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Abstract
Studies have demonstrated that participation on a sail training voyage, as a structured educational activity that is more than mere adventure (McCulloch et al., 2010: 661), enhances self-constructs, and inter- and intra-personal skills. Many studies have followed an outcome-based approach to measure various self-constructs at pre-, on- and/or post-voyage intervals, however, there has been limited investigation as to how these outcomes may be generated; or how they may be ‘laminated’ in participants’ personal and social development, and thereby influence skills for life and work, such as social and emotional skills and supporting educational attainment (Feinstein, 2015). The origins of modern day sail training voyages are to be found in the traditions and practices of the age of sail, representing a rich socio-cultural and historical setting for participants to explore the voyage experience. This study takes an ethnographic approach to explore a six-day sail training voyage as a ‘cultural community’, and how this concept may generate beneficial outcomes through apprenticeship and guided participation (after Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002). Few studies on this topic have extended their scope of interest beyond the young crew participants; this study engages with all of those who sailed on the voyage, comprising twelve 12- and 13-year old girls, two teachers, and the full-time and volunteer sea-staff (and the researcher as a participant observer). This voyage-based case study uses a range of methods, including visual methods, as pre-, on- and post-voyage research activities, complemented with a post-voyage photo elicitation activity and semi-structured interviews to construct a rich, detailed account of the study voyage.

Keywords: Sail training, cultural community, apprenticeship, guided participation, well-being, character, adventure education
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background
The study reported here considers the challenges facing today’s children and young people, as they embark on their journey towards adulthood, and how sail training, as an educative experience, operates to bring about positive outcomes. Extant sail training research has concentrated on the identification and measurement of outcomes, such as self-constructs, and inter- and intra-personal skills, that contribute to well-being. Although some research activity has studied the sustainability of these outcomes, there has been scant attention to investigating how such outcomes are generated. This study breaks new ground by exploring the process for change, using Barbara Rogoff’s concept of the cultural community (Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002) as an orienting framework; an approach that has enabled a new perspective.

The context for this study is today’s more complex society; and society is the setting where children and young people encounter the demands and challenges of growing up, developing foundational skills, attitudes and behaviours needed for them to realise their potential, to flourish and to prosper as full and active members of our contemporary society (see, for example, Hagell (Ed.), 2012). The well-being and character of children and young people is the key motivation for the conduct of the current study.

It is increasingly recognised that the traditional measures of a society’s success, such as economic production, have failed to consider the well-being of their citizens and inform adequately the development of social policy (see Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi, 2008; United Nations, 2013). In the UK, the 2008 Foresight Mental Capital and Wellbeing Project identified several major challenges expected to affect our nation in the next 20 years, these are: the demographic age-shift, changes in the global economy and world of work, the changing nature of UK society, changing attitudes, new values and expectations of society, changing nature of public services, and new science and technology (Foresight, 2008: 11-12). This study highlighted that:

‘[…] if we are to prosper and thrive in our changing society and in an increasingly interconnected and competitive world, both our mental and
material resources will be vital. Encouraging and enabling everyone to realise their potential throughout their lives will be crucial for our future prosperity and wellbeing.’ (ibid: 9).

In considering these challenges there has been an increasing capacity to measure and monitor societal and individual well-being. For example, the UK’s Office for National Statistics (ONS) Measuring National Well-being (MNW) programme collects and analyses data from a wide range of sources and domains to inform social policy (see ONS, 2016a; 2016b).

There is also greater recognition that social and emotional outcomes are ‘important signals of a flourishing or struggling child’ (Feinstein, 2015: 3), and that such outcomes ‘provide important signals about likely outcomes [for future life] above and beyond what is picked up by measures of literacy and numeracy’ (ibid: 7). Drawing on a variety of evidence collected between 1975 and 2005, it has been proposed that there are ‘long-term and substantial rates of adolescent emotional problems […] in the UK, the general pattern of change across psychosocial indicators suggests that [these rates] remain at historically high levels’ (Collishaw in Hagell (Ed.) 2012: 24-25; see also Youth Parliament, 2015; Thorley, 2016).

In the UK, The Children’s Society, in a collaboration with the University of York, has conducted longitudinal research into children’s well-being since 2005. This research programme has used a consultative approach to engage with more than 60,000 children, aged 8 to 17 years, as ‘the main protagonists in [well-being] assessments. […] to tell us – in their own words – what is most important in their lives’ (The Children’s Society, 2016: 11). This research programme proposes that ‘a useful way to think about the themes raised by children was a framework of three related components – self, relationships and environments’ (ibid). These three related components are at the core of the conceptual framework for my current study, and will be discussed further when considering Rogoff’s ‘cultural community’ (Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff in Wertsch, Del Rio and Alvarez, 1995; Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002).
Although neuroscience and emergent brain imaging techniques provide new insights about the physiological development of the human brain (see Blakemore and Frith, 2005; Geake, 2009; Howard-Jones, 2010), I propose that the physiological experience of today’s adolescents may be very similar to that of our ancestors but it occurs in the more complex setting of contemporary society. Responding to the demands and challenges of adolescence is, and has been, a constant challenge for society; over the last eighty or so years, solutions have tended to be predicated in educational doctrine towards meeting broader societal needs (Pring, 2004). However, that some aspects of cognitive and human development (such as personal and social development, and literacy and numeracy) remain difficult issues for policy makers and educators, implies that educational policy may not have been entirely successful in meeting those broader societal needs (after Pring).

John Dewey (1859 – 1952) and Lev Vygotsky (1896 – 1934), independently, considered the personal and social development of children and young people; they both identified themes that resonate today with the debate on educational policy. John Dewey, in 1930s America amidst the transition from a community-based economy and lifestyle to urbanised, industrialised occupations cautioned educational policy makers against the ‘tendency to emphasize technical details and [losing] sight of the broader societal function of education’ (Quay and Seaman, 2013: 2). In 1930s post-revolutionary Soviet Union, Lev Vygotsky’s research on human cognition and development was conducted:

‘within a society that [had] high hopes for the ability of science to solve the pressing economic and social problems of the Soviet people, […] and] the elimination of illiteracy and the founding of educational programs to maximise the potential of individual children’ (Cole and Scribner, 1978: 9).

The UK Government, particularly since World War II, has aspired to ‘a new framework for promoting natural growth and development not only of
children, but of national policy itself towards education in the years to come\(^1\) (extract from the speech to the UK Parliament by Rab Butler MP, see Butler, 1944). The success of this educational policy in developing the character and competence of children during their compulsory education is unclear. Government directives since that time have, and particularly over recent decades, ‘emphasised the importance of enabling young people to thrive and achieve their potential’ (Clarke \textit{et al.}, 2015: 17). For example, the introduction of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL), and the 2015 pledge from the Department for Education to allocate £5million ‘to help schools ensure that children develop a set of character traits, attributes and behaviours that underpin success in education and work’ (\textit{ibid}: 18). However, Birdwell, Scott and Reynolds highlight that ‘[while] policy-makers have often considered character development as a core aim of education, it has never been fully embedded into educational policy’ (2015: 48). It is interesting to note that the \textit{National Citizen Service} (NCS)\(^2\), tasked with the personal and social development of 15 to 17-year olds, does not sit within the Department for Education but is the responsibility of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (see Bradley, 2017).

Since 1945 there has been a range of initiatives intended to bolster the outcomes of educational policy, especially those going beyond academic achievement, including outdoor adventure programmes. For example, there is increasing interest in the development of non-cognitive skills or ‘attitudes, behaviours, and strategies which facilitate success in school and workplace, such as motivation, perseverance and self-control’; and how these may have a positive impact on educational attainment and longer-term outcomes (Gutman and Schoon, 2013: 4).

In my ethnographic study of a single six-day sail training voyage, I became the ‘crucial measurement device’ (Denscombe, 2013: 237); and as

\(^1\) These aspirations were set out in the 1944 Education Act; this Act was informed by the 1943 Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools Report, known as the \textit{Norwood Report}. Available at \url{http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/norwood/norwood1943.html} [Accessed 30 July 2017]. See also Veevers and Allison (2011: 59-63).

\(^2\) For more information see \url{http://www.ncseyes.co.uk/what-is-ncs}
such it is necessary for me to describe how my background, values, perception of identity and beliefs have influenced the design and conduct of this study, and how I have endeavoured to monitor and minimise researcher-bias. My approach has been to use reflective and reflexive practice to recognise bias, and to then make this explicit in this thesis. This is set out in 1.2 below as a Position Statement.

The Literature Review in Chapter 2 describes the role of outdoor adventure education in bolstering educational policy outcomes. This study investigates the case for sail training, as a type of outdoor adventure education, to complement the ‘cognitive and academic skills usually measured by tests or teacher assessment’ (Gutman and Schoon, 2013: 4). It sets out how it provides children and young people with a broader range of social and educative experiences, including well-being, arising from a broader range of formal and non-formal educational experiences, as a means to improving life-long outcomes (see Gutman and Schoon, 2013; Feinstein, 2015).

Sail training comes within the general description of outdoor adventure education. In the largest study of its kind (commissioned by Sail Training International3 (STI) and conducted by the University of Edinburgh), McCulloch et al. posited that ‘Sail training should therefore be understood not solely as adventurous recreation but as a powerful educative experience’ (2010: 661; see also Allison et al., 2007). The age of most participants embarking on a sail training voyage is 12 to 25 years; and the extant sail training literature has studied crews from across this age range to identify and measure voyage outcomes. One exception is a study of older participants as they recovered from alcohol and drug addiction on a Voyage of Recovery (White et al., 2013). The majority of published studies have focussed on young participants, resulting in an absence of studies that have included the sea-staff (see, for example, Hind, 2016). Sea-staff is a collective term for those who support sail training voyages; they may be full-time employed professional seafarers or volunteers (with a range of skills and qualifications) and are considered key to a successful

3 Sail Training International is the organisation representing sail training providers across the globe. See http://www.sailtraininginternational.org/
voyage experience. Whilst some information and guidance is available for sea-staff practitioners (see, for example, Henstock and Moss, 2007); an intended outcome of this study is to provide practitioners with more detail about the what and the why of their role in making the sail training voyage a positive experience for all participants.

To establish the sail training setting as a community with a distinct culture, I have made the case that contemporary sail training practices are to be found in the rich culture and traditions of the age of sail, going back to the 16th and 17th century. Contemporary sail training practitioners may not be aware that their current practices are founded in these historical antecedents.

I use Rogoff’s concept of a cultural community as the orienting framework to explore the sail training voyage. I consider the conceptual roles for Rogoff’s apprenticeship and guided participation, and how these may manifest in the voyage milieu. In contrast to Rogoff’s concepts, there has been a recurring proposition that life-at-sea and life aboard ships represents a total institution (after Erving Goffman’s Asylums, 1991 [1961]; also see Aubert, 1965). I find the concept of the ‘total institution’ and the experience for its ‘inmates’ (after Goffman) to be incompatible with the experience of sail training participants, and my own experience of this setting. It has, therefore, been necessary to investigate the foundation for Goffman’s (as the most cited author for this concept) and Aubert’s generalisation of the ‘total institution’ to life-at-sea, life aboard ships and, particularly, to the sail training vessel (see McCulloch, 2004; 2007).

With this background in mind, I set out to answer these research questions:

1. How does the cultural community operate during a sail training voyage?
2. How might sail training community practices be developed to optimise outcomes for participants (and members)?

I present, in Chapter 3, my approach to research design and methodology, and how I set out to investigate the process(es) to be found during the sail training
voyage. From my own sail training experience, as a member of sea-staff, I consider that I was an ‘insider’ (as opposed to an ‘outsider’); a situation that may manifest in unintentional or unrecognised bias. I therefore intentionally adopted research activities that were intended to make the familiar voyage setting strange to me; to activate my own reflective and reflexive practice. I employed a range of research tools, such as visual methods, that were new to me and that I intended to empower study participants in their contribution to the collected data. In common with other researchers in this setting, I found the balance between sail training practitioner (and participant) and researcher to be problematic (see, for example, Rogers, 2004; McCulloch, 2007). To complement the study I used activities and tools across three time frames, pre-, on- and post-voyage, and I kept field notes. The third iteration of these notes, as out-of-field notes (after Delamont in Walford, 2009) at c.24,000 words, have provided the contextual detail to the contributions of the study participants.

My analysis of data (Chapter 4) uses Rogoff’s proposed planes of analysis: personal, interpersonal and community processes as ‘integrated constellations of community practices’ (in Wertsch et al., 1995: 139-164). In the analysis, I found it difficult to separate these planes; this allowed me to adapt my methodological approach and develop the means for presenting the data. The findings are presented in five personal vignettes, weaving together the contributions of the study participants to demonstrate dimensions of Rogoff’s cultural community, apprenticeship and guided participation. I also make use of Rogoff’s (2014) later writing and the concept of Learning by Observing and Pitching In (or LOPI; also, see Coppens et al., 2014) to explain the sail training voyage as another way to learn.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion on the role of the cultural community, LOPI and the use of the Explain, Demonstrate, Imitate, Practice (or EDIP) model for learning. I also discuss how, in the context of a sail training voyage, novice participants approach this novel setting as strangers; changing the character of the participant’s experience as they embark on a process of acculturation to the sail training cultural community, and as they adjust and adapt to the new culture of the sail training vessel. Acculturation is also
experienced by immigrants and expatriates who enter a new host culture; it is an experience that has been found to be significant for young people, who have been found to be particularly sensitive to this process (for immigrants see, for example, Cheung, Chudek and Heine, 2011; for expatriate families see, for example, Haslberger and Brewster, 2008). Csibra and Gergely (2011) posit that the activation of cognitive mechanisms from experience, such as acculturation, may present as a ‘natural pedagogy’, that enables participants to revert to an earlier and more familiar form of pedagogy. This is a primary pedagogical experience found in a socio-cultural approach to learning that ‘envisions’ the links between history, culture, language, symbols, thought, relationships, social organizations, activity, biological development, self, identity and even […] the ‘meaning of life!’ (Pollard, 2001: 7). Movement between one social context to another becomes a familiar experience, as a form of boundary crossing (see Akkerman and Bakker, 2011; Wenger-Trayner et al., 2015)4.

