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Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to examine some of the educational and sociological conditions underlying the production of teaching in friluftsliv within the Physical Education (PE) subject in Swedish compulsory school. Despite the value awarded to the Scandinavian outdoor practice friluftsliv, in both the national PE curriculum document and in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) in Sweden, it does not seem to be thoroughly implemented in compulsory school teaching. Through analyses of interviews with PE teachers and PE teacher educators, as well as of curriculum documents, using the perspectives of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu, I explore conditions underlying the expressions of friluftsliv teaching in Swedish PE.

The pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv in Swedish PE is described as a teaching that should take place in a natural setting remote from civilisation, involve risks, and require time, technical equipment, financial resources, and cooperation. This discourse for friluftsliv is shown to be similar to the values emphasised in friluftsliv education in PETE. Although proven to be difficult to implement in school, this discourse appear to form the conception of friluftsliv teaching for PE teachers in Sweden. Under the influence of the performance code, friluftsliv is transformed into outdoor activities with which the PE teachers are familiar, or is totally left out of PE teaching.

A turn towards options that are seen as unthinkable in relation to the current pedagogic discourse may benefit the achievement of the aims set out in the national PE curriculum. Values such as environmental awareness, sustainable development and cultural perspectives on the landscape could strengthen the classification of friluftsliv and PE in compulsory school. Further, an increase of socially critical and constructivist perspectives during PETE could make unthinkable options in friluftsliv thinkable and contribute to a break with the reproduction of teaching practices in PE.
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Introduction

My interest in examining the Scandinavian version of outdoor education, *friluftsliv*,¹ as a part of Physical Education (PE)² and Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) in Sweden, has its origin in the observation that despite being one of few obligatory aims in Swedish PE (SNAE, 2000a), *friluftsliv* does not, paradoxically, seem to be thoroughly implemented in compulsory and upper secondary school teaching (Al-Abdi, 1984; Backman, 2004; Svenning, 2001; Quennerstedt et al., 2008).

Being a former PE teacher, I have experienced difficulties surrounding the implementation of *friluftsliv* within the school context in general and in the PE context in particular. Difficulties of implementing outdoor teaching have been confirmed to be a common problem in PE (Beedie, 2000; Brown, 2006; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). These observations have made me interested in what it means to teach *friluftsliv* to a Swedish PE teacher.

Lately, working as a PE teacher educator, my everyday experiences from spending a significant amount of time, energy and resources teaching various outdoor practices at different PETE departments have also made me wonder how my teaching may have affected PE teacher students. Based on this experience, and the fact that PETE has sometimes been described as a conservative and slow-changing context (Tinning, 2006), I have struggled with ideas about how the difficulty of implementing *friluftsliv* in the PE context might be related to the ways *friluftsliv* is taught within PETE.

My observations and my experiences from PE as well as from PETE constitute the basis of my interest in investigating the relationship between, firstly, the intentions in the formal curricula documents regarding *friluftsliv*, secondly, between PE teachers’ different expressions of conditions for teaching *friluftsliv*, and finally, between the values expressed in the teaching of *friluftsliv* within PETE. These levels constitute some of the conditions regulating how teaching in *friluftsliv* is expressed within the Swedish PE context.

As with the concept of “outdoor education”, there is no consensus regarding the meaning of *friluftsliv*. Instead, it is a word imbued with a multiple of values. Investigating conditions for teaching in *friluftsliv* within PE and

¹ In the Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Norway and Denmark) outdoor education within the PE context is expressed as *friluftsliv*, a concept discussed later in this thesis.

² The established abbreviation PE will be used throughout the thesis although the term Physical Education has changed to Health and Physical Education (HPE) in many countries.
PETE has meant that I have had to relate to how these values are expressed within educational contexts.

The papers

The relationship between the wordings of curriculum documents and the actual teaching can be viewed from different perspectives. One is to expect that the relationship should be causal and that deviations should not be tolerated. Based on the several factors that may influence the teaching situation, my perspective is rather that the relationship between curricula documents and teaching are expressions of social compromises and agreements (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000; Linde 2006, p. 48; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000, p. 171-179). Instead of looking at whether Swedish PE teachers follow the directions or not, my ambition here is to investigate how they interpret the assignments in the national Swedish PE curriculum and also to examine their views of the conditions for teaching *friluftsliv* in the Swedish PE context. In my study of these conditions at the compulsory school level, I have been inspired by the work of the educational sociologist Basil Bernstein (2000).

In the first paper, “Friluftsliv: a contribution to equity and democracy in Swedish PE? An analysis of codes in Swedish PE curricula”, I analyse and discuss the strength of the boundaries surrounding *friluftsliv* in national and local curricula documents and discuss meaning-making principles within Swedish PE. The empirical material on which this paper is based consists of national PE curricula documents and general curricula documents regarding compulsory school from 1955 until today together with 31 local PE syllabus documents from compulsory schools in different parts of Sweden.

In Paper II, “What frames teaching of *friluftsliv*? Analysing a pedagogic discourse within Swedish PE through framing and the pedagogic device”, I analyse and discuss PE teachers’ expressions of factors controlling their teaching practice in *friluftsliv* in order to discuss what kind of *friluftsliv* is considered legitimate. This paper is based on interviews with 12 PE teachers working at compulsory schools throughout the country. When trying to understand the teaching practice of *friluftsliv* and its conditions within the Swedish PE context, Bernstein’s perspectives have helped me identify some key issues in need of further examination.

The identification of difficulties in school contexts is often followed by a discussion of the content and methods of teacher education. It has however been argued that the perspectives and content that teacher students meet during their education have only marginal importance for what is expressed in their future teaching (Hensvold, 2003, p. 150-151). Instead it is suggested that the teacher students’ own biography and schooling, in combination with the experiences they themselves have had of teaching, will have a more significant impact on their future teaching (Lortie, 1975, p. 79-81). In my
search for explanations of the circumstances surrounding *friluftsliv* teaching in Swedish PE, I have nevertheless looked at *friluftsliv* education within Swedish PETE. Teacher educators in Sweden are free to design content and methods in their courses, without any ties to national educational policy (SNAHE, 2006). Given the significance of individual sport preferences for the PE teacher’s teaching (Annerstedt, 1991; Green, 2000; Sparkes, 1999), I have been inspired by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu in my examination of *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE.

In Paper III, “What is valued in *friluftsliv* within PE teacher education? Swedish PE teacher educators’ thoughts about *friluftsliv* analysed through the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu”, I analyse and discuss the PE teacher educators’ expressions of the debates over values in *friluftsliv* within PETE and their view of the power relation between *friluftsliv* and sport within Swedish PETE. The study on which this paper is based consists of interviews with 17 Swedish PE teacher educators teaching *friluftsliv* at eight different PETE departments in Sweden.

In Paper IV, “To acquire a taste for *friluftsliv* – a part of becoming a PE teacher? Swedish PE teacher educators’ thoughts about their students’ preferences for *friluftsliv*”, I analyse and discuss what the respondents express as their students’ relationship to, and knowledge of, *friluftsliv*, and how they think that this relationship can be influenced. The empirical material in this paper is based on the same interviews as in the third paper.

The papers on which this thesis is based thus include investigations of how values within the teaching of *friluftsliv* are expressed in the words of PE teachers at compulsory school level as well as at PETE level. Thereby, I try to capture some of the conditions for what may influence teaching in *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE. The issues addressed in these four papers indicate the need for more empirical investigations regarding *friluftsliv* as an educational content in Swedish PE and in Swedish PETE.

**Aims and research questions**

The papers on which this thesis is based each have their own specific aims and questions. My ambition is for this thesis to illuminate what the papers can contribute to when put in relationship to each other. Thus the thesis contains a deepening of the papers’ mutual perspectives and areas of knowledge, as well as a discussion of the relationship between them.

Using educational and sociological approaches, the purpose of this thesis is therefore to examine some of the conditions underlying the production of teaching in *friluftsliv* within the PE subject in Swedish compulsory school.
The first question concerns the teaching of *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE:

1. What pedagogic discourses constitute what Swedish PE teachers value in the teaching of *friluftsliv*?

The second question concerns the teaching of *friluftsliv* in PETE viewed as a condition for the teaching of *friluftsliv* on compulsory school level:

2. How does the struggle for legitimacy of *friluftsliv* in Swedish PETE influence what kinds of *friluftsliv* are thinkable in the PE subject in school?

This study of some of the conditions underlying the production of teaching of *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE, on school level as well as in teacher education, may also contribute to an understanding of the relationship between PETE and the PE teacher profession. The measures illuminated in the conclusions of this thesis may also hopefully contribute to the development of *friluftsliv* teaching. Furthermore the study may hopefully contribute to the discussion of the tasks assigned to PE teachers, and their possibilities to help pupils achieve stipulated aims.

In this thesis, *friluftsliv* is studied as an example of a teaching practice of particular interest within Swedish PE. In order to better understand the object of research addressed, the following section provides an introduction to the debates concerning the definition of *friluftsliv* and a summary of the history of the *friluftsliv* tradition in Scandinavia. Further, I describe research concerning PE and PETE and explain how *friluftsliv* and various outdoor practices are implemented and studied in PE and PETE. I also present the theoretical perspectives used to analyse the empirical material as well as aspects of method considered. Finally, I present a summary of the results and discussions of the papers, discuss the papers’ relationships to each other and from them draw a number of common conclusions.
Friluftsliv

Teaching in the outdoors and in the countryside has a long tradition in the Swedish school. Its origin can be traced back to the influence of scholars such as the French-Swiss educator Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Swedish botanist Carl Linnaeus (Carlgren & Marton, 2003, p. 196-197). From being a concern of the entire school staff during the early part of the 20th century, the responsibility for friluftsliv was successively passed over to the PE teachers (Sundberg & Öhman, 2008). The outdoors, nature and environmental concerns are all concepts that occur in the general Swedish curriculum for both preschool (SNAE, 2006a), compulsory school (SNAE, 2006b), and in the specific curriculum for science studies (SNAE, 2000b).

Although the word friluftsliv is actually mentioned in the national Swedish curriculum for biology as a source of inspiration (SNAE, 2000d), its position as an aim for pupils to achieve is only stipulated in the curricula for PE (SNAE, 2000a, 2000c). This observation, along with the fact that friluftsliv is a word imbued with several different values, is one of the grounds underlying my interest in the area.

It is reasonable to assume that there are various outdoor teaching practices that occur on different levels in Swedish schools. My interest for the conditions underlying the production of the teaching of friluftsliv in Swedish PE is based on the fact that friluftsliv is assigned significant value in the national Swedish PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000a) as well as in Swedish PETE (Larsson, 2009). Therefore, the following review of research will be focused on friluftsliv and will not involve other outdoor teaching practices even though it may be reasonable to assume that these form a significant part of Swedish children’s schooling (see e.g. Szczepanski, 2008).

Defining friluftsliv

Given my ambition to investigate the conditions underlying the production of friluftsliv as a teaching practice within the Swedish PE context, it is important to give an idea of how various friluftsliv-practices are constructed outside the field of formal education. In the following discussion of different

---

3 In the English versions of national Swedish PE curriculum documents the word friluftsliv is translated as outdoor life.
definitions of *friluftsliv* and its traditions in Scandinavia, *friluftsliv* appears to be a concept imbued with a number of different values. The values connected to *friluftsliv* outside formal education may well also be of significance for its expressions in PE and in PETE.

My intention in discussing the definition of *friluftsliv* is not to describe what I consider the most correct definition or to explain my personal position. Rather, this is an attempt to show that taking a stance in this question also involves having to relate to other definitions. Given the number of contributions to this discussion and their distinctive features, it is fair to claim that there exists a certain amount of tension on the issue.

Discussions of the most legitimate definitions of outdoor educational practices also appear to be an international phenomenon. Although *outdoor education* is the concept mainly used in the international PE context, there are also other terms such as: *adventure education; outdoor recreation; environmental education; experiential education; and education outside the classroom.* Despite the theoretical variations signalled by these prefixes, they have often been claimed to share a common ground in practice (Boyes, 2000; Brown, 2006; Zink & Boyes, 2006).\(^4\)

The first official definitions of *friluftsliv*

Based on the difficulties of finding an English translation of the concept of *friluftsliv*, one might get the impression that there exists a homogeneous view of its meaning in the Scandinavian countries. However, this is not the case. In Sweden, Norway and Denmark there has been much discussion of the most legitimate definition of *friluftsliv* and of who would be in a position to make such a definition. The following is an attempt to explain how the definition of *friluftsliv* can be seen as a question of power, dominance and an occupation of positions.

Although the concept *friluftsliv* is found in Scandinavian sources from the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century (Wilson, 1989, p. 2), the first real attempts to define *friluftsliv* began in the 1960s and the 1970s. These attempts coincided with an increasing interest in nature and global environmental issues expressed by the starting of several movements and organisations concerned with preserving the environment. In the ambition to separate “friends” from “enemies” and protect specific interests, several of the definitions had a normative character. Emmelin (1994) claims that some specific contexts are in need of general definitions of *friluftsliv* but he has also noted the difficulties and limitations of defining concepts, due to the fact that *friluftsliv* can have different meanings for different individuals (p. 8-9).

\(^4\) When comparing *friluftsliv* in Scandinavia to international outdoor traditions, I have mainly focused on literature from the UK, the US, New Zealand and Australia due to reasons of translation.
Based on the extent and long history of research into *friluftsliv* in Norway, Norwegian researchers have been seen to have a preferential right of interpretation when it comes to defining the concept. The Norwegian government's official definition was stated more than three decades ago:

*Friluftsliv* means being and being physically active in the open air during leisure time in order to get a change of setting as well as experiences of nature (Stormeldeting, 1972, my translation).

It took several years before the Swedish government realised the significance of having their own official definition. First, the Norwegian definition was, more or less, copied (Swedish Ministry of Culture, 1999) and it has lately been further developed.

*Friluftsliv* means being outside, in the natural and cultural landscape for the purpose of well-being or to gain experience of our natural surroundings without the demands of competition. (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003, my translation)

“Nature” is a word that often occurs in connection with *friluftsliv*. I do not intend to discuss definitions of “nature” at this point but I hope that the investigated values associated with *friluftsliv* will also say something of what is associated with the concept of nature. However, an interesting observation when comparing curricula between Swedish school subjects is the fact that while the word *friluftsliv* is most common in PE (SNAE, 2000a), the word *nature* is definitely most common in biology (SNAE, 2000d). I will return to a discussion of how *friluftsliv* might be expressed outside PE further on in this thesis.

A struggle for positions
Despite the long period of validity of the official Norwegian definition, several influential practitioners, debaters and researchers have been engaged in proclaiming their specific views of the characteristics of *friluftsliv*. Nils Faarlund (1978), one of the early representatives and a founding father of the Norwegian tradition, defines *friluftsliv* as “surplus-life-in-nature” (my translation of the Norwegian expression “overskuddsliv i naturen”), aiming at the mental and spiritual experiences that go beyond the basics of living in the outdoors. To this life he attributes a multitude of activities performed “with respect for the interplay in nature and for the self-realisation of all existence” (p. 137). Dahle (2002) claims that the practice of *friluftsliv* should meet a number of criteria: a) experiencing nature should be the key; b) it should not be dependent on high costs; c) nature and the cultural landscape should be easily accessible; d) the tradition should be passed on by families and friends; and e) it should not be dependent on organizations (p. 15). Bob
Henderson, Canadian researcher inspired by the Scandinavian and in particular the Norwegian *friluftsliv*, describes what he sees as the characteristics of *friluftsliv*:

This sounds vaguely like North American outdoor recreation, but this is outdoor recreation with its heart within the land and linked to a tradition of being and learning with the land (Henderson, 2001b, p. 32).

It appears as if some Norwegian proclaimers of *friluftsliv* are eager to emphasise its specific relation to nationalism and patriotism. Particularly, this is the impression from several of the contributions in the anthology “Nature First. Outdoor Life the Friluftsliv Way” (Henderson & Vikander, 2007). However, the differences between Norwegian and other nations’ outdoor practices have also been examined from a critical perspective.

...there are no clear indications that Norwegian outdoor recreation tastes and habits are entirely different from those of all other nations. On the contrary, there seems to be many similarities between our outdoor recreation patterns and those of people in some other countries or region of countries (Gåsdal, 2007, p. 77)

Tordsson (2002) and Pedersen (1999) have also been engaged in searching for variations and differences in their studies of the Norwegian tradition of *friluftsliv* as a historically, culturally and socially constructed phenomenon.

One main aspect of the definition of *friluftsliv* is its separation from sports. In a governmental report in Sweden from 1969, *friluftsliv* and sport were placed in the same organisation with reference to the difficulty of separating the two areas. The common definition of *friluftsliv* and sport was: “all the competitive and other physical activities, which people perform to achieve a certain result or to get exercise and physically active recreation” (Statens offentliga utredningar, 1969, p. 21, my translation). This definition met strong reactions from the *friluftsliv* movement. Their reluctance to being associated with the competition element of sport resulted in several attempts to redefine *friluftsliv*. “Friluftsfrämjandet” (*Friluftslivpromoters*), an organisation promoting *friluftsliv* in Sweden and sometimes described as a national movement for *friluftsliv*, stresses that:

*Friluftsliv* means making use of nature for purposes of recreation and relaxation (Yttergren, 1996, p. 11, my translation).

At the time, this definition filled a purpose by indicating a clear distinction from sport. However, the expression “make use of” can also be interpreted as humans exploiting nature for their own purposes. Nilsson (2007), PE teacher educator at The Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences, argues that the current official Swedish definition of *friluftsliv* is indistinct and
somewhat contradictory. He claims that the demand for a change of setting is unnecessary for a person who is already committed to nature and that the experience of nature is also possible to achieve indoors. As a reaction against increasing consumption and commercialism, there is also a part of friluftsliv that emphasises a resistance towards these tendencies in society. Sandell (2006) calls attention to the ambivalence involved in the fact that friluftsliv in many ways is a counter-movement to the society it is at the same time a part of.

Discussing friluftsliv through theoretical models

There have also been attempts at separating friluftsliv from frilufts-activities and frilufts-sport. Öhman (1999) says that friluftsliv involves living in nature, i.e. moving, eating and sleeping in nature for longer periods of time. He also claims that this does not have to be the case when practising frilufts-activities, which may involve games, exercises and sport in the open air (p. 6).

In a similar distinction, Edinger (1997) stresses that the way a specific activity, for example paddling a kayak, is practised, is decisive for whether it is friluftsliv, a frilufts-activity or a frilufts-sport. If the aim is to paddle as fast as possible down a wild river, trying to beat another competitor, it is a frilufts-sport. If the aim is recreation and relaxation or if the paddling involves a certain amount of risk, a frilufts-activity is being practised. Friluftsliv, on the other hand, is described by Edinger as “a means to get in authentic contact with nature” and as “an unselfish life in nature on nature’s own terms, that can lead to friendship with nature” (p. 13-14, my translation).

Andkjær (2008), another Danish researcher of friluftsliv, makes a distinction between adventure and simple friluftsliv as two practices involving different relations to nature. Edinger (1997) also emphasises that friluftsliv involves seeing nature as a value in itself. This distinction of friluftsliv as a goal in itself or as a means to attain something else is also discussed by Zeuthen-Jeppesen and Laursen (1997) who emphasise that the intrinsic values of friluftsliv result in difficulties in defining the concept (p. 39).

Sandell (2003) discusses friluftsliv from different perspectives. When studying friluftsliv as an object of research and from a social perspective, he stresses the importance of having a broad definition of what might be regarded as friluftsliv. However, in political debates, Sandell argues for a more limited and explicit definition. There is also a personal and educational perspective, which includes the possibility of arguing for different values in friluftsliv. Therefore, the consequences of discussing friluftsliv from particular perspectives are dependent on the context of discussion.
Deviating features in *friluftsliv*

As previously mentioned, there are influential practitioners, debaters and researchers involved in emphasising deviating features in relation to the official definitions of *friluftsliv* in Sweden and Norway. In the ambition to stress that returning to civilisation is not a necessity for human needs such as food and sleep, *the life in nature* seems to be one of these expressed features (Faarlund, 1974, p. 63-64; Öhman 1999, p. 6). This is also emphasised by Tordsson (1993, p. 32) and Tellnes (1985) who calls attention to *the free and uncivilised nature*, not restricted by civilisation, and that the main purpose with the practice should be to obtain *experiences of nature*. The *resistance towards consumption and commercialism* has also been emphasised in some discussions of *friluftsliv* (Sandell, 2001a, p. 186). The *absence of competition* is stressed by Mytting & Bischoff (1999, p. 40-46) and Breivik (1978, p. 7-16) as well as the fact that *friluftsliv* involves *specific activities* such as skiing, cycling, hiking, hunting, fishing, etc. The Swedish organisation “Friluftsfrämjandet” (2006), suggest that apart from experiences of nature, *friluftsliv* should also involve *physical exercise*. These deviations from the official definition could be seen as a way to occupy a specific position in a field, by emphasising distinctive features of *friluftsliv*.

*Friluftsliv*: an international concept?

Research into the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* is also starting to spread to an international audience. In Canada, the outdoor journal “Pathways” has devoted entire issues to the presentation of the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* and several international contributions have also resulted in an anthology discussing the phenomenon (Henderson & Vikander, 2007). The fact that international researchers are beginning to study a Scandinavian phenomenon can be interpreted as a sign that *friluftsliv* might have the potential to become a concept further used outside Scandinavia (Beames, 2002; Cusack, 2002; Duenkel & Pratt, 2001; Henderson, 2001a; Pendleton, 1983; Priest, 1997).

Although there is some turbulence caused by the practitioners, debaters and researchers claiming deviating values when discussing the legitimate way to define *friluftsliv*, nonetheless the Swedish and Norwegian governments have their official standpoints that contribute to some stability to the field. However, the expressions of instability indicate that a legitimate definition of *friluftsliv* is something worth struggling for. There is every reason to believe that these distinctive features of *friluftsliv* could also be expressed among PE teachers and, particularly, among PE teacher educators who are specialised in teaching *friluftsliv*. Before I try to summarize the values associated with *friluftsliv*, I will give a brief outline of its historical development.
The history of friluftsliv in Scandinavia

In this section, I give a brief summary of the history of what has been called the tradition of friluftsliv in order to better understand its position in Swedish PE and Swedish PETE. Even though my study concerns the Swedish context of friluftsliv, I will also discuss the corresponding conditions in Norway and Denmark. In the international literature that deals with friluftsliv, these three countries are often referred to as “the Nordic countries” although they actually constitute Scandinavia. The exclusion of Finland and Iceland, also Nordic but not Scandinavian countries, in this context is probably due to problems of translation.

The first green wave

The origin of friluftsliv is claimed to be found in the period of Romanticism in the late 18th century. The French-Swiss educator Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), the founder of German gymnastics Johann Christoph Friedrich Guts Muts (1759-1839) and the Swedish botanist Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) are all of great significance for the spreading of an interest in nature during a period stretching from the 1780s to the 1820s. This period has been called the first green wave.

All over Europe, people engaged in the search for an ideal of wild, uncivilized and genuine nature. The interest for spiritualism and mysticism, expressed in organic nature, increased as a reaction against the rationalism characteristic of the Age of the Enlightenment. From having been considered frightening, nature now became a place for activity and recreation for body and soul. Although not preceding the discovery of the Alps, the landscape in Scandinavia formed an interesting motif for painters all over Europe, especially the Norwegian landscape with its dramatic mountains. Most influenced by these new ideas were educated townspeople. For them friluftsliv became one way to realize the ideal of the common people, folk culture and closeness to nature (Blom & Lindroth, 1995, p. 112 & 119-122; Eichberg & Jespersen, 1986, p. 24-25 & 30-34; Tordsson, 2008, p. 55-56).

The mid-19th century saw a decrease in peoples’ interest in nature, along with the construction of new buildings for physical activity and training. In gymnasiuems, swimming baths and sport centres people were starting to engage in physical activities that were earlier performed in the outdoors. The walking and skiing tours in Scandinavia still continued but were overshadowed by the new cultural expressions of bodily exercise that took place in the new buildings and facilities, some of which had the competitive and organised character of English sport (Eichberg & Jespersen, 1986, p. 83-85).
The second green wave

By the beginning of the 20th century there was a revival of nationalism, Romanticism and a longing for the wilderness, referred to by Eichberg and Jespersen as the second green wave (1986, p. 97). Along with the industrialisation and the urbanisation of Sweden, the former peasant landscape, using nature as a source for agricultural production, was now beginning to change into a landscape for consumption. Once again it was the affluent middle classes who were attracted by the exotic and magnificent sceneries of uncivilised nature. Influenced by their patriotism and by the idea of the genuine peasant society, the middle classes were engaged in reproducing the myth of Sweden as natural and safe, unaffected by class conflicts and alienation (Frykman & Löfgren, 1979, p. 45-61). The middle classes’ search for a national identity able to replace the disappearing rural villages, along with an increasing interest for environmental protection and the development of leisure, were important factors for the Swedes’ relation to environment and nature (Sandell & Sörlin, 2008a, p. 10-15).

Several important organizations for the promotion of friluftsliv were founded in Sweden during this period. The Swedish Tourist Association (1885) focused on developing opportunities for Swedes to get to “know their own landscape” by the construction of trail marks and lodging-houses (Sandell, 2008, p. 87-94). “Föreningen för skidlöpningens främjande i Sverige” (The Association for Promotion of Skiing in Sweden) (1892), later developed into “Friluftsfrämjandet” (Friluftsliv-promoters), originally focused mainly on skiing competitions for well-educated middle-class men, but were later developed into promoting friluftsliv for the general public. The founding of the Scout movement in England (1907) also spread to Sweden, with their aim both to develop the character of young people and to protect the environment by using friluftsliv as a method (Sandell & Sörlin, 2008b, p. 27-45). These organisations were important for the spreading of friluftsliv among the Swedes in the beginning of the 20th century.

During this time, a lot of local associations were also founded around activities like skiing, skating, cycling and orienteering. In the development of these activities into competitive sports, the associations were changed into sport clubs (Blom & Lindroth, 1995, p. 190-201). This development of differentiation, resulting in new environments and subcultures in both friluftsliv and sport is also described by Eichberg and Jespersen in their historical description of the Danish friluftsliv (1986, p. 96-183).

Skiing as a symbol of friluftsliv

Skiing has always been a symbol for friluftsliv in Sweden, and during the 20th century also a national sport. The winter landscape and the mountains have contributed to the development of skiing as an important conveyer of
friluftsliv. This is probably even more the case in Norway where back country skiing tours and walks in the mountains are associated with a national identity and culture (Richardsson, 1994, p. 47-69). The roots of the strong Norwegian identification with their landscape and skiing are also related to the polar explorer Fridtjof Nansen, who is described as a role model for the Norwegian tradition of friluftsliv. His tour across Greenland in 1888 gave skiing international attention and the Norwegians a strong sense of patriotism (Tordsson, 2008, p. 56-57). A life close to nature, characterised by simplicity and being able to mentally and physically detach oneself from civilisation are some of the distinctive features in Nansen’s way of practising friluftsliv, symbolising the entire Norwegian friluftsliv tradition (Breivik, 1989; Repp, 2001).

