

White Privilege in Experiential Education: A Critical Reflection

JEFF ROSE

KAREN PAISLEY

Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Through narrative and critique, this critical analysis addresses the role and reification of privilege in the pedagogical processes of experiential education. Using whiteness as a critical and theoretical lens, we argue experiential education is a privileged pedagogy, aimed at maintaining the status quo and reproducing dominant power relations between racialized social groups. Participants, instructors, spaces, and activities often reflect the embedded whiteness of experiential education. We critically examine the use of challenge in experiential education and offer a language of possibility for future trajectories for experiential education which facilitates more just and equitable teaching and learning processes.

Keywords challenge, outdoor education, pedagogy, social justice, whiteness

It was evening after the 20th day of leading an outdoor education course with ten 16- to 18-year-olds. Over the past three weeks, we had spent our time outdoors, sea kayaking through remote islands and mountaineering among rugged peaks and valleys. Many of the participants had scrapes on their legs from recent off-trail travel, and we had bruised hips from heavy backpacks. We all needed sleep. Just the day before, we had endured the pounding rain of a relentless summer electrical storm. By this point, I [Jeff] had grown accustomed to the stench of our moisture-wicking clothing and soggy boots. As a group of 12, we had completed multipitch rock climbs, learned about declination, and understood the phases of group development. We had eaten multiple meals of pasta, rice and beans, or whatever else could be effectively carried on our backs. Importantly, through all of our experiences, we had grown to like each other, developing meaningful friendships along the way. The next morning, we would be picked up for a day of de-issuing gear, taking showers, and generally celebrating our accomplishments over the last three weeks. Then the students would depart to their various homes across the country. In effect, this was our last evening “in the field” together.

While the course was evenly split with five young women and five young men, eight of the 10 participants on this course were funded by scholarship and from a variety of

Received 2 September 2010; accepted 26 October 2011.

Address correspondence to Jeff Rose, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, College of Health, University of Utah, 250 South 1850 East, Room 200, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0920. E-mail: jeff.rose@utah.edu

non-White¹ racial backgrounds. That is, the generosity of donors and various nonprofits paid for them to participate. Sponsoring agencies from around the country had selected these participants because of their motivation and past achievements. Another factor contributing to their selection was that they came from racial and demographic backgrounds which are generally underrepresented in outdoor education; Black, Latina/o, and Asian youth whose families did not have the means and/or the desire to take part in experiences like this one. The other two participants were White youths from upper class Suburbia, USA. They were affluent enough and, since motivation was a requisite for everyone's participation on this course, they were sufficiently motivated to enroll and did not need financial help. Jen, my female co-instructor, and I both came from similar backgrounds as the White participants. We had both grown up appreciating camping and the outdoors, and we genuinely enjoyed being in a position to share these experiences with young people. This was familiar territory for us, both in terms of the activities involved and having the means to engage in them at our choosing.

During our last evening circle, Jen and I facilitated a reflective activity where the participants looked back at their accomplishments during this course, with the intent of also looking forward to how they would integrate these new experiences into their "everyday" lives—the lives where they did not sleep under tarps, cook dehydrated meals over a camp stove, and participate in various adventure activities. As our conversation began to wind down, one of the non-White male participants said to Jen and me, "So let me get this straight, after we go home, you'll turn around and do this again?" We acknowledged we would. After some laughing and head shaking, he replied, "I just don't get it, why would you want to do something like this all the time?" Jen and I explained that we enjoy helping people experience new things, explore new places, and gain outdoor skills. We then acknowledged we generally like camping, climbing, kayaking, and everything that comes with these experiences. The same participant then began to explain how he very much appreciated his experiences over the past three weeks but he would not be participating in something like this again. Others nodded. Given the head nods and other nonverbal signs of agreement, it seemed as though this participant's thoughts rang true for everyone in the group, regardless of their racial affiliations.

At this point, I commenced a familiar monologue explaining why everyone can benefit from these outdoor experiences and, if more people could see as I do, the world might just be a better place. I felt confident I had dispelled any doubts still lingering in the group, and I appreciated the opportunity to state the social and political importance of outdoor education. We were teaching social skills and leadership skills. We were teaching an appreciation for nature and a sense of place. I was certain these were important, lifelong skills everyone should have. After my extended monologue, I felt sure the conversation was over. But this time, it wasn't. The participant persisted, "See Jeff, I don't think you understand. This isn't what I do. This is your thing. Why would I want to do stuff like this? Why would I want to come out here to sleep on the ground if I don't have to? Why would I scare myself on some ridiculous rock climb up a mountain in the middle of nowhere? Why would I work so hard to find water, to fix my dinner every night? I get that every day at home, and I hate it. I work hard to avoid those things, not to look for them. So why would I do that out here if I don't have to?"

¹Classifying historically marginalized races or populations in terms of what they are not ("non-White") is problematic and should be avoided. Such techniques further the normalization and dominance of whiteness. Groups should generally be identified by terms that are embedded and generated from within. However, this opening narrative is meant to expose traditional perspectives I held at the time.

I stared up at the ponderosa pines above us and zipped up my jacket to keep out the cool alpine air. I pondered the question, trying to come to terms with how these participants might better be able to see these last 20 days as I had. I stuck to the importance of self-exploration, leadership practice, environmental knowledge, and social skill development. Given what I perceived as agreement within the group, all of the participants—non-White and White alike—remained undeterred in their opinions of the situation. The conversation politely continued until we all agreed to disagree, but I felt assured the participants would be able to more fully appreciate the spaces and activities we had explored in the months and years to come.

Researcher Positionalities

During that last evening circle, I listened intently to the participants' accounts of their recent experiences in the outdoors as if they should be the same as mine. After the participants shared their conceptual and material difficulties of the past few weeks, I was quick to offer them suggestions that had worked for me and many other participants who came from White² experiences and similar circumstances to mine. I engaged debriefing and processing techniques as a form of communicative domination consistent with teacher-centered rather than student-centered education (Estes, 2004). By (re)interpreting the students' comments through my own lenses, I painted my reality as if it were everyone's reality (e.g., Brown, 2002). My interpretation of our experiences was privileged in our group's discourses (e.g., Bell, 1993). I failed to understand how my experiences and suggestions came from a racialized experience that was rarely, if ever, acknowledged in my upbringing and development as a person, as a professional, and as a White man. I saw my own personal and professional experiences as being normative and successful without any cultural, social, political, or racial privileges.