Children and adolescents link their socio-cultural experiences (after Pollard, ante) as they move within and across social contexts, crossing boundaries as they do so. Early socio-cultural experiences occur in ‘[families], peer groups, classrooms, and schools [as] primary arenas in which young people negotiate and construct their realities’ but with little evidence of or the need for direct assistance as the boundaries between one context and another are negotiated, each context with its own demands on and challenges for cultural knowledge and behaviour (Phelan, Davidson and Cao, 1991: 224-225).

In conclusion, the sail training voyage does satisfy the description of a cultural community (after Rogoff, 1990); and fulfils the seven facets for Learning by Observing and Pitching In (after Rogoff, 2014). This new perspective provides sail training practitioners with an opportunity to consider how they do what they do, to optimise the voyage experience for novice crew and

---

4 The concept of boundary crossing is introduced here and following my viva voce. It was introduced in the discussion with my examiners – Professor David Leat and Associate Professor Pete Allison, and resonates with and extends my thinking about this study. It should be noted, however, that ‘[boundary] crossing and all that it entails is a relatively recent research focus and not completely understood’ (Clark et al., 2017: 245).
themselves as active participants in this unique cultural community, as well as implications for policy makers, funders and future researchers.

1.2 Position Statement

In this statement, I provide sufficient self-disclosure to make explicit my attitudes and beliefs that motivated and influenced the conduct of this study: my approach to collecting, analysing and interpreting the study data, which informs the arguments made in support of my conclusions. I do this in the same way that a medical researcher may describe the technical capability of their microscope or the device used in their technique for functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) (see, for example, Howard-Jones, 2010: 101-106). I will do this as the ‘crucial measurement device’, [recognising] that [my] background, values, identity and beliefs might have a significant bearing on the nature of the data collected and the analysis of that data’ (Denscombe, 2013: 237). By setting out here, as a reflective writing experience, my position on the issues and concepts discussed in this thesis and how this has enabled reflective and reflexive practice (see Turnbull (1973) in Bryman, 2012: 39) provides you, the reader, with this personal insight.

I rely upon some pre-existing texts written during my current academic experience, such as module assignments, my own reflective notes and research journal; and new interpretations of these texts as I re-visit and incorporate them in to my current thinking and writing. I embrace Adams St Pierre’s (2005) proposition that: ‘Writing is thinking, writing is analysis, writing is indeed a seductive and tangled method of discovery’ (in Bolton, 2012: 84, emphasis in original). Throughout this thesis I weave my personal experiences and perspectives to encourage a constructive dialogue with you, the reader.

I will set out the influences that I recognise to have been important in making me ‘who I am’, such as family, friends, school, employment and, since 2012, my volunteering in sail training and embarking upon academic study. However, these descriptions can only ever include those situations, circumstances and thoughts that I can consciously recognise as having had influence. A further filter for inclusion here is found in my decision making when considering whether the consciously-recognised influence is relevant. This may
not be an exhaustive process, as some ‘influences’ may go unreported because of my inability to recognise them as being contributory factors to my thinking. I rely upon the following counsel on this matter:

There is something that I don’t know
that I am supposed to know.
I don’t know what it is I don’t know
and yet I am supposed to know.
And I feel I look stupid
if I seem both not to know it
and not know what it is I don’t know.
Therefore, I pretend I know it.
There is nerve wracking since I don’t
know what I must pretend to know.
Therefore, I pretend to know everything.
I feel you know what I am supposed to know
but you can’t tell me what it is
because you don’t know that I don’t know what it is.
You must know what I don’t know,
but not that I don’t know it and I can’t tell you.
So you will have to tell me everything.


Making these influences explicit is important as they may manifest in conscious or non-conscious bias in the conduct and reporting of this study. In this instance, ‘non-conscious’ is used to describe those influences that affect my thinking without conscious thought; and in acknowledging the existence of these non-conscious influences sensitises the potential for bias, but this may not eliminate it completely. It is the combination of these conscious and non-conscious thoughts, as the influences that have shaped the planning and conduct of this study that are discussed further in Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology; and have also informed the decision-making applied in the
Searching for, the reading and review of texts that I found sufficiently relevant and compelling to be included in Chapter 2: Literature Review.

Setting out my ‘position’ in this way is a form of self-disclosure; this is essential to illuminate my own understanding or insight for the benefit of the reader. The writings of sociologist Erving Goffman (for example, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, 1990 [1959] and Asylums, 1991 [1961]) have influenced my own and other researchers’ thinking about sail training, but he would have disavowed the extent of my self-disclosure and the incorporation of the researcher’s self in the study of others (Shalin, 2013: 2). This is a view that has changed over the years (see, for example, Denscombe, 2013). In reading Goffman’s concept of ‘total institution’ (discussed further in Chapter 2), I readily accepted this as applying to ships-at-sea and sail training vessels. This acceptance was not based on the arguments made or the evidence produced but, rather, the stories and anecdotes that were presented in his convincing narrative. Daniel Kahneman suggests that this is a familiar situation, in that ‘most people believe in [scientific] conclusions before they accept arguments’ (Nair, 2013). This arises from, what Kahneman calls, theory-induced blindness:

‘once you have accepted a theory and used it as a tool in your thinking, it is extraordinarily difficult to notice its flaws. [...] You give the theory the benefit of the doubt, trusting the community of experts who have accepted it.’ (Kahneman, 2012: 277).

Although Kahneman explains this in the context of scientific endeavours, it is worth considering whether this phenomenon exists in other social situations, and in creating our world-view when we apply what we have previously accepted as being true in new or unfamiliar situations. In the context of this position statement and this study I have developed critical thinking skills; criticality being essential when reading and reviewing any factual or academic writing, for example, asking ‘What claims are being made?’ and ‘How persuasive are those claims?’ (see Chapter 2).

In the case of Goffman’s Asylums, I would have benefited from the contextual knowledge that his wife, Angelica, experienced mental ill-health and, after several attempts, had taken her own life. Thus, Goffman was,
understandably, ambivalent toward psychiatry due to ‘the treatment his wife underwent, which he deemed ineffective, and perhaps superfluous’ (Shalin, 2013: 14). Without this contextualisation, I am unable to grasp or comprehend Goffman’s attitudes and beliefs toward his research interest and how this may have influenced his thinking and writing. This emphasises the need to consider the arguments made in support of those claims. In contrast, I endeavour to make my own thinking and understanding explicit here.

The role of self-disclosure is, perhaps, more poignant as I enter new and unfamiliar communities. I am now experiencing a lifespan transition as I embark upon retirement, and in becoming a volunteer in a sail training context and a full-time doctoral student. These transitional processes have involved a re-assessment and reorganisation of my skills, attitudes and beliefs; reviewing my perceptions of self, as I undertake the physical and intellectual challenges and perspectives presented by these new communities (see Rogoff, 1990: 11). The experience of crossing these boundaries manifests as ‘places of potential misunderstanding and confusion arising from different regimes of competence, commitments, values, repertoires, and perspectives’ creating the potential for both intended and ‘unexpected learning’ (Wenger-Trayner et al., 2015: 17). This brings together several constructs of self; the past-self, the now-self and then there are numerous future possible-selves. The past-self is the foundation for our possible selves and, thereby, the life-trajectories that lead us towards personal and social development, as they:

‘are individualized or personalized, but they are also distinctly social. Many of these possible selves are the direct result of previous social comparisons in which the individual's own thoughts, feelings, characteristics, and [behaviours] have been contrasted to those of salient others. What others are now, I could become.’ (Markus and Nurius, 1986: 954).

Lee and Oyserman propose that when we think about these possible selves, these are manifestations of self-concept:

‘[a] theory about oneself, the person one was in the past, is now, and can become in the future, including social roles and group memberships. A well-functioning self-concept helps make sense of one's present,
preserves positive self-feelings, makes predictions about the future, and
guides motivation.’ (2012: 1).

Possible selves include positive futures, that may ‘improve well-being and
optimism about the future’ (ibid: 2), and the negative images of possible selves
that we may fear of becoming. How we present our-selves is important; these
are constructs that make us who we are (or think we are!) and provide the
means to communicate in social interactions.

Goffman (1990 [1959]) uses a dramaturgical metaphor in describing the
different roles and repertoires of performance that we use in our everyday lives.
Bruner uses a similar metaphor:

‘[…] it is as if we walk on a stage into a play whose enactment is already
in progress – a play whose somewhat open plot determines what parts
we may play and towards what denouements we may be heading.
Others on stage already have a sense of what the play is about, enough
of a sense to make negotiation with the newcomer possible’ (1990: 34).

My own repertoires of performance come from the social interactions
encountered through my membership and participation in different sociocultural
communities. It is, perhaps, appropriate at this point to consider what
membership and participation mean to me, as this provides the foundation for
my world-view and the performances of self. Markus and Kitayama posit that:

‘A self is the ‘me’ at the [centre] of experience - a continually developing
sense of awareness and agency that guides action and takes shape as
the individual, both brain and body, becomes attuned to the various
environments it inhabits’ (2010: 421).

I use the term ‘membership’ to describe my feeling of belonging to a
range of sociocultural and vocational ‘communities of practice’; these are
‘communities of practice’ that enjoy characteristics of mutual engagement, a
joint enterprise and a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1999: 73). Communities of
practice are closely associated with learning, not just in the context of vocational
learning, but learning as a process of personal and social development. In this
sense membership is not passive, it ‘is not just a matter of social category,
declaring allegiance, belonging to an organisation, having a title, or having
personal relations with some people’ (ibid: 74). It is this, more active, description of membership that I use in referring to my belonging to these communities.

After 30 years, I belonged to the policing community, the occupational role (mutual engagement), the mission to protect life and property, and to prevent and detect crime (a joint enterprise), and using the language of policing and range of cultural tools (a shared repertoire) ensured my membership. However, I did not immediately regard myself a full member – there was a process of becoming before I had a sense of belonging. The process of becoming involved ‘participation in social practice – subjective as well as objective – [suggesting] a very explicit focus on the person, but as a person-in-the-world, as a member of a sociocultural community’ (Lave and Wenger, 2011 [1991]: 52).

The implication is that participation and membership lie within a non-linear system incorporating ‘a node of mutual engagement that becomes progressively looser at the periphery, with layers going from core membership to extreme peripherality’ (Wenger, 1999: 118). Indeed, Heslop (2011) reports on the emergent identity of new police recruits and their changing attitude to learning, as they transition between participating as a ‘novice’ towards becoming a police officer and a full-member of the police service. The concept of the changing now-self is particularly relevant to my role as academic researcher with discernible changes in the pre-, on- and post-study self (this is discussed further in Chapter 3). Wenger (1999) further posits that:

‘the periphery [of a community of practice] is a very fertile area for change [as it is] partly outside and thus in contact with other views, [and] partly inside and so perturbations are likely to propagate’ (ibid).

Creating dissonance upon initial entry into a new community, if planned for and managed can activate more positive possible selves than negative possibilities. This was my experience as I entered, as a stranger, the sail training and, latterly, the academic communities. Wenger-Trayner et al. (2001) explore further the concept of ‘communities of practice’ and now argue ‘that the ‘body of knowledge’ of a profession is best understood as a ‘landscape of practice’.
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5 Etienne Wenger is now published as Etienne Wenger-Trayner.
consisting of a complex system of communities of practice and the boundaries between them.’ (2015: 13).

My entry as a sail training volunteer, apart from becoming an active participant in ‘adventure under sail’ with children and young people as a form of personal and social development, allowed for an exploration from the periphery to the core of this type of volunteering. I have sailed with full-time and volunteer sea-staff (with a wide variety of experience), and different crews of children and young people. The transition from active participant towards core membership (this will be discussed later), led to an increasing curiosity as to why a relatively short voyage at sea, of two to six days, should make a difference to the young crews, albeit differences which were only observable in some participants; but this effect extended to my own sense of belonging and well-being.

Although the promotional literature for many sail training organisations provides a case for the benefits of this type of adventure outdoor education, it was my curiosity that led me to investigate the academic status for sail training, as an educational intervention to support personal and social development of children and young people. In 2013, my curiosity led me to enrol as a student with the University of Cumbria and conduct a Master’s Independent Study of a five-day voyage (Fletcher, 2013; Fletcher and Prince, 2017). Success in completing this study allowed me to explore the opportunities to pursue a more detailed academic study.

My entry to both sail training and academia was eased by the preparedness of existing members of those communities to enable and support my participation, towards membership. In sail training, my possible self was provided with sufficient support, allowing me to transfer existing knowledge and skills, and leading to an acknowledgement of competence through the award of ‘Watch Leader’ status. Within the current EdD programme, my transition fell within the meticulously planned menu of core and elective modules that have enabled me to plan and conduct this study. I was able to interpret the respective sociocultural patterns, such as the use of rules and tools, and using my past-self I organised these new social situations with the aid of existing knowledge and experience (see Schuetz, 1944).
My life-experiences have stimulated my learning; priming my approach to new experiences framed by a multitude of possible selves. Boud and Walker (1990: 63-65) describe this as the ‘learner’s personal foundation of experience’, comprising a complex mix of personal, family, educational and work experiences as both a member and participant. Access to all domains of this personal foundation of experience is not immediate, and may require conscious effort to retrieve or access them by developing my reflective practice. Reflection has been an ongoing process during my introduction to academia (this was subject of detailed discussion and analysis in a module assignment considering the development of thinking skills and reflective practice (Fletcher, 2015) with a summary presented here). Developing my world view, as a now-self, through the construction and re-construction of knowledge and understanding has been a serendipitous process. My personal foundation of experience and approach to learning allows me ‘to seek social situations in which [I] can grow […] developing [myself] and [my] relationships’ (Dweck, 2000: 67).