The Right of Public Access
An important aspect of the development of friluftsliv in Sweden was the founding of The Right of Public Access to nature. The basic purpose was to provide the Swedish public with opportunities for walking, running, cycling, riding, skiing and camping without restrictions of access to the countryside as long as no one is disturbed and nothing in nature is destroyed (Sandell, 2008, p. 84-86). Sandell (2009) claims that the accessibility to the landscape involved in The Right of Public Access has been of utmost importance for the development of a sustainable environment in Sweden noting that public access to nature in Norway and Finland is also similar to conditions in Sweden.

It is important to emphasize that The Right of Public Access in Sweden is not a general law, but more of a confidence given to the general public. This non-regulated confidence has been expressed as both its advantage and its vulnerability. On the one hand, it affords people excellent opportunities to participate in the landscape and can thereby create a close relationship to, and respect for, living nature. On the other hand, it can make people unsure of what is legally allowed (McIntyre, 2000, p. 236-259). The Right of Public Access in Sweden, and its corresponding incarnations in the other Nordic countries, has been an important condition for the development of peoples’ relationship to nature.

The third green wave
As a consequence of the increasing urbanisation and industrialisation in Sweden, people had more leisure time. At the same time, the authorities were becoming more concerned with protecting the environment from the human exploitation of natural resources. Leisure and friluftsliv thereby became political issues. In the 1930s and 1940s leisure was practically synonymous with friluftsliv (Eskilsson, 2008). Political interest in protecting the
natural environment resulted in a number of laws being constituted or revised. In 1938 there was a bill regulating building close to water and in 1940 another bill concerned the establishment of leisure reserves for citizens in densely populated areas. In the beginning of the 1960s there was a new Nature Conservation Act where conditions for establishing nature reserves were laid down. This led to an increase in physical planning for society’s use of the countryside (Sandell, 2000, p. 96-98).

The third green wave occurred in the 1960s and the 1970s and was characterised by a rapid rise in the interest in nature and environment on all levels in society. New movements were established in Sweden (e.g. Argaladei in 1969) as well as internationally (e.g. Greenpeace in 1971), that had key issues such as non-commercialism and environmental protection. The issues central to these movements also increased in political and media importance. Along with the increasing commitment to nature and the environment during this period, tendencies towards individualisation, commercialisation and medialisation resulted in new types of friluftsliv with more adventurous and trend-sensitive characteristics. In his study of Danish friluftsliv, Andkjær (2008) states that adventurous activities can be reflected in tendencies characterising late modern society. In his study of outdoor activities as a sociocultural phenomenon he finds adventure activities to be more common in New Zealand compared to Denmark. Further he argues that the simple friluftsliv, in many ways a culture fostering values opposite to those of late modern society, still holds a position among the outdoor activities practised in Denmark (p. 378-401).

The third green wave has thus contributed to a further differentiation in outdoor practices (Johansson, 1999, p. 150-151). Ahlström (2008) suggests that this development has resulted in several groups of interest claiming the same goals (i.e. everyone’s access to nature), but that their different means of attaining these goals have led to conflicts of interests. He also argues that values such as experience of nature, silence and peacefulness have been replaced by an orientation towards activities, equipment, constructions and facilities (p. 174-182).

Scandinavian traditions of friluftsliv

As previously mentioned, the Scandinavian countries each claim to have their own tradition of friluftsliv with its own characteristics. However, it is worth asking whether these countries have something in common that would constitute an essence of what is referred to as the Scandinavian or Nordic tradition of friluftsliv? Several Norwegian researchers claim the tradition of friluftsliv to be a unique Norwegian phenomenon. Faarlund (1994) stresses that friluftsliv in Norway has a more limited usage, more related to philosophical ideas of ecology, compared to the situation in Sweden and Denmark.
Swedes and Danes use the term *friluftsliv* too – but apply it also to races on groomed ski tracks, painstakingly marked trails through rural farmland, or cabin-cruising through crowded holiday archipelago (Faarlund, 1994, p. 24).

Dahle’s (2007) concrete expressions of typical Norwegian *friluftsliv* are the long walks and ski tours made at weekends by families and friends. Danish researchers describe the *friluftsliv* in Denmark as being a part of a Scandinavian tradition, though not as developed as in Sweden and Norway. This is thought to be due to the lack of education in *friluftsliv* and also because of the restrictions on countryside access to free nature in Denmark (Ulstrup, 2001). Another factor leading to the subordinate position of *friluftsliv* in Denmark is the lack of a description of the main ideas in *friluftsliv* with reference to conditions in Denmark (Dahl, 1997). Given the increasing number of publications dealing with *friluftsliv* in Denmark, however, perhaps this situation is changing (see e.g. Andkjær, 2008; Bentsen et al., 2009).

The long coastline and large archipelago have always been of great importance for the Danish *friluftsliv*. Based on geographical similarities, the British Isles have been a source of inspiration for the development of different kinds of boats and ships and ways of using them. The kayak is also said to be a characteristic expression of *friluftsliv* in Denmark, corresponding to skis for Swedes and Norwegians (Edinger, 1997). In agreement with Sandell (2001b) and Andkjær (2008), my interpretation is that individuals’ relationship to historical and cultural landscapes involved in time spent outdoors is what separates the Scandinavian or Nordic tradition of *friluftsliv* from more activity-focused outdoor traditions in, for example, North America and New Zealand. I also think that The Right of Public Access, although with some minor differences between the Nordic countries, has contributed to peoples’ relationship to nature and *friluftsliv*, a tradition involving less emphasis on wilderness and more on culture. The characteristics of the different landscapes and the activities performed there, can also be interpreted as separate traditions of *friluftsliv* for each of the Scandinavian countries: Norway with its high mountains and skiing and walking tours; Denmark with its coastline and kayaking and boating; Sweden as a mixture of both of these landscapes in combination with its large areas of forests.

Values in the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv*

This summary of the values in the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* is intended to form a basis for the further examination of *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE and PETE contexts. In addition to the values expressed in the official Swedish definition (experiences of nature; resistance to competition; health; cultural perspectives on the landscape) there are also others such as: environmental awareness; simplicity; folksiness; free and uncivilised nature;
fostering of character; resistance towards consumption and commercialism; ecological perspectives; and mindfulness. When discussing educational expressions of *friluftsliv* further on in the thesis, I use the values expressed in the official Swedish definition (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003) as my point of departure but I also consider other values mentioned. In the following, I try to illuminate which of the values assigned to *friluftsliv* outside the educational context that are of most importance for its expression within PE and PETE.
Friluftsliv in PE and PETE

Although my interest in this thesis is focused on friluftsliv as a specific element of PE, I also find it important to relate to the general issues discussed in PE, seen as a whole. An important part of my study concerns how friluftsliv is formulated in curriculum documents and therefore I also give a general description of governance processes in Swedish compulsory school. Further, research into teacher education in general and PETE in particular is significant for my study, and in this context extra attention will be given to the education in friluftsliv and other outdoor practises.

Research in PE

Research in PE has seen a dramatic increase during the last decade, in Sweden as well as internationally. The anthology, “The Handbook of Physical Education” (Kirk et al., 2006), is a recent effort to assemble the whole of international research into one single production. Some of the contributions in this work display a division in the field of PE research among representatives for strong research contexts in the US on one hand, and in Australia, New Zealand and the UK (and to some extent the rest of Europe) on the other. In short, this division originates from differences in theoretical standpoints and, further, what is considered significant research in the field of PE. PE research from the US can be described as having its main origin in a behaviouristic, empirical-analytical and natural scientific paradigm while the, somewhat more recent, European/Australian/New Zealand PE research is claimed to originate, mainly from a social constructivist, post-structuralist and critical paradigm (Tinning, 2006, p. 370-379). Although the mutual idea behind “The Handbook of Physical Education” has probably not resulted in “peace-making” concerning controversial research issues, the anthology gives a substantial review of questions and perspectives characterizing “the state of the art” in PE and PETE research. Since my thesis includes a critical analysis of how some of the conditions for the production of friluftsliv teaching within PE are constructed through social relations, I consider my point of departure from within a socially critical, constructivistic and structuralistic research tradition. Therefore, I have limited myself to focusing on the research corresponding to my questions and perspectives: research which ori-
ginates mainly from Europe, Australia and New Zealand. However, before I describe this research, I give an overall view of PE research in Sweden.

PE in Sweden
In the Swedish compulsory school, PE is an obligatory subject for all pupils to attend. Generally, it is taught once or twice a week in lessons usually ranging from 40 to 60 minutes. Although the regulations governing Swedish PE have changed through the implementation of new curriculum reforms, its core of content in terms of sport activities has more or less remained the same during the last five decades (Sandahl, 2005).

During the last decade, Swedish PE research has expanded significantly and a number of theses have been produced (see e.g. Ekberg, 2009; Isberg, 2009; Karlefors, 2002; Kougioumtzis, 2006; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2003; Lundquist Wanneberg, 2004; Sandahl, 2005; Tholin, 2006; Quennerstedt, 2006; Öhman, 2007; Larsson, 2009). In a recent issue of the journal “Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy”, especially assigned to Swedish research in sport pedagogy, Quennerstedt and Öhman (2008) describe how the strong physiological tradition within Swedish PE has lately been challenged by a health discourse, a tendency which is also reflected internationally. This development in Sweden has occurred in connection with the latest curriculum reform (1994) when the name “Idrott” (Sport) was changed into “Idrott och hälsa” (Sport and Health). Further, it is suggested that a strong discourse in Swedish PE contains the message that the pupils should be physically active, have a positive attitude and perspire during the lessons (Öhman & Quennerstedt, 2008).

A significant part of the growing research within Swedish PE originates from a number of research programmes implemented during the last decade. Two of these programmes are “Skola-Idrott-Hälsa” (School-Sport-Health), from which some of the empirical material in this thesis has been gathered, and “Kön-Idrott-Skola” (Gender-Sport-School) (Larsson & Redelius, 2008). Another programme is the national evaluation of the PE subject in Sweden (Quennerstedt et al., 2008). The reports from these programmes indicate that Swedish PE teaching is dominated by a sport and physical activity discourse and that the practical skills involved in performing these activities appear to be one of the most important grounds for assessment (Larsson & Redelius, 2008; Redelius et al., 2009). Swedish PE also appears to be an active promoter of the social construction of gender (Larsson et al., 2007), a feature also characterising PE in other countries such as Australia (Hunter, 2004) and the UK (Brown, 2005). Teaching practices involving health, motoric skills, ergonomics, swimming, dance and friluftsliv, all elements emphasised in the national Swedish PE curriculum, appear to be marginalised in Swedish PE teaching (Larsson & Redelius, 2004; Quennerstedt et al., 2008).
Governance of PE in Sweden

The last two curriculum reforms in the compulsory school in Sweden (1980 and 1994) have involved a gradual change in the way school subjects are governed. The national curriculum has moved from stipulating how and what to teach into stipulating aims for the pupils to achieve. This has also been mentioned as a movement from centralised governance into decentralised governance where teachers are given significant responsibility for interpretation of curriculum wordings (Larsson, 2004; Larsson & Redelius, 2008). In subject matter PE, the discussion of the problems made visible in relation to the national Swedish curriculum, have been intensified during the last ten years (Larsson & Redelius, 2004).

On a national level, Swedish compulsory school is governed by aims for the pupils to achieve. These are stipulated by The Swedish National Agency of Education (SNAE) 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 (SNAE, 2009). In the national Swedish PE curriculum there are two aims that concern friluftsliv:

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

Grade 9: Pupils should be able to plan and carry out a field trip in the countryside during different seasons of the year (SNAE, 2000).

It should be emphasised that friluftsliv is one of the few elements (together with dance, swimming, orienteering and handling emergencies related to water) specifically mentioned as an aim for the pupils to achieve. In the aims stipulated in these national documents there is no specific mention of popular sport activities such as track and field, football, ice-hockey, volleyball, gymnastics, cross country skiing etc. Instead it is up to the PE teacher to make his/her own interpretation of what content and methods to use in order to achieve the aims.⁵

Curriculum studies in PE

Since the national and local curricula that govern education form part of the conditions underlying the production of teaching in friluftsliv there is reason to look at curriculum studies in PE. It should be emphasised that the concept curriculum, in the Swedish context, refers to the text document, laid down by the parliament to govern school education, whereas it generally has a wider

⁵ For an extended discussion of the historical development of friluftsliv within the curriculum of Swedish compulsory school, see Paper I in this thesis.
meaning, including teaching practice, in English-speaking countries (Forsberg, 2007). Documents governing teaching on a local level are referred to as syllabi in the Swedish school context.

Drawing from Penney’s (2006) extensive review, international PE curriculum studies appear to be a relatively well-developed area of research. On a national curriculum level, there are examples of an earlier specification of traditional sport activities being replaced by more interdisciplinary intentions and aims, as in the Swedish context. In Germany, this has been illuminated by Kolb (1998) and in parts of Australia, Key Learning Areas have been introduced. In the last Australian curriculum reform, Health and Physical Education constitutes one such area. According to Macdonald and Glover (1997), PE-teachers have a strongly classifying attitude towards what can and cannot count as PE-content. When PE-teachers’ expertise and values are questioned through curriculum reforms, this usually leads to strong opposition and a surveillance of subject boundaries. In Australia, this has been made visible in the reorganisation of subjects into more integrated categories of knowledge.

Kirk and MacDonald (2001) have questioned teachers’ possibilities of engaging in the implementation of curriculum reforms and being a part of the production of new and interdisciplinary areas of learning. Based on their position in the reform process, teachers become receivers of already established decisions, a process claimed to be both “pseudo-participatory and quasi-democratic” (p. 565). PE teachers’ difficulties with governing the direction of their subject has also been claimed to depend upon the political debate. In an issue of “The Curriculum Journal”, especially assigned to PE-research, Evans and Davies (1997) emphasise that the valuations within PE are at risk of being transformed in accordance with valuations on the economic market.

Debate on the PE curriculum has been framed not in terms of the needs of pupils, nor the development of the subject but, rather, in terms of the needs of the economy, social order, elite performance and the interests of sport (Evans & Davies, 1997, p. 187).

With specific regard to Swedish PE, there are a few examples of curriculum studies, among which some include analysis of the local context (Ekberg, 2009; Karlefors, 2002; Kougioumtzis, 2006; Larsson, 2004; Tholin, 2006; Quennevestedt, 2006). The gap between the national Swedish PE curriculum and the local schools’ syllabi documents is emphasised by Tholin (2006). He claims this to be due to a low degree of professionalism among Swedish teachers as well as a lack of competence development. He also emphasises the weak influence of pupils on teaching and assessment and, in relationship with this, the teachers’ position of power (p. 190-196). Larsson (2004) reasons that part of the explanation why the national PE curriculum is trans-
formed into mere sports and physical activities on the local level is PE teachers’ ambition to be able to assess the pupils according to measurable aims (p. 224). International as well as Swedish research appears thus to indicate that there are several different factors and actors involved in the process of transforming the directions in curricular text documents into teaching practices.

**Friluftsliv, outdoor education and adventure education in PE**

The valuation of *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum seems to have its international counterpart in the emphasis on outdoor education or adventure education as parts of the PE curriculum in countries such as the UK (Cooper, 2000; Davies, 1992; Williams, 1994), parts of Australia (Brooks, 2002; Brown, 2006), Canada (Cousineau, 1989), New Zealand (Boyes, 2000; Zink & Burrows, 2008) and parts of the US (Bunting, 2006). Although I do not claim *friluftsliv*, outdoor education and adventure education to be synonymous, some similar values are associated with these practices when expressed in the PE context.

Outdoor education in PE

In the UK, outdoor education originates from the establishment of the Scout movement at the beginning of the 20th century. Around this time, organisations were founded with the aim to foster youths in citizenship through encounters with nature and woodcraft. Camps, hikes and studies of nature were used as methods for developing practical skills (Öhman, forthcoming). Literally translated, outdoor education corresponds to the Swedish word “utomhuspedagogik”, a teaching practice often used in Swedish preschool and at the junior level in compulsory school. In the international context, outdoor education is often referred to as “education in, for, and about the outdoors” (Donaldson & Donaldson, 1958) or as “interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary...an approach to achieving the goals and objectives of the curriculum” (Hammerman, et al., 1985). The value of outdoor education is claimed on the basis of perspectives of social development (Payne, 2002; Quay et al., 2003), environmental awareness (Thomas, 2005b; O’Connel et al., 2005) and equality (Humberstone, 1993; Paechter, 2006).

Adventure education in PE

In a chapter of “The Handbook of Physical Education”, Brown (2006) discusses adventure education within PE. In accordance with Boyes (2000), he
emphasises the lack of consensus regarding the use of concepts in the field and suggests adventure education to be subordinate to the more comprehensive term outdoor education. According to Öhman (forthcoming), the aim of adventure education is to create physical and mental challenges in a natural environment. This teaching practice has connections with the Outward Bound tradition and includes risk-taking as an important part of the experience. Brown (2006) suggests that student-centred pedagogy and an innovative and holistic approach to movement, values often claimed to be a causal effect of adventure education, are in many cases based on pre-assumptions rather than empirical research. He also argues that the environmental setting associated with adventure education can involve educational implications from a perspective of equity.

...whilst it might be argued that adventure education can only be conducted in 'natural' or 'wilderness settings', (…) this restricts adventure education to too narrow a group of programs and too small a potential participant base (Brown, 2006, s. 685).

Implementation of outdoor education and adventure education in PE

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. In the absence of empirical evidence for this argument, 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 criticised. 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; Chapell & Wiggins, 1997; Humbertone, 1993). A common phenomenon in British schools is the substitution of outdoor education by orienteering (Harris, 1999). Zink and Burrows (2008) notes the unquestioned assumption that the outdoors is often emphasised as being a natural and good learning environment and they also argue that this attitude is reproduced by teacher education and carried further into the schools’ curriculum. However, it has also been claimed that we still do not know much of what is actually taught within adventure and outdoor education in PE (Brown, 2006).

Burrus-Bammel and Bammel (1990) call attention to issues of a physical and organisational character involved in the implementation of outdoor education. 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. Expressions of 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). Dyson and O’Sullivan (1998) emphasise interdisciplinary cooperation and integration as well as shared responsibility and decision-making as conditions for the implementation of outdoor projects in schools.

When reviewing literature on outdoor teaching practices, three features have appeared significant to me. Firstly, there is an emphasis on difficulties of physical and organisational kinds connected to the implementation of outdoor teaching. Secondly, assumptions regarding the effects of outdoor teaching are beginning to be questioned. Thirdly, there is an anxiety about whether or not values connected to outdoor education and adventure education can find their expression within the PE context. There are reasons to believe that these features, to some extent, also characterise the teaching of friluftsliv within Swedish PE.

Friluftsliv in Swedish PE

According to the regulations governing the Swedish compulsory school, the school principal is responsible for decisions regarding to what extent friluftsliv is to be taught and by which teachers (SNAE, 1994). The fact that friluftsliv is an aim in the national PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000a) and is not mentioned in the general curriculum or in national curricula for other subjects, is probably a reason why many Swedish teachers and principals consider friluftsliv to “belong” to PE. As in the international context of outdoor teaching, factors of a physical and organisational character such as time, size of group, finances, facilities and access to outdoor environments have been proven to control Swedish PE teachers’ possibilities of achieving the aims for PE, and among them the aims for friluftsliv (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). These conditions might be part of the answer to why the teaching of friluftsliv has proven to be limited, replaceable and why the majority of the pupils claim their lack of knowledge in friluftsliv is difficult to assess (Backman, 2004; Quennerstedt et al., 2008).

One specific phenomenon in the Swedish school is the so-called friluftsliv day, that is, a whole day specifically assigned to friluftsliv and involving both pupils and staff of the schools. In previous curriculum reforms, the number of these days was regulated in the general national curriculum but as from the latest curriculum reform in 1994, it is up to the local schools to decide whether they want to arrange friluftsliv days or not. However, it should be emphasised that even today there are not many schools that do not hold any friluftsliv days at all (Backman, 2004). The development of friluftsliv days in the Swedish compulsory school highlights two, somewhat contradictory features. The idea of devoting one or more whole days suggest
that teaching *friluftsliv* is a project demanding both cooperation between school staff and more time than that offered by the ordinary school schedule. Simultaneously, the non-regulation of *friluftsliv* days in the last curriculum reform means that the responsibility for teaching *friluftsliv* in Swedish schools has moved from involving all the staff to a concern for PE teachers alone.

In accordance with the international literature on outdoor teaching practices in PE, *friluftsliv* in the Swedish school context is claimed to contribute with values that differ to some degree from those dominating PE. According to Sundberg and Öhman (2008) *friluftsliv* can “represent an alternative movement culture, characterised by the joy of movement, sensibility and cooperation, where the experience of nature is in focus” and could thereby be a “guide for other physical activities in PE” (p. 116, my translation). Sandell (2007) also suggests that the view of nature and environment mediated through the teaching of *friluftsliv* is decisive for its potential to lead to environmental awareness. There is some attention devoted to the pedagogical potential involved in knowledge of historical and cultural perspectives on the landscape (Brügge & Sandell, 2007). Further, in contrast to the predetermined patterns of body-movement, and the focus on competition and physical achievements characterising a significant part of the physical activities and sports offered to children today, it is suggested that *friluftsliv* involves opportunities for more of open and non-predetermined encounters with the body (Öhman & Sundberg, 2004). The potential of health involved in *friluftsliv* is emphasised by Quennerstedt et al. (2007). Brügge et al. (2007b) also highlights possibilities of integrating school subjects when teaching *friluftsliv*. This is a pedagogical method that is said to involve the different senses and thereby contribute to a deeper learning.

Altogether, it appears that *friluftsliv* and its international counterparts such as outdoor education and adventure education are important parts of the PE curriculum. When expressed as a teaching practice within Swedish PE, *friluftsliv* is associated with values such as cooperation; resistance towards competition; integration of school subjects; holistic learning; historical and cultural perspectives on the landscape; environmental awareness; non-predetermined body encounters; health; and, experiences of nature. Almost all of these values are also expressed in the international literature on outdoor education and adventure education. I have found that values of risk, challenge, adventure and safety are mentioned in relation to adventure education and a resistance to focus on technical skills and movement skills is mentioned in relation to outdoor education. However, these expressions are not to be found in literature on *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE.

Based on the fact that there seem to be difficulties regarding the transformation of *friluftsliv* from curriculum documents into actual teaching, there is reason to explore what occurs during this transformation. I have been inspired by Bernstein’s theory of how pedagogic messages are constructed,
produced and communicated through social relations. Before I go deeper into this theoretical approach, I would like to illuminate PETE research in general and research on friluftsliv education within PETE in particular. Perhaps some of the difficulties proven to surround teaching in friluftsliv and other outdoor practices on a school level can be made more comprehensible in the light of teacher education in friluftsliv within PETE?

**Research in PETE**

In this thesis, I have considered education in friluftsliv within PETE to constitute a condition that may have an influence on the production of teaching in friluftsliv within Swedish PE. In order to understand the context in which teacher education in friluftsliv is implemented, I will begin by describing PETE from a general perspective.

**Dominating perspectives and privileged knowledge**

In one of several contributions to the field of PETE-research, Tinning (2006) emphasises the importance of paying attention to the variation in contextual setting in different countries. It is reasonable to expect that the academic context of PETE is more differentiated than PE on the school level. Therefore, there are reasons not to assume PETE issues in one country to be valid worldwide.

Tinning and Glasby (2002) have described some of the existing and non-existing activities and perspectives in PE and PETE in Australia and New Zealand. They argue that many potential opportunities in PE and PETE are lost by the particular representations of privileged and marginalised knowledge. Elements such as Western European Diet, body image, motor skills, biomechanics, exercise physiology, fitness, team sports, mental health and drugs are some of the elements referred to as privileged knowledge in PE and PETE. Politics, back health, dance, individual Eastern movement forms, disabilities, ethnicities and sexualities are some of the elements referred to as marginalised knowledge.

Tinning (2006) has also discussed educational implications of different theoretical orientations dominating PETE during certain periods. In the behaviouristic tradition for example, interest has been focused on the efficiency of teaching and the teacher as instructor of “correct” movements. The differences between the behaviouristic tradition and the critical tradition are described as follows.

Some teacher educators define or set the key problems of pedagogy as, ‘How can we train student teachers to become effective teachers?’ Other define
them as, ‘How can we produce teachers who have a critical social perspective and who will work to build a just society?’ (Tinning, 1991, p. 3)

Despite the late expansion of constructivist and socially critical research, Tinning (2006) claims PETE mainly to be a conservative and reproductive research context that gives little space for new and innovative questions and perspectives (p. 380-381). In his early works he has described PETE as a promoter of performance pedagogy rather than a critical and post-modern pedagogy (Tinning, 1991).

PETE’s relationship to the PE curriculum

In a study of PE and PETE in Australia and New Zealand, Tinning (2004) and Macdonald et al. (2002) emphasise the disjunctions between curriculum documents and teacher education programmes. They claim that the establishment of a Key Learning Area, constituted by the former separate subjects of health education, physical education, home economics and outdoor education, have not contributed to an adjustment of the educational content of PETE. The isolation and specialisation within universities and departments around courses in exercise science, physical education, health promotion and nutrition is described as delimiting for teacher students’ approach to new constructions of interdisciplinary areas of knowledge.

Tinning (2004) explores assumptions about essential knowledge that are built into PETE and he discusses what sort of teacher education is necessary and desirable in order to prepare future PE teachers. He argues that alternative ways to think of the body, health, education and the world in general, apart from the traditional discourses of science in former PETE, do not appear in the official curricula of most PETE departments. He suggests that,

…one of the consequences of this situation is that the dominance of science within the knowledge systems that underpin the sub-discipline knowledge of HPE reinforces and fosters a search for order and certainty. Students schooled in anatomy and physiology prefer facts and ‘black or white’ answers, and are often uncomfortable with ‘grey’ and questions without simple answers (Tinning, 2004, p. 248-249).

His “solution” to the problem with the students’ search for facts is that PETE must develop the students’ sociological imagination and connect them with the uncertainties associated with teaching post-modern youth.

It is interesting to note that the curriculum reform of PE in Australia and New Zealand in the early nineties, with emphasis on health education and socially critical perspectives, has had a corresponding development in Sweden (SNAE, 2000a). The identification of certain issues and knowledge in PETE and PE as being especially valuable are in some respects easily transferable to a Swedish context.
In an exploration of Norwegian PETE, Dowling (2008) found that “gender talk seems to evoke strong emotional reactions, often negative feelings, while at the same time, gender equity concerns remain on the periphery of the discipline” (p. 247). In addition to this, Wright (2002) and Brown (2005) have illuminated the difficulties for PETE to challenge traditional and embodied gender patterns.