As a person and as an outdoor instructor, I was adept at moralizing my "unraced" perspectives of the world. I was easily able to see experiential education as a process devoid of a racialized history and a racialized contemporary pedagogy. When racial or other social justice conversations periodically arose during evening circles or daily interactions, I pleasantly deflected these conversations so I could commence what I saw as the *important* work of experiential education, teaching various aspects of character development, leadership, technical outdoor skills, or communicative interpersonal skills. Being respectful and engaging, making things comfortable, and soothing group conflicts were all strategies I learned and were confirmed throughout my socialization into becoming a White male outdoor instructor. I learned these strategies through both formal curriculum and informal mentorship³ over years working in experiential education settings: adventure education institutions, summer camps, environmental education centers, challenge courses, and university recreation programs. In this case, as an outdoor educator, I easily fell into a

²Since this article explicitly questions White supremacy often found in experiential education organizations, we sought to avoid the APA-required capitalization of racial categories (e.g., Asian, Black, Latino, White). With editorial guidance, we have reluctantly abided by this stylistic practice in this article. All direct quotes used in this article are unchanged from the original authors' capitalization.

³Experiential education organizations differ widely in the curriculum taught and the training methods used to educate instructors. However, it is not overessentializing to suggest most experiential educators are taught issues of risk management, group formation and development, leadership styles, and various technical skills.

perspective where privileges associated with my race and socioeconomic status taught me to see my positions in the world as being neutral.

In that evening circle, a critical racial politics could have better supported the interests of social justice. What kind of politics and what definitions of social justice and ethical and moral responsibility are adequate to support and emancipate marginalized⁴ populations irrespective of race, class, gender, and other social markers? As discussed below, social justice promotion may or may not be an explicit outcome of various outdoor and experiential education organizations. In the narrative presented here and possibly in similar outdoor education experiences, a (perhaps unintentional) marginalizing racial politics created a situation in which outdoor education can have negative effects.

We (Jeff and Karen) present this personal narrative in the tradition of academics who “typically eschew positivist and post-positivist claims to objectivity and value neutrality” (McDonald, 2009, p. 9) in favor of scholarship that is situated, personal, reflexive, and normative. The specific experience described above is typical of many conversations we have had with students and participants over the years. The field of experiential education needs to further understand the intricacies of these complex and dynamic pedagogical relationships.

We do not mean to conflate the terms “experiential education” and “outdoor education.” Experiential education is an umbrella concept and pedagogical approach with many, perhaps more specific, manifestations (including a broad range of approaches such as service learning and environmental education). We believe, however, the issues we raise apply to the pedagogies of experiential education as a whole.

This article examines one dimension of “how white privilege and whiteness operate in and through leisure spaces” (Arai & Kivel, 2009, p. 464). We extrapolate our own experiences as educators to place them in a context of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1974; Breunig, 2005) in order to better understand the privileged nature of experiential education (Freire, 1970, 1974, 1992; hooks, 1994; Giroux, 1988).⁵ We examine this subject through a necessarily reflexive lens in the tradition of Wise (2005), Baldwin (1955), and Griffin (1961), where our own bodies and actions are examined, implicated, and explained (Bergerson, 2003).

After an examination of “social justice” through the lens of critical theory, we offer definitions of privilege and oppression, placing these terms within whiteness literature. Recalling the opening narrative throughout, we then provide a critique of experiential education pedagogy, followed by alternative visions of possibilities for incorporating a more equitable pedagogy within the contexts of larger social systems. We ultimately call for a more socially just reformulation of experiential education’s pedagogy and implementation.

Social Justice and Critical Theories

Social justice is widely invoked in leisure literature and elsewhere, and most constructions reference a world with emphasis on equity, dignity, and human rights. Social justice is also a process, or work, of infinitely “articulating needs and aspirations within a democratically

⁴We have intentionally chosen to use the term “marginalized” as we feel it most accurately reflects the process in which we, as White educators, actively engage to disregard and devalue rather than to acknowledge and validate.

⁵Paulo Freire was a revolutionary educator in support of “critical consciousness” for all citizens, particularly in rural Brazil, where he did much of his work. bell hooks is a critical scholar of systems of oppression associated particularly with race and gender. Henry Giroux culturally critiques educational systems’ perpetuation of various injustices.

organized social space” (Hartnett, 1998, p. 233). Social justice has grown to explore and address tensions among individual and institutional inequities by complicating and indicting various social, political, and economic systems (Harvey, 2009). Therefore, social justice is often aligned with critical race perspectives and critiques of systemic White privilege (Arai & Kivel, 2009; Bergerson, 2003; Cooks, 2003; hooks, 1994; Kivel, 2000). Social justice is an incomplete process, as there are continuous avenues for critical engagement (Ladson-Billings & Donnor, 2008). Efforts toward social justice actively interrupt systems of oppression that are rooted in culture, history, and economics.

Social justice is also an explicit aim of research that invokes critical theories. Contemporary critical theory, derived from Marx and the Frankfurt School, claims all behavior either supports or opposes dominant social orders (Giroux, 1983; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2008). In keeping with social justice, critical theories support scholarship that “enacts emancipatory discourses and critical pedagogies” (Denzin, 2008, p. 463), often disrupting forms of social dominance and advocating for or implementing alternatively more just forms instead. Critical theory seeks change that “envisions a democracy founded in a social justice that is ‘not yet’” (Weems, 2002, p. 3). Critical theory serves as an ideological move in advancing social or cultural criticism, with underlying power relations being prominent and value neutrality being obsolete (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2008).

Critical theory’s placement of all action into support or opposition for the status quo creates a privilege/oppression dialectic. Privilege refers to entitlements, advantages, immunities, or permissions enjoyed by a group or individual, while oppression is the willful expression of power by a group or individual to dominate. The categories of “privileged” and “oppressed” are not fixed categories, as they vary with time and place and with situational and cultural contexts, such that any one individual might experience different roles. In this privilege/oppression dialectic, each expression not only relies upon the other to exist, but also defines the other: There is no privilege without oppression, just as oppression cannot exist in any of its multiple forms without commensurate privilege. This dialectic affords no neutrality; one’s position and one’s response to any social order is never neutral. “It is impossible to humanly exist without assuming the right and the duty to opt, to decide, to struggle, to be political” (Freire, 1998, p. 53).

Given these simplistic, but strategic essentializations (Spivak, 1988) of privileged and oppressed populations, most individuals do not fit neatly into these categorizations. For instance, a person facing racial or ethnic marginalization may simultaneously have systemic advantages in terms of gender or sexual orientation. A person likely has both privileged and oppressed subjectivities; privileges in one situation or location may be oppressions elsewhere. Universalizing, foundational, and binaried statements of categorization (privileged/oppressed) are a necessarily incorrect facet of critical theories, but they remain helpful in critically addressing inequities and injustices concerning systems of whiteness.

