in a further weakening of PE teachers’ control of teaching in *friluftsliv*. In order to develop the teaching in *friluftsliv*, it appears that both the ORF and the PRF are responsible for increasing the exchange between the fields.

Beedie (2000) calls for the adaptation of outdoor education to more urban conditions with limited technical equipment in order to increase teachers’ control of pedagogic practice. Similar thoughts are expressed by Thomas (2005) who claims that “practitioners would do well to carefully consider the impact that equipment, technology and skill development have on their participants’ experience of place” (p. 37). Brown argues that the demand for wilderness settings in outdoor and adventure education restricts its pedagogic potential (2006, p. 685). According to the results in this study,

the urban and simple *friluftsliv*, produced without technical equipment and financial resources, constitute the unthinkable options in the distributive process of the pedagogic device (Bernstein, 2000, p. 28-39). A turn to unthinkable alternatives in the production of a pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* and outdoor teaching would most likely be a way to reduce impact of framing relations claimed to weaken the PE teachers' control of teaching in *friluftsliv*. One of the main conclusions from this study is that factors claimed to frame teaching can only be constituted as such because of the dominant ways of thinking of a teaching practice. If the pedagogic discourse were to have a different constitution, there would also be other factors framing the pedagogic practice. A break with the reproduction of the exclusiveness characterising the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* could perhaps lead to better possibilities for pupils to achieve the aims in the national Swedish PE curriculum. Analysing pedagogic discourses by the use of framing and the pedagogic device might be fruitful even for other teaching practices. In this study, my use of Bernstein's concepts has been used for analysing the constitution of a pedagogic discourse and for identifying the contributors to the production and maintenance of this discourse. However, the actual process of acquirement of this discourse has not been dealt with. Here, the focus of discursive representations of the body, and embodiment as a model for understanding communication and practice, as used in the corporal device (Evans et al., 2009) would most likely be of significance.

References

- Au, W.W. (2008). Devising inequality: a Bernsteinian analysis of high-stakes testing and social reproduction in education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 639-651.
- Backman, E. (2008). What is valued in *friluftsliv* within PE teacher education? Swedish PE teacher educators' thoughts about *friluftsliv* analysed through the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(1), 61-76.

Beedie, P. (2000). Teaching outdoor and adventurous activities: Issues surrounding modes of delivery. *British Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 31(4), 18-20.

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, Codes and Control*. Vol. 1. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity. Theory, research, critique*. Rev. ed. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. et al. (1999). *The Weight of the World. Social suffering in contemporary society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brooks, A. (2002). Lost in the Australian bush: outdoor education as curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34(4), 405-425.

Brown, M. (2006). Adventure education in physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education*. (pp. 685-703). London: Sage Publications.

Bunting, C.J. (1989). The compatibility of physical education and outdoor education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 60(2), 35-39.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.

Cooper, G. (2000). Opportunities for outdoor education in the new national curriculum. *Horizons*, no. 9, 26-29.

Creswell, J.W. (2002). *Educational research. Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Curtner-Smith, M.D. & Meek, G.A. (2000). Teachers' value orientations and their compatibility with the national curriculum for physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 6(1), 27-45.

Davies, C. (1992). Youth, Schools and National Curriculum with Regard to Outdoor Education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 9(2), 28-31.

Dyson, B. & O'Sullivan, M. (1998). Innovation in two alternative elementary school programs: Why it works. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69(3), 242-253.

Evans, J. & Davies, B. (1997). Editorial introduction: Physical education and the sport curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal*, 8(2), 185-197.

Evans, J., Davies, B. & Wright, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Body, knowledge and control. Studies in the sociology of physical education and health*. London: Routledge.

Evans, J., Davies, B. & Rich, E. (2009). The body made flesh: embodied learning and the corporeal device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(4), 391-406.

Faarlund, N. (1994). *Friluftsliv – a way home*. In B. Dahle (Ed.), *Nature – the true home of culture*. (pp. 21-28). Oslo: Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.

Fitz, J., Davies, B. & Evans, J. (2006). *Educational Policy and Social Reproduction*. London: Routledge.