A review of international research indicates that the privileged issues in PETE are more concerned with knowledge of a technical and instrumental character, influenced by a tradition of science and the context of sport, than with changes in curriculum and society in general. These observations might be of significance for understanding expressions of outdoor education within PETE. However, based on the Swedish context, one can say that the emphasis on friluftsliv in the last curriculum reform (SNAE, 2000a) corresponds to the extent of teaching in friluftsliv within PETE. It appears as if some of the changes in the PE curriculum have a more direct impact on the teaching in PETE than others.

PETE in Sweden

Teacher education in Sweden varies from 3.5 to 5 years in duration. Today, most teacher students study to teach at least two school subjects. PE teacher students can choose between 16 PETE departments in Sweden and the total length of the specific PETE courses varies from one to two years. The length of the degree programme varies with regard to choice of department, choice of courses and whether the programme targets primary, lower secondary or upper secondary school. At present, teacher education in Sweden is facing a reform that will very likely influence how Swedish PETE is constituted in the future (Swedish Ministry of Education and Research, 2010).

In one of few Swedish studies, Annerstedt (1991) has described the influence of sport within PETE as a conflict between the interests of educating coaches for the Swedish sports movement, on one hand, and on the other to provide for the need of well educated PE teachers in school (p. 123). His study also highlights the former PE teacher students’ critique of their education as divorced from reality, in lack of adaptation to school conditions and as focused on developing physical skills and skills in sport (ibid, p. 241-245). In a later study, Annerstedt and Bergendahl (2002) made several important observations regarding Swedish PETE. Among other things, they were able to detect significant differences in formal competence among PE teacher educators. They also revealed weak links to research and considerable adaptation to the school PE syllabus and teaching conditions. One of the more significant debates within Swedish PETE seems to concern whether the degree programme should be adapted to school conditions or to the academic context (in Sweden expressed as “the training college tradition” and “the university tradition”). This debate was clearly expressed in the study by
Annerstedt and Bergendahl (ibid), and several of the interviewed PE teacher educators expressed concern about the dominance of the academic perspective over the school perspective (p. 73-81). Similarities can be seen in the way Tinning (2006) describes struggles between different orientations in teacher education (p. 369-370).

Larsson (2009) has analysed Swedish PETE and the students’ expectations of their education. From a cultural and sociological perspective she describes Swedish PETE as an arena where struggles for valuable positions are taking place. These struggles concern different views on what content teacher education should have and what the aim of the programme should be. Larsson (2009) emphasises movement skills in sport activities as an element assigned significant value by students as well as their teachers (p. 29-31). She also suggests that gender issues tend to be neglected and that activity-centred PETE in Sweden is an arena of reproduction rather than an arena for change (p. 290-299).

There is no mutual strategy expressed in order to change or make visible the construction of gender within the education. Rather, it appears to be an issue for the PE teacher educator’s own interest. (Larsson, 2009, p. 169, my translation)

Further, the connection to research, scholarly progression and issues on democracy are highlighted as potential areas of development within Swedish PETE (Larsson, 2008, p. 67-73).

One conclusion from this review is that the values expressed within Swedish PETE to some extent reflect the values expressed within international PETE. Swedish PETE appears to be an area involving positions and values that PE teacher educators find worth struggling for. In the following review of friluftsliv and outdoor education within PETE, and in my empirical studies contained in this thesis, some of these values might be expressed.

**Friluftsliv and outdoor education in PETE**

Today, there is a significant amount of literature on leadership and learning in “the outdoors” (see e.g. Miles & Priest, 1999; Ogilvie, 1993; Priest & Gass, 2005). In the international context of research it is difficult to identify the part of outdoor education (or corresponding educational practices) that specifically concerns PETE. Therefore, I have tried to highlight some of the issues recurring in both the Swedish as well as in the international context, although I have focused on education in friluftsliv within Swedish PETE. One of these issues concerns the importance of technical and movement skills in order to teach different outdoor teaching practices.
In several studies on the Australian context, Thomas (2005a, b, 2007) discusses the relationship between technical skills and environmental issues in higher education. He suggests that although technical and movement skills are basic qualities among outdoor leaders, this ability is not enough as an aim in itself. If environmental awareness is to be a consequence of outdoor education, this presupposes a balance between practical skills, theoretical understanding and a critical approach to environmental issues (2005b). Further, he questions the efficiency of direct instruction as a teaching method for the learning of skills and asks for more of student-centred and experience-based attitudes towards learning (2007, p. 18). He also discusses the meaning of place.

Practitioners would do well to carefully consider the impact that equipment, technology and skill development have on their participants’ experience of place. (Thomas, 2005a, p. 37)

From Larsson’s (2009) study, friluftsliv appears to occupy a position apart from other elements in Swedish PETE. In interviews with students as well as PE teacher educators, friluftsliv is expressed as one of the most positive values in the education (p. 147 & p. 251-253). However, Larsson claims the education in friluftsliv to be more of an investment in the individual project rather than adapted to the future profession of a PE teacher.

… the respondents’ expressions of friluftsliv do not include knowledge useful for the exercise of a future profession. Instead emphasis is put on the individual experience, to try something new and exciting, a kind of personal development. (Larsson, 2009, p. 225, my translation)

It may be that the valuation of personal development within friluftsliv education is at the expense of critical perspectives. Another observation from Larsson’s (2009) study is that the students’ notion of education in friluftsliv is primarily about friluftsliv during winter and the skiing trips included in the programme (p. 225). In a previous study of teacher education in friluftsliv, I have illuminated the long tradition and self-evident position of skiing trips within Swedish PETE (Backman, 2007). Apart from this study, and Larsson’s (2009) examination of Swedish PETE, in which friluftsliv holds a specific position, there is a general lack of research within this area. In a report on the educational content at two Swedish PETE departments, Schantz and Silvander (2004) claim the extent of friluftsliv to correspond to 10 percent of the compulsory courses and an additional 10 percent in the voluntary courses (p. 31-36).

As we have seen, there is a lack of research concerning conditions of Swedish PETE and also of the ambiguous position of friluftsliv within higher education in Sweden. These observations call for more studies of these areas. In order to make the position of education in friluftsliv at Swedish PETE
departments visible, I have carried out a brief comparison of their syllabus documents.

*Friluftsliv in curriculum documents within Swedish PETE*

PETE has seen a dramatic increase in Sweden during the last decade, from four departments in 1994 into 16 in 2006 (Meckbach et al., 2006). This has caused considerable variation in teaching content, which makes a comparison somewhat problematical.

I have collected information from the websites of the departments where my respondents are located. In my ambition to maintain the anonymity of the respondents, I will not reveal the sources of the departments here. The comparison is based on programme and specialisation courses in Swedish PETE that together amount to 90 ECTS (European Credit Transfer System).

When looking through the information concerning *friluftsliv* from the different departments it is possible to find some recurring themes. One kind of logic in the organisation of the teaching content, recurring at several of the departments, is that the physical activities specified in the curriculum for PE in the compulsory and the upper secondary school (*friluftsliv*, swimming, CPR, dancing and orienteering), are also expressed as especially valuable in the PETE curriculum.

The estimated extent of *friluftsliv* in Swedish PETE corresponds to 7.5-15 ECTS (sometimes even up to 22.5 ECTS) of the total of 90 ECTS. To specify the different elements in *friluftsliv*, the concept is often preceded by “summer” or “winter”, referring to the activities usually carried out during these seasons. Another way that the different activities are organised is by dividing them into colours. Blue *friluftsliv* includes activities carried out on water (kayaking, sailing, etc.), white *friluftsliv* means activities carried out on ice or snow (downhill skiing, backcountry skiing, skating, etc.) and green *friluftsliv* refers to activities carried out in the forest or in the mountains (walking, hiking, camping, etc.).

An element common to almost all PETE departments in Sweden, is that parts of the education in *friluftsliv* are not held at the university, but in places where an overnight stay is involved. It can be in the mountains (when involving snow, also expressed as winter education), by a lake or the sea or in a forest. To participate in these activities, the students often have to pay for some of the costs themselves, a fact that is often mentioned in the syllabi.

An overall impression of the literature in *friluftsliv* is that there is a wide variation in characteristics. The literature lists from most departments include a book called “*Friluftslivets pedagogik*” (The pedagogy of *friluftsliv*) (Brügge et al., 2007a) in which *friluftsliv* is discussed from social, philosophical, ideological and educational perspectives. Based on the fact that values such as: resistance towards competition; cultural perspectives on the landscape; health and environmental awareness are emphasised in Brügge et
al. (2007a), I have considered these features to be a part of the education in friluftsliv within Swedish PETE. Many of the departments also have literature of the “tips and advice” kind, recommending methods and technical aspects of practising friluftsliv. Research reports regarding empirical studies of friluftsliv as a part of PE, or of peoples’ habits in friluftsliv, are not frequent. The literature prescribed for the courses can be seen as an expression of what is valued in the friluftsliv taught within PETE and also seems to reflect the literature produced within the international field (Brown, 2006).

The values expressed in the review of literature and syllabus documents concerning friluftsliv within Swedish PETE are: personal development; skiing-trips; techniques; equipment; teaching methods; environmental awareness; health; experiences of nature; resistance towards competition; and, cultural perspectives on the landscape.

In the previous review I have tried to illuminate how friluftsliv and various outdoor teaching practices are expressed within the context of PE, on a school level as well as on a teacher education level. Socially critical analysis of school and higher education often adresses issues regarding the promotion and marginalisation of children and young people. Several studies indicate that PE appears to contribute to the construction of traditional gender patterns rather than to neutralise these patterns (see e.g. Dowling, 2008; Hunter, 2004; Larsson et al., 2007; Redelius et al., 2009). Therefore there are reasons to pay attention to how gender might have an influence on the teaching of friluftsliv.

**Friluftsliv and gender**

It has been claimed that friluftsliv and adventurous outdoor activities can compensate for the effects of the gender order within PE.

It may be that the co-operative nature of some outdoor adventure activities, if they can be prevented from becoming arenas for displays of masculine prowess, may give some possibilities for using PE to encourage more open, communicative and connective body practices and break the stranglehold that gender stereotypes have on the more traditional forms of PE and sport. (Paechter, 2006, p. 203)

Several of the interviewed PE teacher educators in Larsson’s (2009) Swedish study suggest teaching in friluftsliv to be unique in the sense that “there is nothing that encourages the creation of gender differences” (p. 162-163, my translation). Consequently, in Swedish PETE there would appear to be expressions for gender having less influence within outdoor teaching compared to other elements in PE. However, several studies call attention to the vigilance demanded regarding gender issues in PE (Brown, 2005; Dowling,
2008; Wright, 2002). The idea of outdoor teaching practices being gender-neutral has also been questioned (Dignan, 2002; Humberstone, 2000). *Friluftsliv* has been claimed to be a practice contributing to notions of masculinity and associated with traditional masculine attributes (Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001; Pedersen Gurholt, 2008). Humberstone suggests that the gender order also characterises outdoor teachers on different levels in the educational system.

The majority of providers of outdoor adventure activities are men, particularly at the more prestigious and influential positions such as in teacher education... whereas, at the grass roots...where the interpersonal and holistic approach is valued and less emphasis is placed upon technical skills, there is a higher percentage of women utilizing these activities safely and competently. (Humberstone, 1993, p. 222)

This opinion might seem somewhat generalising but was nevertheless confirmed in the division of men and women participating in my own study of PE teacher educators (Paper III and IV). In a study of the Norwegian PETE-context, Dowling (2008) points to the fact that her respondents seem to regard the qualities of men and women to be a product of genetics rather than of a social construction. She also calls attention to her respondents’ intolerance to deviations from the norm regarding sexuality, ethnicity and body figure. If this tendency also exists in Swedish PETE departments, it may provide part of an explanation to the proven difficulty of breaking with stereotypical gender patterns in Swedish PE (Larsson et al., 2007). It should be emphasised that gender issues were not my primary concern in the process of constructing my object of research. However, looking back I realise the importance of being vigilant about aspects where notions of gender might have had influence on my study.

It is reasonable to expect that part of the explanation of why teaching in *friluftsliv* is expressed in a certain way can be related to the background and individual preferences of the teacher. Therefore, I want to highlight research on PE teacher students and PE teacher educators.

**PE teacher students and their teachers**

**Becoming a teacher**

Several studies of teachers, teacher students and teacher education indicate that an individual’s early embodied preferences for specific practices, and the first impressions of the teaching profession, are more decisive for the socialisation process of becoming a teacher compared to the impact of
teacher education. Lortie’s (1975) sociological work emphasises the importance of the private experiences teachers have when entering their occupation. He implies that teachers’ primary learning is done through trial and error in the classroom and that they thus can be referred to as “self-made”.

Teachers seem to emerge from their induction experiences with a strongly biographical orientation to pedagogical decision-making (Lortie, 1975, p. 81)

Lortie also suggests that teachers do not claim to take part in a shared body of specialised knowledge or to contribute to “the state of the art”. Their incapacity to respond to society’s demands as a group and their individualistic conception of pedagogic practice and performance poses a threat to the teachers’ collective status (p. 55-81). The work of Marton and Booth (1997) also shows that students seldom use the concepts and theories they learn from their education.

In a Swedish study of pre-school teachers, four years after obtaining their degree, Hensvold (2003) argues that the teachers’ memories of their education are mainly focused on the learning in their group work and the organizational methodology and epistemology of problem based learning (PBL). The specific subject content or various theoretical perspectives are not areas that have made an impact on the pre-school teachers. The author raises the question: “How are such various perspectives to be clarified in teacher education?” (Hensvold, 2003, p. 158). However, Hultqvist and Palme (2006) emphasise that among the Swedish teacher students, generally recruited from lower social groups, there are some students with a strong cultural capital (which to some extent depends on the student’s social background) who develop the ability to decode the complexity of the content in the teacher education and thereby experience meaningfulness in their studies (p. 56-61).

PE teacher students
Annerstedt (1991) suggests that Swedish PETE’s possibility to have an impact on the content and methods in PE can be questioned. Instead he emphasises the individual’s early preferences for sport as more decisive for expressions of PE teaching (p. 146-152). The Swedish PE teacher student’s strong identification with sports and physical activity is also emphasised by Meckbach et al. (2006). Larsson’s (2009) study shows that Swedish PE teacher students are brought up in homes with a relatively low level of education and that the choice to become a teacher is often reproduced through generations (p. 212-214). Dewar and Lawson (1984) have found that the students recruited to PETE can be divided into two categories: those who are oriented to teaching and those who are oriented to coaching. They argue that these orientations have implications for the student’s attitude to the PE teacher profession. Green (2000) suggests that PETE has strengthened rather than
changed the ideas of sport and PE that the PE teacher students had before entering PETE. According to Templin (1979), arranging teaching that “works” is of priority for a teacher student entering the PE field. The described studies suggest that some factors, such as PE teacher students’ background and their preferences for sports activities, are more decisive than the educational content in PETE for what is implemented in PE teaching.

Perhaps there is no other route for the student teacher to follow. Regardless of training or entering ideology, the student teacher must maintain the basic requirements of the organization to protect his or her rite of passage into physical education (Templin, 1979, p. 491)

As suggested by Templin, the controlling function of some physical and organisational factors is also of great significance for PE teachers’ first experiences of teaching. Sparkes (1999) has shown that the identity of the PE teachers is strongly associated with maintaining a physically active lifestyle and being a practical “doer”. The research stresses the problem for teacher education in general, and for PETE in particular, of making an impact on students’ valuations, embodied preferences and expectations of their future occupation. There also seem to be difficulties in using the knowledge and perspectives from teacher education when entering the teacher occupation.

PE teacher educators

Despite the late expansion of PETE-research we still do not know much about the PE teacher educators and even less about the relationship between their personal biography and their practised pedagogy. Camacho and Fernández-Balboa (2006) suggest this condition to be due to the difficulties of adapting an open and critical approach to one’s own profession. Another explanation emphasised is that this type of research has traditionally not been considered to be scientifically reliable and has therefore not been published. As with PE teaching on the school level, Camacho and Fernández-Balboa are convinced that the individual biography is often reflected in PETE teaching practice.

…history is not something that happens to us; but, rather, something we construct daily with our actions (Camacho & Fernández-Balboa, 2006, p. 16).

In her work on the construction of PE teacher educators’ professional identities, Dowling (2006) touches upon the same topic. She argues that issues of democracy and social justice are often marginalised in comparison to PE teacher educators’ ambition to transfer their embodied and uncritical attitude towards sport and how it should be taught most effectively.
Being a PE teacher educator and undertaking continuing professional development seem largely to be individualistic in nature, and a reflection of biographical (sporting) interests rather than a reflection of a (pedagogical) collective, democratic subject culture (Dowling, 2006, p. 258).

On the basis of empirical material from one Swedish PETE department, Larsson (2009) emphasises that “the most common background for Swedish PE educators is, apart from an exam from PE teacher education, to have experience from a few years of PE teaching and to be a man” (p. 132). Further, she claims that Swedish PE teacher educators often have significant experience from competing in sports during their childhood and adolescence, which might have shaped their preferences for physical activities. Similarly to Annerstedt and Bergendahl (2002), the respondents’ in Larsson’s (2009) study shows scepticism towards what the call for a strengthening of academic competence in Swedish PETE might mean for educational content. She also stresses that “the supply of teachers that have a high competency in their subject knowledge as well as having reached an adequate academic level, is limited. Often, it is the smaller PETE departments which have difficulties in recruiting teachers with an adequate academic competence” (ibid, p. 132, my translation). An additional aspect in Larsson’s study (ibid) is that Swedish PE teacher educators appear to express their experience of, and interest in, friluftsliv (p. 134-135). This may indicate that the preference for friluftsliv is not only a distinguishing feature for the friluftsliv educators interviewed in my study, but perhaps also for Swedish PE teacher educators in general. This interest in friluftsliv can also be understood in relationship to the proven middle-class background among Swedish PE teacher educators (Erixon Ar- remain, 2008, p. 56-58).

**Summary of research**

The empirical material collected shows that this thesis concerns several areas of research. It has been clear to me that my questions regarding the teaching of friluftsliv, which is expressed as an important element in Swedish PE, also implies that I must relate to the context in which teaching in friluftsliv is to be implemented, i.e. Swedish PE.

Figure 1 is an attempt to illustrate the result of bringing together values emphasised within, firstly, the literature on the Scandinavian tradition of friluftsliv, secondly the literature on friluftsliv within Swedish PE and thirdly the literature and curriculum documents on friluftsliv within Swedish PETE.
Figure 1: Values expressed in the literature on the Scandinavian tradition of friluftsliv, in the literature on friluftsliv within Swedish PE and in the literature and curriculum documents on friluftsliv within Swedish PETE.

As seen from Figure 1, only a few of the expressed values within the three compared contexts are synonymous with each other (those in the triangle). In fact, four of these (with environmental awareness as an exception) are the values expressed in the official Swedish definition of friluftsliv (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003). There are several values that appear to be specific for whether friluftsliv is discussed in the Scandinavian tradition, in PE or in PETE. This might be seen as an expression of the dependency on context involved when bringing friluftsliv into school or into higher education. Friluftsliv seems to be differently constructed in different contexts. Whether or not the teaching of friluftsliv within Swedish PE and in Swedish PETE actually involves the values expressed, is an empirical question on which I hope my results can shed some light. The answer to this question will most likely depend on the conditions of its implementation. I also discuss the values expressed in Figure 1 in relationship to the results of my studies further on in the thesis.
In dealing with the questions of how pedagogical messages of *friluftsliv* are produced and communicated, I have found the theories and concepts of the British educational sociologist Basil Bernstein useful. There are probably several possible answers to why the teaching of *friluftsliv* is expressed in a certain way. I think some of these answers are to be found in PE teachers’ everyday working conditions. I also think that the answers must be sought in the individual biographies of PE teachers and their own education in *friluftsliv*. Therefore, I have also investigated what types of knowledge are being promoted in the education in *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE and what conditions underlie the production of this knowledge. For this purpose, I have used the theories and concepts of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. More specifically, I have taken note of his work on how positions in social contexts are a product of individual biographies and patterns of behaviour. In the following I give a fuller description of my interpretation of these perspectives.
Theoretical perspectives

A mutual point of departure

A somewhat cursory description of the mutual features of the two perspectives used in this thesis would be that they both focus on issues of equity, democracy and peoples’ right to equal conditions. Through investigations of cultural production in French society, Bourdieu has shown that in certain social contexts, specific strategies for action and valuation are developed. These strategies are reflected in the social structures of society and are further reproduced through generations. Thereby he explains why the embodied lifestyles of the middle class differ from the lifestyles of the working class (see e.g. Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu’s use of the concept of field offers an explanation to how dominance and subordination are produced in social contexts (Bourdieu, 1993; Bourdieu, 2000). Despite the fact that Bourdieu himself has dealt primarily with sociological issues outside school, his concepts have also been used in several studies of school and education (see Brown, 2005; Hultkvist & Palme, 2006; Hunter, 2004; Skawonius, 2005). It should be mentioned that key concepts such as field and capital are to be found in the work of Bourdieu as well as in the work of Bernstein and to a certain extent the two writers also relate to each other’s work. I discuss these matters later in the thesis.

The dimension of embodiment offered by Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, however, has no correspondence in the theories and concepts of Bernstein (Evans & Davies, 2006b, p. 211). Instead, Bernstein’s focus is on how the systems of school and education reproduce social inequalities (Bernstein, 2000; Sadovnik, 1995). These inequalities are maintained through the production of codes, i.e. principles regulating meaning, in which the possibilities for children and young people to orientate themselves differ. Codes depend on whether categories (for example subjects in school) are surrounded by distinct or blurred boundaries (classification) and to what extent the control of the teaching is weak or strong (framing) (Bernstein, 1971; Bernstein, 2000, p. 3-14). Both Bourdieu and Bernstein question the claimed ability of school and educational systems to compensate for the social hierarchies existing outside school (Bernstein, 2000, Introduction). A focus on structural
conditions and equity can therefore be described as common features of the works of both Bourdieu and Bernstein.

As mentioned in my review of research above, issues of gender are occasionally debated in outdoor education and friluftsliv. Although the discussion of my results will focus primarily on Bourdieu’s and Bernstein’s theories, I have the ambition to be vigilant to issues of gender and teaching in friluftsliv. In the preface to the anthology “Gender and Education” it is emphasized that ”gender is an important lens through which we can interpret the role of education in society…” (Arnot & Mac an Ghaill, 2006, preface). Being interested in social relations between groups of people, the different conditions offered for men and women in society are important to relate to. I believe the different perspectives mentioned, each in their own way, will contribute to making my investigation of the conditions for the production of the teaching of friluftsliv in Swedish PE more complete.

Curriculum theory according to Bernstein

In two anthologies dedicated to the work of Bernstein (Atkinson et al., 1995; Sadovnik, 1995), the educational systems’ part in the reproduction and the justification of social inequalities is emphasized. For the purpose of analysing these social inequalities, Bernstein have developed a system of concepts which has been widely acknowledged (see e.g. Arnot, 2002; Fitz et al., 2006; Morais, 2002; Singh, 2002) but also criticized for being too theoretical, indistinct and abstract (see e.g. Gibson, 1977; King, 1981). His work is summarized in the sequential series ”Class, codes and control”, comprising five volumes. In these volumes Bernstein’s interest shifts from ”the social class regulation on families and schools” into ”more general issues of symbolic control” and ”the processes whereby symbolic control and its modalities are realized…”. (1996, p. 12).

The first volume consists of Bernstein’s own studies on the sociology of language and here he also defines some of his most fundamental concepts. The paper “On the classification and framing of educational knowledge” is one of his most prominent contributions from this volume (1971). In the second volume, in collaboration with other sociologists, he applies this conceptual framework on the study of children’s language. The papers presented in this volume indicate the use of a more differentiated and sophisticated language among the children of the middle-class compared to the children of the working-class (1973). In the third volume, Bernstein describes how dominating codes in the systems of school and education are produced in relations between social classes (1975). He tries to develop the concept of code in the fourth volume, named “The structuring of pedagogic discourse” (1990). After this he received criticism for the level of abstraction and the
lack of concrete illustrations which he further develops in the fifth and last volume, named “Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity” (1996, 2000).

According to Bernstein (1971), the unequal conditions for the acquirement of teaching are created in pedagogic communication. The expression “pedagogic communication” is widely used and refers to the process in which knowledge is formulated in curriculum documents, further interpreted on different levels in the educational system, expressed in implemented teaching, and finally acquired by the student. Here I must emphasise, that this thesis does not include an investigation of how students or pupils acquire teaching in *friluftsliv*. Instead my use of Bernstein is focused on how some educational and sociological conditions can influence the production of the teaching of *friluftsliv* offered by the PE teachers.

Just as for Bourdieu, Bernstein’s concepts are difficult to describe as separate but must be understood in relationship to each other. In the first volume of “Class, codes and control” (1971), Bernstein makes a distinction between two types of curricula, a collection type and an integrated type. These two types of curricula are primarily distinguished by whether the educational content is in a closed (the collection type) or open (the integrated type) relationship to each other. In order to describe the possibilities of transmitting knowledge through the three systems of communication: curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation, Bernstein uses the concepts of classification and framing. In the further explanation of my interpretation of these concepts, my ambition is primarily to use original sources. However, I also focus on the work of British educational sociologists John Evans and Brian Davies (Evans & Davies, 1993, 1997, 2008; Evans et al., 2006; Fitz et al., 2006). Their interpretation and application of Bernstein’s theories have received attention in sociological issues regarding school and education in general as well as in PE in particular.

**Classification and framing**

To describe the structure of knowledge and the ways it can be communicated in the relationship between teacher and student, Bernstein uses the concepts of *classification* and *framing*. By classification he means “the degree of boundary maintenance between contents” (Bernstein, 1971, p. 205). If the classification is strong, the content is clearly insulated by distinct boundaries and if the classification is weak these boundaries are more blurred. He also stresses the following basic rules regarding the degree of classification:

Where we have strong classification: things must be kept apart. Where we have weak classification, the rule is: things must be brought together (Bernstein, 2000, p. 11).
The classification tells us something about relations of power between categories and of the structure within the first level, the curriculum (Bernstein, 2000, p. 5-11). Further, Bernstein suggests that strong classification reduces the teacher’s power over what is communicated due to the difficulties of crossing clearly marked boundaries (1975, p. 90). In this thesis, the concept of classification has been primarily used in Paper I in order to understand how the formulation of a specific content in Swedish PE, i.e. friluftsliv, can say something of the structure and the division of categories within the subject.