Critical Theories of Whiteness

Whiteness, in addition to being a descriptive physical and social characteristic, is a position in society in terms of one’s relationship with a culturally and materially privileged race. Whiteness is often presented in terms of social constructions of race and the commensurate privileged social statuses tied to these constructions. “Whiteness is understood as a process composed of both social and material practices in which white people (and often non-white people for survival) are invested, by which they are socialized, and through which they are produced” (Shome, 2000, p. 368). Whiteness “presuppose[s] the superiority of white bodies in contrast to the apparently inferiority of racialized others” (McDonald, 2009, p. 8). Further, whiteness sets up a paradoxical situation because it both produces and reifies

White individuals and cultures who believe in the illusion of a normatively White world. Experiences rooted in whiteness take part in “the elevating of the majority viewpoint to the status of unquestioned and unquestionable truth” (Wise, 2005, p. 59). Race is one of many essentialized markers of one’s social and individual identity and it functions to ideologically (re)enforce social and political positions. White privilege “silences racism through obscuring whiteness as a category of racial identity and reinforces the power of white hegemony to make socially constructed categories of race seem natural” (Kivel, 2005, p. 26). Therefore, White experiences often become perceived as mainstream and pervasive.

Rather than universalizing a stance in which broad statements contain all permutations, whiteness is situational and contextual, “a nuanced formation that secures its power in different ways through different sites” (Shome, 2000, p. 368). Performances of whiteness depend on and often reaffirm historical roots, indicating how whiteness can be performed differently depending on the context. Regardless of the context, however, a primary concern is the process of othering that tends to ensue from seeing White narratives as an “unmarked category against which difference is constructed” (Lipsitz, 1995, p. 369).

Whiteness and Social Justice in Leisure Studies

Contemporary leisure studies discourse sees race not just as a category of difference but also as an area in need of greater justice. Certainly, underrepresentation of marginalized populations in various leisure pursuits has problematics (e.g., Gobster, 1998, 2002; Gomez, 2002; Outley & Floyd, 2002), and the marginality and ethnicity hypotheses (Washburne, 1978) are primary lenses of critique.⁶ Only recently have leisure studies scholars begun to unpack the complex and intricate systems that underlie racial privileges (e.g., Kivel, Johnson, & Scraton, 2009; McDonald, 2009; Mowatt, 2009). Contemporary critical leisure research on issues of race does not just seek to understand how “others” recreate and experience leisure but also to address the symbolic and material systems that both privilege and oppress.

Critical race theory and whiteness studies illustrate two overtly critical stances which have recently gained prominence in leisure studies literature. While Kivel (2000, 2005) contributes to understanding and reconciling various forms of difference, the work of McDonald (2009) addresses the systemic and often covert forms of privilege and oppression accompanying various racial and ethnic markers. Kivel (2005) moves from understanding race as “other” to also understanding the seemingly unmarked category of power that comes with whiteness. There are connections between systemic and politicized race narratives and the leisure contexts in which they take place. In addition to bringing forward the voices of those often at the racialized margins (Mowatt, 2009), a central goal of this line of research is to examine “how white privilege and whiteness operate in and through leisure spaces and impact leisure experiences of people of color” (Arai & Kivel, 2009, p. 464).

Various social systems of oppression embedded within leisure experiences often result in fewer opportunities for marginalized populations. Kivel (2005) asks, “To what extent does white privilege and status keep us from naming the perpetrators of discriminatory practices and actions?” (p. 26). Leisure studies scholars trace how systems of privilege are embedded throughout the construction of experience and leisure (Kivel, Johnson, &

⁶Washburne’s (1978) marginality hypothesis claims that under-representation of African Americans in certain leisure activities is due to limited economic resources, often due to historical discrimination. The ethnicity hypothesis claims that lower minority participation rates come from variations in racial groups’ values, norms, and socialization patterns.

Scraton, 2009). Further, racialized privileges have specific leisure contexts, including outdoor settings (Erickson, Johnson, & Kivel, 2009). Whiteness and critical race theory help conceptualize social and environmental justice, where parks (as leisure spaces and as settings for experiential education) remain sites of power, privilege, and oppression (Roberts, 2009).

Whiteness in Experiential Education

As a subset of leisure studies, because it emphasizes processes, activities, and spaces of leisure, experiential and outdoor education scholarship also addresses issues of privilege and social justice (Brown, 2002; Estes, 2004; Martin, 1999; Nagda, Gurin, & Lopez, 2003; Warren, 2005). With respect to participants, Warren confronts issues of social justice directly, although her recommendation to increase participant diversity in existing outdoor programs may or may not move toward social justice. Experiential educators should learn to value various social differences within their participant groups (Mitten, 1989, 1997; Warren, 1989). Experiential education should focus “more on how to develop outdoor leadership opportunities for people of color . . . especially as it relates to self-awareness of white privilege by outdoor leaders” (Warren, 2002, p. 232). Finally, some outdoor recreation management literature indicates how various individuals or groups face issues of disempowerment or inaccessibility (Floyd, 1998, 1999; Shinew et al., 2006). We need to examine, however, the often unquestioned *systems* of privilege that support and reproduce these conditions of uneven access and underrepresentation (McClintock, 1989).

Among the privileges associated with the processes of experiential education, issues of race remain an open avenue for greater social justice. Whiteness (as an integral subset of social justice) in experiential education is further in need of critical exploration and development. These perspectives are particularly important considering that various issues of social difference may have major roles in how leisure is experienced (Kivel, 2000). Much of the racialized social justice literature in leisure studies examines increased diversity, multiculturalism, and access to recreation opportunities and services (Sasidharan, 2002). Warren (2002) examines this problematic conflation of social justice and increased diversity, illustrating a common misperception that “social justice education can’t happen until groups are diverse . . . [and] insisting that targeted people be at the table before privileged groups can work on social justice concerns” (p. 236). The dominance of White privilege is well-established in experiential education, and simply encouraging more racially diverse participant groups amounts to a benevolent invitation for “others” to take part in processes and institutions already well under way without them. “Making minor modifications in a theoretical framework in order to accommodate newly recognized issues and challenges too often means giving lip-service to their importance while carrying on the educational practices that contributed to the problem in the first place” (Bowers, 2001, p. 26). Thus, we need to trouble educational practices, including those that take place in experiential or outdoor settings.

Part of me was proud of myself for clearly articulating the numerous benefits of our experiences over the past three weeks. Plus, what we were doing was just really cool. We’d just traversed a fixed line in fifth class terrain while wearing full packs, in one of the most remote wilderness areas in the lower 48. We were hundreds of feet off the ground, unpacking our sleeping bags and getting ready to sleep in a shallow cave tucked high away in a granite rock face! Tomorrow morning we would rappel down to the ground and then navigate off-trail a few miles, following a stream out to the trailhead.