What follows is an attempt to explain how I have arrived at my current now-self, however, the fog-of-time makes this difficult, as I have reflected and thought about my past-self and its influence on the here and now. I have previously reflected that:

‘I was always conscious that I had thoughts; much of these occurred without actually thinking about them, or their component parts, but that is not to say that I did not develop any thinking skills’ (Fletcher, 2015: 3).

Thinking skills, including ‘reasoning, feeling, sensing, intuiting, remembering, imagining and willing’ (Boud, Cohen and Walker (Eds.), 2010: 46), were not an explicit element of my compulsory education; had I been more aware of these skills then ‘my ability to engage efficiently and fruitfully in the learning process would have been greatly enhanced’ (Mulligan in Boud et al. (Eds.), 2010: 57).

This type of self-awareness correlates to meta-cognition or ‘an awareness of one’s own cognitive functioning (metacognitive knowledge) and […] application of one’s cognitive resources for learning or problem-solving’ (Moseley et al., 2005: 13).
As a developing police officer I created a repertoire of performances (after Goffman, 1990 [1959]) commensurate with the role, for example, I would employ a different performance when interacting with victims of crime, witnesses or suspects, or my police colleagues and supervisors. These performances would become part of my personal and social development across all domains of my life.

My initial police training involved listening to didactic presentations on theory and practice, occasionally complemented with activities to apply this learning, and leading to on-the-job training alongside an experienced ‘tutor’ officer – as a form of guided participation (see Rogoff (1990) post).

The current training for police recruits incorporates a range of student-centred teaching/learning methods and has a framework to enable and support reflective practices, but guided participation with a more experienced officer remains an essential component of this training. Similarly, working with more experienced practitioners is an approach to the apprenticeship of US Navy quartermasters to complement their ‘exposure to basic terminology and concepts’ (Hutchins in Lave and Wenger, 1991: 73). Novice quartermasters in applying their learning to the specific situation of their role, that is, when they are at sea:

‘may be asked to perform all of the duties of the quartermaster of the watch. While under instruction, his activities are closely monitored by the more experienced watch stander who is always on hand and can help out or take over […]’ (ibid, 1991: 74).

I take the view that a police officer’s key competency can be described as a problem solver, that involves ‘interpersonal and practical goals, addressed deliberately (not necessarily consciously or rationally) […] [emphasising] the active nature of thinking’ (Rogoff, 1990: 8-9). All police officers are trained in and develop a range of investigative skills towards solving problems. Investigations, as a type of problem, begin as soon as a report of crime is
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made, as the details of the offence are captured by a call-taker, leading to the
deployment of a uniform patrol officer and then, depending on the nature of the
crime, more specialist investigators. Some investigations are wicked problems,
where ‘for which each attempt to create a solution changes the understanding
of the problem’ (Alison and Crego, 2008: 19). A wicked problem requires both
reflective and reflexive thinking as the consequences of a solution are
monitored to identify or recognise any changes to the character of the problem,
as it may be that the solution changes the behaviour of the offender(s) thereby
increasing the risk or manifesting in unacceptable consequences (see Rittel and
Webber, 1973). This approach is an example of Donald Schön’s (1983)
reflection-in-action; or the ‘capacity to walk around the problem while you are in
the middle of it, to think about what you are doing as you are improvising it’
(Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012: 98). My emergent thinking concerning academic
research approaches (such as quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods) and
the use of an approach that is best suited to the research setting, subjects and
the question(s) to be answered is influenced by reflections on my investigative
experiences. These experiences have much in common with deductive theory,
as the ‘commonest view of the nature of the relationship between theory and
social research’ (Bryman, 2012: 24), in that investigators will often develop
hypotheses to inform their investigative strategy.

I should, at this point, describe my reflective and reflexive practice, and
how this influences the current study. There are two fundamental forms for
reflective practice proposed by Schön (1983): ‘Reflection-in-action is the hawk
in the mind constantly circling, watching and advising on practice. Reflection-
upon-action is considering events afterwards’ (Bolton, 2012: 33). These two
forms of reflection engage emotions, they activate thought about ongoing or
past events and may shape the presentation of self. Reflective practice
monitors the actions and emotions of others allowing for adjustments in the
ongoing performance in any social interaction. Marlowe describes these
attributes as social intelligence: ‘the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts,
and behaviours of persons, including oneself, in interpersonal situations and to
act appropriately upon that understanding’ (1986: 52; see also Leithwood,
Jantzi and Steinbach, 1999; Leithwood and Beatty, 2008). Reflexivity is ‘[a]
characterization of the relationship between knowledge and society and/or researcher and subject, focussing on the continuous reflection of social action on themselves and their social context’ (Giddens and Sutton, 2014: 36). This position statement is a response to my reflexivity; it provides my ‘reflexive stance’ (see Reinharz, 2011: 2) and has informed some of the decisions made in this study, for example, whilst conducting the fieldwork and in my ethical approach (see Chapter 3). I rely upon Groundwater-Smith and Mockler’s proposition that researchers require ‘not only an understanding of the technicalities of research and reflective practice, but an unwavering commitment to ethics’ (2007: 209).

When I became a police trainer, reflection took on a new meaning as I was introduced to purposeful reflection. Throughout my police service I wrote down, contemporaneously or as soon after the event as possible, any primary evidence and exceptional items in a Pocket Note Book (PNB). These notes were not intended for or used to support learning or reflective practice, they were an evidential record for use in the course of an investigation or criminal proceedings absent of interpretation or reflection.

I recognise that reflection-in-action is key to the role of a police officer but that reflection-upon-action was often neglected. As I became a police trainer my reflective practice evolved and I would come to use the reflective journal to record my thinking and reflections on teaching sessions for the ‘development of self as a professional’ (Moon, 2009: 72). As a learner, I wish that I had been introduced to this practice sooner. New police recruits now use development portfolios and reflective journals as tools to support learning, however, entries in such portfolios may be influenced or inhibited due to the nature of their purpose, in that the author knows that they are to be shared or used for assessment by tutors or supervisors (Moon, 2009).

With the benefit of hindsight ‘I also became more aware of the emotional influences upon my thinking; in policing, we do not often recognise or admit to having emotions (and certainly do not record them in a PNB entry)’ (Fletcher, 2015: 8). At the time, we might not recognise or understand how our emotions affect thinking, reflection and decision making (see, for example, Goleman,
1996; Kahneman, 2012). Alison and Crego (2008: 188) argue that, in a policing context, the negative emotions of regret or anticipated regret are potentially the most powerful component in decision-making, leading to decision-inertia or decision-avoidance, and is one aspect of the emotional response to reflective practice. The relationship between fear in the context of negative images of possible selves and the regret related to past-self is unclear, but could be significant. This may be a consequence of negativity dominance, as:

‘[the] self is more motivated to avoid bad self-definitions than to pursue good ones. [However], bad impressions and bad stereotypes are quicker to form and more resistant to disconfirmation than good ones.’

(Kahneman, 2012: 302).

Equipped with these life experiences I became a sail training volunteer, I recognised an observable effect on the behaviour of crew participants and how my participation affected my own sense of well-being too. After the most challenging of voyages, in the sense of experiencing crew behaviour, I found myself reflecting on the drive home with a smile on my face and a sense of accomplishment. I became intrigued about how sail training worked and began my search for answers, initially through on-line, non-academic searches, such as open-access reports on adventure and outdoor education, text books covering general concepts and fictional accounts of seafaring exploits.

My early approach to searching for, reading and reviewing the literature could only be described as haphazard, even naïve, and my review of this literature lacked criticality. As a newcomer to academic practices, I accepted much of the academic writing as being relevant and credible, because it was academic! I now realise that this unquestioned acceptance gifted some manuscripts greater status or weight than, with hindsight, they merited. This was especially true, where I could ‘make’ what I had read fit with my own observations and feelings. For example, I initially relied upon the concept that the ‘ship is a total institution’ (after Erving Goffman’s (1991 [1961]) Asylums); further reading and the reconstruction of my understanding and application of this concept (which still appears in many maritime studies), has led me to question it as an explanation for the benefits arising from a sail training voyage.
This new and evolving approach to reading has shaped my thinking, and reflective and reflexive practice – this has been an empowering experience, not just for what I now know but, also, I am better able to identify gaps in my knowledge, motivating me to extend my search and to learn more; creating my academic identity. The evolution of this academic identity has informed my approach to researching and reading the literature, contributing to my personal development as I participate in and move towards membership of an academic or research community (see McAlpine, Jazvac-Martek and Hopwood, 2009; see also McAlpine, 2012; Sheridan, 2013).

I am now better able to recognise that my life transitions from an operational police officer to a training role, and my subsequent entry into retirement, sail training and academia have enabled detailed reflection on the various past-selves and the now-self. These insights inspired me, in my training role, to create and develop course materials to better equip police learners to meet the challenges of wicked problems, and to contemplate the potential of their possible-selves. I have developed this approach further in my volunteering, entry into academic study and to the conduct of this sail training research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Background

It is important to describe and explain my approach to reviewing the literature that informs this chapter; this will provide any reader with some insight into my thinking, and how I perceive the matters that I will introduce and discuss throughout this thesis. The review set out here has informed my understanding of the context, issues, solutions and concepts that may be found in the investigation of a sail training voyage.

As a foundation to my current approach and applying my emergent academic identity, I rely upon the following considerations for a literature review:

- What is already known about this area?
- What concepts and theories are relevant to this area?
- What research methods and research strategies have been employed in studying this area?
- Are there any significant controversies?
- Are there any inconsistencies in findings relating to this area?

(Bryman, 2012: 98)

These considerations provided the ‘purpose’ and rationale for the inclusion of topics, and my propositions in the writing of this chapter, and explaining how they inform the foundational concepts for this study. It has been more than an expectation of a doctoral thesis or a mere ‘academic duty’ (Silverman, 2014: 48). In conducting this review, I have included many investigations of outdoor adventure education, sail training and the outcomes from participation, such as well-being and character, with a sociological mindset. To give this review an authoritative stance I have drawn upon primary sources, and some secondary referencing where the primary source is not currently available or accessible, to develop this personal but critical narrative. I am also conscious that some citations may be dated, in such cases I have endeavoured to contextualise these to their time and present an argument for their continued relevance; I have also challenged assertions made, for example, see 2.5 (post) on the application of Goffman’s total institution to the sail training
vessel. Primary sources included study reports, academic journal articles and books; extending to researching the social, cultural and historic dimensions of life-at-sea as an explanation for the efficacy of *Sail Training*. The literature cited here provides a description of the field of study, and has been considered for its relevance to the current study.

Sail training has been subject of only limited research, and only a small number of studies have found their way in to formal publication (McCulloch in Humberstone, Prince and Henderson, 2016: 240). In 2016, a rapid systematic review, commissioned by the UK’s Association of Sail Training Organisations (ASTO)⁷, was unable to find sufficient sail training studies to make the review of any value, and found it necessary to extend its scope to all types of outdoor adventure programmes (see, O’Mara-Eves, Fiennes and Oliver, 2016). The research questions for this rapid review were:

- Which outcomes show maintenance of adventure programme effects or increases in effects over time? and
- Are any short-term outcomes linked to different outcomes at later measurement points? (*ibid*: 8).

However, the protocol and search criteria for this systematic review limited its utility to inform the relationship between short-term outcomes (such as self-esteem) and longer-term outcomes (such as employability). This review failed to consider non-intervention variables that may have influenced or impacted upon any relationship. This review (O’Mara-Eves *et al.*, 2016), however, has been superseded by the systematic review conducted by Schijf, Allison and Von Wald who confirm the personal and social development outcomes and recommend further ‘research into the processes involved in sail training could provide valuable insights for the purposes of program design, practice, and policy’ (2017: 176).

The sail training studies that have been published have formed the backbone of my searches for relevant literature, as these have then signposted other, possibly, related studies or conceptual frameworks in their references; for
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⁷ This is the umbrella organisation for UK Sail Training. I was a member of the ASTO Advisory Group commissioning this systematic review.
example, studies on outdoor adventure education (OAE) or self-concepts, such as well-being and character.

Using these few published studies, I applied a methodical approach to the planning for and recording of my literature searching using the Newcastle University library. This process has been a self-directed learning experience; it has been a concrete experience that has enabled me to construct and re-construct my own understanding. This understanding originates from, and is anchored by my personal foundation of experience (after Boud and Walker, 1990). As described in Chapter 1 (ante), my personal foundation of experience has been shaped by my membership and participation in and transition between a range of family, school, police and now academic communities; these in turn have shaped my thinking as I approach the future.

This approach allowed me to develop an emerging conceptual framework; combining my reading and understanding with my personal foundation of experience, and reflective and reflexive practice (ante) that ‘accommodates purpose (boundaries) with flexibility (evolution) and coherence of the research (plan/ analysis/ conclusion) which all stem from the conceptual framework’ (Leshem and Trafford, 2007: 95). It is important to note that this conceptual framework is not static, it is constructed and re-constructed as my knowledge and understanding evolves, and as this matures from discovering and reading manuscripts. I have found it useful to re-visit articles, making notes in different coloured ink for each re-visit; and have recently began to note the date of my re-reading. This re-visiting has allowed me to recognise that passages in these texts may not have been as significant, as I first thought, to my current thinking. This is indicative of my own personal development.