The concept of framing is used to decide the structure within the second level; the pedagogy. By framing, Bernstein refers to the “the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organisation, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship” (1975, p. 89). Within the educational relationship between the teacher and the student, framing refers to who is in control of what can and what cannot be transmitted. Where framing is strong, the transmitter (i.e. a teacher) is in control of pedagogic communication and where framing is weak, the acquirer (i.e. a student) has this control (Bernstein, 1996, p. 27). Bernstein claims that the degree of classification and framing is of significance for the production of knowledge in a society and that this creates codes in the school and educational system (Bernstein, 1971, p. 205-207). Further, he suggests that a strong classification can create a sense of belonging to a specific group and a special identity. A strong framing reduces the student's control over when, where and how to assimilate knowledge and will increase the teacher's control of the pedagogical relationship.

In Swedish curriculum theory research, Bernstein’s theories and concepts have been of great significance. In the early seventies, the concepts of classification and framing were important for the development of a research tradition called the “Frame factor theory” (Dahllöf, 1971, 1978; Linde, 2006; Lundgren, 1972, 1983). Underlying this approach was the basic idea that a number of physical, organizational and institutional “frame factors”, such as available time for teaching, size of group, facilities, finances, etc., are vital to the outcomes of the teaching. Lately, however, the relevance of the “Frame factor theory” has been questioned. It has been claimed that learning situations involve a complexity and dynamic that is greater than can be explained by the controlling function of physical, organizational and institutional frames (Englund, 2007, p. 109; Selander, 2007, p 32). It is reasonable to expect that factors such as time, size of group, equipment, facilities and financial resources have the power to control and regulate the teaching of friluftsliv within PE. However, it is also reasonable to ask whether the governing impact of these factors only works in a one-way relationship. In Paper II, I have used the concept of framing as an analytical tool in order to identify the factors that may affect PE teachers’ flexibility and control when teaching friluftsliv.
Evans and Davies suggest that the concepts of classification and framing are of great significance for the analysis of how the distribution of power and principles of control are translated into educational codes.

Armed with these concepts, we can ask, amongst other things, what preserves the insulation, for example, between the disciplines or activities that constitute PE, or between PE and other subjects on the curriculum? What preserves the space between categories? (Evans & Davies, 2006b, p. 208).

In an Australian study of how the construction of knowledge takes place in the relationship between PE and PETE, MacDonald et al. (1999) illuminate how strong classification can be combined with weak framing. The authors suggest that subject disciplines within PETE, in which teachers are usually specialists, indicate a strong classification compared to PE on a school level where teachers are more of generalists. The framing is, however, said to be weaker at PETE compared to PE, due to the universityteacher’s lesser control of the learning among his/her students. The difficulty of crossing subject boundaries at the university is claimed to have potential consequences for the perception of knowledge among future PE teachers.

…from the students’ perspective this approach results in the absence of epistemological principles that could provide thematic unity between school and university and within university study (Macdonald et al., 1999, p. 45).

During the last decade, several Swedish PE studies inspired by Bernstein have been reported. Karlefors (2002) claims that “PE is strongly classified and its content, consisting of sport activities, does not appear to be questioned” (p. 161, my translation). Contrary to this, Ekberg (2009) and Lundvall and Meckbach (2008) suggest a weak classification of Swedish PE due to its vague identity and the dominance of a sport discourse rather than of stipulated aims of learning. Earlier studies show different results and therefore, the degree of classification in Swedish PE is not clear. This may be due to whether PE is looked upon from a formal (i.e. in relation to curriculum documents) or an informal (i.e. in relation to public discourses) point of view. Based on this idea, the division of a subject’s classification into internal and external perspectives respectively appears to be relevant (Bernstein, 2003, p. 41).

Performance code and Competence code
The degree of classification and framing regulates the production of codes, or code modalities, within the systems of school and education. On a general level, Bernstein (1990) defines a code as “a regulative principle, tacitly acquired, which selects and integrates: relevant meanings, forms of their realisation and evoking contexts” (p. 14). The codes are made visible in the ex-
pressions of teaching. Two codes permeating the educational system in the UK are the competence code and the performance code. These codes have similarities to the integrated code and the collection code mentioned above in that they focus on what people have in common (the competence code) and on what separates people (the performance code). Bernstein (2000) describes the performance code as a “model of pedagogical practice and context (which) places the emphasis upon a specific output of the acquirer, upon a particular text the acquirer is expected to construct and upon specialised skills necessary to the production of this specific output, text or product” (p. 44). The competence code and the performance code are not only expressed within school and education but also in other sectors of society.

Fitz et al. (2006) suggests the performance code to be a pedagogical model with clearly marked subject boundaries, i.e. with strong classification, while the competence code involves more of themes, crossing of subject boundaries and interdisciplinary areas of knowledge, i.e. weak classification (p. 6-7). These features also characterize Bernstein’s (1971) description of the collection code and the integrated code (p. 202-230). Further, Bernstein (2000) stresses how the competence code implicates a displacement of the control over the pedagogic communication from the teacher to the student, i.e. a movement towards a weak(er) framing. Most likely, this condition involves difficulties for teachers as well as students due to the questioning of the teacher as in possession of “the right answers”. Another difference between the competence code and the performance code is that in the latter, deficiencies rather than present qualities are acknowledged (p. 45-46). Bernstein also describes the competence code as financially more expensive compared to the performance code.

The costs of training the teachers are likely to be high because of the theoretical base of competency models. (Bernstein, 2000, p. 49)

In addition to the expensiveness of the theoretical base, the competence code also involves hidden costs in terms of individual communication between teacher and student. However, these costs are often difficult to specify and acknowledge in financial budgets. Compared to this, the performance code can be described as being more financially efficient. Taken together, these two pedagogic models involve differences in basic theoretical assumptions. The performance code can be described as originating from within a behaviourist tradition in which the nature and quality of knowledge can be valued in hierarchical relations. The assumptions within the competence code can, on the other hand, be described as originating from within a socially critical and constructivist tradition in which relationships and boundaries are not constant but changeable. Differences between people exist, however, not in terms of shortcomings but they are instead regarded as resources (Evans & Davies, 2006b, p. 209-210). Evans and Davies (2006b) claim the perfor-
performance code to have a dominating position within PE, a fact they suggest will have consequences for which pupils are acknowledged and which are marginalised. In modern society, the ability to perform and compete is highly valued, an observation reflected in the political discussions of school and education in Sweden (Björklund, 2006; Jällhage, 2007). Even though Bernstein does not particularly devote his interest to the body, Evans and Davies suggest that the process of embodiment is of significance to understand the development of codes in the PE-context.

...physical education and health (PEH) curricula are now increasingly dominated by pedagogic modalities expressing body perfection and performance codes. Our use of the term code is drawn explicitly from the work of Bernstein (…) and we use it, as he does, to explore how (…) pedagogic codes and pedagogic modalities in schools are acquired, shape pedagogic consciousness and, in our terms, are 'embodied' (Evans & Davies, 2006b, s. 207)

Further, Evans and Davies (2006a) question the future for social, democratic and inclusive ideals given the increasing tendencies towards talent identification, achievement, elitism and perfection that are reflected in the profiles of schools. They refer to Bernstein’s emphasis on three basic conditions required to realize social and democratic values in school. The first condition is about enhancement and the possibilities of strengthening one's individual qualities. The second condition is about the possibilities of being socially, intellectually and culturally included in a social context. The third condition is about the possibility of participation. Evans and Davies suggest that both curriculum documents and teaching should be evaluated towards these three conditions, which might imply a questioning of the distribution of power and control (p. 7-11).

Regarding Swedish PE, there are similarities between the performance code’s domination over the competence code and the domination of what in Sweden can be described as a sports and physical activity discourse over a learning discourse (Larsson, 2004; Larsson & Redelius, 2008; Redelius et al., 2009). The logic inherent in the Swedish sports movement has been proven to have great significance for teaching practices in Swedish PE. Sport activities characterised by physical achievement and competition tend to dominate the teaching content, rather than marginalised elements such as dance, friluftsliv and swimming, all emphasised in the national Swedish PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000a). In Paper I and paper II, I have tried to analyse the teaching of friluftsliv within Swedish PE using the concepts of classification and framing in order to investigate whether, and how, dominating codes within PE are expressed in a pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv. Based on my analyses, I have considered the possibilities for friluftsliv to contribute to democracy and equity within Swedish PE.
Pedagogic discourse

If code was the dominating concept in the former work of Bernstein, discourse holds a significant position in his later work. According to Bernstein, the pedagogic discourse is in fact built out of two discourses. One of these, the instructional discourse, regulates the creation of various skills and their internal relationships. The other, the regulative discourse, regulates the social order. Bernstein claims that the instructional discourse is embedded in the superior and dominating regulative discourse and that these together constitute the pedagogic discourse. The reason for his interest in the pedagogic discourse is described as follows:

Often people in schools and classrooms make a distinction between what they call the transmission of skills and the transmission of values. These are always kept apart as if there were a conspiracy to disguise the fact that there is only one (Bernstein, 2000, p. 32).

According to Bernstein, individual values are always embedded in the knowledge we try to communicate and thereby pedagogic messages are never neutral or objective. Further, he describes the pedagogic discourse as “the principle by which other discourses are appropriated and brought into a special relationship with each other…” (ibid, p. 32).

The relationship between the concepts of code and discourse has been discussed earlier. While the understanding of a certain code was formerly regarded to be regulated merely by social class, little attention has been directed to the actual production of a certain discourse. Bernstein suggests that we should “see code modalities as realisations of forms of discourse” (ibid, p. 207). Macdonald et al. (1999) stress that an instructional discourse in the form of teaching practices within PETE is embedded in the regulative discourse dominating the field of sport and physical activity. They claim the educational implications of this condition as follows:

We might surmise from this that the regulative discourse of the physical activity field, the communities of practice of sport, physical recreation and exercise has similarly shaped discourses in schools and universities (Macdonald et al., 1999, p. 43-44).

In Paper II, I have searched for distinguishing features in the friluftsliv-teaching expressed by the PE teachers interviewed. I have then tried to identify the pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv within Swedish PE. Instructional and regulative discourse may be valuable tools in the analysis of this discourse.
The pedagogic device

In his later work, Bernstein uses the concept of *pedagogic device*. He suggests that the pedagogic device must be understood as a process through which potential discourses have to be activated before they can result in pedagogic communication. He resembles the pedagogic device with Chomsky’s concept of the language device, which is a system of rules regulating our use of language. According to Bernstein, these rules are not free from values, but should be viewed upon as a reflection of dominating groups in society. Hereby, he separates the carrier, i.e. relatively stable rules regulating language, from the carried, i.e. rules adopted to a specific language context. He suggests that this is also a model to use for the theorising of the pedagogic device (see Figure 2). By “meaning potential”, mentioned in Figure 2, Bernstein refers to a discourse that has not yet been pedagogised. In my study, meaning potential is constituted by the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* while the pedagogic communication refers to the teaching in *friluftsliv* expressed within Swedish PE (as expressed in Figure 1, p. 47). How *friluftsliv* education in Swedish PETE contributes to the teaching of *friluftsliv* within PE through the rules constituting the pedagogic device is the subject of the following discussion.

![Figure 2: Bernstein's model of pedagogic communication through the pedagogic device (2000, p. 26).](image)

Bernstein (1996) describes the pedagogic device as a system with "internal rules which regulate the pedagogic communication which the device makes possible" (p. 41). Another definition is offered by Singh (2002) who suggests the pedagogic device to be an "ensemble of rules or procedures via which knowledge (intellectual, practical, expressive, official or local knowl-
edge) is converted into classroom talk, curricula and online communication.” (p. 573). Bernstein makes a distinction between three different types of rules with the following internal relationship: distributive rules produce recontextualising rules which in turn produce evaluative rules.

**Distributive rules**

The purpose of *distributive rules* is to regulate the relationship 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* options. 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 constitute the teaching that is “yet to be thought (of)” which could be “both beneficial and dangerous at the same time” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 30). Besides regulating what is experienced as thinkable and unthinkable, the distributive rules also regulate who has the power to set these boundaries (Bernstein, 1996, p. 42-45). Wayne W. Au (2008), a Bernstein-inspired researcher, suggests that distributive rules work through “teacher’s curricular planning, textbook creation and adoption by educational institutions (...) where limits of legitimate knowledge and forms this knowledge takes are established and regulated” (p. 642). Following these ideas, there are non-neutral rules regulating PE teachers’ choice of content for the teaching of *friluftsliv*. The thinkable teaching in *friluftsliv* is the teaching which is experienced as possible to choose. Thereby, the unthinkable, the *friluftsliv* never thought of, will not be expressed in teaching.

**Recontextualising rules**

The pedagogic discourse is also generated by *recontextualising rules*. A recontextualised pedagogic discourse contains knowledge from outside the pedagogic field, converted into pedagogy. Thereby, a pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* within PE is a combination of the *friluftsliv* skills considered valuable by Swedish PE teachers (i.e. a instructional discourse) and the values produced within the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* (i.e. a regulative discourse). Bernstein suggests the regulative discourse to be superior to the instructional discourse. Thereby the regulative discourse will set the rules for the social order. Following this, some of the values produced within the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv* can be carried into school and expressed in teaching.

The process of recontextualisation also produces social fields which, like Bourdieu’s concept of field (1993), involve a certain degree of autonomy. Here, Bernstein separates the official recontextualisation field from the pedagogic recontextualisation field. The official recontextualisation field is created and dominated by the state and its agents (e.g. the producers of curricular text documents) while the pedagogic recontextualisation field con-
sists of school teachers, colleges and departments of education (Bernstein, 1996, p. 46-49). Thereby, in a pedagogic context of friluftsliv, the official recontextualisation field can be constituted by the actors and institutions contributing to the formulation of the aims for friluftsliv, while the pedagogic recontextualisation field can consist of PE teachers as well as PE teacher educators. In an analysis of the British system of school and education, Fitz et al. (2006) point to the constant exchange in terms of conflicts and cooperation between, and within, the official and the pedagogic fields. This exchange is claimed to concern “all aspects of educational arrangements and practices, not least the rules of order of school subjects concerning content selection, relation, sequence and pace…” (p. 5). Further, Singh (2002) suggests that teacher education and teacher educators play important parts in the creation of the system of rules and principles constituting the pedagogic device.

Agents, often working within strongly insulated agencies or institutions (e.g., curriculum authorities, education departments, teacher education organisations, schools) may contest, maintain, and/or challenge the ordering/disordering principles of the pedagogic device. These agencies make up the fields of pedagogic device. (Singh, 2002, p. 573)

It is reasonable to believe that education in friluftsliv within PETE is a significant contributor to the production of a specific pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv in Swedish PE, probably along with the PE teachers themselves. The pedagogic discourse for teaching friluftsliv within PE is created in the relationship between the official field and the pedagogic field. Bernstein argues that what is excluded and included in this process, and by whom, involves socio-economical power relations.

**Evaluative rules**
The *evaluative rules* constitute the specific discourse expressed on a classroom level. It is made up of the knowledge being communicated and acquired between teacher and pupils, i.e. the specific pedagogic discourse realised (Bernstein, 1996, p. 49-51). Through these three levels of rules, Bernstein claims the pedagogic device to work as a symbolic regulator of consciousness offering concepts to understand ”the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic discourse” (1996, p. 42). As mentioned, Bernstein has not devoted particular interest to the body. In an attempt to illuminate the discursive representations of the body, however, and as a model for understanding embodied communication and action, Evans et al. (2009) discuss the corporeal device. My motives for using Bourdieu’s concept of habitus in order to analyse how PE teachers’ embodied experiences can be of significance for teaching practices in friluftsliv will be discussed shortly.
The pedagogic device is a tool for understanding how the pedagogic discourses in school are constituted. However, it is also a tool for identifying who contributes to the production and maintenance of this discourse. The teaching of friluftsliv in PE, offered to the pupils in the Swedish compulsory school, is a specific pedagogic discourse, shaped through influences from many different areas. Some of the contributors to this discourse, highlighted in this thesis are the following: physical, organisational and institutional frames in PE teachers’ working-environment (e.g. schedule, group-size, facilities, etc.); PE teachers’ and PE teacher educators’ background and value orientations; the aims for friluftsliv stipulated in curriculum documents; and dominating values in friluftsliv expressed in: the Scandinavian tradition, in Swedish PE and in Swedish PETE.

In my ambition to understand some of the conditions underlying the production of teaching in friluftsliv within the PE subject in Swedish compulsory school, I see the pedagogic device as a valuable tool. I return to Bernstein later in this thesis, but there is now reason to delve into the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.

**Sociology according to Bourdieu**

Through empirical analyses of the literary field in France (1993; 2000), Bourdieu explains how relations of power and dominance within a specific social field are developed and create positions of value. Apart from the identification of the struggles within the field, the analysis of its boundaries and autonomy is significant for the understanding of its qualities and structure. The methodology behind Bourdieu’s empirical analysis of the social field has been adopted within several research areas, for example in the contexts of sport and university (Lövgren, 2001; Munk, 1999; Nilsson, 1998). According to Bourdieu’s exploration of the relationships within a social field it follows that the actors (or the agents as Bourdieu prefers to call them) who are given the preferential right of interpretation, respect and recognition, possess some kind of capital by which they can procure this position. By symbolic capital Bourdieu (1990) refers to what is recognised as valuable in a certain social context and this capital can be constituted for example by knowledge, education, contacts, expressions and material items (p. 112-121).

In order to understand the expressions of the symbolic capital, the human body is of central significance. According to Bourdieu, experiences during the individual’s early childhood and growth are embodied and will thereby constitute a regulating system for what actions are experienced as possible and suitable in a certain social context. This individual and embodied system is called habitus by Bourdieu and he believes it can explain why human actions and patterns of behaviour show structural social connections with relatively few exceptions (1978, 1984). Habitus must thereby be understood as a
sluggish system, strongly dependent on the concepts of symbolic capital and social field. Whether the agent’s habitus is valid as symbolic capital is determined in the social context, i.e. on the field, where the agent is active (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 101).

Viewing the social world in the perspective of Bourdieu involves an assumption that the individual’s options in life are not unlimited, but that choices are made from the options that are experienced as possible. This is confirmed not only by the empirical studies of Bourdieu, but also in several studies in the field of physical exercise, sports and *friluftsliv* (see e.g. Arnegård, 2006; Engström, 2008). This perspective also involves the assumption that the leaving out of one’s social and cultural luggage, and the change of one’s identity and tastes, is a difficult and slow process. In several studies of teachers, teacher students and teacher education it has been confirmed that the individual’s own biography, the personal preferences and the first experiences of the teaching profession is of greater significance to the actual teaching than teacher education (Annerstedt, 1991; Green, 2000; Hensvold, 2003; Lortie, 1975; Templin, 1979). Based on this research, I find Bourdieu’s perspectives to be a reasonable starting point for a sociological study of education in *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE. First, however, I give a more detailed description of the theory behind the concepts Bourdieu uses, of research inspired by his theory and attempt to explain its value for my object of research.

Social field

The concept of field is useful in many different contexts. In everyday language it is synonymous with area, landscape, space or arena. However, in Pierre Bourdieu’s terminology the concept has a more precise and specific meaning. Bourdieu is restrictive towards absolute definitions of his concepts, and claims they must be understood in relation to each other. Therefore it is not an easy task to make short definitions and explanations of his concepts. On an analytical level, Bourdieu’s description of a social field is as follows:

…a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by the present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc). (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 97)

A social field in Bourdieu’s sense constitutes a network of positions. The relationships and the tension between these positions are created by the agents’ strategy concerning movement and placement within the field. This
tension, also described by Bourdieu as a struggle, can for example deal with different views on who has the preferential right of interpretation in a certain question. The recognised values in the field, by Bourdieu called capital, are accumulated at the objectively defined positions. When you have solved the code for what is at stake and what is recognised as valuable within a specific social context, you become in possession of capital within a field. When this is made visible, it is determined who is the winner in the struggle and thereby gets a share of the profit. Bourdieu’s description of the field has many similarities with the world of sport. He emphasises similarities between the agents and players (from a sport context) and the importance of participating in the game and understanding the point of the game. The dynamics and the struggle within the field imply that there is something worth debating for and among the forces in motion, the dominating and the dominated agents are made visible. The dynamic and the mobility also concern the boundaries of the field and the quality of these boundaries is determined by the autonomy within a field, i.e. the degree of independence to the surrounding world. Even though the existence of the field presupposes a certain degree of autonomy in relation to other fields, complete autonomy will mean that the dominating force is unchallenged. The polarisation between the forces within the field also means that there might be agents who never meet and also those who systematically avoid each other (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 38-46; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 94-104). The possible positions within the social context of friluftsliv within Swedish PETE, are constituted by the distinctive values that have been expressed in the review of literature and curriculum documents (see Figure 1, p. 47).

It is important to emphasise that a social field is not predetermined, but has to be empirically studied. The described characteristics of a social field are not only theoretical ideas, but its origin is to be found in the relationships between the socio-cultural background and the lifestyles of people. Bourdieu has devoted a lot of attention to the origin and structure of the literary field in France (2000). The study of a field with Bourdieu’s methodology demands empirical information of quantitative character. Peoples’ social, cultural and economic history can be seen as an expression of their habitus. Bourdieu has then used this information in order to form correspondence analyses, where the accumulation of the agents’ cultural and economical capital at certain positions constitutes a foundation for the agents’ lifestyles to rest on. This is described as the space of lifestyles and from these studies, and the struggles included, the concept and the meaning of the social field have their origin (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 340; Bourdieu, 1994, p. 290-291). Within a social space of lifestyles there can however exist several fields.

The interviews with the PE teacher educators do contain information on the respondents’ socio-cultural background (in terms of the occupation and education of their parents) and, above all, of how their relationship to friluftsliv has developed. However, the limited number of respondents means that
the relation between their social positions and the values expressed in the interviews are not possible to analyse. Being aware of the criticism from a social field perspective, I would like to highlight other studies inspired by Bourdieu’s concept of social field and carried out with the same methodology as mine (see e.g. Larsson, 2009; Munk & Lind, 2004; Skawonius, 2005). I would also like to emphasise that the use of Bourdieu’s concept of the social field in Paper III is not in order to prove the existence of a field of *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE. Instead I see it as a tool for the exploration and understanding of a certain social context.

Brown (2005) suggests that PE and PETE can be seen as social fields with an inherent cultural economy. According to Brown, when entering the field of PE as a pupil, the teaching generates a gendered habitus, which becomes recognised as valuable within this specific context. For those pupils who become PE teacher students there is a refinement and reinforcement of their gendered habitus in ways, which closely fit the profile demanded within the field. Thereby, Brown suggests that PE teacher students are oriented towards existing teaching practices maintaining continuity rather than change. In a study of the cultural constructions of the Norwegian *friluftsliv* in the publications of “Den Norske Turistforening” (The Norwegian Trekking Association), Richardsson (1994) discusses Norwegian *friluftsliv* as a social field. She argues that the continuous change of ideas and practices in the Norwegian *friluftsliv* is an expression of the struggle for hegemony in a social field. Further, she suggests that the occupation of positions within the field are determined by the performers’ knowledge and view of *friluftsliv* and that this can result in symbolic profits, expressed as status within the field (p. 16-18 and p. 42-45). Another field study of the Norwegian *friluftsliv* was done by Tordsson (2002), but from a phenomenological perspective. Tordsson focuses his attention on expressions of *friluftsliv* in a context of meaning. When doing this, he highlights the relationship between the field of *friluftsliv* and the field of sport and emphasises that there are different rationalities and logics within these two fields. According to Tordsson, one distinguishing feature in sport is the focus on the activity, while in *friluftsliv* the focus is on nature (p. 61-66).

**Symbolic capital**

The abilities, qualities and properties that people consider to be their assets acquire their real value in relationship to a specific context. Even though Bourdieu’s discussion of the concept capital is often from an economic perspective, its field of application is much wider. His real interest is in *the symbolic capital* by which he wants to explain how people or institutions can gain confidence and respect in a certain social context. The Swedish expert on Bourdieu’s writing, Donald Broady, is often quoted by researchers inspired by Bourdieu, probably because of his brief, but nevertheless vigorous
interpretations of Bourdieu’s theoretical concepts. He suggests that “symbolic capital is what social groups recognise as valuable and assign value” (Broady, 1990, p. 171, my translation).

One type of symbolic capital and one of Bourdieu’s most famous concepts is cultural capital. By this Bourdieu refers to the ability of expressing oneself in the spoken and written language, familiarity with art and literature and different types of education (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 112-121). To illustrate a difference between symbolic and cultural capital, a knowledge of skiing techniques can, within a circle of acquaintances, constitute a symbolic capital, while cultural capital refers to conditions of dominance that tends to be valid in society in general. Another illustration: a professor with a great amount of cultural capital and a dominating position within the academic field, will probably not have the same dominating position on a building site, where another type of capital is recognised as valuable. The use of the social field as a tool for exploring positions in friluftsliv education within Swedish PETE implies that I must relate to what is recognised as valuable among the friluftsliv educators, since the capital only exists in relation to a field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 101; Bourdieu, 1984, p. 113).

In a Bourdieu-inspired study, Redelius et al. (2009) investigate valuations made by Swedish PE teachers in their assessment of pupils and what consequences they might have for the construction of gender. Their findings suggest that pupils can generate symbolic capital in Swedish PE by expressing qualities such as discipline, physical activity, kindness, and thinking of PE as fun. In other studies of PE, Bourdieu’s concept of capital has been explored as physical capital (Brown, 2005; Ekberg, 2005; Shilling, 1993; Wright & Burrows, 2006). Aiming at the ability to participate and perform in sport and physical activities or the contemporary valuation of body appearance, physical capital is ascribed with the potential to convert itself into other forms of capital such as economic, cultural or social capital. In my study, I believe physical capital to be of significance in order to explain values expressed in the teaching of friluftsliv within PE and PETE.

Sub-fields

Bourdieu also emphasises that there can exist smaller and subordinate fields within greater fields, so called sub-fields (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30-31). Based on this construction one might ask what social contexts are possible and permissible to study as social fields. In the preface to the Swedish translation of “Les règles de l’art” (Bourdieu, 2000) (The Rules of Art), Broady gives some guidance and expresses that “the concept of field is used slightly incautiously in contexts of research not so much related to Culture (in Bourdieu’s narrow sense)”, (p. 22-23, my translation). The areas of research that Bourdieu himself has mentioned as social fields are most likely to be approved, as well as larger empirical studies based on the methodology used
by Bourdieu. To prove the existence of a field is a process divided into three steps: Firstly, one must locate and analyse the positions within the field and its inherent forces. Secondly, one must map out the structure of relations between positions occupied by agents or institutions taking part in the struggle of power. Finally, one must analyse the habitus of the agents, i.e. their incorporated system of dispositions (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 104-105). However, the application of Bourdieu’s theoretical concepts should, in reason, be dependent on the claims of their contribution. Based on Bourdieu’s texts on sport as a field and a social space (Bourdieu, 1978; Bourdieu 1987, p. 156-167) it should, in theory, be possible to imagine sub-fields within the field of sport.