At the same time, part of me was disappointed. This was the most (racially) diverse group I'd ever led, which was exciting to me to see outdoor education reach out to underrepresented groups. The whole group was smart, fun, and curious. Yet these students didn't seem to appreciate the impact and meaning overcoming the challenges we'd faced together. They definitely felt how "cool" it was in the moment, but their reflections didn't romanticize these experiences nearly as much as I did. How could they not just "get it?"

Pedagogies of Experiential Education

Foucault (1994) states that "an experience is something that one comes out of transformed" (p. 239), but transformed how, and toward what ends? Experiential learning can take place in a variety of settings and conditions and, importantly, can take place solely within the context of an individual—meaning there need not be an educator or facilitator involved for learning to occur. Practical definitions of experiential learning (see Kolb, 1984, p. 38; Luckner & Nadler, 1997, p. 3) tend to focus on psychological, sociological, and developmental aspects of information intake, processing, and transfer, but they tend to overlook systemic social inequalities that color individuals' lives.

Experiential learning can and often does occur within experiential education, so these two constructs are not mutually exclusive. However, in contrast to experiential learning, experiential education must have intention behind it, such that the process does not occur through happenstance. We define experiential education as the intentional use of activity (e.g., by an educator) to teach (e.g., students). This definition is largely in keeping with Dewey (1938) who, through a critique of "traditional education" (p. 18), speaks of the educative role of experience. But he saw experiences taking place within the context of a classroom (albeit a "progressive" classroom; p. 18), where the experiences could be contrived by a benevolent educator. This "classroom" now takes on multiple meanings, but it normatively remains any setting in which teaching and learning take place.

Implicit in experiential education is an inescapable power differential between teacher and student (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011), regardless of calls for decreasing or eliminating the distance between these two entities (Brown, 2002; Cooks, 2003; Estes, 2004; Freire, 1970). Despite the incorporation of constructivist pedagogical techniques, experiential education necessarily involves the use of a teacher (instructor, facilitator, or similar leadership position) and one or more students. The teacher is part of the experiential educational process, and that teacher necessarily brings along her or his own values and experiences, though this lens can be mitigated by empowering students to create their own meanings and their own interpretations of knowledge (Brooks & Brooks, 1999).

Given our beliefs in the intentionality embedded within experiential education (admittedly a contested notion of this pedagogy), we can subsequently build and layer some logical stipulations to this process. Experiential education cannot exist on its own; it is a construction that must be created, engineered, developed, or otherwise implemented into being and into practice. Therefore, experiential education is a contrived process characterized by intentionality toward a certain end. Dewey (1938) felt an experience should push students in a variety of realms (socially, cognitively, and intellectually). Further, Hegel (as cited in Kolb, 1984) asserted "any experience that does not violate expectation is not worthy of the name experience" (p. 28). Any intentionality, then, specifically seeking to dislodge or change current patterns of thought or behavior is challenging by definition.

Therefore, experiential education necessarily involves some element of instructor- or situation-induced challenge. Challenges in experiential education are often structured such that they do not appear to be insurmountable or dangerous, but participant growth depends upon the constantly, though incrementally, increasing type and degree of such challenges

(Kimball & Bacon, 1993). For instance, outdoor educators may present challenges such as climbing a peak; ropes course facilitators may arrange challenging problem solving initiatives; and classroom teachers may introduce topics producing cognitive dissonance. In all of these cases, experiential education requires instructor-created challenges to catalyze these pedagogical moves.

Inherent in this dynamic is the teacher's active role in the educative process. Using techniques of reflexivity or critical awareness (Freire, 1974), teacher-student disparities can be minimized, blurred, and accommodated, but they cannot be completely dismissed, as a teacher remains the initiating actor who introduces the challenge. Intentionality is the element that introduces and contributes to the privilege embedded within experiential education leadership and curriculum. Intensifying this effect is the educator's responsibility for intentionally metering (to some degree) the level of challenge of an activity. An experiential educator is, therefore, structurally granted an entitlement—a script to help narrate students' experiences—that is the source of power, knowledge, and privilege (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011; Brown, 2002; Estes, 2004). The content and texture of the subsequent experience may help the experience negotiate its own way and tell its own story, but the experience certainly would not exist without the impetus and manipulation of the empowered and privileged educator.

In addition, many pedagogical traditions of experiential education also confer privilege to the educator. For instance, just as class bells, assigned seats, and rows of desks are indicative of traditional education settings, experiential education often incorporates similarly universalized mechanisms of participant control (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011), such as circles for discussion, the offer of “challenge by choice,” full value contracts, or environmental behavior guidelines such as “Leave No Trace.” Experiential education programs may take this perspective for granted, offering curricula deemed to be value-neutral and free of any advantages or disadvantages based on race, gender, class, geography, culture, or otherwise. Dewey (1938) illustrated this point early on when coming to terms with experiential education:

We live from birth to death in a world of persons and things which in large measure is what it is because of what has been done and transmitted from previous human activities . . . It ought not to be necessary to say that experience does not occur in a vacuum. (pp. 39–40)

We must, then, reflexively trouble the value-neutrality that seems to be all too common in traditional experiential education.

White Participants in Experiential Education

In experiential education, instructors often facilitate as though all participants experience the activities uniformly, without appropriate consideration of students' various incoming positionalities. Simplified and generalized, privileged people may appreciate many of the traditional challenges and pedagogies of experiential education because we are more likely to live free from many everyday structural challenges, such as institutionalized racism, sexism, ghettoism, classism, ageism, and similar forms of othering taking place through discourses surrounding various minoritized and marginalized populations (Dimitriadis, 2008). Those who generally have advantages and live with various privileges in everyday settings may be freer to respond well to the comparatively contrived challenges often found in experiential education. Individual recipients of privilege may not be encumbered by structural inequalities that make basic, everyday existence challenging. The novelty and the

voluntary nature of committing one's self to experiential challenges make these experiences more appealing when safety and the meeting of physiological and emotional needs are taken as given. In contrast, creating scenarios with contrived challenges in conjunction with existing oppressive structural systems may produce situations that are inappropriately and injuriously challenging. Experiential education practitioners are unlikely to be intentionally incorporating oppression into the design of programs, but White privilege is at work even when no minoritized populations are participating. The settings, the activities, the visceral nature of the challenges presented (DeLuca, 1999), and the voluntary nature by which the challenges are overcome are all elements of White privilege being constantly enacted in outdoor education.