McAlpine posits that reading contributes to the identity-trajectory of doctoral candidates, as it ‘[…] involves bringing particular purposes to active transactions with text – text that invites different interpretations and reinterpretations – resulting in a changing reservoir of knowledge.’ (2012: 357). Reading critically is a skill that ‘entails moving beyond mere description and asking questions about the significance of the work’ (Bryman, 2012: 98) and has allowed me to discriminate better the papers that are relevant, rigorous in
their methodology and significant to my research. These are personal judgements that have been made as this study has progressed, which I intend to make explicit by setting out my approach, rationale and reasoning. A large part of this process has been a reflective one – a dialogue with myself; but it has occasionally included discussions with sail training practitioners or doctoral peers and supervisors. Dialogue has also occurred in EdD Progress Panels and in the regular meetings with my doctoral supervisors. It is my intention that this manuscript should allow the reader to make their own judgements about my rationale and reasoning, to inform a constructive dialogue with other practitioners and researchers (after Wegerif, 2008).

Optimising the electronically available literature has been at the core of developing my emerging conceptual framework; however, it is important to acknowledge that the recent digitization of older manuscripts has allowed me access to manuscripts that were not necessarily available to earlier researchers. It is also recognised that older texts are framed by their context and setting, their time and place; this is relevant to judgement-making about the messages, both explicit and implicit, contained in these texts.

My practice and attention to detail has evolved in this area, for example, modifying search terms, and saving and dating my on-line searches, so that I can re-visit the ‘moment’, reflect on the experience and review any progress made. The volume of search responses has often been overwhelming, so it has been necessary to become more discriminatory between those manuscripts, that may be relevant or non-relevant (it would be improper to imply that any published academic paper is irrelevant) to sail training and related themes, discussed here.

The general themes that arose from my approach to reviewing the literature relate to the Outdoor Adventure Education (at 2.2) providing the overview of the development of outdoor adventure interventions and out-of-class experiences that complement or bring added-value to more formalised classroom-based education (after Hattie et al., 1997). This section also describes the inspirational role of Kurt Hahn (1886-1974), whose achievements included the co-founding of the Outward Bound movement and supporting the
establishment of the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, as well as being the
‘pioneering educator behind Salem Schule, Germany (1920) [and] Gordonstoun
School in Scotland (1934)’ (van Oord, 2010: 253). This is complemented by *Sail
Training* (at 2.3), including the findings of extant research and its sociocultural
and historical origins towards a representative *cultural community*. *Cultural
Community* (at 2.4), the framework provided by Barbara Rogoff’s early writings
on *apprenticeship* and *guided participation*, and her later concept of *learning by
observing and pitching in* (LOPI).

The proposition that has been made for the sail training vessel being a
‘total institution’ (after Goffman) is also discussed (at 2.5); this is necessary, as
this conflicts with my own proposition that the vessel may operate as a *cultural
community*.

### 2.2 Outdoor Adventure Education

As a term that is in general use, Outdoor Adventure Education (OAE)
incorporates the many descriptions used by providers, practitioners,
participants, authors and researchers of outdoor experiences that ‘involve doing
physically active things away from the [participant’s] normal environment’
(Hattie *et al*., 1997: 44; see also McKenzie, 2000; Sibthorp and Richmond in

In this study, I use the term Outdoor Adventure Education (OAE) to
describe the use of this broad range of primarily recreational uses of adventure
and the outdoors. OAE has an operational definition:

‘A variety of teaching and learning activities and experiences usually
involving a close interaction with an outdoor natural setting and
containing elements of real or perceived danger or risk in which the
outcome, although uncertain, can be influenced by the actions of the
participants and circumstances.’ (Ewert and Sibthorp, 2014: 5).

OAE may comprise short-term out-of-classroom experiences, such as those
conducted within school grounds or field trips, through to longer duration and
more challenging expeditions in the wilderness or voyages at sea; these may be
isolated events or incorporated as part of more targeted programmes (see, for
example, Scrutton, 2015; Stott *et al*., 2015). Humberstone *et al*.
have used the
term outdoor studies to describe these purposes as ‘encompassing a broad range of approaches, foci and methods, such as, but not limited to, experiential learning, adventure education, organised camps, environmental education, outdoor leadership, nature-based sport and wilderness therapy’ (2016: 2). There is an increasing recognition that OAE develops not just technical or hard skills, but also benefits the ‘soft’ skills that are to be found in personal and social development; for example, character or ‘the distinct combination of individual characteristics that make a person who he or she is’ (Ewert and Sibthorp, 2014: 131). Academic research reaching across the many facets of OAE activities has delivered greater clarity about the characteristics of participant outcomes, and how these outcomes may contribute to the personal and social development of children and young people (for example, see Sibthorp, 2003; Scrutton, 2015; White, 2012; Stott et al., 2015; Fuller, Powell and Fox, 2016).

Whilst Fiennes et al. found that ‘almost all outdoor learning interventions have a positive effect’ (2015: 7), their UK-based systematic review identified inconsistencies in the nature of OAE provision and the quality of research into such interventions and their outcomes. The UK’s Institute for Outdoor Learning (IOL) has responded to this review’s criticisms and are piloting IOL Research Hubs for the ‘better join-up between academics and practitioners and better co-ordination of research activity in the sector’.

‘In the UK, there is a centuries-old tradition of adventure and exploration, which some would argue has laid the foundation for the modern concept of outdoor education’ (Stott et al., 2015: 198); in the context of Sail Training this proposition is explored further at 2.3 (post). The appetite for and provision of adventure and exploration as a means for personal and social development has, over the years, become more focussed. In the post-1945 period, when the outcomes of educational doctrine were supplemented by an emerging and ‘vigorous social movement […] developed on the margins of youth work, outdoor recreation, further education and industrial training’ (Roberts, White and Parker, 1974: 11); this was known as character-training. This social movement
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8 For more information, see https://www.outdoor-learning.org/Membership/Current-Initiatives/Research-Hubs [Accessed 30 July 2017]
acknowledged that ‘each youngster will carry [their] own personal likes, dislikes, attitudes and beliefs through a course and into [their] subsequent life’ but that ‘[following] their training most young people feel ‘different’, more mature, self-confident, and better capable of handling relationships with others’ (Roberts et al., 1974: 148).

‘Most researchers trace the origin of modern adventure education to Kurt Hahn [1886-1974]’ (Hattie et al., 1997: 44). Hahn is also regarded as an inspirational educationalist who is ‘known more for his achievements in education than for his educational ideas’ (van Oord, 2010: 253; see also Veevers and Allison, 2011). Kurt Hahn grew up in Berlin, a member of an affluent German Jewish family, he studied at the universities of Berlin, Heidelberg and Göttingen and at Oxford, England. Between 1914 and 1918 he served in the German Foreign Office and, in 1933, after criticising the policies of Adolf Hitler was taken in to custody before emigrating to Britain upon his release (van Oord, 2010: 254-255). Hahn’s experiences would see him espouse Williams James’ (1842-1910) call for a moral equivalent of war, and develop a new approach to education. James proposed that war was the only means to discipline and bring a whole community together and that in the absence of a ‘moral equivalent to war’ humankind would be committed to warfare. Hahn’s solution to James’ quest led to him founding the Salem Schule, Germany (in 1920) and Gordonstoun School, Scotland (in 1934). It is noteworthy that:

‘At both of these fee-paying schools activities such as sailing and hill-walking, often through expeditions lasting more than one day, played a prominent role in the education of the students.’ (Veevers and Allison, 2011: xix).

During World War II, Hahn developed the first Outward Bound programme, in conjunction with Lawrence Holt, the owner of the Blue Funnel Line, and which is now recognised globally. Ironically, in the context of this current study, it has been stated that Hahn and Holt’s purpose was to ‘train young seamen in small boat handling, and improve their physical and mental
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9 William James, psychologist and philosopher, first used this phrase in his 1906 speech to Stanford University. Available at [http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/moral.html](http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/moral.html) [Accessed 20 June 2017]
capabilities’ (Veevers and Allison, 2011: 55); many of whom would have been first and second generation mechanised-seafarers shipwrecked during the Battle of the Atlantic (see Hattie et al., 1997: 44; van Oord, 2010). Hahn would later advocate character-training for those going to sea and experiencing training under sail but beyond vocational instruction, reflecting that:

‘During the war, a leading ship owner told me that in an open lifeboat he would prefer to have a sail-trained octogenarian in charge rather than a young man who had only experienced a mechanical sea-training.’ (1947: 2).

In the broader context, character-training used a variety of residential courses for young people often involving adventurous outdoor pursuits; this was provided by a number of independent organisations, such as The Outward Bound Trust, Brathay Trust, and the Sail Training Association. This type of provision was largely taken up by employers investing in developing the character of their new employees, having left school at the age of 1511:

‘In Britain by 1969 as many as 25 per cent of young people in the 14-20 age range had attended a residential non-vocational course, in most cases based upon outdoor pursuits’ (Roberts et al., 1974: 15).

Outdoor adventure education remains on the periphery of compulsory education; as education has become more focussed upon the measurement of individual performance, OAE falls increasingly within the remit of youth work. As Waite notes: ‘The decline in holistic approaches to education since the 1980s has been traced to a secularisation of education away from its endeavours to create character, strength and moral fibre’ (in Humberstone et al., 2016: 104; see also Freeman, 2011). That is not to say that there have not been consistent calls for the inclusion of OAE activities within the mainstream curriculum. For example, in 1984, Mortlock argued that ‘adventure’ should be a core component of the British curriculum towards the formation and development of ‘an
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10 Notwithstanding the actual motives of Hahn and Holt in creating Outward Bound, their purpose is unclear and subject to debate, see Veevers and Allison, 2011: 55-56.

11 The Education Act 1944, taking effect in 1947, set the school leaving age at 15 years. In 1972, the UK school leaving age was increased to 16 years. Since 2015, the Education and Skills Act 2008 requires young people in England to remain in education or training until the age of 18 years.
awareness of, respect for, and love of self, ...others, [and] the environment’ (1994: 18). Mortlock’s description of ‘adventure’ has much in common with Roberts et al.’s (1974) description of character-training (ante). Secondary research that has synthesised studies of adventure-based provision and its outcomes gives some weight to Mortlock’s argument for the inclusion of adventure-based activities in the curriculum; see, for example, Hattie et al. (1997); Rickinson et al. (2004); Fiennes et al. (2015); Stott et al. (2015).

Over the years, the labels and descriptions of specific OAE-based outcomes have emerged and the academic research has been able (or has claimed to have been able) to differentiate between the multi-layered dimensions of personal and social developmental outcomes, such as self-esteem or self-concept. However, many studies fail to explore how these very precise components are consciously or unconsciously\(^\text{12}\) used by individual participants in their trajectory towards well-being, and forming and developing character. Many of the outcomes that have been distilled in these studies have now been consolidated or re-branded within the definitions of well-being, however, it is unclear as to how individuals may utilise, adopt or laminate these multi-dimensional and layered components to create and strengthen well-being and character.

Well-being is important to us all, and it contributes to ‘how young people feel about their lives as a whole, ...their relationships, the amount of choice that they have in their lives, and their future’ (The Children's Society, 2015: 3). This description resonates with Kurt Hahn’s (ante) concept of and Roberts et al.’s (1974) description of the purpose of character-training, however, the relationship between these two concepts is unclear. The Children's Society has previously set out a framework for the connected concepts of well-being (subjective or hedonic, and psychological or eudaimonic) that contribute to self-reported well-being (2015: 9). In their recent report, The Children's Society make the point that:
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12 In this context, the word 'unconsciously' is used to describe how an individual may utilise outcomes instinctively or without having to think about them.
‘[well-being] can mean different things to different people […] and] may best be thought of as an umbrella term that encompasses different concepts and approaches – the ‘best’ being dependent on the circumstances in which it is used.’ (The Children’s Society, 2016: 8). Hedonic and eudaimonic well-being have both been interpreted to mean ‘happiness’; although these concepts arise from different philosophical positions they are not independent constructs (Waterman, Schwartz and Conti, 2008: 42), but they have led to different research traditions and a tension between the psychological and philosophical language used in defining them (Waterman, 2008: 249; see also Biswas-Diener, Kashdan and King, 2009).

*Hedonic happiness*, or hedonia, has been defined as ‘the belief that one is getting the important things one wants, as well as certain pleasant affects that normally go along with this belief’ (Kraut, 1979: 178; see also Waterman, 2008). *Hedonic well-being*, which has been closely allied to *subject well-being* or SWB (Diener, 1984) may be short-lived, or associated to a specific event or setting where individual needs are satisfied; comprising ‘the presence of positive affect and the absence of negative affect’ (Deci and Ryan, 2008: 1).

In contrast, *eudaimonic happiness*, or eudaimonia, is a more complex construct that can be traced back to the writings of Aristotle and the 4th century BC. Difficulties with this concept appear to arise from the translation of Aristotle’s original works, and its later application from philosophy to psychology (Biswas-Diener et al., 2009: 209). Waterman (2008) describes *eudaimonia* as the feeling of ‘being where one wants to be, doing what one wants to do’ (citing Norton, 1976: 216) ‘where what is wanted is to be taken as being something worth doing’ (*ibid*: 236); or ‘living life in a full and deeply satisfying way’ (Deci and Ryan, 2008: 1).

I would argue that eudaimonia resonates more closely with longer term well-being and the formation and development of character arising from deeply-fulfilling experiences, especially those experiences that incorporate an emotional dimension. Dewey described such experiences as an *aesthetic* experience: ‘[that] is emotional but there are no separate things called emotions
in it’ (Dewey, 1934: 42). As this relates to the current study, sailing has been described as an optimal experience and having the potential for creating flow:

‘It is what the sailor holding a tight course feels when the wind whips though her hair, when the boat lunges through the waves like a colt – sails, hull, wind, and sea humming a harmony that vibrates in the sailor’s veins’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 2008: 3).