In Lövgren’s (2001) study of students’ leisure habits in two university contexts, he establishes the existence of different sub-fields within the academic field. Further, Peterson (2005) has discussed the relationship between education and sport from a social field perspective. From a Swedish perspective, he highlights similarities and differences between PE and the voluntary sports movement. Based on this comparison he then discusses potential consequences of the government’s initiative to involve the Swedish sports movement in teaching in school via the so called “Handslagssatsningen” (The Handshake Initiative). Peterson expresses his anxiety that collaboration within this project may result in confusion regarding the assignments of school and the assignments of the Swedish sports movement. He fears that the logic of sport might dominate over the logic of education. In Paper III, I imagine friluftsliv within Swedish PETE as a field adjacent to the field of sport as well as to the academic field.

Fields of consumption and fields of production

Bourdieu makes a significant division of production and consumption within the social field and he has devoted most of his attention to the field of cultural production (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 10; Bourdieu, 1993, p. 29-40). In his analysis of the field of sport he uses economic terms such as supply and demand to illustrate that sport products, in this respect, can be interpreted as, for example, practice of sport, reading about sport or watching sport on TV. Thereby, the production and consumption of sport is not limited to material products but must be understood in a wider sense (Bourdieu, 1978).

In this thesis, I have considered Bourdieu’s metaphor of producers and consumers useful in illustrating the power balance between PE teacher educators and PE teacher students. In an educational context, this illustration, based on economic terms, might be claimed to be a static description of the relationship between students and their teachers. I do not suggest that the communication between the educators and their students is only one-way. However, when entering PETE, students have only limited possibilities of influencing their own studies in terms of content and methods.
Therefore, I have considered Swedish PE teacher educators to be producers of friluftsliv education in relationship their students, i.e. the consumers. The PE teacher educators produce what is considered to be legitimate friluftsliv within this social context. It is important to emphasise that the students, in their future occupation as PE teachers, will change from their role as consumers into a role as producers of teaching in friluftsliv. An analysis of how and by whom teaching in friluftsliv is produced and consumed in PETE can probably contribute to a deepened understanding of to what extent attitudes and valuations within PETE are reproduced and reflected in the teaching of friluftsliv on a school level.

Habitus

Through empirical studies of peoples’ lifestyles, Bourdieu (1984) has shown that socio-cultural background often correlates with taste for food, art, clothes, music and leisure activities (p. 128-129). He emphasises that social actions and behaviour are not necessarily a result of conscious choices, but can instead be based upon a sense of what is suitable behaviour in a certain situation. Experiences and memories during childhood and growth contribute to the shaping of a regulating system for actions, described as incorporated dispositions. This system of dispositions, also known as a bodily schema, is called habitus and is perhaps Bourdieu’s most fundamental theoretical concept (Bourdieu, 1990, s. 9-10). According to Bourdieu, habitus must be understood as a process of learning and acquirement, and not as determined by genetics. Based on this theory, the idea of the beauty of nature or the existence of a natural relationship to the landscape is not given by birth. Instead, this disposition has been founded and shaped while spending time in nature and being told of its beauty. Given this theory, it follows that the individual habitus is most receptive to influence during childhood and growth and this explains why habits and behaviour are reproduced through generations.

In a study of Swedish PETE, Larsson (2009) argues that “the structural conditions for the education programme seem to be in harmony with the students’ habitus” (p. 311). Other research describes PE teacher students’ personal biographies and preferences for physical movement as more decisive for their future PE teaching, compared to the teaching of PETE (Annerstedt 1991, p. 146-152; Green 2000; Templin 1979). In Paper IV, I use the theory of habitus to study PE teacher educators’ expressions of their own and their students’ relationship to friluftsliv.

Taste

Bourdieu describes taste as expressing the individual habitus, a system of classifications generating practices and maintaining differences among individuals. Taste can explain some peoples’ yearning and expectations for a
skiing tour in the mountains and other peoples’ aversion to the same thing. In that taste brings people together with other people, items or practices, Bourdieu describes it as a “match-maker” (1984, p. 243).

Choosing according to one’s taste is a matter of identifying goods that are objectively attuned to one’s position and which ‘go together’… (Bourdieu 1984, p. 232).

The development of taste is not only dependent on positive experiences from childhood. Even later in life, the performance of a former unknown practice, can restructure ones incorporated dispositions and result in the development of a new taste. Habitus is not impossible, though more difficult, to change among adults. Bourdieu’s probable answer to whether or not the practice of friluftsliv is an option for all individuals, is that we are often unaware of what is excluded and included in our options, and that this unawareness is based on the tastes generated by habitus.

How then, does one study the taste of individuals? In Bourdieu’s methodology, peoples’ practices have been investigated as expressions of their habitus and taste. Paper IV, in which I use the concepts of habitus and taste, is not based on the practices performed by PE teacher educators, but on their expressions of their own and their students’ relationship to friluftsliv.

**Similarities and differences between Bourdieu and Bernstein**

As mentioned earlier in the text, Bourdieu and Bernstein have a fundamental perspective in common in that they are both interested in investigating the mechanisms producing social stratification and inequalities. From my review of their works, I have found that Bernstein relates more to Bourdieu than vice versa. In the last volume of the series “Class, Codes and Control”, Bernstein expresses an ambition to explain some of the differences between himself and Bourdieu. According to Bernstein, Bourdieu suggests that school makes social inequalities legitimate through the belief that the social hierarchies within school can exist independently of the social hierarchies outside school. This phenomenon is referred to by Bourdieu as “la violence symbolique” (symbolic violence). In relation to this, Bernstein claims this legitimation of inequalities to take place in interaction between the school and the family.

I feel very confident that some social groups are aware of that schooling is not neutral, that it presupposes familial power both material and discursive, and that such groups use this knowledge to improve their children’s pedagogic progress. It may be that they have to rationalize their children’s success
by believing that their children deserve such success while others do not. (Bernstein, 1996, p. 9)

Similarly to Bourdieu, Bernstein uses the concept of field in order to illuminate social spaces in which struggles for positions are taking place. However, with reference to Bourdieu’s concept of field, he also emphasises that “I have had some difficulties over its boundaries, inter-relations and conditions of existence for my own work” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 202). Perhaps this reservation from Bernstein is due to the claim that field analyses in Bourdieu’s sense are suggested to be limited to certain social and cultural contexts (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 22-23). The combination of Bourdieu’s and Bernstein’s perspectives is not a new phenomenon. Linné (1999) suggests that Bourdieu’s concept of field offers possibilities for analyzing struggles within the codes dominating different curriculums reforms.

I see the field of teacher education as a relational structure of contextual positions defined by its struggles over basic curriculum ideas, contextual frames, and formal regulations. (Linné, 1999, s. 432)

Further, Bernstein’s use of the concept of resources has similarities with Bourdieu’s concept of capital, i.e. the individual’s capacity to acquire profits within a specific social context (Singh, 2002, p. 573-574). Consequently, there are similarities as well as some differences between Bernstein and Bourdieu regarding the concept of field as well as capital/resources.

**Summary of the theoretical contributions**

In order to summarize this review of theoretical perspectives, I would like to specify what I see as their contribution to my study. Table 1 below is an attempt to describe how the purpose and source of information in each paper is linked to the theoretical concepts.
Table 1: An overview of the papers included in the thesis, their purposes, sources of information, theoretical approaches and analytical concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To analyse the relationship between the representation of friluftsliv in the national Swedish PE curriculum and the transformation of friluftsliv into local PE syllabi in a selection of Swedish compulsory schools.</td>
<td>Textanalysis of the national Swedish PE curriculum from 1994; the general curriculum from 1994; and 31 local PE syllabus documents.</td>
<td>Interviews with 12 Swedish PE teachers.</td>
<td>Interviews with 17 Swedish PE teacher educators.</td>
<td>To investigate Swedish PE teacher educators’ views of their own and their students' relationship to friluftsliv, how this relationship can be developed and under what conditions it can be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of information</td>
<td>Source of information must be specified.</td>
<td>Source of information must be specified.</td>
<td>Source of information must be specified.</td>
<td>Source of information must be specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical concepts</td>
<td>Code, Classification.</td>
<td>Framing, Pedagogic discourse, The pedagogic device.</td>
<td>Social field, symbolic capital</td>
<td>Habitus, taste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sociological perspective of Bourdieu offers tools for analyzing how the embodiment of experiences from friluftsliv can shape habituses with the disposition to value specific teaching practices. The tension regarding different preferences for legitimate teaching in friluftsliv, created within a specific social context and explored with Bourdieu’s concept of field, can be understood as a result of this process of embodiment. Bourdieu’s theories offer an understanding of how reproduction within the system of school and education is dependent on embodied experiences, founded in early childhood and shaped during growth. Consequently, the knowledge of what contributes to equal conditions within school and education must not only permeate school but also contacts with homes and families.

This dimension of embodiment, on which the theory of habitus is built, is not discussed specifically in Bernstein’s theory. However, it should be emphasised that Evans and Davies, in their interpretation of Bernstein, focus their attention on the body, especially in relationship to PE (Evans et al., 2006, 2009). Instead, Bernstein’s contribution to my study, represented in Papers I and II, can be found in his concepts dealing with the relationship between categories of knowledge (classification), which produces principles...
for what we experience as meaningful (codes), through which we can understand the control and regulation of the expressions of teaching (framing). Further, his construction of a system of rules, working on different levels, has helped me understand how pedagogic discourses for *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE are produced and maintained (the pedagogic device).

In the study based on interviews with PE teacher educators (Papers III and IV), Bourdieu’s concepts were used as my tools for analysis. The empirical material collected in this study (interviews), does not correspond to a field analysis in Bourdieu’s sense, i.e. I have not performed a correspondence analysis. Further, the PE teacher educators interviewed could be claimed to better suit the pedagogic field as discussed by Bernstein. However, I have found Bourdieu’s use of superior and subordinate sub-fields as significant for illuminating how values from different social contexts are expressed in teacher education in *friluftsliv*. The economic metaphor of producers and consumers in Bourdieu’s use of the concept of field has also been a valuable tool for my investigation of academic education of *friluftsliv* within PETE in Sweden. In the study of the school level, my experience is that I can come closer to understanding PE teachers’ expressions of teaching, and its relation to curriculum documents, with Bernstein compared to Bourdieu. Based on the sociological approach of Bourdieu, and the educational approach of Bernstein, I claim that the comprehensive purpose of the thesis, based on four included papers with their specific aims, can be formulated as an examination of some conditions underlying the production of the teaching of *friluftsliv* in PE in Swedish compulsory school.

I have not asked questions specifically regarding teaching in *friluftsliv* in relation to gender and I have not had that perspective in focus when constructing my object of research. However, based on my interest in which pupils and students are being privileged and marginalized by the teaching of *friluftsliv*, I believe that my approach is based on an overall perspective of equality. It is therefore my ambition in this thesis is to be vigilant on issues regarding social class, ethnicity and gender.
Method

This part of the thesis does not only include a description of the technical and practical issues involved in empirical collection. My intention is also to describe how I consider my role as researcher and discuss the possibilities of expressing what my empirical observations represent.

Constructing the object of research

In the process of constructing my object of research, I have tried to distance myself from common-sense understanding and pre-assumptions regarding friluftsliv within PE. Bourdieu et al. (1991) suggest that through breaking with what is known as common knowledge, and through questioning ideas and conceptions, the object of research will eventually formulate its own questions. Further, they argue that the construction of an object of research presupposes the formulation of a theoretical problematic, making it possible to conduct a systematic questioning of specific aspects of reality. In this process, I have found that thinking about friluftsliv in relationship to the theories of Bourdieu and Bernstein has made me see problems and questions more clearly.

However, Bourdieu et al. (ibid) also emphasise that researchers are agents among other agents and that they are unable to stand outside the world they analyse. I have accepted the idea that my empirical results are not to be understood as real and true knowledge or a reflection of reality, but as constructed knowledge. According to Bourdieu et al. (ibid), the separation of common knowledge from scientific knowledge in the social sciences is more indistinct than elsewhere and it is therefore especially important to be epistemologically vigilant (vii-ix, p. 13 & p. 35).

I have also been inspired by the ideas of Bourdieu et al. (1991) regarding the relationship between different levels in the process of research. The authors suggest that the whole process of operations involved in sociological research (critical thinking, the formulation of questions, recording, transcription and the analysis, etc.) are “so many theories in action, inasmuch as they are conscious or unconscious procedures for constructing facts and relations between facts” (p. 39). Thereby, they mean that talk about epistemological neutrality supports the positivist illusion and argues that the sociological researcher must “subject his own questioning to sociological questioning”,
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or else he/she “will be incapable of making a truly neutral sociological analysis of the answers it receives” (Bourdieu et al., 1991, p. 41). The relationship between the different levels in the process of research is also discussed by Alvesson and Sköldberg (1994, p. 324-328) and Lincoln and Guba (2003, p. 269-270 & p. 282-284). Drawing on their ideas of reflexivity, I have not tried to separate processes such as empirical collection, interpretation and the reflection of issues regarding language and authority from each other. Rather, these processes have been reflected in and glided over into each other.

Pre-understanding and interpretation

Since my object of research concerns PE and PETE where I do my teaching, I have developed a pre-understanding of the area which most likely has had an influence on my way of constructing the object of research. Being a former PE teacher and currently working as a PE teacher educator in friluftsliv, along with experiences from my own education in friluftsliv during PETE, has all shaped a certain understanding of friluftsliv, making it difficult for me to fully understand why I find certain questions in the area as self-evident, natural and interesting to explore. This type of knowledge has probably directed my attention towards issues regarding the conditions for teaching friluftsliv within PE, which a teacher with another background, or a researcher from another discipline, would perhaps not find as meaningful to explore. In addition to this knowledge, which is probably partly shared with other PE teachers and PE teacher educators, my personal preferences for outdoor practices have very probably also contributed to my pre-understanding of the object of research (Gustavsson, 2004, p. 120-125; Karlsson, 2004, p. 162). My personal interest in practising friluftsliv has especially involved different types of skiing (cross-country, back-country and downhill), but also hiking in the mountains, camping in forests and using boats (sailing dinghies, motorboats, canoes and kayaks) in lakes or in the archipelago. Given this background, together with growing up in the Scout movement, I could claim to have a close personal relationship to friluftsliv with experiences from a wide range of outdoor practices.

I also want to touch upon what I consider significant assumptions regarding interpretation. I agree with the idea that the intention of a person’s statement is not possible to understand fully or to make completely visible (Karlsson, 2005, p. 149-156; Kristensson Uggl, 2005, p. 181-183). I do not suggest that I have discovered the one and only truth about the conditions for the production of teaching in friluftsliv within PE. However, in accordance with Karlsson (2005), I believe that interpretation and understanding must be either or less reasonable.
Sometimes, one can get the impression that the difference between the author’s creation of the text and the interpretation of the text have been erased and that the two have the same creative quality. There is a risk that the text turns into a projection rather than something that is to be understood. (Karlsson, 2005, p. 155, my translation)

Therefore, it is important for me to emphasise what I have considered as more reasonable and unreasonable interpretations of my results. I deal with these issues further in the discussion section of this thesis.

The discrepancy between the value assigned to friluftsliv in the national Swedish PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000a) and the differentiation of implemented teaching practices (Backman, 2004; Svenning, 2001) has also been significant for my interest in questions regarding friluftsliv within PE. The current decentralized governing of Swedish schools contributes to a number of local interpretations of what teaching of friluftsliv might mean and how it can be implemented. The fact that the room for interpretation in the former, more centralised and detailed governing of the Swedish school was more limited is perhaps one reason why these questions have not been investigated before. The differentiation in teaching practices today indicates that there are a number of different “truths” about the meaning of teaching in friluftsliv within Swedish PE.

The collection of information

The thesis includes three different sets of empirical material presented in four different papers. The empirical material was collected using two different methods. The first of the three studies, in Paper I, is a text analysis of a number of curriculum documents from which wordings regarding friluftsliv have been analysed. The second study, in Paper II, is based on interviews with PE teachers in a number of Swedish compulsory schools. The interviews concerned the PE teachers’ views on the conditions for teaching friluftsliv. The third study, in Papers III and IV, is also based on interviews, this time with Swedish PE teacher educators on their views of friluftsliv as an educational phenomenon. The choice of technique for the collection of information has been closely associated with the questions in focus. Kvale (1996) emphasises the importance of obtaining a pre-knowledge of the object of research and clarifying the purpose of the study, before deciding which method to apply (p. 94-98). Based on my experiences, the what and the why questions have been hard to separate entirely from the how question, but have instead overlapped each other in a parallel process.

In a discussion of different models of interpretation, Gustavsson and Bergström (2004) emphasise that understanding depends on the ability to place oneself in another person’s life situation (p. 199-201). This involves a
situation where the respondents can describe the topic in their own words and where the researcher has the chance to ask follow-up questions, as in an interview (Creswell, 2002, p. 145-146). However, based on the relations of power involved in the interview (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 607-626), the respondents might also look upon the researcher, who is a researcher and a PE teacher educator, as being in possession of the correct answers. From this perspective, an analysis of texts can be argued to be more neutral than an analysis of interviews.

The local syllabus document can be seen as an informative source as to how teachers think about their teaching with regards to aims, content and criteria for assessment. Supplementing a study of syllabus documents with conversational interviews would perhaps have given the authors of the written syllabi greater opportunities to express their thoughts and also created possibilities for meeting complex issues arising from the text analysis. However, the choice to carry out the interviews separately from the text analyses was partly due to the logistics involved in the collection of the empirical material and partly to methodological reasons of neutrality. An awareness of the multiple possibilities of interpretations is of importance in the sense that all the authors of the syllabi studied will probably have different understandings of the meaning of the word *friluftsliv*. It is my hope and belief that the two methods included in this thesis have enriched each other and have contributed to a deeper understanding of the respondents’ thoughts on *friluftsliv* in school and teacher education. Thus my study can be described as having a triangulating or a multi-methodical approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a, p. 9-11; Fontana & Frey, 2003, p. 99; Kullberg, 2004, p. 83-84).

**Interviews**

In my approach to interviews I have been inspired by Bourdieu et al. (1999) and their discussion of how social relationships between the researcher and the respondent might affect the outcome of the interview. Although not denying the importance of methodological writings concerning interview techniques, Bourdieu et al. (ibid) call primary attention to "the simultaneously practical and theoretical problems that emerge from the particular interaction between the investigator and the person being questioned" (p. 607). Further, they describe the interview situation as a market for linguistic and symbolic goods in which the researcher is often in a superior position of power in relation to the respondent due to his/her possession of capital, mainly cultural capital. The involvement of the social relationship in the interview situation and its significance for the generated knowledge is also emphasised by Fontana and Frey.

Social scientists are more likely to recognize, however, that interviews are interactional encounters and that the nature of the social dynamic of the inter-
Further, they claim that the detection of when and how a respondent actively contributes to the construction of knowledge is dependent on the experience of the researcher. Bourdieu et al. (1999) argue that the lack in balance of power between the researcher and the respondent might lead to the latter being exposed to a symbolic violence, a limitation in the ability to express one’s thoughts, which is an effect of the social structure influencing the interview situation. According to this, then, my questions on personal experiences, thoughts and opinions have implied an intrusion into the teachers’ and educators’ social sphere. This is not to suggest that my respondents have been totally powerless in relation to me and have only expressed what they believe I want to hear. However, my position as a researcher, asking questions about their teaching practice and their personal thoughts and ideas around friluftsliv, might have made them somewhat reserved.

Inspired by what Bourdieu et al. (ibid) refer to as the researcher’s socio-logical “eye” or “feel”, I have tried to identify situations where my respondent’s expressions have been limited, and where I have had the chance to act on the spot, i.e. during the interviews, in order to minimize the effects of the social intrusion and the symbolic violence (p. 607-609). Based on my relatively limited experience of interviewing it is more than likely that I have missed several of these situations.

Bourdieu et al. (ibid) argue that the researcher’s attempts to put himself/herself in the same situation as the respondent also involve trying to understand the respondent’s social life conditions. A similarity in social background may increase the possibility of a mutual understanding of the object of research (p. 611-613). In my study, it is difficult to compare my own social, cultural and economical background with that of my respondents based on the information collected. There may also be some differences between the PE teacher educators interviewed and the PE teachers interviewed in this matter. On a comprehensive level, I detected more similarities between myself and the PE teacher educators interviewed, compared to the PE teachers that I interviewed. Among other things, I have understood my relation to friluftsliv, developed during childhood and adolescence, as similar to that of most of the interviewed PE teacher educators. My own education and teaching experience also appeared to be similar to that of several of the PE teacher educators, as well as in views of what it means to teach friluftsliv to PE teacher students. These conditions might have resulted in similar preferences regarding these particular aspects.

Although not denying that the thematising process has probably placed me in a superior position of power in relation to all of my respondents (a fact identified by an impression of insecurity and a nervousness among a few of the respondents in the start of the interviews), the general impression was
that “the social distance” between me and my respondents was not significant (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 610-611). Particularly this was the case with the PE teacher educators, some of whom I was familiar with before the interviews.

In scientific studies, the researcher’s objectivity and neutrality is often mentioned as important, in order not to influence the respondent. Rather than this non-involving approach, Bourdieu et al. highlight engagement and compassion as significant in order to create an interview with the character of ordinary conversation.

It is this participation, in which one engages in conversation and brings the speaker to engage in it as well, which most clearly distinguishes the ordinary conversation, or the interview as we have practised it, from the interview in which the researcher, out of a concern for neutrality, rules out all personal involvement. (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 619)

Frey and Fontana (2003) describe this type of conversation as an unstructured interview, in which the researcher strives for an understanding of human complexity and is not trying to fit the answers into predetermined categories (p. 74-75). Inspired by the approach to unstructured interviews as described, but also using an interview guide as support, I would characterize my interviews as semi-structured. Apart from some exceptions in the beginning of the interviews, it was my impression that the respondents were not limited or restricted, but instead engaged, in our conversations.

Text analysis

One of the three types of empirical material included in the thesis is a text analysis of national PE curriculum documents as well as local PE syllabus documents presented in Paper I. In these documents formulations regarding friluftsliv were investigated. Although not being an important reason for the choice of collection technique, text analysis has several advantages of a practical character. For following an historical course of events, text analysis is an effective method. Texts are usually relatively easily accessible and collection is generally not expensive (Hodder, 2003, p. 156).

In literature discussing text analysis, written documents are sometimes described as a material trace which, similar to buildings and other material artefacts, can give us insights in peoples’ lives. This type of information has been described as constituting a material culture. The great variation regarding empirical information within this culture also involves a variety of theoretical approaches. Thus, Hodder (ibid) emphasizes that a “material culture always has to be interpreted in relation to a situated context of production, use, discard, and reuse” (p. 160). My search for a theoretical foundation in order to explain my curriculum analysis has not been done “blindly”. My
identification of Bernstein’s theory and concepts as useful is instead a result of studying theoretical applications in similar studies.

It has been discussed whether or not written texts bring us closer to an original meaning in comparison with other types of empirical material. Once again, I would like to refer to Hodder (ibid) who rejects the idea of a “true” or “essential” meaning in a text. Instead, he emphasizes the interpretation of the text as contextual (p. 156). This notion is also supported by Tully (1988) who claims that all texts have to be related to their historical, social and cultural context in order to be able to compare a text with others in the same genre and to understand why it is written in a certain way (p. 9). One important piece of contextual information in my study of curriculum documents is Swedish teachers’ obligation to make the national aims explicit and clear to the pupils (SNAE, 2009). The fact that the production of local syllabi is not a task chosen by the teachers but one that has been imposed on them is an important circumstance for me to relate to (Hodder, 2003, p. 157).

Further, my ambition has been to regard the analysed texts as “actions” in the sense that they can have consequences for the implemented teaching. The way in which a teacher speaks or writes about friluftsliv is based on values which can find expressions in the PE teaching (Säfström & Östman, 1999, s. 20-21).

Sample

The first study – text analysis of curriculum documents – Paper I

My empirical material is divided into two levels: First, I have analysed how friluftsliv is expressed on a national curriculum level, i.e. in general national Swedish curricula and in the national PE curricula from 1955, 1957, 1962, 1969, 1980 and 1994. When analysing the national PE curriculum from 1994, I have focused on the aims for friluftsliv, which can be seen as governing teaching. Secondly, I have analysed how friluftsliv is expressed in local PE syllabi from a sample of compulsory schools in Sweden. Since the local syllabus documents analysed lack a mutual and comprehensive structure, I have tried to identify the parts of the syllabi in which friluftsliv is mentioned. The syllabi have been collected within the SIH research programme, an acronym for “Skola-Idrott- Hälsa” (School-Sport-Health). Within the SIH-programme children’s and young people’s physical activity, physical ability, health, leisure habits and experience of PE have been studied. The programme has involved both quantitative and qualitative empirical collection, carried out in 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2007, mainly from PE teachers and pupils in selected compulsory schools, equally spread over Sweden (Larsson & Redelius, 2008; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). The collection of the local PE
syllabi was done after contact with the PE teachers taking part in the SIH programme in 2007 (see Appendix 1). From the 47 compulsory schools taking part, 31 syllabus documents were sent in by PE teachers.

The second study – interviews with PE teachers – Paper II
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 the 47 schools participating in the SIH programme in 2007. Initially, the criteria for the selection of PE teachers were based on their answer in the questionnaire as to whether they taught several (more than six of eight given alternatives) or few (less than two of eight given alternatives) activities in friluftsliv (see Appendix 6 for a specification of these activities). The point of selecting these two groups of PE teachers was to include possibly different views on the conditions regulating friluftsliv teaching, a strategy which can be described as purposeful or purposive sampling (Creswell, 2002, p. 194; Cohen et al., 2000, p. 103-104). 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 programme in 2007 fulfilled the criteria (three in each group). Therefore, the remaining six PE teachers in the sample where selected on the basis of their location (an even distribution over Sweden) and their gender (equal numbers of men and women).