Among these entrenched yet often unacknowledged experiential education values are those of a dominant racial order in the United States. As experiential education asserts its control over participants, it further defines who is allowed, encouraged, or enabled to continue to value and practice the processes of experiential education itself (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011). Experiential education relies on privileged groups and individuals to continually feed into its various cycles (e.g., pedagogical, financial, professional). When marginalized individuals enter into the privileged domains of experiential education, voluntarily or otherwise, this reification and reproduction can then expand and occur on an even larger scale. Essentially, though, we are bringing racially diverse participants into entrenched and critically static structures we are unwilling to change. Through this institutional control, marginalized individuals can also come to engage in behaviors that enact institutions' desires and benefit from experiential education in the same manner as privileged individuals. If such a scenario holds, then the practice and process of experiential education can be universalized to all people regardless of social differences, thus creating problematic situations where traditional experiential education practices can become normalized, justified, and perpetuated.

The (Historically White) Spaces and Activities of Experiential Education

As experiential education and outdoor education often take place in settings we identify as spaces of leisure, experiential education also takes on privileges associated with leisure (Dare, Welton, & Coe, 1987). Mainstream history books illustrate that leisure emanates from privileges, including those associated with class, race, gender, and private property. These leisure experiences date back to prominent privileged men such as Plato and Aristotle. Today, leisure classes all too closely correspond with those individuals who are privileged in terms of race, gender, class, access to private property, sexual orientation, ability, and so forth. Contemporary experiential education programs face similar difficulties of aligning the leisure experiences of individuals accustomed to privilege with those who have been systematically disadvantaged. Further, many activities in experiential education programs derive from leisure activities of privileged classes. Institutional outdoor experiential activities, such as backpacking, ropes courses, and orienteering, are generally and contemporarily understood to be White domains in both content and physical location (Chavez, Winter, & Absher, 2008; DeLuca, 1999; Roberts, 2009), as people of color often choose different leisure pursuits for a variety of reasons, including historical inequalities (Meeker, 1973; Roberts, 2007). Becoming absorbed in an outdoor experience removes from one's consciousness the awareness that the experience may not be available to all races, genders, classes, and so forth (DeLuca, 1999).

Perhaps these are the favored activities and locations of experiential education because, among other reasons, that is where and how (White) experiential educators are most comfortable. Outdoor instructors may be more comfortable in outdoor settings because

of the (recent) historically White nature⁷ of the activities and locations of outdoor education. Instructors' comfort levels with outdoor adventure activities may be (understandably) drastically disparate to those of the participants and, often, this discrepancy amplifies with White instructors and participants with racially diverse backgrounds, as well as with disparate social markers.

Many outdoor education programs have recognized the problematic nature of transporting historically marginalized populations into remote outdoor settings (Warren, 2002), where the physical and social distances are such that a positive learning environment is difficult to achieve. Experiential education often takes the form of participants removing themselves from common, daily experiences and placing themselves in socially and geographically unfamiliar terrain. Walsh and Golins (1976) proposed that unfamiliar environmental settings enable participants to gain different perspectives on more familiar, everyday environments. Participants may also gain a "fresh sense of identity" (Kimball & Bacon, 1993, p. 26). Nadler (1993) supports the concept of dissonant feelings during experiences, as such activities might create a "constructive level of anxiety, a sense of the unknown, and a perception of risk" (p. 61). These programmatic suggestions tend to disregard various social differences.

Experiential education programs may attempt to mitigate the difficulties of the dissonance of participants no longer being in familiar settings. Some programs have changed by rearranging themselves geographically, touting urban features that can offer challenge closer to the participants' everyday experiences. For example, some urban programs may use "traditional outdoor adventure activities such as ropes courses and rock climbing ('buildering' or the use of city buildings for climb sites), but are designed to address the real life urban challenges and problems faced by city youth" (Warren, 2005, p. 94). While the spatial and structural settings might be more consistent than programs which take place in remote areas, these urban programs still operate from a pedagogical framework using challenge (and, therefore, some level of privilege) to instigate learning.

Contrived challenges may inadvertently trivialize structural inequities some individuals face on a daily basis—why introduce challenge when daily life is sufficiently challenging? Such program practices reiterate privilege for those whose lives are already relatively free of challenge. Counter-narratives to this construction are prevalent anecdotally, in wilderness therapy programs (Hunt, 1991; Russell, Hendee, & Phillips-Miller, 2000) and juvenile justice programs (Wilson & Lipsey, 2000). In such programs, individuals facing various daily challenges turn (willingly or otherwise) to experiential education to seek further, albeit different, challenges. Without disparaging the positive outcomes and often social justice-orientation of such programs, it remains poignant to note how the pedagogical moves, the physical settings, and the notion of overcoming challenge, all used to produce enlightenment, may still be grounded in constructions of White privilege.

We all experience education differently. One of the primary ways in which we experience education is through the social and material privileges we all possess to varying degrees. In this manner, experiential activities, such as challenge courses, rock climbing, canoe expeditions, and various team-building exercises, can serve to unintentionally belittle everyday challenges in favor of voluntarily engaging in contrived experiential challenges.

⁷When taken in context of a longer and more inclusive history, these outdoor education activities are certainly not the sole domain of White people. In fact, many contemporary outdoor activities were historically in the purview of multiple races and ethnicities, but as people of color were exploited, and dispossessed through colonization, many of their indigenous practices were marginalized. See Meeker (1973) for further elaboration of this concept.

Lying in my sleeping bag that night, staring out the cave entrance at the familiar stars in the crisp night, I was on cloud nine. We'd had a full meal, and I was listening to the participants wind down their conversations, knowing tomorrow would bring some finality to our experiences. The course was almost over, yet so much learning and good times had taken place for all of us. I had seen these students grow as individuals and as a cohesive group, proceeding through the classic stages of group development. Jen and I had been challenged as instructors, but it was the good kind of challenge, where we put our skills to the test and they were enough for whatever situation was at hand. Most importantly, everyone was safe. However, that last evening circle just wasn't sitting right with me. I couldn't believe, when I asked them what they'd gotten from the past three weeks, they hadn't responded as so many groups in the past had: they should have said that they learned teamwork, leadership, communication skills, and how to problem solve as a group and as individuals. Instead, they departed from this familiar narrative, and I didn't understand why. The course had been great: challenging conditions but not too challenging; timely and solid lessons from me and Jen, when appropriate; an itinerary that hit some technical objectives, plus hit lots of the best sights in our course area; great group dynamics and a generally enjoyable social atmosphere. Yeah, something about the wrap-up of this course just wasn't quite settling with me, and it's hard to say exactly what it is. Something just wasn't right though . . .