Csikszentmihalyi’s concept of flow ‘constitutes] an expression of eudaimonia. […] experienced only in connection with a limited set of specific sources, such as activities associated with self-realization and expressions of virtue’ (Waterman, 2008: 237).

Well-being prepares children and young people for the rigours of adulthood and contributing to society (Aked and Thompson, 2011); other related concepts are citizenship (see Keating et al., 2010) and social capital (see Finkelstein and Goodwin, 2006; Beames and Atencio, 2008; Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012).

Today’s journey towards adulthood, especially for those from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds, in an increasingly complex society does not alter the fact that:

‘[their] ‘needs’ will remain very much as they are now but at a later chronological stage in life. …The need to establish individual identity, self-assurance and skills in inter-relationships will remain central tasks for adolescents and young people – even if deferred by a few years’ (Gutfreund, 2000: 8).

The UK Government’s Cabinet Office now describes this developmental phase as emerging adulthood or ‘a new stage in the life course of many young people, who are experiencing longer, more complex paths to full adulthood and independence’ (2014: 76), and this may frustrate and undermine individual well-being and, thereby, the individual’s journey towards flourishing.

2.3 Sail Training

It is within the context of children and young people in contemporary society, set out in 1.1 Background (ante), that I find the impetus and rationale for this study to investigate further how sail training, as a type of OAE, may
support the personal and social development of children and young people, and bring about positive \textit{well-being} outcomes and contributing to the formation and development of \textit{character} towards \textit{flourishing}.

\textit{Sail training} is an adventurous residential activity where, in addition to technical sailing skills, participants can experience beneficial outcomes, such as an increase in self-concept, self-esteem, social confidence, and inter- and intra-personal skills (see, for example, Gordon \textit{et al.}, 1996; Rogers, 2004; Grocott and Hunter, 2009; McCulloch \textit{et al.}, 2010; McCarthy and Kotzee, 2013). Sail training research studies have also considered the therapeutic nature of sail training; for example, the potential of therapeutic and rehabilitation effects from drug and alcohol addiction (White \textit{et al.}, 2013); and the psychosocial wellbeing in children and young adults treated for cancer (Roberts, 2014).

2.3.1 The historical origins of sail training

Sail training is an experience encompassing ‘training by the sea’ as opposed to ‘training for the sea’ (although they share the same sociocultural and historical antecedents); it is not the same as sailing instruction which has the sole purpose of teaching the skill of sailing (see Wojcikiewicz and Mural, 2010). McCulloch proposes sail training as a ‘modern phenomenon with deep historical roots’ (in Humberstone \textit{et al.}, 2016: 236), however he fails to explore fully these antecedents which are now described here.

The origins of seafaring traditions and practices can be found in antiquity. Dunsch (2012) describes the success of Greek and Roman seafarers in conducting both coastal and open-sea passages, all in the absence of a technical handbook. Although ancient texts have been discovered that informed safe navigation from port A to port B (these were called \textit{periploi} or ‘circumnavigations’), the training of professional seafarers and the maintenance of their traditions and practices have, largely, followed an oral tradition. The training of seafarers, in antiquity, was ‘mimetic, almost some kind of behaviourist conditioning, and the mode of instruction was definitely oral’, devoid of written instructions (Dunsch, 2012: 274). This oral tradition, especially as the means to train the novice sailor, led to the development of a language
that is unique to seafaring, an argot for seafarers (Roberts et al., 1974; Rediker, 1993).

The reliance on this oral tradition does not imply that seafaring was a primitive culture; indeed, it is worthy of note that seafaring evolved from a simple means of transport and local trade for subsistence communities to a technologically sophisticated means for exploration, scientific discovery, conquest and colonisation, and the creation of international commerce and globalization. The ocean-going sailing ships of the late 15th and early 16th century were the ‘most advanced and sophisticated machines of their time’ (Leitão, 2016: 113); and the seaman was key to the evolution of technological advances and, perhaps, development of society as the seafarer became a ‘collective worker’ and ‘wage labourer’ (Rediker, 1993).

Seafaring was an organised venture. For example, in May 1514 King Henry VIII granted a Royal Charter to The Master Wardens and Assistants of the Guild Fraternity or Brotherhood of the Most Glorious and Undivided Trinity and of Saint Clement in the Parish of Deptford Strond. This charter created a regulatory body for pilots operating on the River Thames, but evolved as a body ‘to improve the art and science of mariners; […] and regulate the conduct of those who take upon them the charge of conducting ships’ (John Whormby, Clerk to the Corporation, 1746). This corporation would introduce a range of benefits for seafarers, ranging from the introduction of buoyage and the building of lighthouses (advances that were indicative of ‘civilised man’ (Dewey, 2012 [1910]: 16) to the management of almshouses, and the dispersal of welfare and pensions to seamen and their dependants. This corporation still exists, recently celebrating its 500th anniversary – it is known as Trinity House13. Today, the Corporation of Trinity House, as part of its charitable activities, provides bursary funding for staff and volunteers engaged in the delivery of sail training14.

In 1627, Captain John Smith (1579 – 1631), the English explorer, Admiral of New England, soldier, sailor and author, wrote A Sea Grammar

---

13 For more information about Trinity House, see https://www.trinityhouse.co.uk/
14 For more information see https://uksailtraining.org.uk/sea-staff/trinity-house-bursaries
detailing, for the benefit of young seamen; ‘all the most difficult words [seldom] used but amongst seamen; [...] you shall find the exposition so plainly and briefly, that any willing capacity may easily understand them’ (1627: 221). Many of Captain Smith’s 17th century terms and language are still in use today; these terms do not only describe the parts of the vessel and working practices aboard ship, but also provide a vocabulary for the elements of nature, such as the wind, the oceans and seas. This argot was, and still is, a language of ‘technical necessity’ that is devoid of ambiguity, as ‘[each] object and action had a word or phrase – short, clear, and unmistakable – to designate it’ (Rediker, 1993: 163).

In 1660, A Sea Grammar was one of two publications purchased by Samuel Pepys (1633 – 1703), when he became a member of the newly overhauled Navy Board to oversee the revitalisation of the British Royal Navy15: ‘[launching] a new standard of bureaucratic efficiency for the navy and for the English government as a whole’ (Herman, 2005: 188). The influence of the new-found efficacy of the Navy (from my limited review of the historical literature), may account for improvements in the nature and role of government, and vice versa (see Elias, post).

Captain Smith’s A Sea Grammar not only set out the language used for the building of vessels, their preparation for sea and for their safe and efficient operation, it also describes the shipboard hierarchy and the operational roles and responsibilities of, for example, the Captain, Master, Pilot, Mate, and Boatswain (or Bosun) – terms we still use today. Rediker posits that:

‘[as] the seaman learned maritime language, he also learned the requirements of the ship’s social structure, for maritime speech ordered social relations within the wooden world. […] providing] the broad basis for community’ (1993: 164).

---

15 The other publication purchased by Pepys was lawyer John Selden’s (1635) Mare Clausum or The Closed Sea. This made the legal claim that “the King of Great Britain is Lord of the Sea flowing about’ his domains, including the Channel, the North Sea and Irish Sea’ (Herman, 2005: 149).
This was a shipboard community bounded by the confines of the vessel, with occupants sharing a common, collective and cooperative existence which developed the community’s *maritime culture*.

It is difficult to say whether it was the seafaring traditions and practices that forged the *maritime culture*, or whether the *maritime culture* influenced the development of those traditions and practices for men engaged in the occupation of seafaring over the ages. In the age of sail, seafarers were predominantly men and there is relatively little known about the role of women at sea at that time, indeed there were superstitions about women being aboard ships. There are, however, a few women who received some notoriety during the eighteenth century, such as Hannah Snell, who impersonated a man for several years aboard a warship; also, Mary Ann Talbot and the pirate Anne Bonny (see Cordingly, 2002). Between 1650 and 1815, there were twenty examples of women seafarers identified as serving in the Royal Navy, of which eighteen seemed to be ‘genuine’ reports (Stark, 1998). Even today, women seafarers in commercial maritime operations are relatively rare (Kitada, 2010; see also Kitada, 2013). However, women have been and still are critical in maintaining the seamen’s shore-based lives, as women adopted new family and community roles resulting in individual and cultural changes as they ‘[interpret and/or re]interpret gender norms, expectations and attitudes’ (Sampson, 2013: 136). The periodic and long-term absence of male seafarers may have also led to social change for their families and shore-based communities.

For those women who do now go to sea, Kitada posits that the masculine-oriented seafaring culture requires commercial female seafarers to switch between their shipboard and shore-based identities (2010: 97); however, it is unclear how gender and identity management manifest aboard the sail training vessel. In the current study voyage, the entire sea-staff and crew (except for the researcher) were female, however, gender and identity management of these study participants is not within its scope.

On lengthy ocean-going voyages Leitão posits:

‘[Crews] and travellers were exposed to and participated in a type of ‘maritime culture’ whose content, practices, justification, accepted
authorities, and modes of transmission differed drastically from any training or education they could possibly have had before: […]. All of this amounted to a highly syncretic body of knowledge, practical expertise and mental attitudes.’ (2016: 115).

The *maritime culture* was forged from two related confrontations; the confrontation between ‘man and nature’ and between ‘man and man’ (Rediker, 1993: 154). Modern day sail training embraces this maritime culture, as the challenges of ‘man and nature’ and ‘man and man’ confrontations become manifest during a voyage; to both the practitioners, who are experienced in this environment and familiar with the maritime culture, and newcomers, as novice participants, who may be anxious as they enter this strange new setting. About 1910, the ‘age of sail’ came to an end as sail was replaced by steam (Foulke, 1963). However, sailing vessels of the Tall Ship tradition were still used, and new vessels were commissioned and built to be used for professional training purposes, by nation states, for both their Navies and merchant marine (McCulloch in Humberstone *et al.*, 2016: 238).

McCulloch describes two distinct traditions or ideologies in sail training provision:

‘The Tall Ship tradition has its origins in the technologies and practices of pre 19th century mercantile and naval seafaring. It uses square-rigged vessels carrying numerically large crews, and is characterised by hierarchical authority structures and a highly structured way of life.’ (2004: 186).

The vessels used in this ‘tradition’ are instantly recognisable as being based upon a design and build from the ‘age of sail’; they are larger vessels with multiple masts and square-shaped sails. The vessel on which the current study was conducted is of the second tradition (proposed by McCulloch):

‘The Recreational tradition has roots in the kind of leisure sailing that was developed during the 19th and 20th Centuries. This tradition is typified by the use of the ‘fore and aft’ rigs typical of leisure yachts, by the use of vessels carrying a crew of staff and trainees numbering no more than 18
or so in most cases, and by less formal, less structured ways of life and structures of authority and control’ (ibid).

McCulloch later characterizes and rebrands this tradition as leisure yachting (in Humberstone et al., 2016: 238).

### 2.3.2 Extant sail training studies

The few formally published articles on sail training present a common case, that it is:

‘a beneficial experience for young people, […] with] differing emphases on participants developing social and self-confidence, capacities such as cooperation with others, and attitudinal change in relation to, for example, tolerance of diversity’ (McCulloch in Humberstone et al., 2016: 240).

In their collaborative global study\(^{16}\) of thirty-five voyages with 325 ‘trainees’ aboard a range of vessel types, (Tall Ship: large: \(n=6\); medium: \(n=6\); and Recreational or Leisure traditions: \(n=5\)); McCulloch et al. (2010) found that beneficial inter- and intra-personal outcomes were sustainable beyond the voyage experience; and proposed sail training as an educational practice (ibid; also see Allison et al., 2007; McCulloch in Humberstone et al., 2016: 240).

It is proposed that sail training outcomes contribute towards the participants’ well-being, and may be indicative of character formation and development. Many of the available studies have focussed on identifying or isolating, and then measuring outcomes, which may then be assimilated, consolidated and re-branded within the definitions of well-being; however, it is unclear as to how these multi-dimensional components are, or may be, consciously or unconsciously\(^ {17}\) laminated to create and strengthen well-being and character. I would argue that this is critical to understanding how the sail training voyage contributes to the participant’s and practitioner’s personal and social development. Some sail training studies are highlighted below.

---

\(^{16}\) This study, funded by Sail Training International (STI), was conducted by the University of Edinburgh.

\(^{17}\) In this context, the word ‘unconsciously’ is used to describe how an individual may utilise outcomes from their experience instinctively or without thinking about them.
This predominantly outcome-based approach to the study of the sail training experience tells us little about what the experience means to the individual participant or how these outcomes are then utilised. For example, Capurso and Borsci’s (2013) quantitative, quasi-experimental voyage-based study aboard the *Nave Italia*, (a vessel of the Tall Ship tradition operated by the Italian Navy), measured self-concept using only the *Social* and *Competence* sub-scales (of the six sub-scales available) of Bracken’s (1992) Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS).\(^{18}\)

Further, Kafka *et al.*, (2016) present four case studies, using various measures of self-esteem, of several ten-day voyages aboard the *Spirit of New Zealand* (a Trust-owned vessel of the Tall Ship tradition). Study 1 (30 female and 26 male participants) and study 2 (14 female and 15 male participants) revealed that having completed the ten-day voyage, self-esteem (with both studies using the same measure) was elevated. One hundred and sixty young people (aged between 15 and 18) took part in study 3; a control group of seventy-one participants did not sail. Study 3, using a short form *Self-Description Questionnaire* (SDQ III) (see Marsh and O’Neill, 1984), found that voyage participants experienced elevated self-esteem from day one to the final day of their voyage, whereas non-voyage participants experienced no change in self-esteem. Study 4 engaged one hundred and two participants (aged between 15 and 18); fifty-one undertook a ten-day voyage; fifty (*sic*) represented the control group. In Study 4, self-esteem was assessed using the self-concept sub-scale of ROPELOC (see Richards, Ellis and Neill, 2002); this demonstrated that voyage participants experienced elevated self-esteem, and that this increase was maintained up to 4-5 months after the voyage.