The third study – interviews with PE teacher educators – Papers III and IV
The sample consists of 17 PE teacher educators (12 men and five women) working at eight higher education departments in Sweden. From the 16 PETE departments in Sweden, the sample was selected on the basis of two criteria: 1) The PETE department should offer courses in PE up to at least 90 ECTS (European Credit Transfer System), i.e. 1.5 years of full-time study. 2) From the departments that fulfilled the first criterion, the ones with the longest history of educating PE teachers were chosen. The departments then chose their own participants, but two criteria were asked for: 1) The respondents were to be engaged mainly in teaching friluftsliv. 2) Based on research emphasising friluftsliv, outdoor recreation and outdoor education as a male hegemony (see e.g., Humberstone, 2000; Pedersen, 2003), the participation of one male and one female respondent was required from each department. The fact that the sample, despite this inquiry, consisted of significantly more men than women is discussed elsewhere in this thesis. There were thus two respondents from each department except for one with three respondents. The sample of departments as well as of respondents corresponds to what Creswell (2002, p. 194) and Cohen et al. (2000, p. 103-104) describe as purposeful or purposive sampling.
Collecting the empirical material

The first study – text analysis of curriculum documents – Paper I

The texts on the national curriculum level were collected from libraries and the internet. Collection on the local level was initiated by a letter to the PE teachers and was then followed up by reminders via telephone and e-mail (see Appendix 1). After assenting to participate in the study, the majority of the PE syllabus documents were sent in by e-mail. It is possible that the schools contributing with their local PE syllabus documents are not representative in the sense that they may have got further in their internal curriculum development compared to the schools not submitting their PE syllabus documents. For this reason, the local PE syllabus documents in this study cannot be seen as representative of a larger sample. During my reading of the curriculum documents, friluftsliv was the “appraisive term” in focus. This means that I have tried to “understand the sense of a word, (and) its role in language” and “what exact range of attitudes the term can standardly be used to express” (Skinner, 1988, p. 122). I believe that my introductory review of different values and meanings ascribed to friluftsliv has been helpful in this ambition.

When reading through the curriculum documents, I have marked the word friluftsliv and other, closely related concepts. The words considered by me as closely related to friluftsliv, were “natur” (nature), “naturupplevelse” (experience of nature), “miljö” (environment), “ekologi” (ecology) and “utomhuspedagogik” (outdoor education). The identification and copying of sentences including friluftsliv and closely related concepts, resulted in shorter texts. Aspects considered in the analysis of these texts are presented later. Since the PE syllabi collected were written in Swedish, I have translated the quotations presented in Paper I.

The second and third study – interviews with PE teachers (Paper II) and with PE teacher educators (Papers III and IV)

There were major similarities in the implementation of the interviews in the second study with the PE teachers and the third study with the PE teacher educators. Introductory letters to the respondents presented information about the studies and the opportunity to participate in an interview regarding friluftsliv in the contexts of PE and PETE (see Appendices 2 and 4). After having established contact and received approval from the respondents to participate in the studies, the interviews were carried out in isolated rooms at each school and at each department. The interviews with the PE teachers lasted between 45 and 70 minutes and the interviews with the PE teacher educators lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. All the interviews were carried
out as private conversations with one exception in the study with the PE teacher educators, where the respondents asked to be interviewed as a pair. The ambition was to create a sense of an ordinary conversation in order to avoid making the respondents feel they were being questioned (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 607-626). After approval, all the interviews were recorded on tape or as MP3 files. An interview guide was used as support, and the questions can be described as semi-standardised and semi-structured (see Appendices 3 and 5). 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. 342-347). 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; Vetenskapsrådet, 2009). After the interviews, they were all transcribed verbatim. 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 me.

**Transcription and analysis**

Analysis is a difficult process which includes the challenge of making sense of a massive amount of information and transforming it into findings. There are guidelines in this process, but no rules to rely on. Today there are several software programs available that can provide assistance in the analysis of qualitative research (Creswell, 2002, p. 261-265). However, it is the creativity and the intelligence of the researcher that decides the quality and the uniqueness of the qualitative analysis (Patton, 2002, p. 440-447). Silverman (2003) describes the realistic approach to analysis as different from the narrative approach. The realistic approach is based on the idea that it is possible to reproduce the surrounding reality and that the value of the analysis can be verified in relation to other studies. This approach often involves software programs in the analysis. In relation to this, the narrative approach involves abandoning the idea of a reality possible to capture and is instead receptive for new and culturally rich representations of the world (p. 343). Although I have had the ambition to analyse the formulations and statements with an open mind and with a degree of creativity, the idea of verification is difficult to let go.

In qualitative research, the importance of separating the processes of collection, transcription and analysis of the empirical material is not as clearly emphasized as in quantitative research, but instead these processes can overlap each other. During my collection of information and transcription, I have tried to get a sense of the major ideas and themes in the material, a strategy that I believe may have facilitated the analyses (Creswell, 2002, p. 258; Kvale, 1996, p. 176-178; Patton, 2002, p. 436-437).
There are similarities in the acts of analysing texts and analysing interviews, especially regarding the process of finding a way of presenting the material in themes and categories. I have tried to follow Silverman’s (2003) advice of adopting a clear analytic approach and working with a deep analysis of a limited number of texts, (p. 347-353). I have also dealt with what Hodder (2003) calls the three areas of evaluation. Firstly, I have tried to identify the context in which the documents have a similar meaning. Secondly, I have tried to recognise similarities and differences in the textual document, and thirdly, I have tried to apply a relevant theory to discuss the evidence (p. 167-168). The recorded interviews were all transcribed verbatim after they had taken place. In order to get to know the material better and to get a general sense of it, I transcribed the collected material myself (Patton, 2002, p. 441).

An issue often discussed in qualitative research concerns whether the theoretical perspective has been decided prior to the construction of questions or if the theory has been developed after collecting the empirical information. These two approaches are usually mentioned as deduction and induction respectively. In my study, I have tried to combine these two approaches, although with somewhat more inspiration from the inductive approach. Combining induction and deduction have implied a questioning of what the empirical material contains while searching for fixed conditions in the material. This oscillation between empiri and theory is called analytical induction (Watt Boolsen, 2007, p. 26-28) or abduction (Alveson & Sköldberg, 1994, p. 41-45) and is an approach frequently used.

In order to bring order into chaos, I have tried to create a manageable classification or coding scheme. As Patton (2002) suggests, my interview guides actually constitute analytical frameworks, but my ambition has been to move beyond this descriptive level (p. 440). As a first step in order to achieve this, I have read through the transcribed material and tried to get a first sense of the content. Naturally I had ideas about what theoretical perspective to apply before collecting of empirical material but it was not until I started to transcribe and read through the empirical material that these ideas were strengthened and confirmed. I will further develop my abductive approach and the oscillation between empiri and theory in the discussion of my results. During the following reading, I have searched for recurring regularities in the text and tried to come up with topics or codes that can serve as labels for segments of the text. Doing this I have asked myself questions such as: “What is this text about?” and: “What are the different themes in the text?” Patton (2002) describes this process as the challenge of convergence (p. 465). In this process, Silverman (2003) calls attention to the fact that the ambition to make the results accessible and interesting for a public audience can have an influence on the coding and categorising of the text (p. 350). The process of labelling the transcribed text with different codes that could constitute a classification system required several readings.
The next step involved a careful examination of the data that did not seem to fit into the identified pattern. The categories were then clustered into themes containing similar codes, a process referred to as examining the divergence (Patton, 2002, p. 466). After this, I have focused on the relationship between the identified categories and I thus tried to elucidate how the theoretical concepts can explain the patterns discovered in the analysis. By following the guidelines for analysis as described here, I have been able to reveal the themes presented and discussed in the papers (Creswell, 2002, p. 265-271; Patton, 2002, p. 462-466).

Silverman (2003) is sceptical as to whether the statements of the respondents can be viewed as a direct representation of their experiences (p. 346). I agree with the idea of paying consideration to the context and also the specific position from which the statements are being made. I do not, therefore, see my analysis as a direct reflection of the respondents’ experience of my questions (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 625). Using the theoretical framework of Bourdieu and Bernstein, my analysis must be seen as a construction of knowledge. However, it is a construction based on what I consider reasonable interpretations of the respondents’ expressions (Karlsson, 2005, p. 155).

Validation of qualitative research

The difficulty of examining validity in qualitative research is much discussed. In the positivist paradigm, validity is an indicator of the quality of the research and this is also the case for a substantial part of the tradition in natural science. However, within the constructivist paradigm in qualitative research it is more common to discuss aspects of credibility and authenticity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003b, p. 247). There is a risk that validity may be considered synonymous with objectivity (Lincoln & Guba, 2003, p. 274). Despite the constructivist rejection of objectivity within qualitative research, there is still the problem of evaluating our conception of reality (Ödman, 2004, p. 104). Lincoln and Guba formulate the challenge as follows:

How do we know when we have specific social inquiries that are faithful enough to some human construction that we may feel safe in acting on them, or, more important, that members of the community in which the research is conducted may act on them? (Lincoln & Guba, 2003, p. 277)

Not having a clear answer to this question, I have tried to follow some directions during the research process. Within qualitative research today, there is consensus around the idea that credibility and authenticity are dependent on a critical attitude towards all methodological issues rather than on whether or not a certain method is being used. Therefore, one method is not considered better suited than another but the choice of method should be based on the
problem being addressed (ibid, p. 274). Further, Lincoln and Guba (ibid) argue that the researcher’s ethical considerations involve a certain degree of credibility and authenticity (p. 281). Although not without difficulties, I have tried to follow the ethical guidelines stipulated by “Vetenskapsrådet” (2009) (The Swedish Research Council). A significant part of the ethical considerations in my study have concerned preserving the anonymity of my respondents. Another ethical issue considered has been to assess which questions may have been sensitive to answer (Patton, 2002, p. 415). The sensitivity involved in proclaiming one’s view of friluftsliv was especially noticeable in some of the interviews with the PE teacher educators.

During the process of research, I have also been made aware of the importance of trying to separate the word friluftsliv from the conceptual understanding of friluftsliv and phenomena associated with friluftsliv. Since the conceptual understanding of the word friluftsliv has proven to be so individually and contextually dependent, it is most likely that my respondents have sometimes misunderstood the intentions of my questions. When asking PE teachers about their teaching of friluftsliv, it is possible that they have excluded some of the values and outdoor practices that they in fact teach, due to the uncertainty of what should be included and excluded in our conversation. Although I have had to relate to the expressions of the respondents, this issue is important to consider in order to present the object of research as richly and authentically as possible.

According to Ödman (2004), one basic condition for evaluating validity is our awareness of an existing mutual interpretation, or intersubjectivity, i.e. some sort of concordance in peoples’ perception of reality. Thereby, the validity, or more correct credibility and authenticity, aimed at in my study presuppose that my respondents understand my questions in approximately the same way as myself. Despite the difficulty involved in evaluating this quality, Ödman (2004) suggests the argumentation, i.e. the search for alternative ways of interpretation, may help bring us closer to a concordance in our perception (p. 104-110). I further develop my search for alternative interpretations in the later discussion of my results. The concordance in perception of the issues discussed in the interviews might have been facilitated by my experiences from teaching in PE and PETE, as well as by my ambition to be sociologically vigilant during the interviews.
Summary of the papers

In this section I present a summary of the papers on which this thesis is based. Since a more thorough review of earlier research and theoretical perspectives has already been presented, this summary will focus on the results and discussions of the four papers. A complete version of each paper is attached at the end of the thesis.

Paper I


During the last decade, expanding research investigating school subject Physical Education (PE), indicates a promotion of inequalities regarding which children benefit from PE teaching (Brown, 2005; Evans & Davies, 2006a, b; Hunter, 2004; Redelius et al., 2009). Outdoor education and Scandinavian *friluftsliv* is a part of the PE curriculum in many countries and these practices have been claimed to have the potential to contribute to more equity in PE teaching (Humberstone, 1993; Paechter, 2006). Through an investigation of the relationship between the representation of *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum and the transformation of *friluftsliv* into local PE syllabi in 31 Swedish compulsory schools, this paper investigates the possibilities for *friluftsliv* to fulfil this potential. More specifically, taking the perspective of educational sociologist Basil Bernstein, the questions asked were, firstly: How is *friluftsliv* formulated in the national Swedish curriculum documents?, secondly: How is *friluftsliv* transformed into local syllabus documents in some Swedish schools? and finally: What can the analysis of the transformation of *friluftsliv* from a national to a local level say about the possibilities for *friluftsliv* to contribute to more of democracy and equity in PE?

From a historical perspective, formulations regarding *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum have been transformed from detailed descriptions regarding outdoor activities and teaching methods into merely expressing “basic knowledge in *friluftsliv*” as an aim of learning today (SNAE, 2000a). Using the concepts of educational sociologist Basil Bernstein, one
way of describing this development would be that PE in Sweden has moved from a relatively strong classification into a weaker one (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008; Tholin, 2006). The removal in the general curriculum of formulations regarding specified days for friluftsliv confirms this assumption. However, Swedish PE has also been described as having a strong classification (Karlefors, 2002), which is perhaps an expression of the general idea of PE as being an important and appreciated subject in school.

The analysis of the local syllabus documents reveals a significant variation in how friluftsliv is interpreted among Swedish PE teachers. When addressed at all, the most common ways of expressing friluftsliv were: as orienteering; as The Right of Public Access; and as the ability to choose suitable clothes for being outdoors. Formulations regarding encounters with nature, environmental perspectives and a sustainable development were almost never mentioned in the PE syllabi studied. In Sweden, the tendency to organise PE in terms of activities and quantitatively measurable aims has been described as a sports and physical activity discourse’s domination over a learning discourse (Larsson & Redelius, 2008; Redelius et al., 2009). My findings regarding the interpretation of friluftsliv within PE confirm the reproduction of the sports and physical activity discourse. I find this discussion of school discourses to be similar to what Bernstein (2000) calls the performance code and the competence code. Evans and Davies (2006b) argue that the domination of the performance code in PE will limit the possibilities to improve the current condition of enhancement, inclusion and participation in school. According to the findings in this study, friluftsliv, when occasionally addressed in Swedish PE, will have only limited possibilities to reach its claimed potential of equity.

Paper II


Lately, research has shown that factors such as teachers’ value orientations, available time, size of group, equipment and teaching environment have a controlling and regulating function for teaching practices in PE (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). This is also the case in outdoor education and Scandinavian friluftsliv within PE (Beedie, 2000; Brown, 2006; Repp, 1993). In this study, I have analysed how the pedagogic discourse for teaching friluftsliv in Swedish schools can influence the PE teachers’ control of the teaching practice. The study was based on qualitative interviews with 12 Swedish PE teachers. Using Basil Bernstein’s perspectives, the following questions were asked: What is expressed as hav-
ing influence on Swedish PE teachers’ framing relation to the pedagogic communication of friluftsliv?; What pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv in Swedish PE engenders these framing relations?; Who contribute to the production of the specific pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv within Swedish PE? and, 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?

The respondents interviewed expressed inadequacy at not being able to fulfil the aims regarding friluftsliv formulated in the national Swedish PE curriculum. This insufficient fulfilment of aims was claimed to be, partly, due to factors meant to control the teaching of friluftsliv and, partly, due to indistinct and inexplicit wordings in the national aims. The friluftsliv described by the respondents is a teaching practice that requires time, equipment, financial resources and that is to be carried out in nature, a setting regarded as close by some teachers and distant by others. This teaching also involves risks for pupils as well as teachers and is to be carried out as cooperative projects between subject teachers. The factors mentioned as conditioning friluftsliv teaching have been proved to have the capacity to control and limit teachers’ possibilities of PE teaching in general (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008).

I have found Bernstein’s (2000) concept of the pedagogic device to be valuable for analysing how this specific outdoor teaching discourse is produced and for illuminating how the exclusiveness of the analysed friluftsliv discourse actually involves obstacles for achieving national aims regarding friluftsliv in Swedish PE. The empirical evidence in this study supports earlier research claiming teacher education to be a significant producer of the pedagogic discourses practised at the school level (Singh, 2002), but also points at the responsibility of the PE teachers themselves. From the distributive rules in the pedagogic device, I state that the identified pedagogic discourse constitutes the thinkable option in the distributive process. Drawing on Bernstein (2000), I call for a turn to the unthinkable options in order to identify alternative pedagogic discourses. An outdoor discourse characterised by a more urban and simple friluftsliv, with less technical equipment and financial resources, would possibly be a way to strengthen teachers’ control of their teaching and to create better possibilities for pupils to achieve the aims in the national Swedish PE curriculum.

In the recontextualisation process of the pedagogic device, Bernstein also makes a distinction between the official recontextualisation field (ORF) and the pedagogic recontextualisation field (PRF). The ORF is created and dominated by the state and its agents (i.e. the producers of curricular text documents) while the PRF consists of schoolteachers, colleges and departments of education (Bernstein, 2000). The inadequacy experienced by Swedish PE teachers regarding fulfilment of aims and their call for more explicit aims on a national level suggests the need of an intensified discussion be-
tween the ORF and the PRF about principles underlying the national PE curriculum and ways of interpreting the national aims.

Paper III


The value assigned to friluftsliv in PETE and in the PE syllabus in Sweden does not seem to result in the implementation of friluftsliv in the teaching in Swedish schools (Al-Abdi, 1984; Backman, 2004; Svenning, 2001). Based on this identification, this study has investigated how debates concerning values in friluftsliv, expressed in interviews with 17 Swedish PE teacher educators who are specialised in teaching friluftsliv, reflect struggles for legitimate and privileged knowledge within PETE in Sweden. More specifically the questions asked were, firstly: What specific values in the friluftsliv practised within PETE do Swedish PE teacher educators publicly discuss? and secondly: What is the relationship between friluftsliv and sport within PETE according to Swedish PE teacher educators?

The exploration of friluftsliv within PETE revealed some specific themes which recurred as opposing standpoints. Competition and experience of nature appeared to be two opposing themes, of which the latter was expressed as the essence of the practice of friluftsliv. Generally, the respondents believed that friluftsliv should not involve competition since this was expressed to be the essence of sport. What I have called the ordinary and the exclusive friluftsliv appeared to be another pair of opposing themes. Ordinary friluftsliv was characterised as possible to practise in the easily accessible environment, not demanding any special skills from the performers. The practice of exclusive friluftsliv, on the other hand, was described as taking place in untouched natural environments and requiring physical exertion and special knowledge. Exclusive friluftsliv seemed to be especially valuable within PETE while ordinary friluftsliv was expressed to be more appropriate in the school context. The genuine and the new friluftsliv were two themes illustrating on the one hand, the simple, unaffected and pure life close to nature without too many modern and technical aids, and on the other hand, sportified activities appearing as a consequence of modern processes such as commercialisation, technicalisation and medialisation. Of these two themes, genuine friluftsliv was considered most valuable. The last two themes discovered I have called theoretical and practical friluftsliv. The context of higher education contributed to a discussion of what can be considered knowledge in friluftsliv. Practical friluftsliv corresponds to the techniques
and the bodily skills in the performance of activities in *friluftsliv*. Theoretical *friluftsliv* refers to the assimilation of knowledge through literature and being able to reflect, analyse and discuss *friluftsliv* as a social, cultural and educational phenomenon. Of these two themes it was practical *friluftsliv* that seemed to be given priority within PETE.

Analysing the themes thus discovered from the sociological perspectives of Pierre Bourdieu, they could correspond to positions in a field, resting upon the agents’ social positions, and also to a struggle of forces within the *friluftsliv* practised within PETE (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 38-46; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 94-104). The values expressed by the PE teacher educators teaching *friluftsliv* within PETE were experience of nature, exclusive *friluftsliv*, genuine *friluftsliv* and practical *friluftsliv*. These recognised values can then be interpreted as symbolic capital when exploring *friluftsliv* within PETE as a social field. The results also indicate that the logic of sport, i.e. the competition, was used as a point of reference to describe the identity of *friluftsliv*. My interpretation is that some of the themes discovered appeared as an effect of the dominating logic of sport within Swedish PETE and the limited influence of the academic field. Based on Bourdieu’s construction of sub-fields existing within a greater field (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30-31), it would be possible to consider PETE a sub-field in the crossing between the field of sport and the academic field. My object of research, teaching in *friluftsliv* within PETE, could then theoretically be considered a sub-field within PETE. It would appear that the struggles in the field consist of making a clear distinction from the superior field of sport, but not as clear a one in relation to the academic field.

**Paper IV**


The difficulty of making an impact on the values and dispositions students take with them into their education seems to be a general problem in teacher education (Henswold, 2003, p. 150-151; Lortie, 1975, p. 79-81). Compared to the teaching in PETE, PE teachers’ and PE teacher students’ personal preferences for physical activities have been shown to have great significance for what is expressed in the teaching in PE (Annerstedt, 1991; Camacho & Fernández-Balboa, 2006; Green, 2000). Based on the fact that *friluftsliv* is expressed as one of few compulsory elements in the national Swedish PE curriculum, the purpose of this study was to investigate how 17 Swedish PE teacher educators, who are specialised in teaching *friluftsliv*, describe their own and students’ relationship to *friluftsliv*, how this relation-
ship can be developed and under what conditions it can be changed. More specifically, taking the socio-cultural perspective of Pierre Bourdieu, the questions asked were, firstly: How is the taste for friluftsliv acquired?, secondly: How do the Swedish PE teacher educators describe their students’ taste for physical practices?, and finally: What educational tools within PETE have the potential to strengthen the teaching of friluftsliv within Swedish schools?

The results indicated that the respondents’ own relationship to friluftsliv was generally developed during childhood, through spending time and practising activities in the outdoors, often with their parents. The respondents claimed that they had developed a close relationship to friluftsliv through early experiences and that this has been of great importance for their valuations and lifestyle today. It was suggested that for the students to develop a close personal relationship to friluftsliv as adults, this requires strong experiences of nature during continuous and long-lasting practice of friluftsliv.

Inspired by the concepts of Bourdieu, I see similarities between the respondents’ description of the development of their preferences for friluftsliv and the theory of how embodied experiences can shape a system of dispositions constituting the individual habitus, which is thereafter expressed in a specific taste (Bourdieu, 1990, s. 9-10). In accordance with the proved correlation between socio-cultural background and taste for a certain lifestyle (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 128-129), the respondents’ relationship to friluftsliv can also be interpreted as an expression of their middle-class background.

The PE teacher students were generally described as having many experiences from sport, but fewer from friluftsliv. This condition was said to be especially significant for the immigrant students. The qualities emphasised as important for PETE to develop among future PE teachers in order for friluftsliv to be implemented in school, were enthusiasm, energy and a strong, inner conviction of the importance of implementing friluftsliv despite all obstacles. Therefore, I asked what educational tools the PE teacher educators use in order to change the students’ relationship to friluftsliv during PETE.

When discussing PETE’s importance for the teaching of friluftsliv in schools, there were expressions of optimism as well as of realism. Although it was stressed that the teaching of PETE was of great significance for the students’ development into PE teachers, there was also an expressed awareness that friluftsliv education in PETE might not leave as big an impression as hoped. Individual preferences for physical activities were said to have a strong influence on the content and methods of PE teaching. The main impression from the interviews was that the students’ relationships to physical practices, carried into PETE, are so strongly engraved, that PETE’s potential to change them is fairly limited. Despite their awareness of many of their students’ lack of experience of friluftsliv, as well as PETE’s limited potential to change the students’ habituses, the respondents did not mention any spe-
cific tools (except perhaps for the combination of theory and practice in their teaching) aimed at converting the “souls yet to be saved”.

What was not mentioned as an educational tool was for example the students’ own awareness of the conditions for development of habitus, tastes and practices and the reflection of its importance for PE teaching practices. Based on the expressed idea that the primary purpose of friluftsliv education in PETE is to develop the students’ enthusiasm and taste for friluftsliv through strong and long-lasting experiences of nature, I have argued for more of socially critical perspectives in the friluftsliv education within Swedish PETE.

In the following discussion I try to develop further my view of what I see as the educational issues originating from the relationships between the four papers and emphasise what I see as the conclusions of this thesis.
Discussion

Based on the analyses presented in the four papers included in this thesis, I now discuss what I see as significant contributions to the discussion of the conditions underlying the production of friluftsliv within Swedish PE. Although my object of research concerns a specific element in Swedish PE, I have found some aspects in the material that relate to PE as a whole. This assumption is supported by the identification of friluftsliv as having a unique position in the curriculum for Swedish PE (SNAE, 2000a) as well as in Swedish PETE (Larsson, 2009). My discussion is presented in a number of themes in which I develop issues raised in the papers included and which also reflect the various contributions of the papers viewed in relation to each other.

Reflections on the implementation of the studies

I would like to start my discussion by returning to the point when my interest for educational aspects of friluftsliv was founded, and explore further what I have mentioned as my analytically inductive, or abductive, approach (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 1994, p. 41-45; Watt Bo Olsen, 2007, p 26-28). I was familiar with the theories of Bourdieu and Bernstein, as well as with research in the area of friluftsliv and PE, even before I began constructing my research questions. Although the theoretical perspectives in my thesis were not consciously predetermined before the construction of the questions to my respondents, I have probably been aware of their appropriateness for my study right from in the beginning of the process. In accordance with Bourdieu’s ideas on the subject, my experience of a total freedom in my choice of theoretical perspective might in fact have been a choice made from a limited number of options. Not least Bourdieu’s theories have had a significant influence in the research environment where I have been working.

However, my decision to deepen my understanding of Bernstein’s (2000) theory of the communication of pedagogic messages was not made until I discovered that the conversations with the PE teachers involved a complex relationship between the national aims for friluftsliv and the teaching implemented. Further, it was the sensitivity and tension involved in some of the PE teacher educators’ expressions of friluftsliv which made me understand that this condition might be reflected as positions within a field (Bourdieu,
The choice of Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus and taste (1984, 1990) was also strengthened by the expressions of the importance for the PE teacher students to acquire an enthusiasm for friluftsliv. After my decision to analyse the material using the approaches of Bourdieu and Bernstein, I have oscillated between an exploration of the empirical material and a deepening of my understanding of the theoretical perspectives. Looking back, I cannot see the alternatives to this mutual process of developing the empirical material and choosing theoretical perspectives. From my perspective, a one-sided inductive, or deductive, approach would have been difficult to relate to.

I want to emphasise that I do not claim my study to involve an investigation of whether or not Swedish pupils’ and students’ have in fact learnt friluftsliv, or how this process of learning friluftsliv is constituted. Bernstein himself has devoted interest to the acquisition and use of language among children and young people (1973). If my purpose had been to investigate the process of learning friluftsliv, this would probably have involved participating in, and observing teaching. A specific focus on learning aspects in friluftsliv would perhaps also have involved interviewing pupils and students. Since I have chosen to concentrate on some of the educational and sociological conditions underlying the production of teaching in friluftsliv within Swedish PE, my claims only concern the teaching of friluftsliv that is offered and expressed by the teachers and educators interviewed. Although not explored in this study, pupils’ and students’ learning in friluftsliv can of course be discussed in terms of potential consequences of the teaching offered.

The socially critical and constructivist approach which I have claimed implies that I do not believe there to be only one, true and producible representation of the conditions underlying the production of the teaching of friluftsliv (Burr, 2003). In accordance with the emphasis of Bourdieu et al. (1999), my respondents have made their statements at a specific moment, from a specific position, and I have interpreted their experiences of the questions I have asked.