Future Trajectories

With respect to the question of how to begin the process of social change, most justice-oriented and critical scholars as well as ethnic identity models begin with awareness. Simply becoming aware of race, gender, and other singularities at the level of individuals, however, often illustrates how marginalized populations can better incorporate and assimilate themselves into (White) mainstream ways of knowing and behaving. Without acknowledging the privileges imbued in these ways, recognizing difference and increasing diversity will not break the systems of oppression embedded in the nature of whiteness. *The White Boys Handbook* (Wildman, 1997, p. 307), a de facto set of codes for how to succeed and advance in a White male world, begins to address this problem by illustrating pathways to success within contemporary social systems. However, opening up this White playbook only represents change enacted within problematic and already existing systems. Critiques of whiteness challenge us all to consider change in which the systems themselves are placed into critical consideration in light of multiple and intersecting oppressions. There is a need, then, to re-imagine and rework experiential education, and this must occur at both individual and structural levels.

At the individual level, instructor reflexivity requires us to ask whose values are being transmitted, who is being empowered, and who is being silenced by the operation and implementation of those values (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011). Reflexivity is a strategy to critically situate our own knowledge, values, and power within dominant social orders (in this case, whiteness) and encourages us to navigate the ramifications of this situated context. Educators must "be aware of the relationship of power that prevails in the society at large" (Bowdridge & Blenkinsop, 2011, p. 162). In addressing the influences we all face, we must realize the multiple and often contradictory roles race (as well gender, class, and other social markers influencing privilege) plays in informing our pedagogical choices and instructional strategies. In one context, specific social markers might be beneficial, but those same markers may be detrimental in other times, places, or cultures. Training for instructors, then, should include sensitivity and competency around "intention, self-awareness, intervention, and information" (Warren, 2002, p. 234). With this awareness,

instructors' questions might then take on different and important meanings. Whose voice is (and is not) being heard, how that voice is being heard, and ultimately why it is being heard as it is are all critical questions pointing to larger social issues of equity, justice, and agency. Through these questions, instructors (and students, as individuals bearing their own social markers) can further recognize and implement accountability and responsibility to their various communities, recognizing how various social and material structures distribute power and privilege throughout.

Beyond reflexivity for instructors, conceptions of justice should vary with the participants involved, providing participant-informed curriculum and pedagogy. In practice, a more progressive and a more socially just implementation of experiential education might be as a pedagogy that "comforts the afflicted and afflicts the comforted."⁸ To the extent that challenge is a necessary component of experiential education, comfort for anyone is, perhaps, antithetical. By its very nature, challenge serves the role of, albeit differentially, afflicting both the comforted and the afflicted alike. But we may need to reconsider our motives and strategies for working with privileged populations. Experiential education uses relatively contrived challenges to promote value formation and social and individual growth and development. While activities in justice-focused experiential education might look similar to those commonly in use, the intent and the desired outcomes should be ones that directly confront issues of privilege.

Currently, based on the populations we generally serve, educators may use experiential education processes as metaphors for individuals with privileges overcoming whatever individual difficulties arise, regardless of these problems' subjective importance. The point of education for these individuals, however, could be to help them recognize such challenges are, in fact, often quite different in comparison to those who face systematic oppression and structural inequalities on an ongoing basis. While all individuals face some level of challenge through the rigors of daily living, a more socially just outcome might be students identifying their own privileged positions in their daily lives that might be comparatively free of challenge. Further, we should not discount the possibility that solutions to creating a more socially just world might lie in reducing the privileges of those best off. In such a view, whiteness is not a logical position of privilege, but a position that has been socially constructed for hundreds of years. A pedagogy with explicit outcomes of addressing privilege, while surely afflicting the comforted, offers critical themes that are transferable from experiential education settings to everyday settings.

At a more institutional level, experiential education should change in order to be of better comfort for those who have been historically and systematically oppressed. Such changes might include shifts in organizational philosophy, program activities, locations, staffing decisions, and identification of relevant target outcomes. To facilitate this change, we must question the "benevolence" driving "benevolent assimilation": Why do experiential educators (who are often the recipients of multiple privileges) seek to bring participants (who may or may not have backgrounds of similar or different privileges) into educational opportunities which may be neither geographically nor financially available? We must realize that the construction of "living simply" for a period of time carries a hefty price tag in terms of gear and access. Often, we go "into the woods" with thousands of dollars worth of equipment, available only through privileged discretionary income. Beyond that, we capitalize on permits and transportation based on privileged information and, typically,

⁸This quote has been appropriated from the field of journalism, and is most likely traced back to the prominent newspaper writer Finley Peter Dunne near the turn of the 20th century. Since that time, this phrase has been used to link pedagogy and justice (Omatsu, 1999), as well as in other social justice contexts.

motorized access in order to enjoy the natural world. Certainly, these privileges are differentially available to individuals as a result of social markers and systemic conditions. As a result, providing scholarships to marginalized students, for example, may only provide a venue change for the same patterns of privilege and power to manifest rather than tilting the systems that made such access unattainable or unappealing. Further, to suggest that including marginalized participants on a course is beneficial for privileged students by exposing them to diversity only reiterates this perspective. We should “see the conflict between upholding humanistic, nonracist values and [our] contradictory behavior” (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 279). Experiential education should change in order to more practically and theoretically address these more socially just values.

Freire (1992) suggests that we should be careful of the language and processes we use as educators, both during formal instruction as well as in those we use to talk *about* education. Giroux (1988, p. 94) articulates a supposedly innocuous “discourse of cordial relations” that serves to contain and control students, while establishing a good rapport with them and keeping them entertained. All too often, experiential education falls into the realm of striving to keep things emotionally “safe” and comfortable. But then the question emerges: Comfortable for whom and for what reason? As mentioned in the opening narrative, deflecting social justice conversations is not helpful to this end. Attempts to reduce or restrict discourse, paradoxically, caused an increase in the discourse produced, as there were more unspoken formations of race and social (in)justice than were actually spoken.

White privilege must be acknowledged in the realm of education, in general, and experiential education, specifically, before it can be interrogated and, ultimately, addressed. “Those of us who are ‘white’ can only become part of the solution if we recognize the degree to which we are already part of the problem—not because of our race, but because of possessive investment in it” (Lipsitz, 1995, p. 384). We cannot divorce ourselves from our various embodied privileges, but we should seek to understand the complex social and material advantages associated with them. Once understood and acknowledged, these inequalities can then be materially addressed. True reflexivity, considering the ramifications of our individual histories and experiences, suggests how White experiential educators must make efforts to disavow the notion of racial neutrality and, ultimately, acknowledge that the very process of experiential education is simultaneously privileging and emancipatory in its various manifestations.

It is incumbent upon those with various privileges to lead the charge in addressing social injustices that are incorporated into the systems that have provided us with those privileges. Delpit (1988, p. 297) contends “it is those with the most power, those in the majority, who must take the greater responsibility for initiating the process.” While formal educational structures have been the focus of much critical attention, we also believe that one realm in which to fight systemic, institutionalized, covert racism is through the processes of experiential education. However, this will only occur through an expanded ethic of experiential education informed by increased critical awareness that coincides with a critically compassionate pedagogy (Breunig, 2005; Itin, 1999).