Scrutton and Beames (2015) question whether outdoor studies are measuring the correct self-concepts, using the most appropriate methods. For example, in Kafka *et al.*’s study, described above, self-esteem was measured using various valid and reliable methods; however, as a measurable concept, the value and utility of self-esteem is unclear and any benefit to academic

---

\(^{18}\)The MSCS is one of a range of valid and reliable tools to measure child and adolescent multidimensional self-concept (Anstey, 1999; Bracken *et al.*, 2000).
achievement is questioned, for example, Baumeister et al. argue that ‘there is very little evidence that self-esteem correlates with IQ or other academic abilities’ (2003: 10).

There are, however, some recent studies that have illuminated the utility of sail training outcomes, beyond simple measurement, and which I find to be of greater interest. For example, a study of five sail training participants (female: n=3, aged 18, 20, and 20 years; male: n=2, aged 16 and 18 years) during and after an eleven-day sail training voyage aboard Young Endeavour (a vessel of the Tall Ship tradition operated by the Australian Navy), found that networking and relationship outcomes contributed to participant engagement (or re-engagement) with learning and education (Henstock, Barker and Knijnik, 2013). The conceptual framework for this study used a model of engagement (after Wang, Willett and Eccles, 2011), and considered the ‘cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies employed by an individual in a learning task’ (Henstock et al., 2013: 33). This study’s participants ‘[agreed that] the social bonds developed during their voyage [were] a strong asset for them to rethink their life and involvement in learning’ (ibid). I like the description of the positive effect of improved social networking, this can be seen in the following examples of participant responses:

‘... made me feel more at ease to know I’m in a comfortable environment and when you talk to the teachers and fellow students you feel safe knowing that they are there for the same reason.’ Participant 1.

‘When you’ve made friends with people there you can talk about class assignments and stuff and help each other out.’ Participant 4. (ibid: 39).

I would propose that the positive sail training experience has opened up the study participants’ appetite for further experience (after Dewey).

Another study of three, ten-day voyages aboard the Spirit of New Zealand (ante) found, that in comparison to a control group (n=63; mean age = 19.42), voyage participants (n=63; mean age = 16.55) enhanced their resilience or ‘the ability to react to adversity and challenge in an adaptive and productive way, [...] considered crucial to healthy development’, and that this enhanced post-voyage resilience was maintained for five months (Hayhurst et al., 2015: 33).
Resilience is a ‘social and emotional skill’ within the definition of character (Birdwell et al., 2015: 17); it equips the individual, particularly young people, with the ability to cope ‘with disruptive life events, [...] as well as the development of new protective coping skills that are effective when dealing with future adversity (Richardson et al., 1990)’ (ibid: 41; see also Girlguiding, 2016). Hayhurst et al. suggest that the sail training voyage provides an inoculation of increased resilience, using Rutter’s (1987) immunisation metaphor (ibid: 50).

The published literature is predominated by studies conducted aboard vessels of the Tall Ship tradition; this is probably because these larger vessels are better able to accommodate the researcher(s). Hunter et al.’s (undated) survey of sail training organisations suggested that the ‘most common model of sail training uses modest vessels carrying a dozen trainees and four or five staff’ (cited by McCulloch et al., 2010: 667); and these smaller vessels are under-represented in the research literature. My own simple review of the 655 sail training vessels (listed with Sail Training International; see table 1), found that sail training vessels of the Tall Ship tradition or ideology (after McCulloch, 2004) represent only 20% (n=135) of the global population of vessels; with 520 smaller vessels (that is, vessels less than 40 metres) of the Recreational or Leisure tradition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Class</th>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Tradition or ideology</th>
<th>No. vessels (N=655)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>Square-rigged; LOA &gt;40m</td>
<td>Tall Ship</td>
<td>135 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>Traditional rig; LOA &lt;40m</td>
<td>Recreational/Leisure</td>
<td>196 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>Modern rig; LOA &lt;40m; without spinnaker</td>
<td>Recreational/Leisure</td>
<td>189 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class D</td>
<td>Modern rig; LOA &lt;40m; with spinnaker</td>
<td>Recreational/Leisure</td>
<td>135 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Vessels by tradition or ideology (after McCulloch, 2004) listed with Sail Training International (at 16 January 2017).
The under-representation in the literature of these smaller (Recreational or Leisure tradition) vessels may arise from their limited capacity and the lack of opportunity for researchers to be accommodated, especially if they are to be supernumerary or ‘passengers’, for more detailed on-voyage studies. There are currently 46 vessels listed with the Association of Sail Training Organisations (ASTO: the UK’s national sail training organisation); six are of the Tall Ship tradition or ideology (Class A), and 40 (of both traditional and modern rig) are of the Recreational or Leisure tradition or ideology (Class B, C and D).

I will now set out the case for sail training to be considered as having its own culture (set within a distinct spatial and environmental setting, and the challenge of being at sea), and how the vessel may be regarded as an operational community. Sail training ‘[incorporates] traditions and practices with different emphases on types of vessel, criteria for participation, voyage duration and expressed purpose’ (McCulloch in Humberstone et al., 2016: 236); and its antecedents, regardless of its respective ‘tradition’ (after McCulloch; ante), are to be found in the ‘traditions and practices of professional seagoing in the age of sail and recreational sailing since the late 19th century […]’. Ships and the sea have a strong cultural significance’; and as sailing ships gave way to steamships much of this culture was adopted and/ or adapted for the ‘new age’ of mechanised propulsion (ibid: 237). McCulloch’s description of the post-Second World War development of sail training only alludes to the origins of that ‘strong cultural significance’. I argue that this ‘culture’ is a key dimension of today’s sail training and its contribution towards the personal and social development outcomes for its participants and practitioners (see 2.3.4 and 2.4 post). Extant studies have often overlooked the effect of sail training voyages in the personal and social development of sea-staff practitioners, both full-time and volunteers. In the current study, all of those who sailed on this voyage – the young crew participants, their teachers and the full-time and volunteer sea-staff, were engaged as participants (see Chapter 3 for Research Design and Methodology).
2.3.3 The challenge of being at sea

The challenge of nature, the sea and weather, together with the perceived isolation from the shore and living in close proximity with others creates a novel situation. These unpredictable external conditions place the individual in a situation that is directly concerned with their own, and their crew mate’s, survival. ‘The strangeness of the ocean environment inevitably causes anxiety as its unpredictability makes land-based models of probability unusable’ (Bender, 2013: 88); it engenders a different perspective on behaviours and traits, such as problem solving, communication skills or resilience, that may have greater value and affect relations with the other people on board the vessel – the confrontation of ‘man and man’.

As voyage participants adapt, endeavouring to transfer their ‘land-based models’, to the shipboard setting it becomes a liminal space, in a way of being ‘betwixt and between’ in a setting, that was described by Foucault:

‘[The] ship is a piece of floating space, a placeless place, that lives by its own devices, that is self-enclosed and, at the same time, delivered over the boundless expanse of the ocean, and that goes from port to port, from watch to watch, [...] you see why for our civilization, from the sixteenth century to our time, the ship has been at the same time not only the greatest instrument of economic development, of course [...] but the greatest reservoir of imagination’ (Rabinow (Ed.), 2000: 184-185).

The concept of liminality is closely associated to threshold concepts (for example, see Meyer and Land, 2005; Land, Rattray and Vivian, 2014), and how troublesomeness prompts ‘a letting go of customary ways of seeing things, of prior familiar views’ (Land et al., 2014: 200). A voyage aboard a sail training vessel allows the individual and their crew mates to use their imagination to consider alternative perspectives. This potentially has a transformative quality by ‘[involving] an individual or group being altered from one state into another. [...] the participating individual acquires new knowledge and subsequently a new status and identity within the community’ (Meyer and Land, 2005: 376).

Varley, in his study of the practices of sea kayakers embarking upon expeditions, posits that liminality is a ‘key adventure quality as it involves a
separation, a becoming other, in the sense that new environments, different ways of living and different social forms are taken on’ (2011: 95).

The transition in this voyage-based liminal space, between the known land-based and the unknown ship-board experience, is facilitated and bridged by a new:

‘psychological structure of the environmental situation on board, the social structure of the group and the personalities of its members stand in a dynamic developmental relationship to each other. […] we grow up and develop in a world on land. When we go to sea we are ‘socialized’ for a second time.’ (Stadler, 1984: 92).

It may be that this second period of ‘socializing’, especially for those who are experiencing liminality, manifests in the socially oriented outcomes that are found in the extant sail training literature. The collective nature of the crew sailing together ‘against the elements’, provides clarity and stability of the ‘sources of companionship and social validation […] and] agents of socialization and as convoys for social support’ (Cotterell, 2007: 74). I will argue that the sail training environment is an enabling (as opposed to an inhibiting) setting for Stadler’s ‘second period’ of socialization, as participants seek to establish competence, autonomy and belongingness in the voyage-based community (Hagell (Ed.), 2012: 52, referring to Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The unpredictable nature of the sea and weather has seen seafarers develop an appreciation for discipline and teamwork, towards the collective and cooperative effort required for those aboard a sailing vessel to survive their voyage (Herman, 2005; Rediker, 1993). Although there have been advances in the technologies of sailing these unpredictable natural challenges remain; and despite the advancements in vessel design, ship and boat building methods and materials, safety equipment, means of communication, and weather forecasting, there is still a risk in going to sea. Operating practices on most vessels, and certainly aboard commercial vessels and those engaged in sail training, the risks of being at sea are now managed, meaning that many risks are now more perceived-risks rather than actual. The human response to the confrontation of ‘man and nature’ resonates with the ‘ancient human organizing principle of the
primal band, [...] with a common bond and whose survival depended on close understanding and cooperation'; and an approach that involves emotional intelligence and \textit{resonance}, becoming a factor in considering the confrontation between ‘man and man’ (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee, 2013: 217-218). It is the skill of an emotionally intelligent leader, in the case of a vessel-at-sea – the Captain or Skipper – that allows them to monitor and respond to the unpredictability of nature, and the ensuing emotional states of their crew, so that:

‘they can keep their focus, thinking clearly under pressure, [...] they stay flexible, adapting to new realities, [...] they can see their way to a brighter future, communicate that vision with \textit{resonance}, and lead the way.’

(Goleman \textit{et al.}, 2013: 247).

For those who found themselves aboard the sailing vessel of the past there was the enforced, often pressurised, situation requiring the collaboration of powerholders and dependents to work together; an \textit{asymmetric} situation. Interestingly, Kelley \textit{et al.} posit that where ‘an Asymmetric situation involves common interests, the emotional experiences of both [powerholder and dependent] are likely to be benign’ (2003: 257); this may account for the positive outcomes for the confrontation between ‘man and man’ as they survive their confrontation between ‘man and nature’.

Going to sea in a shipboard community, the novel setting for the confrontation between ‘man and man’, can be viewed in two ways: the social interactions that occur between those situated within the vessel, and those without. The setting is so unique, the most basic components of the experience have an effect on the individual, for example, ‘[even] in bed your body is moving. While sleeping the body is unconsciously active, aware of the rise and fall of the ship, the roll port and starboard’ (Griffiths and Mack, 2007: 268). The social interaction between those aboard the vessel and ‘outsiders’, especially in the age of exploration, scientific discovery, conquest and colonisation, has shaped the maritime culture, however, the focus here will be on the social interactions between those on-board the vessel.
2.3.4 The sociocultural and historical legacy of being at sea

Whilst this study relies upon the socio-cultural and historical antecedents of sail training, it is worth mentioning the psychological effect of the ship board community, where:

‘the yachtsman finds himself for a long period of time in extremely cramped conditions with no personal privacy and with no possibility of escape. He is part of a group which has a fixed formal structure that does not necessarily coincide with its psychological structure’ (Stadler, 1984: 91).

Rogers describes her own feelings, when conducting her own ‘participant-as-observer’ research, aboard the One and All (an Australian trust-owned vessel of the Tall Ship tradition), as she recalled:

‘I began to ask myself what I had got myself into and how I could get through it. [...] There is no escape, no personal space, and you need to make the best of the strange situation’ (2004: 72).

In the creation and evolution of the maritime culture, it should be recognised that social interactions did not just involve the inter- and intra-personal relations between one seaman and his leaders and crew mates. These social interactions were framed by the land-based social strata and conventions of the day, and the diverse origins of seafarers – reflecting the pre-existing land-based models for social institutions and communities.

In the 1940s, the sociologist Norbert Elias (1897 – 1990) conducted an interesting (and relevant to the current study) but largely unpublished inquiry into the ‘social origins of one of the key institutions in British society: the Navy and its officers’ corps’ (Moelker, 2003: 374). Elias considered the conflict between two divergent social groups, the ‘nobility and bourgeoisie’, perhaps, as an early example of social mobility; relying upon history to inform and shape his thinking, Elias is best known for his sociological concept of figuration (Giddens and Sutton, 2014; see, also Elias, 2000). Elias explained figuration as ‘[the] network of interdependencies among humans [binding] them together. [...] by

---

19 These studies were undertaken on behalf of the Social Research Division of the London School of Economics (Elias, 1950: 291, footnote). Only one article of the three proposed was ever published; however, more detail of these studies are to be found in the Norbert Elias Archive (Moelker, 2003).
nature and then through social learning, through education, socialization and socially generated reciprocal needs’ (2000: 482).