Sociologists cannot be unaware that the specific characteristic of their point of view is to be point of view on a point of view. (Bourdieu et al., 1999, p. 625)

Based on the plurality of conceptual understandings involved when discussing a value-laden word such as friluftsliv, I have tried to remind myself to keep an open mind on what the teachers and educators might associate with friluftsliv in order not to restrain or limit areas of conversation. I am aware that I can only present one of several images of the conditions for teaching friluftsliv within Swedish PE, and therefore I further argue for what I have considered to be reasonable interpretations of my results (Karlsson, 2005). My argumentation for alternative ways of interpreting my results is an effort
Friluftsliv in the documents of Swedish schools

At the time of writing this thesis, Swedish schools are facing a new curriculum reform. My results indicate that the teaching of friluftsliv in Swedish PE is surrounded by difficulties of implementation. Perhaps this is due to the exclusiveness of the pedagogic discourse investigated in Paper II, and the fact that Swedish friluftsliv teaching, when it occurs, appears to consist of only a few specific, and usually sportified, teaching practices (see results from Paper I). Thereby, claimed values of equity and democracy are not likely to be normal consequences of the friluftsliv taught in Swedish PE. This interpretation is based on the fact that friluftsliv, when explored in Papers I and II, is not explicitly expressed as an alternative to challenge the effects of differentiation and stratification characterising many of the sport practices dominating Swedish PE. Based on this identification, alternatives to the current formulation of friluftsliv in the Swedish curriculum documents can be discussed.

In Paper I, I claim that friluftsliv in Swedish PE has a weak classification in that it appears to be difficult to express in texts in terms of learning aspects. Further, I suggest that the ignorance of friluftsliv, although being expressed as a PE-element assigned specific value, indicates the whole of Swedish PE to be surrounded by weak and blurred boundaries (Bernstein, 1971, p. 205). This conclusion is shared by other researchers of PE in Sweden (Ekberg, 2009, Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). Based on this observation, one might ask whether or not a strong classification is an obvious ambition for a school subject to aim for? In the performance code characterising public debate on schools and education in Sweden as well as in the UK, school subjects with a strong tradition and explicit boundaries, i.e. a strong classification, appear to avoid being publically questioned (Björklund, 2006; Fitz et al., 2006, p. 6).

Thus, a part of the problem emanating from this thesis can be defined as how the teaching of friluftsliv, and perhaps the whole of Swedish PE, is to gain acknowledgement from a learning perspective. In order to develop alternative strategies for meeting this complex issue, I believe attention should be drawn to the formulations of the aims in the national Swedish PE curriculum. In accordance with the current decentralized governance of the Swedish school, the national aims for friluftsliv have a broad character (“the pupils should have a basic knowledge of friluftsliv”). This is for the purpose of encouraging PE teachers to deepen their subject knowledge and making their own interpretations of the national aims. However, Swedish PE teachers appear instead to see obscurity in the assignment, a critique also highlighted
by the PE teachers interviewed in Paper II. One consequence of this type of governance, is claimed to be that “decentralization will lead to a number of different arenas of formulation” (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000, p. 174, my translation).

If the stipulated aims are not to be ignored, one possibility would perhaps be to follow the PE teachers’ demand for an increasing degree of concreteness in the national Swedish PE curriculum. Linde (2006) suggests that “in subjects with distinct boundaries, the formulations in the curriculum will have a strong impact” (p. 57, my translation). In the national Swedish PE curriculum, an exception from the principle of decentralization has already been implemented regarding the aim for swimming. It is now explicitly expressed that the ability to swim means being able to swim 200 metres breaststroke and 50 metres backstroke. However, this was the result of strong pressure from organizations involved in swimming and life-saving, rather than from PE teachers (Casson, 2007). In the light of this, the importance for Swedish PE teachers to participate in curriculum reforms, rather than being passive receivers of decisions, cannot be ignored (Kirk & Macdonald, 2001).

In my interpretation, Bernstein (1971) recommends more of interdisciplinary and thematic projects in schools (i.e. a weakening of the classification between subjects) in order to develop children’s’ creativity and openness to new categories of knowledge (p. 202-230). In order to obtain these profits of interdisciplinary cooperation, I believe that a move towards dissolving the boundaries surrounding a school subject has to start from an acknowledged and unquestioned position with strong classification. The process of crossing boundaries can involve jeopardizing the identity of subjects, which says something of the sensitivity of this issue. Paradoxically, PE is often publically legitimized and acknowledged in a discourse dominated by issues of physical activity and obesity, a tendency that can be interpreted as a sign of a strong classification (Elm et al., 2007; Evans, 2003; Gard & Wright, 2001). However, my point is that the strength and the maintenance of the boundaries surrounding PE should be evaluated primarily in relation to how the subject can be formulated in terms of learning.

As in the current reform in Sweden, so far I have only discussed friluftsliv as a part of PE and not as a part of other subjects or in the general curriculum. It appears that the overall objective of physical activity in PE has a significant influence on expressions of friluftsliv. Perhaps friluftsliv would have greater possibilities to contribute to Bernstein’s (1971) call for the development of children’s’ creativity and openness to new categories of knowledge, if it was positioned outside the PE context and within the curriculum of another school subject? And perhaps there are outdoor teaching practices that already occur in school subjects other than PE that could be labelled as friluftsliv? However, the following discussion takes its departure from the fact that when expressed as an aim in the Swedish school, friluftsliv can be
considered to belong to PE. Therefore, I have focused on the conditions for its implementation in this particular context.

The local interpretation of the aims for friluftsliv (Paper I), as well as the statements of the PE teacher educators (Papers III and IV), indicates the difficulty of formulating friluftsliv in terms of learning. An alternative to formulating friluftsliv in terms of aims for the pupils to achieve, would perhaps be to position it outside the ordinary school subjects, as a method for personal development of children. It is however difficult to assess whether such proposals would create better possibilities for including elements currently absent, such as encounters with nature, environmental awareness, and sustainable development, as well as contributing to the enhancement, inclusion and participation of pupils (Bernstein 2000, xx-xxi).

As is evident from the preceding discussion, there are several alternatives to consider regarding the position of friluftsliv within future curricula. To keep friluftsliv within PE and develop its content in terms of learning could perhaps limit the influence of the dominating performance code within PE and increase the influence of the competence code (Evans & Davies, a, b). To move friluftsliv outside of PE, as a whole or partially, and emphasise its values in other subjects in school, could be an alternative in order to avoid the values of friluftsliv being marginalized into mere techniques, skills or physical activity (compare with Gard, 2006 about dance within PE). Irrespective of which direction is chosen, one important conclusion of this study is that curriculum reforms should be implemented in close cooperation and exchange between the agents in the official field constructing curriculum documents, and teachers and teacher educators in the pedagogic field, in order to create a sense of inclusion in the process of implementing friluftsliv in the school context (Bernstein, 1996, p. 46-49). In the following text, I discuss friluftsliv as being a part of PE, i.e. as positioned in the current curriculum documents.

**Values in friluftsliv within Swedish PE**

As discussed in the review of research above, the conceptual understanding of friluftsliv is strongly contextually dependent. Building on Figure 1 (p. 47), Figure 3 is an attempt to illustrate how the values expressed in Paper I and Paper II relate to the values expressed in the literature on friluftsliv within Swedish PE.
On a comprehensive level, there are several values expressed in the literature on friluftsliv within PE which are not expressed in my results from Papers I and II, and vice versa. It seems as though the values expressed in the official Swedish definition of friluftsliv (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003; see the triangle) are not to be found in the PE teachers’ description of their teaching of friluftsliv. Swedish PE teachers seem to be unfamiliar with making their own interpretations of how “environmental awareness”, “experiences of nature”, “cultural perspectives on the landscape”, “holistic learning”, and “non-predetermined body encounters” can be expressed in documents and teaching. It is also astonishing that “health” is not expressed as a value in friluftsliv in my investigations, especially since it is a part of the Swedish name of the school subject PE as “Idrott och hälsa” (Sport and Health). Perhaps this is due to the fact that many Swedish PE teacher students have their background in the Swedish sports movement (Annerstedt, 1991; Larsson, 2009) and there developed a rational and instrumental way of thinking about body movement, health and ability in PE.

In Paper I, when addressed at all, friluftsliv becomes a teaching practice in which the logic and grounds for assessment do not seem to differ significantly from other traditional outdoor sport activities in the PE teaching. The pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv in Swedish PE, explored in Paper II, also reveals that there are many requirements of a physical and organizational character to fulfil for teaching in friluftsliv to be considered legitimate. When described as in Paper II, friluftsliv becomes an exception from ordinary teaching, a project that is probably difficult for PE teachers to implement.
themselves. As expressed in the values emphasized in the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv*, several elements of an ideological nature, involving alternative lifestyles in modern society, could contribute with new perspectives to the *friluftsliv* taught within Swedish PE. I elaborate later on the development potential for the teaching in *friluftsliv*.

### Increasing equity through teaching *friluftsliv*?

One of my main arguments in this thesis is that the classification of *friluftsliv*, and thereby indirectly the classification of PE as a whole, will have to be strengthened through increased conformity to the aims stipulated in the national Swedish PE curriculum. This will most likely be a protracted, but nevertheless necessary process to be able to gain the benefits emphasized by Bernstein as a consequence of integrating areas of knowledge.

As shown in Figure 3, *friluftsliv* is associated with values of an environmental, social, non-competitive and humane character, values that never really find expression in Swedish PE. International outdoor teaching practices such as outdoor education and adventure education are also often claimed to include similar qualities, including a holistic approach, a student-centred pedagogy, social interaction, and a potential for environmental awareness (Brown, 2006, p. 689; Beames & Atencio, 2008; O’Connell et al., 2005). Further, Humberstone (1992) suggests that outdoor education rests upon “a consensual, coherent and powerful ideology whose underlying values appear strongly democratic” (p. 164). However, Zink and Burrows (2006) claim there to be many “taken for granted assumptions around the meanings and roles of outdoor education” (p. 39), which is also an argument emphasised by Brown:

> For some people in the field the value of outdoor education programs is self-evident and requires no further justification or proof (Brown 2006, p. 692).

Although some international outdoor teaching practices display similarities with *friluftsliv* in claiming certain values, my ambition here is not to make further comparisons regarding discrepancies between claimed values and implemented teaching. From the results in Papers I and II, I have drawn the conclusion that what *friluftsliv* becomes is to a significant extent dependent on the code dominating the context in which it is implemented.

Contemporary tendencies in society of talent-identification, perfection and elitism are reflected in the performance code and are currently dominating schooling in general and PE in particular (Fitz et al., 2006, p. 6; Evans & Davies, 2006a, b). In Swedish PE, this situation can be described as a discourse characterized by learning being marginalized on behalf of a discourse characterized by physical activity and sport (Larsson & Redelius, 2008). The
Tendency to separate children and young people, strengthened by the current political discourse in Sweden (Björklund, 2006; Jällhage, 2007), will run the risk of reproducing segregation of humans and social classes (Sörlin, 2009; Evans & Davies, 2006c). These issues have also been discussed within Swedish PE (Redelius et al., 2009; Lundvall, 2005).

At present, the possible potential of equity and democracy involved in friluftsliv appears to be inhibited by the performance code. It is not surprising that values emphasized in an alternative movement-culture such as friluftsliv will have only limited possibilities to manifest themselves in relation to the focus on physical activity in Swedish PE (Larsson & Redelius, 2008; Öhman & Quennerstedt, 2008), the interests and preferences of Swedish PE teacher students when entering PETE (Larsson, 2009, p. 170-214), and also in relation to counteracting tendencies in contemporary society. This might be at the expense of children who are already marginalized within PE.

**Thinkable and unthinkable teaching in friluftsliv**

In Paper II, there are a number of factors discussed as having the potential to influence teachers’ control over teaching (Bernstein, 1975, p. 89). Factors such as inexplicit formulations in curriculum documents, the short time offered by the schedule, the lack of material and financial resources and the remoteness of nature, are claimed to make the PE teachers’ control of teaching relatively weak. The nature of these factors is similar to the explanations of teaching outcome offered by the frame factor theory (Dahllöf, 1971, 1978; Linde, 2006; Lundgren, 1972, 1983). This model for exploring the regulation of teaching outcome appears to be logical and has also been applied to Swedish PE (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008).

However, the factors said to weaken the PE teachers’ control of teaching in friluftsliv also reveal a dominating pedagogic discourse. In this discourse, friluftsliv should be taught during a relatively long period of time, it should involve some kind of outdoor equipment, take place in a natural setting distant from civilization and require financial resources. Drawing on Figure 3, the instructional discourse in friluftsliv on the PE level appears to be strongly influenced by the instructional discourse on the PETE level and from some elements of the dominating and regulative discourse constituted by the Scandinavian tradition of friluftsliv (Bernstein, 2000, p. 32; Macdonald, et al., 1999).

Although the character of the official definition of friluftsliv is relatively wide and inclusive (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003), the pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv in PE and in PETE appears to be exclusive rather than ordinary. I claim that the adjustment to the PE teaching activity within this discourse is weak and that this might be part of an explanation why friluftsliv is transformed into sport or excluded completely in Swedish
schools. If the classification and the framing had been strong(er), the PE teachers would have expressed their educational ideas of teaching in *friluftsliv* with more self-assurance.

In a search for the mechanisms contributing to the reproduction of this exclusive pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv*, which also involves identifying possibilities for change, the pedagogic device appears to be a suitable analytical tool. In the system of internal rules regulating pedagogic communication, Bernstein (2000) suggests that the thinkable alternatives, i.e. the choices producing the pedagogic discourse, can also highlight the unthinkable alternatives, i.e. what is never thought of as possible to choose (p. 30). Based on the interviews with the PE teachers in Paper II, unthinkable teaching in *friluftsliv* can be described as close to civilization, demanding little or no material and financial resources, and can be taught during a short period of time. Based on this assumption, I suggest that the factors claimed by the PE teachers to weaken their control of the teaching in *friluftsliv* are only constructed as such in relation to the dominating pedagogic discourse. If the dominating discourse had been differently constituted, the expressions of framing would also have been different.

The relatively wide and inclusive character of the aims for *friluftsliv* in the national Swedish PE curriculum (SNAE, 2000a) as well as the official Swedish definition of *friluftsliv* (Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003) do not seem to limit the options for alternative pedagogic discourses. A question evolving from this reasoning is how the unthinkable alternatives are to be made thinkable. Here, I would suggest the critical questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions regarding one’s own teaching to be vital for the construction of new discourses. According to Tinning (2006), socially critical perspectives are still marginalized within PETE, a context also described as conservative.

In far too many cases the literature on PETE is basically a rehash of what has been circulating for many years (Tinning, 2006, p. 380).

In an analysis of the recontextualisation of the landscape and its significance for peoples’ practice of *friluftsliv*, Sandell (2003) asks: “Where is the outdoors?” (p. 151, my translation). This question can be seen as one way of challenging taken-for-granted assumptions within the area and also a way of making unthinkable alternatives for *friluftsliv* thinkable. It seems as if the exclusive character of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* contributes to the maintenance of the performance code within PE. If the investigated pedagogic discourse had been more permissive and inclusive, values such as participation, equality and democracy would perhaps have been more prominent in PE (Bernstein, 2000, p. 202). Instead, some of the values of distinction associated with *friluftsliv* in PE appear to counteract the movement to-
Towards a competence code and the possibilities to fulfil the stipulations of the curriculum.

The struggle for values in *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE

According to Bernstein, there are recontextualising rules regulating the junction between the instructional discourse and the dominating, regulative discourse. The production of the pedagogic discourse takes place in the field of tension between the pedagogic recontextualisation field and the official recontextualisation field (Bernstein, 1996, p. 46-49). Singh (2002) and MacDonald et al. (1999) claim teacher education to be an important contributor to the production of the pedagogic discourse. Further, Tinning (2006) suggests that the guarding of positions within PETE leads to the obstruction of openness towards new perspectives and a reproduction of a restrictive and conservative attitude (p. 381).
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Figure 4: A comparison between the values expressed in the literature and curriculum documents on *friluftsliv* within Swedish PETE and values expressed in Papers III and IV.

When also considering research in which teacher education in general (Hensvold, 2003; Lortie, 1975; Marton & Booth, 1997) and PETE in particular (Annerstedt & Bergendahl, 2002; Larsson, 2009) is claimed to have marginal importance for what is expressed in the teaching on a school level, it seemed interesting to investigate what an exploration of education in *friluftsliv* within PETE could say of its relationship to the pedagogic discourse.
for friluftsliv within Swedish compulsory school. Figure 4 is an attempt to describe the relationship between the values expressed in the literature and curriculum documents on friluftsliv within Swedish PETE and the values expressed in Papers III and IV. On a comprehensive level, the findings in Papers III and IV correspond well with the values expressed in the literature and the curriculum documents.

While exploring friluftsliv within PETE inspired by Bourdieu’s concept of social field as described in paper III, I discovered that the debates concerning the legitimate education in friluftsliv could be resembled to a social field involving struggles for objectively defined positions. I reached this interpretation based on the PE teacher educators’ emphasis on different values associated with friluftsliv education. Their choice of strategy in this struggle, i.e. their positioning within the field, made visible which of the positions that were assigned value, or with the words of Bourdieu, by which positions symbolic capital was accumulated (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 94-104; Broady, 1990, p. 171). My interpretation was that some of the positions made visible in Paper III appeared as a consequence of the fact that the context studied was under the influence of the different logics inherent in the academic field, the field of sport and in the Scandinavian tradition of friluftsliv. The discrepancy in the respondents’ ideas of friluftsliv as an educational element was not unexpected, given the discussion of different views as a foundation for the development of knowledge within the academic field.

In Paper III, I found it self-contradictory that Swedish PE teacher students are examined in the practical and technical skills seen to be required to perform activities in friluftsliv while they are, simultaneously, taught about the experience of nature as the essence of friluftsliv. The importance of skills to perform physical activities is an issue of constant debate in Swedish PETE. This ability is often emphasised as the essence of the professional PE teacher’s identity but at the same time, the academic acceptance of examining physical skills is not obvious, a condition creating ambivalence among Swedish PE teacher educators (Larsson, 2009, p. 140-148).

One part of the explanation of this ambivalent attitude might be found within a tradition in Swedish PE focusing the performance of “correct” body movements as an important ability per se. Drawing on Bourdieu interpreters’ discussion of physical capital (Brown, 2005; Ekberg, 2005; Shilling, 1993; Wright & Burrows, 2006); in friluftsliv within Swedish PETE, physical capital appears to be constituted by technical and predetermined skills required to perform activities in the outdoors. However, I suggest that the interpretation of physical capital in friluftsliv could be wider. A supplement to the discussion of the importance of skills in performing physical activities

---

6 The strong tradition of Swedish Ling-gymnastics has most likely been influential on the idea of correctness and effectiveness regarding body movements within Swedish PE (see Blom & Lindroth, 1995).
in the outdoors could be viewing them as one of several abilities needed to teach body movements. If the ability to teach movements in the outdoors is primarily focused, this might also involve a reassessment of the role of the skill-instructor in PE. An inclusive approach within PE could mean viewing body movements not as hierarchic, predetermined or “correct”, but instead as a plurality of equal opportunities. Similarities can be seen with the way Öhman and Sundberg (2004) discuss open and undetermined encounters with the body through *friluftsliv*.

Another self-contradiction was found in the valuation of *friluftsliv* taught in a remote wilderness (for example on skiing trips) with a certain focus on physical exertion and specialized knowledge, while simultaneously the respondents claimed this type of *friluftsliv* to be difficult to implement on a school level. Further, the PE teacher educators thought that *friluftsliv* should be a simple, unaffected and pure life close to nature without too many modern and technical aids. In Paper III, I have referred to these positions within PETE as exclusive *friluftsliv* and genuine *friluftsliv* respectively. These positions can also be reflected in the valuation of students’ enthusiasm for *friluftsliv* and their personal development investigated in Paper IV. It appears reasonable to assume that the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* within Swedish PE has to a certain extent been shaped and recontextualised during education in *friluftsliv* within PETE (compare with Bernstein, 1996, p. 46-49 and Singh, 2002).

In order to further discuss the results presented in Figure 4, I have used Tinning’s illustration of how dominating ontological and epistemological notions relate to different views of the purpose of teacher education and of human interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>World view</th>
<th>Purpose of teacher education</th>
<th>Human interests</th>
<th>Research paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviouristic</td>
<td>Objective reality</td>
<td>Prepare skilled technicians</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Empirical-analytical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science for a</td>
<td>of teaching</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Natural science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better world</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Multiple realities</td>
<td>To develop the individual</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>teacher as a person</td>
<td>Interpretive understanding</td>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional/craft</td>
<td>Reality exists in ‘the</td>
<td>Prepare teachers for the</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Simple descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>field’ not in theory Practice is best</td>
<td>current system</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical inquiry</td>
<td>Reality is socially</td>
<td>Challenge the school system</td>
<td>Criticism Libration</td>
<td>Action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constructed</td>
<td>where necessary</td>
<td>Emancipation</td>
<td>Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social inequities, power</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
<td>Feminist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and oppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poststructuralist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: A model of theoretical orientations within PETE (Tinning, 2006, p. 376)

When comparing my results from Papers III and IV with Tinning’s model presented in Figure 5, a number of conclusions can be drawn. I have claimed
there to be a primary focus in *friluftsliv* education in Swedish PETE towards the reproduction of predetermined patterns of body movement (as in the behaviouristic orientation), the development of students’ personal relationship to and enthusiasm for *friluftsliv* (as in the personalistic orientation), and to some extent to the transfer of different exercises for teaching (as in the traditional/craft orientation). I argue that more attention should be paid to challenging the hierarchy of body movements and to the development of alternatives to the skill-instructor as the main role of the PE teacher. Values such as environmental awareness and cultural perspectives on the landscape, which are central to the literature within all contexts presented in Figure 1 (p. 47), although not visible in Papers III and IV, could also be given more attention in Swedish PETE. From my point of view, these ideas involve moving from behaviouristic, personalistic and traditional perspectives of knowledge towards more critical and constructivist perspectives.

In my way of reasoning, the (re-)production of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE might to some extent originate from the approach to knowledge underlying *friluftsliv* education within PETE. Exploring *friluftsliv* within PETE with inspiration from Bourdieu’s concept of social field involves identifying the profits at stake in the struggle for values. Where, then, lies the benefit for the PE teacher educators to contribute to the production and the maintenance of the pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv*? For my discussion of this issue I need to call attention to Bourdieu’s use of economic metaphors in terms of producers and consumers.

**Producers and consumers of *friluftsliv***

Being well aware of the fact that I have not carried out a quantitative correspondence analysis in accordance with Bourdieu’s own empirical work (Bourdieu, 1993, 2000), I do not claim to have proved the existence of any social fields. Rather, I have used Bourdieu’s concepts as tools in order to explore my own object of research. There are examples of recent studies based on interviews in which Bourdieu’s concepts have been used in a similar way (Larsson, 2009; Skawonius, 2005).

As already shown in the results of Papers II, III and IV, PE teacher educators are involved in the production of an exclusive pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv*. It might be claimed that using Bourdieu’s (1978) metaphor of producers and consumers is a static description of the relationship between students and their educators which does not capture the dynamics and complexity involved in the pedagogic situation. I do not deny that the communication between students and their educators is often characterised by openness and several possibilities of interaction, especially since the introduction of web-based learning sites at universities. However, there is an inequality in power between PE teacher educators and PE teacher students. For example,
in Sweden students have only limited possibilities of influencing the content, the literature, the schedule and the grounds for assessment when starting a course at the university. To a significant extent, these elements have already been planned and decided beforehand by the educators.

Therefore, I have considered that the PE teacher educators could be regarded as producers of a pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv which is consumed by their students. Simultaneously, this discourse appears to lack in adaptation to the future occupation as PE teachers. When the PE teacher students leave their role as consumers and face the role as producers, having the exclusive friluftsliv discourse as their frame of reference appears to transform friluftsliv into teaching of already embodied practices of movement (often sport activities) or to be totally left out of PE teaching.

In order to avoid the gap appearing during the transformation from consumer to producer, I argue that greater opportunities for an active contribution to the production of the pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv should be offered to the students. It is possible that the reason for this not taking place is that it involves a displacement of power from the PE teacher educator to the student and, thereby, a marginalization of the PE teacher educator’s position as the expert. The distinction following the drawing up of boundaries for what is considered legitimate teaching in friluftsliv, which is most likely a part of the profit at stake, could then run the risk of being lost. At present it seems as if education in friluftsliv is (re-)produced without considering the needs of the consumers.

**The logic of taste for friluftsliv in Swedish PETE**

In Paper IV, I have identified a logic among the interviewed PE teacher educators based on the belief that the friluftsliv taught during PETE is to benefit the students’ personal development and also to develop their enthusiasm for friluftsliv. According to the respondents, this enthusiasm will in turn make the students teach activities and practices in the outdoors. Larsson (2009) has detected a similar pattern in her study of Swedish PETE. She has identified the idea that “the feeling of being able to perform the movement is embodied to the extent that even if you will not be capable of performing the same movement later in life, you still know the feeling” (p. 144, my translation). According to the PE teacher educators interviewed in Paper IV, an enthusiasm for friluftsliv should be acquired through having powerful experiences of outdoor activities carried out in a remote wilderness. A similar idea was discovered by Larsson (ibid):

> …if PETE is focused on experiences, there is a belief in that this can produce real enthusiasts who, having finished PETE, will work hard for their pupils to experience a lot of friluftsliv” (Larsson, 2009, p. 147, my translation).
The orientation towards self-development is also displayed in the overview of international PETE research in Figure 5 (Tinning, 2006, p. 376).

From the PE teacher educators’ testimonies of how their own close relationship to friluftsliv developed during childhood and growth, and from their ideas of how they want their students to acquire the same relationship to and enthusiasm for friluftsliv as they have themselves, I see points of contact with Bourdieu’s theory of how experiences through a process of embodiment can become a part of the regulating system of dispositions constituting habitus and thereby manifest themselves in taste (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 232 & p. 243; Bourdieu, 1990, p. 9-10). Using the theory of habitus, it seems from the interviews in Paper IV that the idea behind the friluftsliv taught during PETE is that it should leave such strong impressions that it becomes a part of the students’ habitus. Further, the idea seems to be that the students, through their taste for friluftsliv, will include this practice in their teaching. In these ideas of taste development, there might be additional reasons making it worth struggling for the maintenance of the exclusive pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv. For the PE teacher educators, a part of the profit at stake could consist of getting opportunities to spend time in fascinating environments such as the mountains or the sea. Another part of the profit might lie within the students’ appreciation of the exclusive friluftsliv, making it difficult to question.