Conclusions

Jeff came to understand the privileged nature of experiential education while engaging as an outdoor educator, confronted by a racially diverse student group. Expanding on the notion of “the field,” I (Karen) realized this privilege in a traditional classroom, where I seek to be an experiential educator, confronted by seas of White faces. After having “successfully” taught core courses myriad times, I found myself troubled by an ethical quandary: Should I continue just teaching the “facts and figures” or should I seek to instill a sense of what

I perceived to be the “shoulds and oughts” underlying the provision of leisure services? Ultimately, I decided it was imperative that students graduate with a desire to improve the human condition, to work for social justice (see Paisley, 2010), which in part meant that they had to come to terms with some of their own privileges. So I actively sought to “afflict the comforted” and challenged my students to become change agents and democratically engaged citizens. And, with full passion and commitment, I went beyond professing to preaching this conviction.

My teaching evaluations demonstrated this tack to be profoundly polarizing. Some students loved it; they understood and were inspired by “why we do what we do.” In contrast, others stated they “didn’t want to change the world” and just wanted to be fed the material. As frustrating and disappointing as the latter reactions were, it was because of that dissent that I realized I was mindlessly enacting the privileges granted a teacher through experiential education. Since then, I find myself moved by the words of Jasper Hunt (1994):

Concern with social implications need not result in moral fanaticism and ideological pomposity . . . Seeking the socially right path, while avoiding complacency, is what I am arguing for here. What this means in practical terms for practitioners can only be ascertained by those making these hard decisions. (pp. 126–127)

We are not encouraging all experiential education programs to adopt a social justice lens as the driving force of their work (Itin, 1999). Rather, there may be levels at which re-visioning can occur based on programs’ orientations. Assuming that learning of some type and the transfer of learning are central aims of experiential education, types of learning transfer provide a useful framework for considering implementation (Priest & Gass, 2005). Specific transfer uses the “same products” (p. 185) of learning from one setting in another; the authors identify how knot tying in sailing transfers to knot tying in a climbing experience. Nonspecific transfer uses the “same processes” (p. 185) of learning from one setting in another. Here, the authors identify how the trust built during belaying transfers to the trust needed to take risks in social settings. Metaphoric transfer uses “similar processes” (p. 186) of learning from one setting in another, and occurs most readily when parallels exist between the two. As an example, the authors relate the real and perceived risks of taking the first step over the edge in rappelling to the real and perceived risks of other “first steps,” such as taking a new job or moving to a new place. A challenge to experiential educators, then, might be to co-construct, along with students and participants, metaphors that are more explicitly oriented toward a justice framework.

Though Priest and Gass (2005) do not explicitly suggest a rank-order of these types of transfer, we argue, from a justice framework, the value is clearly progressive. Specific transfer should be a minimum goal of experiential education programs. After participating in a mountaineering course, for example, participants should be prepared to safely engage in some type of mountaineering activities on their own. Nonspecific transfer is, perhaps, what experiential education programs have historically “done best.” Using the tools of our trade, such as processing, we facilitate learning on a personal level, well beyond activity skill development.

Perhaps most important is the metaphoric potential of experiential education to address issues of privilege and oppression. In experiential education, whiteness operates among a series of tensions concerning pedagogy, privilege, politics, history, and practicality. Can existing experiential education organizations (re)organize to better serve the needs of social justice? Are such processes needed? Are they even possible, given the often contradictory demands of curricular design, staff training, risk management, and customer satisfaction? In

considering these critiques of whiteness, educators might feel both inspired and frustrated. Foucault (1994) helps us clarify our positions on these tensions:

I have absolutely no desire to play the role of a prescriber of solutions. I think that the role of the intellectual today is not to ordain, to recommend solutions, to prophesy, because in that function [she or] he can only contribute to the functioning of a particular power situation that, in my opinion, must be criticized. (p. 288)

Power discrepancies in experiential education are constructed through race, gender, class, relationship to nature, pedagogy, and instructor/student roles. Dismantling these discrepancies is inherently difficult. However, this work must inch forward, as experiential education groups have tremendous metaphoric potential as microcosmic representations of society at large (Hunt, 1994). The way we construct educational experiences has powerful and direct impacts on the lived experiences of participants. As educators, we can continue (or begin) to address the structural inconsistencies that constitute our collective social and cultural experiences, with the intention of introducing challenges that more thoughtfully consider the daily lived experiences of participants. Experiential education, as a metaphoric practice, can be ideally suited to model and facilitate social justice and should work to do so. However, the adoption and implementation of justice is best left to those making these hard decisions.

References

- Arai, S., & Kivel, B. D. (2009). Critical race theory and social justice perspectives on whiteness, difference(s) and (anti)racism: A fourth wave of race research in leisure studies. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(4), 459–472.
- Baldwin, J. (1955). *Notes of a native son*. New York, NY: Beacon.
- Bell, M. (1993). What constitutes experience? Rethinking theoretical assumptions. *Journal of Experiential Education, 16*(1), 19–24.
- Bergerson, A. (2003). Critical race theory and white racism: Is there room for white scholars in fighting racism in education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 51–63.
- Bowdridge, M., & Blenkinsop, S. (2011). Michel Foucault goes outside: Discipline and control in the practice of outdoor education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 34*(2), 149–163.
- Bowers, C. (2001). *Education for eco-justice and community*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Brooks, J., & Brooks, M. (1999). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brown, M. (2002). The facilitator as gatekeeper: A critical analysis of social order in facilitation sessions. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning, 2*(2), 101–112.
- Breunig, M. (2005). Turning experiential education and critical pedagogy theory into praxis. *Journal of Experiential Education, 28*(2), 106–122.
- Chavez, D., Winter, P., & Absher, J. (2008, August). *Recreation visitor research: Studies of diversity*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, General Technical Report PSW-GTR-210.
- Cooks, L. (2003). Pedagogy, performance, and positionality: Teaching about whiteness in interracial communication. *Communication Education, 52*(3/4), 245–257.
- Dare, B., Welton, G., & Coe, W. (1987). *Concepts of leisure in Western thought: A critical and historical analysis*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 280–298.