Sailors in the 16th and 17th centuries were predominately young men from humble backgrounds; they had learned their maritime skills as apprentices to the sea (Rediker, 1993; Moelker, 2003). Ship’s officers were often of noble birth or regarded themselves as gentlemen, reflecting the social strata to be found ashore. Seafaring created a setting that allowed the boundaries imposed by these dominant social strata to become blurred as gentlemen opted to embark on apprenticeships to the sea. For example, this was the career pathway taken by Captain John Smith (ante), and the English explorer, Captain James Cook (1728 – 1779) (Edwards (Ed.), 2003; Kitson, 2015 [1912]). The training of seaman skills, such as navigation and boat handling, took a long time:

‘[…] a sailing ship required the mind of a craftsman. Only people apprenticed to the sea early in life could hope to master it. “To catch ’em young” was a well known slogan of the old Navy.’ (Elias, 1950: 293).

Crews aboard British-owned vessels experienced tensions and occasional conflict between the incompatibility of the contemporary land- and sea-based social strata and attitudes. British crews were recruited from diverse nationalities and ethnicities, for example, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, France, Holland, Portugal, Spain, and Scandinavia, as well as the New World, such as, North America and the West Indies (Rediker, 1993: 156). In considering the increasing complexity of life for those at sea, and aboard larger and larger vessels (as ship building technologies advanced), there is some merit in Elias’ view that:

‘As more and more people must attune their conduct to that of others, […] The individual is compelled to regulate his conduct in an increasingly differentiated, more even and stable manner […]. The web of actions grows so complex and so extensive, the effort to behave ‘correctly’ within it becomes so great, that beside the individual’s conscious self-control an absolute, blindly functioning apparatus of self-

Other countries aspiring to maritime supremacy took a different approach to the challenges of blending these disparate social and ethnic cultures. For example, France and Spain imposed solutions and strict sanctions from above: ‘[open] conflicts between seaman and gentlemen were hardly ever allowed to develop. They were suppressed by strict immovable regulation’ (Elias, 1950: 296).

In England, however, there emerged two categories of seafaring commanders, the ‘seamen captains’ (or *Taraulins*) and ‘gentlemen captains’. This approach went some way in delivering professional equality whilst afloat, extending to both the naval and merchant fleets; however, this equality did not manifest itself ashore as they ‘were separated by a wide social gulf’ (Elias, 1950: 299). Sail training, particularly in the Recreational or Leisure sailing tradition, has been regarded as a means of bridging issues of social class, as McCulloch describes:

‘[sail training] was undertaken in a spirit of what might be called patrician philanthropy. Beliefs in the benefits of sailing as a recreation merged with a concern to, as it was and still is claimed, *break down the barriers of social class*’ (in Humberstone *et al.*, 2016: 238, emphasis added).

In the 16th and 17th centuries any gentleman wishing to subject himself to the traditional ‘hands-on’ professional training of the seafarer was stigmatised; however, despite the possible effect on their social status, some did and created a *hybrid*, but these men were rare. For example, Sir William Monson (1569 – 1643) was of noble birth with ‘family connections to the court of Elizabeth I and James I’ but, at the age of 16, he ‘ran away to sea, […] after some years at Balliol [College], and learned the trade of seaman […] in the same hard and rough manner as an ordinary seaman’ (Elias, 1950: 307). A solution to the tensions between the social classes led, in the mid-18th century, to the creation of a new Naval position – that of *midshipman* as an entry-level

---

20 The term *Taraulin* originates from the piece of woven canvas washed with tar, that was used as a weather-proof cover or garment (Elias, 1950: 297, footnote); and was later adopted as *Jack Tar* or *Tar* to describe a seaman or sailor.
post for young men on a career pathway towards the command of a ship (ibid: 299). This rank still exists in the Royal Navy.

The tensions resulting from the disparate social backgrounds of those aboard sailing vessels affected not just those commanding the vessel and its hierarchy but their crews too. As a ‘collective worker’ and ‘wage labourer’, seamen tended toward ‘an extraordinary tradition of [labour] militancy’ (Rediker, 1993: 205). Indeed, the term ‘strike’ (used in the context of industrial disputes) originates from the decision, in 1768, by London seamen to ‘strike the sails of their ships’ bringing commerce on the River Thames to a halt (ibid). During the eighteenth century, particularly in the period 1700 to 1750, the relationship between ship owners, their captains and the seaman that sailed their ships was often fraught as ship owners tried to optimise profit at the expense of their crews. Harsh conditions, excessive often brutal discipline and the abuse of the established relationships led some seamen to withdraw their labour and, on occasion, to mutiny in their efforts to secure better working conditions.

Some seamen turned to piracy, where they invented a ‘rough, improvised, but effective egalitarianism that placed authority in the collective hands of the crew’ (Rediker, 1993: 261). Pirates introduced measures to prevent misuse and abuse of authority, including the delegation of powers to the ‘quartermaster’. A quartermaster was an experienced or ‘smart’ seaman (ibid: 85), who ‘was not considered an officer […] elevated to a valued position of trust and authority’ bridging the occupational and social space that existed between the crew and the ship’s hierarchy (ibid: 263). The role of modern-day quartermasters (a specialist role for non-officer seaman engaged in the navigation of vessels) in the US Navy, was one of the five apprenticeship-based case studies described in Lave and Wenger’s (2011 [1991]) Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation.

I would argue that it is the sociocultural and historical legacy described here, and the invention of a new type of collective and waged occupation that confronted the social barriers of the past, that has manifested in a unique culture – the maritime culture that is now at the core of sail training practice,
albeit current practitioners and participants are not necessarily (nor do they need to be) aware of or familiar with its antecedents.

2.4 The sail training voyage as a cultural community

Life aboard a sailing vessel, as described above, has rich sociocultural and historical origins. Over a number of centuries this setting has benefited from the diverse contributions of its participants to construct a unique culture, however, current participants and practitioners may not be aware of this legacy. When aboard a vessel at sea, especially a sailing vessel, the voyager becomes a member of the vessel-bound community as it faces the challenges of being at sea. I argue that the sail training voyage represents both a culture and a community; I will now explore how these two components may be combined as a cultural community (after Rogoff).

Professor Barbara Rogoff, University of California Santa Cruz, has spent the last three decades investigating cultural variations in learning processes and their settings. Much of her research has been conducted within indigenous communities in the Americas, where Western-style schooling has not been prevalent. She has authored and co-authored several books (see, for example, Rogoff and Lave (Eds.), 1984; Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff in Wertsch, Del Rio and Alvarez (Eds.), 1995; Rogoff, Turkanis and Bartlett, 2001; Rogoff, 2003); and many peer-reviewed journal articles on the role of social, cultural and historical influences on human development (for example, Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002; Rogoff et al., 2003; Paradise and Rogoff, 2009; Rogoff, 2014; Coppens et al., 2014).

Although much of Rogoff’s research has focussed on the development of infants and younger children within sociocultural and historical settings, largely in indigenous subsistence communities in South America, she does declare that these principles extend to human development beyond childhood:

‘[that development] is assumed to proceed throughout the lifespan, with individuals’ ways of thinking reorganizing with successive advances in reaching and contributing to the understanding, skills, and perspectives of their community’ (Rogoff, 1990: 11).
She has also written about how her work in an innovative ‘Open Classroom’ (or OC) public school in Salt Lake City, Utah, applying the concept of learning as a community for children, aged 5 to 12 years, in a ‘parent-teacher-child co-operative’ (Rogoff et al., 2001: 8). This work highlights the difficulties of applying a concept developed from the observations conducted in a non-Westernised context to Western-styled schooling, and how this concept fits with the expectations and demands of educational policy and its curriculum – limiting its wider application. The intentions of these indigenous communities, observed and studied by Rogoff, were to engage their children in the valued activities of the community, without the requirement for, or some might say the burden of, academic assessment. For children graduating from the OC and progressing to junior high school it was found that although ‘OC students have little practice taking tests, they usually perform at about the level of students in other schools on the mandated standardized tests’ (ibid: 46), they were impressively receptive to new conceptual knowledge (such as mathematics, literacy and oral expression). Indeed, OC graduates were found to be more receptive to new learning and their results were often higher in junior high and high school standardized tests when compared with non-OC students from similar family backgrounds (ibid).

We will all experience change in our lives, often requiring a ‘reorganization of thinking’ as we transition from childhood to adolescence, to adulthood, to parenthood, and on to retirement and old age. Our development resulting from these lifespan transitions, occurring over many years, are described as ontogenetic; however, microgenetic development is experienced in the ‘transformations in thinking that occur with successive attempts to handle a problem, even in time spans of minutes’ (Rogoff, 1990: 11). This implies that even a short time spent in a sociocultural and historical setting may activate or support ‘development’. This is particularly relevant to the current study, as the duration of a sail training voyage ranges from a few days to two weeks (McCulloch, 2007: 289). In the global STI/ University of Edinburgh study, the research voyages lasted from 5 to 15 days (Allison et al., 2007; McCulloch et al., 2010).
Rogoff has argued that:
‘cognitive development is an apprenticeship – it occurs through guided participation in social activity with companions who support and stretch, [...] understanding of and skill in using tools of culture. The sociocultural basis of human skills and activities – including children’s orientation to participate in and build on the activities around them – is inseparable from the biological and historical basis of humans as a species.’ (Rogoff, 1990: vii).

In considering human development in a sociocultural historical setting or context, Rogoff initially described these settings as ‘institutions’ or ‘systems’ (Rogoff, 1990: 43); representing ‘not only bureaucratic or hardened institutions, such as schools and economic and political systems, but also informal systems of practices in which people participate’ (ibid: 45). The terms ‘institutions’ and ‘systems’ have since been substituted, by Rogoff, for the term ‘community’, but an explanation for this change in terminology is absent (see, for example, in Wertsch et al. (Eds.), 1995: 139), although ‘community’ is later defined. In describing the sail training setting I will use the term ‘community’, except for the discussion (post) on the application of the terms cultural community and total institution (after Goffman, 1991 [1961] and Aubert, 1965).

Rogoff proposes that ‘communities can be defined as groups of people who have some common and continuing organization, values, understanding, history, and practices’ (2003: 80; see also Rogoff et al., 2001: 10); and supporting the view that:
‘There is more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. [People] live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common’ (after Dewey, 1916: 5).

This reflects the cooperative and collective characteristics of relationships to be found aboard the sailing and the sail training vessel, as it provides a common bond created in the confrontation of ‘man-and-nature’. Whilst these descriptions of ‘community’ imply its affect is limited to the members or participants in the community, within in a particular time and space, Rogoff extends her interpretation of ‘community’ beyond those who are in face-to-face contact or
living in geographic proximity. This extended use of the term includes those who are ‘at a distance’ but share community values, traditions, understanding and history or participate in community-based activities and practices (see Rogoff, 2003: 80-81). Giddens and Sutton support the view that a community’s affect goes beyond temporal and spatial boundaries:

‘[A community is] a type of relationship involving a shared sense of communal identity … [a] ’communion’, as it may be that this shared identity continues to exist even after people move away from the locality’ (2014: 118; see also Lee and Newby, 1983).

The sense of belonging to a community with a shared identity and mutual values and behaviours is evident amongst those engaged in seafaring today, where there remains an expectation that other seafarers will always come to the assistance of others in distress. Today, when at sea we will always monitor radio Channel 16 listening out for any calls to Search-and-Rescue services (SAR) for PAN PAN (urgent) or MAYDAY (life-threatening) assistance – a new dimension to the argot of the sea.

Having established the characteristics of the community it is important to consider the nature of its cultural origins, however, this is not a simple task as ‘[there are tensions] revealed in competing definitions of ‘culture’ and the labelling of contemporary theoretical approaches as, for example, either socio-cultural or cultural-historical’ (Daniels, 2015: 36). For Rogoff: ‘Culture is best understood historically, examining how current practices reflect past circumstances and ideas, and seeing how new generations adapt practices of those who went before’ (Glăveanu, 2011: 410, italics in original). The historical origins of that culture may not be immediately evident to the community or institution’s current members or its participants:

‘The members of [a community] need not necessarily have been its originators; they may be second, third, fourth, etc. generation members, having “inherited” the [community] from their forebears. And this is a most important point, for although there may be an intentional structure to [community] activities, practitioners of [community] forms need have no awareness at all of the reason for its structure – for them, it is just
“the-way-things-are-done”. The reasons for the [community] having one form rather than another are buried in its history’ (Shotter, 1978: 70).

This position is supported by Oyserman, emphasising the situatedness of culture:

‘Culture is thinking for doing – the way things are done in a time and place influences how they are thought about. [...] it] can be operationalised as a set of structures and institutions, values, traditions, and ways of engaging with the social and non-social world that are transmitted across generations in a certain time and place (for example, Shweder and LeVine, 1984). That is, culture is both temporally continuous (transmitted over generations) and temporally specific (located in a time and situated in a geographic and social place).’ (2011: 167).

The origins and evolution of the maritime culture (ante) represent the heritage of today’s sail training ship-board practices. The predominantly masculine nature of the ‘age of sail’ has now been adopted and adapted by today’s sail training practitioners; who now include both men and women. I am sure that, whilst most will be aware of some of the exploits of exploration, scientific discovery, conquest and colonisation of days gone by, there will be few contemporary sail training practitioners who are aware of the sociocultural dimensions of their inheritance and how this may contribute to self-concept, and inter- and intra-personal outcomes. Even those authors who have made the case for and set out the development of sail training have failed to include any detail of this rich heritage (see, for example, Hamilton, 1988; Rowe et al., 2014).