In Paper IV, I have questioned the ideas expressed by the PE teacher educators interviewed, that the development of the students’ taste for friluftsliv should be a primary purpose of friluftsliv education in PETE. Some clarification may be necessary regarding this matter. I believe that an embodied recognition of movements and environments, and of situations which can favour positive experiences of movements in certain environments, are good qualities for future PE teachers to possess. A part of PETE should aim at the development of these qualities. However, I do not believe the acquirement of these qualities should be the one and only purpose of friluftsliv education in PETE. I base my argument primarily on the fact that the process of embodiment and a change of the system of dispositions constituting habitus is usually the result of a long process of acquirement also connected to the person’s other social and cultural habits (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 232 & p. 243; Bourdieu, 1990, p. 9-10). Thereby, I suggest that the logic underlying friluftsliv education in Swedish PETE should not primarily rest upon the idea that PE teacher students, after a few stays in more or less remote landscapes, will have had acquired a taste for friluftsliv. My point is that friluftsliv in Swedish PE should be taught according to the aims for friluftsliv in the national Swedish PE curriculum, whether the PE teachers personally have a close personal relationship to friluftsliv or not.

The results from Papers III and IV are reflected in research claiming the significance of teacher education on the one hand (Macdonald et al., 1999;
Singh, 2002), as well as in research claiming teacher education’s low impact on teaching in school on the other (Annerstedt & Bergendahl, 2002; Larsson, 2009; Lortie, 1975). Although the exclusive friluftsliv excursions in Swedish PETE can provide references among future PE teachers for what friluftsliv ought to be like, these references also seem to constitute an obstacle to the implementation of friluftsliv in PE. Based on the significance of social and cultural biography for PE teachers’ approach to their assignment (Annerstedt, 1991; Green, 2000; Larsson, 2009), I suggest that Swedish PETE in general, and its friluftsliv education in particular, should contain more perspectives critical to the conditions underlying the reproduction of teaching practices in PE. A risk following the idea of focusing merely on the acquisition of the students’ own taste for practising friluftsliv lies in the PE teacher educators’ preferences becoming the frame of reference for friluftsliv, rather than the students’.

The issues addressed are critical and a constant object of debate in Swedish PETE due to the question of resources in terms of time and finances involved. Thus, there is much worth struggling for. I suggest that the epistemological conception of friluftsliv is of great significance in order to understand the production of the pedagogic discourse for friluftsliv. Further, I believe the critical attitude towards the values and standards produced within the fields of PE and PETE to be the only way for PE in general and friluftsliv in particular to achieve legitimacy within a social science tradition.

The claim for gender equality in friluftsliv

Although issues regarding friluftsliv in relation to gender can be considered within the overall equality perspective considering which pupils and students are promoted respectively marginalized within PE, I want to devote special attention to these questions. Outdoor education has been seen as a teaching practice in which notions of masculinity and femininity are not as significantly expressed as within other PE teaching practices (Paechter, 2006). These ideas have also been expressed among PE teacher educators in Sweden (Larsson, 2009, p. 162-163). As I have mentioned, I have not asked questions regarding friluftsliv in relation to gender when collecting the empirical material. However, when looking back, I see reasons to be vigilant in relation to these issues.

Although the distribution according to gender was relatively equal among the PE teachers interviewed, there was a lack of balance in the same distribution among the interviewed PE teacher educators. Humberstone’s (1993) description of the typical educator in outdoor education being a man is confirmed in my sample in Papers III and IV (p. 222). The cause of gender imbalance in these prestigious positions might be sought in the fact that PETE is one of few options to work professionally with friluftsliv in Sweden.
Based on the demands connected with the assignment in terms of being away from home for shorter or longer periods, the male dominance can be seen as a reflection of the general conditions offered to men and women on the labour market. Further, the large number of male educators in friluftsliv can be mirrored in the stereotypical gender patterns reproduced within outdoor education (Humberstone, 2000) as well as within friluftsliv (Pedersen, 1999, 2003; Pedersen Gurholt, 2008).

There is a strong codification of gender in the media representation of the performers of friluftsliv. Men are represented as physically active, strong, endurant, adventurous and busy challenging risky environments. In contrast to this image, women are represented as passive, delightful, tranquil and turns up especially in peaceful environments (Horgen, 2008). The statistics of the practice of friluftsliv in Sweden show no significant differences among men and women, although some specific activities seem to be gender coded.

Hunting and fishing are most popular among men and walking is most popular among women. The differences with regards to peoples’ practice of friluftsliv are more significant when considering socio-economical variables. Groups with a high degree of economic and cultural capital are more involved in practising friluftsliv compared to groups with a low degree of economic and cultural capital (Statistics Sweden, 2004). In a recent investigation in Norway, a similar pattern can be discerned. This study also shows that among practitioners of adventurous and trendy outdoor activities such as off-piste-skiing, kite-surfing and paragliding, there is a significant majority of men (Odden, 2008, p. 119-125).

Are there, then, any disadvantages connected to the male dominance among friluftsliv educators in PETE? Although I have not specifically analysed differences in their views of education in friluftsliv according to gender it would be reasonable to suppose that if the PE teacher students usually meet with male teachers, this might reproduce the notion of friluftsliv as implying a male subject and as connected with male attributes. If Swedish PE teacher educators’ relationships to gender-roles, sexuality and body figure resemble the patterns displayed in Dowling’s (2008) examination of the Norwegian context, there is reason to expect that this educational element will also reproduce stereotypical notions of gender.

From a comprehensive perspective, I could not perceive differences regarding gender in the statements of the respondents in Papers III and IV. It was expressed that male students are perhaps more used to nature due to their experiences from military service. However, this idea was only expressed by one of the respondents. One question to both PE teachers and PE teacher educators concerned whether there were any specific characteristics of the pupils and students who showed good competence in friluftsliv. However, it seemed difficult to distinguish such a group (which could have been boys/men or girls/women). This might be an expression of the lack of learning perspectives connected to friluftsliv. In accordance with Paechter (2006),
I believe friluftsliv to have the potential to contribute to equality in PE teaching. However, I do not regard this potential of equality as taken for granted or especially reserved for friluftsliv, but as due to the intentions under which the teaching is implemented. If the teaching of friluftsliv is carried out in accordance with the performance code, a code characterizing many of the expressions of sport activities within PE today, there is a risk it will contribute to unequal conditions for young men and women. I shall return to how friluftsliv could be expressed within a competence code later in my discussion.

Friluftsliv – a concept with great pretensions

As previously mentioned, I have assumed that friluftsliv will still be an element within PE in the coming Swedish curriculum reform. From this point of view, I have discussed possible measures to develop friluftsliv within PE on the compulsory school level as well as on the teacher education level. Here, I want to discuss an additional idea concerning the formulation of friluftsliv in the curriculum.

The discussion of definitions and the historical review in the introduction of this thesis demonstrates that the word friluftsliv is permeated with conceptions and that the debate sometimes has a normative character, tending towards “right and wrong”. This realization formed a basis for my interest in investigating the area from the start. In Sweden, ideas regarding the meaning of friluftsliv have been strongly influenced by the discussion in Norway. This is especially demonstrated by the fact that the official Swedish definition to a large extent has been, and still is, a copy of the official Norwegian definition (Stormeldeting, 1972; Swedish Ministry of Culture, 1999; Swedish Ministry of the Environment, 2003). When represented in the anthology “Nature first. Outdoor life the friluftsliv way” (Henderson & Vikander, 2007), friluftsliv cannot be life in nature of any kind, but is obliged to involve specific values.

Friluftsliv is well-grounded in Scandinavian educational and philosophical thought. The idea relates to eco-activism and deep ecology… (Henderson, 2007, p. 5).

It is appropriate that friluftsliv be adapted to the circumstances in which it is being made concrete. However, such changes have implications for the (…) educational qualities we might suppose are associated with friluftsliv (Brooks & Dahle, 2007, p. xi).

I have tried to gather some of these values in Figure 1 (p. 47). To a significant extent, the Norwegian way of expressing the tradition of friluftsliv has become a model with preferential right of interpretation from an internation-
al perspective. Using Bourdieu’s concepts, the quotations just referred to can be seen as a way of creating a distinction from other agents in a field of Scandinavian *friluftsliv*. In a certain social context, this distinction could generate symbolic capital in terms of high esteem, good reputation and valuable positions (Bourdieu, 1984). An aspect not given much attention, but which might have pedagogical implications, is the fact that the meaning associated with *friluftsliv* seems to differ between, as well as within the Scandinavian countries. The discussion of what *friluftsliv* "is" and "is not" could perhaps be a part of the difficulties created for the Swedish PE teachers to the extent that they surrender to the claims rather than trying to interpret and implement *friluftsliv* in the PE context. My point is that a less exclusive approach to *friluftsliv* could perhaps produce more alternative pedagogic discourses and practices.

However, it may be that a discussion on approaches to definitions will in fact have little potential for constructive educational development. The word *friluftsliv* might be too imbued with different and contradictory values and conceptions in order for it to function as an educational element and for it to be formulated as an aim of learning in school. Examples of alternative formulations, which could open for more freedom of interpretation would perhaps be “lärande genom naturmöten” (learning through encounters with nature) or the already established “utomhuspedagogik” (outdoor education). This could be seen as one way of adapting the formulations in the curriculum documents to school activity rather than the opposite.

**Friluftsliv in a competence code – some conclusions**

In an attempt to summarize my conclusions from this thesis, I would like to start by briefly answering the questions asked in the introduction.

1. What pedagogic discourses constitute what Swedish PE teachers value in their teaching of *friluftsliv*?

The pedagogic discourse for *friluftsliv* in Swedish PE is produced in a fusion between the formulations of aims for *friluftsliv* in curriculum documents, the biographies of PE teacher students and their educators, physical and organisational factors’ control of PE teaching in the outdoors, the values emphasised in the *friluftsliv* taught within PETE, and the values associated with the Scandinavian tradition of *friluftsliv*. This fusion, regulated by contextual rules on different levels, has produced the notion of *friluftsliv* in PE as teach-

---

7 See Sandell (2003), for an extended discussion of how the individual attitude towards the meaning of *friluftsliv* can differ depending on whether personal, pedagogical or societal perspectives are considered.
ing which should take place in a natural setting remote from civilisation, involve risks, and require time, technical equipment, financial resources, and cooperation. With this pedagogic discourse as the frame of reference, the teaching of friluftsliv is difficult to implement and is instead, under the influence of the performance code, transformed into outdoor activities with which the PE teachers are familiar and can themselves recognise (often sports), or is totally left out of PE teaching. I have argued that the offering of friluftsliv teaching according to the aims in the national Swedish PE curriculum would benefit from a turn to a friluftsliv that is experienced as unthinkable in relation to the pedagogic discourse. This would also result in a strengthening of the classification of friluftsliv and Swedish PE.

2. How does the struggle for the legitimacy of friluftsliv in Swedish PETE influence what kinds of friluftsliv are thinkable in the PE subject in school?

Friluftsliv education in Swedish PETE is a site for struggles regarding what values are regarded as legitimate. I have considered the values expressed in this context as a consequence of the influence of the different logics inherent in the academic field, the field of sport, and the Scandinavian tradition of friluftsliv. The exclusive friluftsliv, carried out in a remote natural setting and requiring physical exertion and special knowledge, and the genuine friluftsliv, a simple, unaffected and pure life close to nature without too many modern and technical aids, are two variants considered valuable among PE teacher educators. These types of friluftsliv appear to fit well into the ideas expressed here for developing students as individuals and developing their enthusiasm and taste for friluftsliv through experiences of nature during PETE. Physical and technical skills in outdoor activities have also been considered a valuable physical capital for future PE teachers. As has been shown, these values in friluftsliv education in PETE do not seem to be easily transferable to PE teaching in a school context. I have argued for more of socially critical perspectives in Swedish PETE courses in general and in friluftsliv in particular, in order to make teaching according to the national Swedish PE curriculum possible and for friluftsliv to contribute to more of environmental awareness, historical and cultural understanding of the development of landscapes, and finally a questioning of our lifestyles in modern society.

Finally, I would like to outline briefly how I visualise friluftsliv within a competence code. Initially, it can be established that to some extent, the conceptual understanding of friluftsliv draws attention to aspects of recreation and experiences, rather than to aspects of learning and education. This might be an issue to consider when discussing formulations regarding learning in the outdoors in future curriculum documents. As mentioned earlier, “utom-
huspedagogik” (outdoor education) is a concept established in Swedish primary school which may draw more attention to aspects of learning.

In a discussion of the concept of competence, Bernstein (2000) calls attention to its disciplinary differences as well as to its mutual features. Primarily, he suggests that competence involves “a universal democracy of acquisition” and that “all are inherently competent” (p. 43). Differences between people are acknowledged, not in terms of hierarchic relations or as deficiencies, but regarded as assets. In the UK, this perspective on competence has been most influential in pre-school. In a discussion of codes permeating PE, Evans and Davies (2006b) suggest that the movement from a performance code to a competence code implies “a shift from explicit pedagogies of order (featuring hierarchy, positional relations and imposed discipline) to implicit pedagogies of social control (featuring personal relations, horizontal hierarchies and self-regulations of individuals...’’ (p. 211, authors’ emphasis). The approach to learning characterising public debate on education in Sweden today, with differentiation and categorisation in focus (Björklund, 2006; Jällhage, 2007; Sörlin, 2009), is fundamentally different from the values characterising the competence code as described by Bernstein, Evans and Davies. How then, should knowledge assessment be carried out if it is to strengthen competence among children and young people? For friluftsliv within PE, I believe one part of the answer to this question can be looked for within what is assessed.

For PE on a school level, I have argued that the introduction of teaching content such as plants, animals, outdoor cooking, environmental awareness, sustainable development, and historical and cultural changes of the landscape could develop the teaching of friluftsliv within Swedish compulsory school. Although these elements already form, to some extent, a part of the literature on friluftsliv in PE as well as in PETE (Brügge et al. 2007), they do not come to expression in my interviews or in my analysis of texts. The introduction of these elements, which have not been a traditional part of PE, could perhaps contribute to more of open, unpredictable and undetermined body-encounters as discussed by Öhman and Sundberg (2004). A movement from less of outdoor sport activities in the teaching in friluftsliv in Swedish PE, towards more of the above-mentioned content would perhaps also change teaching methods as well as their grounds for assessment towards less hierarchical relations. Paradoxically, an introduction of these values could contribute to a higher degree of fulfilment of the aims for friluftsliv (and thereby a strengthening of the classification of PE), while at the same time requiring a crossing of the traditional boundaries surrounding PE.

The challenge for friluftsliv, as for all of PE, seems to lie in the arrangement of a teaching which, in its content, methods and grounds for assessment, does not produce hierarchic differences but can instead strengthen self-esteem and identity among young people. With its claimed values of a holistic approach, its integrative and cooperative potential, its open and un-
determined body encounters and the environmental aspects involved, *friluftsliv* as an element in Swedish school has been argued to have the specific qualities needed to achieve these aims (Sandell, 2007; Sundberg & Öhman, 2008; Quennerstedt et al. 2007; Öhman & Sundberg, 2004). Given certain similarities with outdoor education, *friluftsliv* in PE might also be considered to involve a potential of more inclusion, democracy and equity compared to other PE teaching practices (Humberstone, 1992; Paechter, 2006). Some of the proposals in this discussion may hopefully contribute to more discussion of how these values can be implemented in *friluftsliv* to a greater extent than now appears to be the case.

Based on the knowledge of what *friluftsliv* has, and has not, become during the 15 years since the implementation of the last Swedish curriculum reform, I am not convinced that the solution of retaining *friluftsliv* as a part of PE is the best for *friluftsliv*. However, I do believe this solution to be the best for PE, as the claimed values of *friluftsliv* may help to focus a discussion moving away from ranking, separation and elitism more clearly (Evans & Davies, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c).
Further research

This thesis is an examination of some educational and sociological conditions underlying the production of *friluftsliv* within PE in Swedish compulsory school. The results indicate there to be a complex interplay between formulations in curriculum documents, *friluftsliv* education in PETE, PE teachers’ working environments, and the individual biography and value orientations among PE teachers and PE teacher educators. Naturally, there are other factors influencing the production of *friluftsliv* within PE that I have not considered in my study.

In the process of examining what has actually been investigated in my thesis, it becomes clear to me that I can only make statements concerning the teaching of *friluftsliv* being offered to the pupils and/or students, but not about the actual process of learning in *friluftsliv*. How, then, does the process of learning *friluftsliv* work? Is it possible to perceive what happens when a person learns something? What signs are there to search for? These questions would be interesting to explore. Since human behaviour and actions are valuable sources of information for these kinds of questions, I believe an investigation of this kind would probably involve other methods than the ones I have used in this study. Further, investigating these questions would mean directing focus towards the pupil or the student, instead of towards the teacher, as in this study.

Along the way I have also realised that the relationship between gender and *friluftsliv* might be more complex than I assumed at the beginning of my project. Contemporary tendencies towards individualisation, globalisation, commercialisation and medialisation produce new expressions of *friluftsliv*. These changes in society are important for schools to relate to. Within these new expressions of *friluftsliv* there are several, more or less explicit, signals embedded of what a male and a female practitioner in *friluftsliv* should do, look like and be like. The idea of nature as a neutral environment in which notions of gender are erased can seriously be questioned. These types of questions regarding pedagogic aspects of *friluftsliv* have appeared to me as issues in need of further research and development.
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Appendix 1

Request for local PE syllabus documents within the SIH-project

The reason why you are receiving this letter is that you, or your school, or some of the pupils in your school, have participated in the interdisciplinary project “Skola-Idrott-Hälsa” (SIH). SIH has been a collaborative project between researchers from Gymnastik- and idrottshögskolan (GIH), Stockholms Universitet (SU) and Karolinska Institutet (KI) since 2001. The project is now in its seventh year and during 2007, a follow-up-study has been carried out. Suzanne Lundvall has the general responsibility for the SIH-project and Jane Meckbach is specifically responsible for the study of the PE teachers.

My name is Erik Backman and I am a researcher in sports pedagogy at Stockholms universitet. As one of the researchers within the SIH-project, I am interested in investigating the contents of local PE syllabi documents from the schools participating in the SIH-project 2007. I would be very grateful if you could send me the local PE syllabi from your school by using the contact details below.

Best regards

Erik Backman

For questions, contact:
Jane Meckbach Suzanne Lundvall
Appendix 2

Invitation to PE teachers to participate in an interview about friluftsliv within Swedish PE

The reason for why you are receiving this letter is that you, or your school, or some of the pupils in your school, have participated in the interdiscipli- 
nary project "Skola-Idrott-Hälsa" (SIH). SIH has been a collaborative project between researchers from Gymnastik- and idrottshögskolan (GIH), Stockholms Universitet (SU) and Karolinska Institutet (KI) since 2001. The project is now in its seventh year and during 2007, a follow-up-study has been carried out. Suzanne Lundvall has the general responsibility for the SIH-project and Jane Meckbach is specifically responsible for the study of the PE teachers.

My name is Erik Backman and I am a researcher in sports pedagogy at Stockholms universitet. As one of the researchers within the SIH-project, I am interested in the teaching of friluftsliv within school and teacher education. At present, I am investigating the teaching of friluftsliv within the Swedish compulsory school. For that reason, I would appreciate the opportunity to visit your school and carry out an interview with you on conditions for teaching friluftsliv.

The interview would require approximately 60 minutes and would have to be implemented sometime during the period from the middle of April until the beginning of June at a time that suits you. I would be grateful for your participation. Your name will not appear in the study and your participation will be anonymized. If you are willing to participate and would like to decide upon a time for this, you can make contact with me using the details below. If I do not hear from you within a week, I will contact you again to ask for your participation.

Best regards

Erik Backman

For questions, contact:
Jane Meckbach
Suzanne Lundvall
Appendix 3

**Interview guide for interviews with PE teachers about friluftsliv**

**Introduction**
1. Can you tell me something about your motive for the choice of occupation and education? How long have you worked as a PE teacher? How many years at your current school? Would choose the same occupation today?

**Teaching in friluftsliv**
2. Do you teach friluftsliv? What do you do when you teach friluftsliv? Do you have friluftsliv days? How often? Do you use lessons or whole days? Which teachers/subjects are involved in the friluftsliv days? Who initiates the friluftsliv days and the cooperation between different subjects on the friluftsliv days?

3. What qualities do you think a PE teacher needs to be able to teach friluftsliv?

**Education in friluftsliv during PETE**
4. What was your education in friluftsliv during PETE like? (extent, theory/practice)

5. What was your relationship to friluftsliv before your education during PETE? How/when have you learnt the things you know?

**Pupils experiences of friluftsliv**
6. What is your impression of your pupils’ experiences of friluftsliv? (Fun/boring, important/unimportant). What do you think the teaching of friluftsliv should be like for the purpose of being as interesting and captivating for pupils as possible? Are there any specific characteristics of the pupils who like or show good competence in friluftsliv? Do you need to adjust the degree of difficulty according to the pupils you teach? Is the teaching in friluftsliv differently designed according to which pupils you teach?
Formulations in PE curricula documents

7. About the aims for friluftsliv (grade 5: "to have a basic knowledge in friluftsliv and be familiar with The Right of Common Access", and grade 9: "to plan and carry out a field trip during different seasons of the year"): 
   a. What explicit qualities do the pupils need to be able to achieve the aims?
   b. How is the teaching assessed? Limits for grades?
   c. What do you think about the relevance of the aims? Are there any other alternatives?

8. Do you have a local PE syllabus document? If so, how has it been produced? Who was involved in the production?

9. Is there anything in your local PE syllabus document that might be specific for your school and not occurring at other schools?

The school, its surroundings and physical and organisational conditions for teaching friluftsliv

10. About the school: 
   a. What is the socio-economic status in the catchment area? Are your pupils interested in culture? What types of activities are there for young people to participate in within the area?
   b. What is the geographical position of the school? What are the immediate surroundings like with regard to countryside areas, parks, water, forests?
   c. What type of outdoor equipment does the school have? Do you have your own financial budget? What type of equipment does the school invest in?
   d. Are there any demands or support from the directors of the school regarding the teaching of friluftsliv?
   e. Does the school arrange trips to mountain areas? Camps? Hikes? Other excursions? Who initiates these arrangements? Is the school allowed to arrange teaching that involves costs for pupils?
   f. Does the school have the resources to transport pupils by bus?
g. Are there possibilities for integrative themes and projects at your school?

h. What are other teachers’ attitudes towards PE in general and towards friluftsliv in particular?

i. What are the parents’ attitudes towards teaching in friluftsliv? Do they contribute in any way?

Concluding questions

11. How do you consider your possibilities to have an influence on the PE teaching compared to teachers in other subjects?

12. Would you like to change your teaching in friluftsliv in some way? What would facilitate such a change?

13. What is your personal attitude towards friluftsliv?
Appendix 4

Request for PE teacher educators to participate in an interview about friluftsliv within Swedish PE teacher education

My name is Erik Backman and I am a researcher in sports pedagogy at Lärarhögskolan in Stockholm. I am interested in the teaching of friluftsliv within school and teacher education. At present, I am investigating the teaching of friluftsliv within the Swedish PE teacher education. For that reason, I would appreciate the opportunity to visit you and interview two of the educators at your department who are mainly engaged in teaching friluftsliv. If possible, I would like to interview both a man and a woman.

The interview would require approximately 60 minutes and would have to take place sometime from the end of April until the middle of June at a time that suits you. I would be grateful if you could forward this information to two educators at your department that might be willing to participate in my study. Their names will not appear in the study and their participation will be anonymized.

If you are willing to participate and would like to decide upon a time for this, you can make contact with me using the details below. If I do not hear from you within a week, I will contact you again to ask for your participation.

Best regards

Erik Backman
Appendix 5

**Interview guide for interviews with PE teacher educators about friluftsliv**

**Introduction**

1. Can you tell me about:
   
a) your experience of being a teacher and a educator in PE? (how long, which schools, what courses, specific assignments)

b) your experience as a practitioner in friluftsliv? (background, specific activities or practices, membership in associations or clubs, etc)

2. Why do you think you are one of the educators in friluftsliv at your department?

3. Can you tell me about your experiences from your own education in friluftsliv during PETE? (what, how)

**Friluftsliv in PETE curricula:**

4. a) Can you tell me about the teaching in the PETE-courses where friluftsliv is an element?

b) How is the teaching implemented? (organisation, equipment, places and environments)

c) Who decided on this content in friluftsliv in the courses at your department?

d) What do you think about the extent of friluftsliv during PETE courses in relation to other elements in the programme?

e) Looking back 10-20 years, do you think the position of friluftsliv within PETE has been strengthened or weakened?
f) Can you tell me about the last time the students had friluftsliv? (what, how)

g) What literature do the students read concerning friluftsliv? In what way is the literature examined?

Definitions of friluftsliv:

5. What do you think about the following definitions? (showing the respondent 5-6 different definitions). Which one is most and least applicable?

6. Consider activities like skiing or orienteering; is it possible to say what distinguishes them when being practised as sports rather than friluftsliv?

7. When is it important to define friluftsliv?

8. Based on the definitions discussed; how do you consider the friluftsliv-content in your PETE-courses?

9. What role do technical and physical skills in performing outdoor-activities play in friluftsliv?

10. What do you think about dividing students into different levels according to their technical and physical skills when teaching friluftsliv? Is it useful in your education in friluftsliv?

The profession as a PE teacher:

11. What elements in friluftsliv do you consider important for PE teachers to teach to their pupils?

12. How do you consider PE teachers’ conditions for teaching friluftsliv in schools today? What factors are of most importance for the implementation of friluftsliv in schools?

13. What are the most important qualities for PE teacher students to develop in order to implement friluftsliv in schools today?

14. What do you think about the relationship between the education in friluftsliv in PETE and the possibilities to implement friluftsliv in schools?

15. Is there any element of friluftsliv that you think the students need to develop during PETE, which is not a part of your
PETE-courses today? Is there any element in your PETE-courses that you consider not relevant for becoming a PE teacher?

16. How do you consider the position of friluftsliv within the national Swedish PE curriculum? Why do you think it is emphasised as being of specific significance in relation to other PE content?

Examination and assessment in friluftsliv

17. How do you examine friluftsliv in your PETE-courses? Do students receive grades in friluftsliv? What are the grounds for assessment in friluftsliv at your department?

18. What do you think about examination and assessment in friluftsliv within compulsory school and upper secondary school? What should the grounds for assessment be?

19. Are there any specific characteristics for students who show good competence in friluftsliv?

Research in friluftsliv

20. Is there any research in friluftsliv (or closely related areas of knowledge) at your department?

21. Are you a researcher yourself? Within what area? If not, would you like to be?
Appendix 6

The 8 *friluftsliv* activities on which the sample of PE teachers in the second study (Paper II) was based.

1. Climbing
2. Skating on natural ice
3. Activities with the aim to learn about plants, animals and nature
4. Canoeing
5. Cooking and/or spending the night in the open air
6. Cross-country skiing
7. Downhill skiing or snowboarding
8. Hiking in the forest