- Deluca, K. (1999). In the shadow of whiteness: The consequences of construction of nature in environmental politics. In T. Nakayama & J. Martin (Eds.), *Whiteness: The communication of social identity* (pp. 217–245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. (2008). Emancipatory discourses and the ethics and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed., pp. 435–471). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Dimitriadis, G. (2008). *Studying urban youth culture: Primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Erikson, B., Johnson, C., & Kivel, B. D. (2009). Rocky Mountain National Park: History and culture as factors in African-American park visitation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 529–546.
- Estes, C. (2004). Promoting student-centered learning in experiential education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 27(2), 141–160.
- Floyd, M. (1998). Getting beyond marginality and ethnicity: The challenge for race and ethnic studies in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(1), 3–22.
- Floyd, M. (1999). Race, ethnicity and use of the National Park System. *Social Science Research Review*, 1, 1–24.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Interview with Michel Foucault. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 239–297). New York, NY: New Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Critical theory and educational practice*. Melbourne, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Gobster, P. (1998). Explanations for minority “underparticipation” in outdoor recreation: A look at golf. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 16, 46–64.
- Gobster, P. (2002). Managing urban parks for a racially and ethnically diverse clientele. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 143–159.
- Gomez, E. (2002). The ethnicity of public recreation participation model. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 123–142.
- Griffin, J. (1961). *Black like me*. London, UK: Collins.
- Hartnett, S. (1998). Lincoln and Douglas meet the abolitionist David Walker as prisoners debate slavery: Empowering education, applied communication, and social justice. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26(2), 232–253.
- Harvey, D. (2009). *Social justice and the city*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hunt, J. (1991). Ethics and experiential education as professional practice. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 14(2), 14–18.
- Hunt, J. (1994). *Ethical issues in experiential education* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: The Association for Experiential Education.
- Itin, C. M. (1999). Reasserting the philosophy of experiential education as a vehicle for change in the 21st century. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 22(2), 91–98.
- Kimball, R. O., & Bacon, S. B. (1993). The wilderness challenge model. In M. A. Gass (Ed.), *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming* (pp. 11–41). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2008). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 403–455). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kivel, B. D. (2000). Leisure experience and identity: What difference does difference make? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 79–81.

- Kivel, B. D. (2005). Examining racism, power, and white hegemony in Stodolska's conditioned attitude model of individual discriminatory behavior. *Leisure Sciences*, 27(1), 21–27.
- Kivel, B. D., Johnson, C., & Scraton, S. (2009). (Re)theorizing leisure, experience and race. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 473–493.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Donnor, J. (2008). The moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 371–401). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lipsitz, G. (1995). The possessive investment in whiteness: Racialized social democracy and the “white” problem in American studies. *American Quarterly*, 47(3), 369–387.
- Luckner, J., & Nadler, R. (1997). *Processing the experience: Strategies to enhance and generalize learning* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Martin, P. (1999). Critical outdoor education. In J. P. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure education* (2nd ed., pp. 463–471). State College, PA: Venture.
- McClintock, M. (1989). Ten ways educators can limit or empower members of subordinate social groups. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 12(3), 45–46.
- McDonald, M. (2009). Dialogues on whiteness, leisure, and (anti)racism. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(1), 5–21.
- Mowatt, R. (2009). Notes from a leisure son: Expanding an understanding of whiteness in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 511–528.
- Meeker, J. (1973). Red, white, and black in the national parks. *The North American Review*, 258(3), 3–7.
- Mitten, D. (1989). Healthy expressions of diversity lead to positive group experiences. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 12(3), 17–22.
- Mitten, D. (1997). In the light: Sexual diversity on women's outdoor trips. *Journal of Leisurability*, 24(4), 22–30.
- Nadler, R. S. (1993). Therapeutic process of change. In M. A. Gass (Ed.), *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming* (pp. 57–69). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Nagda, B., Gurin, P., & Lopez, G. (2003). Transformative pedagogy for democracy and social justice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 6(2), 165–191.
- Omatsu, G. (1999). Teaching for social change: Learning how to afflict the comfortable and comfort the afflicted. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, 32, 791–797.
- Outley, C., & Floyd, M. (2002). The home they live in: Inner city children's views on the influence of parenting strategies on their leisure behavior. *Leisure Sciences*, 24(2), 161–180.
- Paisley, K. (2010). Is college worth more than a buck fifty in late charges at the public library?: The shoulds and oughts of a higher education. In K. Paisley & D. Dustin (Eds.), *Speaking up and speaking out: Working for social and environmental justice through parks, recreation, and leisure* (pp. 3–7). Champaign, IL: Sagamore.
- Priest, S., & Gass, M. A. (2005). *Effective leadership in adventure programming* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Roberts, N. (2007). *Visitor nonvisitor use constraints: Exploring ethnic minority experiences and perspectives*. General Technical Report, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University.
- Roberts, N. (2009). Crossing the color line with a different perspective on whiteness and (anti)racism: A response to Mary McDonald. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 495–510.
- Russell, K., Hendee, J., & Phillips-Miller, D. (2000). How wilderness therapy works: The wilderness therapy process for adolescents with behavioral problems and addictions. In S.F. McCool, D. Cole, W. Borrie, & J. O'Loughlin (Eds.), *Wilderness science in a time of change conference—Volume 3: Wilderness as a place for scientific inquiry*. Ogden, UT: USDA, Forest Service. (Proc. RMRS-P-15-vol. 3), pp. 207–217.
- Sasidharan, V. (2002). Special issue introduction: Understanding recreation and the environment within the context of culture. *Leisure Sciences*, 24(1), 1–11.

- Shinew, K., Stodolska, M., Floyd, M., Hibbler, D., Allison, M., Johnson, C., & Santos, C. (2006). Race and ethnicity in leisure behavior: Where have we been and where do we need to go? *Leisure Sciences*, 28(4), 403–408.
- Shome, R. (2000, September). Outing whiteness. *Review and Criticism*, 366–371.
- Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Walsh, V., & Golins, G. (1976). *The exploration of the Outward Bound process*. Denver, CO: Colorado Outward Bound School.
- Warren, K. (1989). On valuing differences. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 12(3), 4.
- Warren, K. (2002). Preparing the next generation: Social justice in outdoor leadership education and training. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 25(1), 231–238.
- Warren, K. (2005). A path worth taking: The development of social justice in outdoor experiential education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38, 89–99.
- Washburne, R. F. (1978). Black under-participation in wildland recreation: Alternative explanations. *Leisure Studies*, 1(2), 175–189.
- Weems, M. (2002). *I speak from the wound that is my mouth*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Wildman, S. (1997). Reflections on whiteness and Latina/o critical theory. *Harvard Latino Law Review*, 2(1), 307–316.
- Wilson, S., & Lipsey, M. (2000). Wilderness challenge programs for delinquent youth: A meta-analysis of outcome evaluations. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23, 1–12.
- Wise, T. (2005). *White like me: Reflections on race from a privileged son*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull.

Copyright of Leisure Sciences is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.