Forsberg, E. (Ed.). (2007). *Curriculum Theory Revisited*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Green, K. (2000). Extra curricular physical education in England and Wales: A Sociological perspective on a Sporting Bias. *European Journal of Physical Education*, 5(2), 179-207.

Henderson, B. & Vikander, N. (Eds.). (2007). *Nature First: Outdoor Life the Friluftsliv Way*. Toronto: Natural Heritage Books.

Humberstone, B. (1993). Equality, physical education and outdoor education ideological struggles and transformative structures. In J. Evans (Ed.), *Equality, Education and Physical Education* (pp. 217-233). London: The Falmer Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews. An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. California: Sage Publications.

Larsson, H. & Redelius, K. (2008). Swedish physical education research questioned – current situations and future directions. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(4), 381-398.

Linde, G. (2006). *Det ska ni veta! En introduktion till läroplansteorier* [This you ought to know! An introduction to curriculum theories]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lundgren, U.P. (1972). *Frame factors and the teaching process : A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching*. Doctoral disseration. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg.

Lundvall, S. & Meckbach, J. (2008). Mind the gap: physical education and health and the frame factor theory as a tool for analysing educational settings. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(4), 345-364.

Macdonald, D., Kirk, D. & Braiuka, S. (1999). The Social Construction of the Physical Activity Field at the School/University Interface. *European Physical Education Review*, 5(1) 31-51.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Quay, J., Dickinson, S. & Nettleton, B. (2003). Students caring for each other: Outdoor education and learning through peer relationships. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 7(1), 45-53.

Quennerstedt, M., Öhman, M. & Eriksson, C. (2008). *Physical Education in Sweden – a national evaluation*. School of Health and Medical Sciences, Örebro University. Retrieved October 27, 2009 from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/169508.pdf>

Repp, G. (1993). *Natur og friluftsliv i grunnskulen*. [Nature and *friluftsliv* in compulsory school]. Volda: Volda laerehogskule.

Repp, G. (1996). Outdoor adventure education and *friluftsliv* seen from a sociology of knowledge perspective. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 13(2), 63-66.

Sadovnik, A.R. (Ed.). (1995). *Knowledge and pedagogy. The sociology of Basil Bernstein*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Sandell, K. (2001). The Landscape Perspective of 'Friluftsliv': Out-of-doors in Scandinavia and the Right of Public Access. *Pathways. The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education*, 13(3), 20-22.

Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 571-582.

Sparkes, A.C. (1999). Understanding Physical Education Teachers: A Focus on the Lived Body. In C. Hardy & M. Mawer (Eds.), *Learning and Teaching in Physical Education* (pp. 171-186). London: Falmer Press.

Swedish National Agency of Education, SNAE (2000). *National Swedish curriculum for Physical Education, compulsory school*. Retrieved October 27, 2009 from <http://www3.skolverket.se/ki/eng/comp.pdf>

Swedish Ministry of Environment (2003) *Om statsbidrag och friluftorganisationer*. [Government subsidy and outdoor organisations]. Retrieved October 27, 2009 from <https://lagen.nu/2003:133>

Thomas, G. (2005). Traditional adventure activities in outdoor environmental education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 9(1), 31-40.

Tinning, R. (2006) Theoretical orientations in physical education teacher education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education* (pp. 369-386). London: Sage Publications.

Waite, S. (2009). *Outdoor learning for children aged 2-11: perceived barriers, potential solutions*. Paper presented at the International Outdoor Education Research Conference, La Trobe Beechworth Australia, April. Retrieved October 27, 2009 from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/oent/OE_Conf_2009/Conference%20Papers/waite.pdf

Williams, A.P. (1994). Outdoor education and physical education in the national curriculum. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 11(4), 12-14.

Zink, R. & Boyes, M. (2006). The nature and scope of outdoor education in New Zealand schools. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 10(1), 11-21.

Footnotes

1: The Right of Public Access is a non-legislated tradition, with its history back in the beginning of the 20th century. It can be described as a confidence given to the Swedes, allowing them to make outings in their land and countryside without many detailed restrictions (Sandell 2001).