For researching human development Rogoff proposes a sociocultural approach to observing such development across three co-dependent planes of analysis; the personal, interpersonal and community processes (in Wertsch et al., 1995: 139-164). These planes of analysis coincide with the themes of well-being – self, relationships and environment that we find in the analysis of surveys conducted by The Children’s Society (2015; 2016). Rogoff emphasizes that these planes are co-dependent; that they are ‘integrated constellations of community practices’ (in Wertsch et al., 1995: 139-164); they are inseparable, and as development occurs in one plane this must affect change, or exert
influence, in the other two planes. This is a proposition that creates tensions for the research of human development in the cultural community as:

‘[the] larger story involves a dynamic multifaceted explanation of a number of related aspects of cultural practice, not an amalgam of variables to be compared singly or in controlled simple combinations’ (Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002: 220).

This position presents considerations and challenges for my research design and methodological approach which are discussed later (see Chapter 3).

Rogoff initially defined, and provided some descriptive terms for each of, these planes of development: apprenticeship, guided participation and participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 1990). However, the application of some terms has evolved and new terms have been introduced to the lexicon. For example, Learning by Observing and Pitching In (LOPI) is the current term used by Rogoff and her associates to describe the type of informal learning found in the sociocultural and historical setting of the cultural community (see Rogoff, 2014; Coppens et al., 2014). Such an approach provides children of the cultural community with the opportunity to adapt and accommodate to the needs of their situation; whereas ‘in other societies (e.g. Euro-American middle class) adults exert considerable effort accommodating the situation to the perceived needs of young children’ (Ochs, 2014: 165, italics in original). Ochs asserts that through the LOPI model: ‘Children learn executive-function skills, autonomy, self-esteem, cooperation, citizenship, empathy, ethics, and other forms of intelligence’ (2014: 166). The difficulty for non-indigenous cultural communities is the application of this model to Western-style educational settings, where measurement of student performance is prioritised. I will argue that the sail training voyage provides the opportunity for children and young people to ‘accommodate to the needs of their situation’ (after Ochs).

For the purposes of the current study, I use Rogoff’s original (1990) concepts of apprenticeship, guided participation and participatory appropriation as the orienting framework, however, LOPI will be considered in the academic discussion and the formulation of conclusions (see Chapter 4).
2.4.1 Apprenticeship

Apprenticeship is the metaphor for the plane of personal development occurring within a:

‘community activity, involving active individuals participating with others in culturally organized activity that has as part of its purpose the development of mature participation in the activity by the less experienced people’ (Wertsch et al., 1995: 142).

Apprenticeship involves an interaction between an expert and a novice; the variance in knowledge or skills between the expert and novice need only be slight, notwithstanding that it represents a powerholder/dependent relationship in an asymmetric situation (after Kelley et al., 2003). This is not limited to the expert and novice interacting as a dyad, but is more commonly found in ‘a system of interpersonal involvements and arrangements in which people engage in culturally organized activity in which apprentices become more responsible participants’ (Wertsch et al., 1995: 143). Such expert-novice interactions may be peer-to-peer, and are not limited to those involving adult-to-child situations. It is important to note, that in the context of the current study of personal and social development the ‘community activity’ is a ‘culturally valued activity’ – participation in a sail training voyage. However, Rogoff speculates that this orienting framework may also have applications for ‘learning to participate in activities censured by the communities being studied’ (in Wertsch et al., 1995: 161, note 1), such as immoral, illegal or unacceptable activities.

My interpretation of apprenticeship, as a mediated activity towards personal development in a sociocultural and historical setting, is closely associated with the descriptive development of the self. I find support for this stance from several sources: in Markus and Nurius’s concept of possible selves, as we develop ‘ideas of what [we] might become, what [we] would like to become, and what [we] are afraid of becoming, [provide] a conceptual link between cognition and motivation’ (1986: 954). Possible selves derive from our own ‘sociocultural and historical context and from the models, images, and symbols provided […] by the individual’s immediate social experiences’ (ibid).

Further support, for this stance, can be found from Jerome Bruner:
‘[…] to understand man you must understand how his experiences and his acts are shaped by his intentional states, and […] that the form of these intentional states is realized only through participation in the symbolic systems of the culture’ (1990: 33).

Bruner proposes three domains of ‘intentional states’, each influenced by internal (1.) or external factors (3.), or a mix of both (2.):

‘1. […] a domain where Self as agent operates with a world knowledge and with desires that are expressed in a manner congruent with context and belief.

3. (sic) […] events from “outside” in a manner not under our own control. It is the domain of nature.

In the first domain we are in some manner “responsible” for the course of events; in the third not.

2. […] comprising some indeterminate mix of the first and third, and it requires a more elaborate form of interpretation in order to allocate proper causal shares to individual agency and to “nature”.’ (1990: 40/41).

The situation described at 2. above reflects not just the situation to be found in an apprenticeship within a cultural community but also that of participating in a sail training voyage, comprising the confrontations of ‘man and nature’ and ‘man and man’ (discussed at 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 ante). I note that in describing the role and presentation of self, both Bruner (1990) and Erving Goffman (1990 [1959]) use dramaturgical analogies.

2.4.2 Guided participation

Guided participation describes how people engage in processes and systems, communicating and coordinating their efforts while participating in culturally valued activity. This engages the individual in a social interaction, relying upon transforming relationships, as the:

‘collaborative processes of (1) building bridges [between] present understanding and skills to reach new understanding and skills, and (2) arranging and structuring […] participation in activities, with dynamic shifts over development in […] responsibilities. [Using] social resources for guidance – both support and challenge – in assuming increasingly skilled roles in the activities of their community.’ (Rogoff, 1990: 8).
The interpersonal relationships that may be found in the sociocultural and
historical setting enable development and, perhaps, a new way of thinking
about how we relate to others through face-to-face, side-by-side or other types
of social interaction.

The oral tradition found in the training *for* and *by the sea* (as described at
2.3.1 ante) means that it is inherently dependent upon communication and the
development of interpersonal relationships. The ways of learning in the sail
training setting, such as Learning by Observing and Pitching In (LOPI) and
Explain, Demonstrate, Imitate and Practice (EDIP) (see Chapter 4), rely upon
the social interaction between the expert and novice participants as they
engage in activities that are valued by the community.

### 2.4.3 Participatory appropriation

*Participatory appropriation* is the term Rogoff applies to the ‘process by
which individuals transform their understanding of and responsibility for
activities through their own participation’ (Wertsch *et al.*, 1995: 150). It is ‘[…] how individuals change through their involvement in one or another activity, in
the process becoming prepared for subsequent involvement in related activities’
(*ibid*: 142). The community provides the context and setting for complex social
interactions, particularly when they are not dyadic in their nature, that ‘facilitate
learning [or engender a type of mindfulness or preparedness that may allow the
individual] to anticipate the future plans or directions of the group’ (Rogoff,

Rogoff’s concept reflects a type of *reciprocity*, in that the individual is
changed by their involvement in cultural community-based activities but also
that the cultural community changes too:

> ‘**overarching orienting concept** for understanding cultural processes […]
from a] sociocultural-historical perspective [is that]: *Humans develop
through their changing participation in the socio-cultural activities of their
communities, which also change*’ (Rogoff, 2003: 11, italics in original).

It has been my experience that every skipper has their own particular way of
operating their vessel. This is true of both recreational sailing and sail training
vessels, such as the ritual used to introduce new crew members to the vessel or
the use of a certain knot for a specific purpose. This reciprocity also extends to the approach employed in establishing and developing on-board relationships; for example, our Skipper describes how she adapts her communication style and voyage plan to the differentiated needs and circumstances of each new voyage crew (see extract of interview with Skipper on page 120). Our study Skipper’s practice had benefited from a negative voyage experience and subsequent training to develop her ‘understanding of panic zones and stretch zones and needs, and having that understanding and then understanding more how the young person works.’ (Post-voyage: Interview with Skipper, lines 78-81).

In summary, Rogoff’s concept of a cultural community resonates with my experience of recreational sailing and sail training; and it is the framework for the analysis of data collected in this study (see 3.6 Analysis). However, it is important to remember that Rogoff based her concept on studying indigenous communities, where those embarking on apprenticeship through guided participation were already part of their communities. There is no evidence that the transfer of this concept and the LOPI model to Western-style educational settings has yet been successful; and this will certainly be a challenge for those cultural communities who aspire to develop such Westernised educational settings. Participants approach the sail training voyage, as a cultural community and a ‘cultural island’ (after Kurt Lewin, 1952: 232), as new members; as such they become:

‘active in their attempts to make sense of activities and may be primarily responsible for putting themselves in a position to participate. Communication and coordination with other members of the community stretches the understanding of all participants, as they seek common ground of understanding in order to proceed with activities at hand.’

(Rogoff in Wertsch et al., 1995: 148).

These new members, or strangers, experience acculturation to the newly encountered cultural community; it will be argued later (at 4.2 The stranger approaching the cultural community) that the process of acculturation activates an earlier ‘readiness to learn’, for example, language and other cultural
processes (see Rogoff, 2003: 67-71); or a *natural pedagogy* (after Csibra and Gergely, 2011; see 4.2 post).

2.5 The sail training vessel as a *total institution*

Most sail training studies have set out to isolate, identify and measure participant outcomes; there has been little attention devoted to the sail training setting itself to investigate how these positive benefits are generated. There are, however, two studies that go beyond mere descriptive accounts of this complex setting; McCulloch (2004, 200721), and more recently, the study by Capurso and Borsci (2013).

Dealing with Capurso and Borsci’s contribution to this discussion. This quantitative study conducted aboard the *Nave Italia*, a sail training Tall Ship operated by the Italian Navy, ‘followed a quasi-experimental design in which a dependent variable (i.e. self-concept) [was] measured by a pre-test post-test procedure’ (2013: 17). These authors described the mechanism for changes in self-concept as a ‘black box’ (citing Bunge, 1963). Morrison proposes that the ‘black box’ explains that ‘we know the input and we know the outcome, but the causal processes between the two – the genuine causation – are unexplained’ (2009: 123).

Capurso and Borsci’s study endeavours to explain the ‘black box’ causation of the positive benefits by using a framework for the analysis based upon Bronfenbrenner’s ‘Bio-ecological model’ (*sic*) (2013: 17). Although their approach is original in this field of study, the way in which Bronfenbrenner’s writing has been employed is flawed. The reporting of this study is devoid of the methodological detail that would allow the reader to make informed judgments about the collection and analysis of any observational data. However, of greater concern is the authors’ failure to differentiate between Bronfenbrenner’s earlier concepts found in his ‘ecology of human development’ (1979) and his mature ‘bioecological theory of human development’ (2005). Tudge *et al.* discuss the use and misuse of Bronfenbrenner’s work, and the implications for ‘conceptual incoherence’ when ‘studies […] are described as being based on

\[21\] These two journal articles report the same study and study data.
Bronfenbrenner’s theory but some use ideas taken from the 1970s or 1980s and others from the 1990s’ (2009: 199). Capurso and Borsci’s study is an example of this ‘incoherent’ approach as they have used Bronfenbrenner’s process-person-context-time (PPCT) model, which became the essence of his later writings, but discuss their analysis using the concepts of activities, relation and role taken from his earlier 1979 framework. In respect of my current study, Bronfenbrenner’s theorising and ecological models for human development have informed Rogoff’s ‘cultural community’ (see, Rogoff, 2003: 44-48).

Bronfenbrenner’s ecological approach to ‘studying the relations among multiple settings in which children and their families are directly and indirectly involved. [...] constrains ideas of the relations between individual and cultural processes’ (Rogoff, 2003: 48). For the purposes of the study reported here I will only utilise Rogoff’s concepts.

McCulloch’s proposition is that the sail training voyage represents a total institution (after Goffman). Indeed, Goffman’s (1991 [1961]) Asylums and his concept of the ‘total institution’ has been used across many aspects of maritime studies to describe life aboard a ship and the ship-at-sea. This proposition has been a consistent theme of McCulloch’s writing since 2002, and uses the definition that a total institution is a:

‘place of residence and work where a large number of individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life’ (Goffman, 1991 [1961]: 11).

In applying this concept, McCulloch describes how the:

‘analysis of the practices of mental hospitals in mid-twentieth-century America is interwoven with evidence regarding, for example, prisons, concentration camps, boarding schools, convents and crucially, in the present context, ships’ (in Pike and Beames, 2013: 69).

In my initial reading of Goffman I was accepting of this concept as truly reflecting the sail training environment, but I have since considered the characteristics present in sail training that were not present in other ‘total institutions’. As I embarked on more sail training voyages, read and re-read Goffman’s Asylums, and became a more critical reader (through my university studies and assignments) I found ‘total institutions’ a less compelling concept to
explain the positive outcomes identified in the academic sail training research literature. This initiated the search for a more compelling explanation.

There have been occasions in the past when ships were used as places of detention for children and young people, which may identify more closely the ‘total institution’. Smith, for example, provides a descriptive account of the use, in the mid-19th century, of ship schools as floating-reformatories for children that were considered as dangerous (that is, those already involved in criminality), and perishing (that is, those at risk of offending) resulting from ‘ignorance, destitution and [their] circumstances’ (1998: 20). The Clarence and the Akbar did not sail anywhere (they were moored on the River Mersey, Liverpool) and were, initially, ‘highly commended in the first rank of reformatories’ (ibid: 23) as providing training and instruction towards employment in the Merchant Navy, suggesting that the ship-board experience had a certain quality. However, the poor health of the children, prior to entering these floating reformatories, meant that the mortality rate on these vessels was high, despite concerted efforts to create a healthier environment than could be found ashore. These vessels were soon replaced with the UK’s introduction of free compulsory education and the creation of the juvenile justice system leading to an alternative approach to caring for these dangerous and perishing children.

I have, however, been unable to reconcile sail training, as a form of personal and social development, with the other institutions to which the concept of total institutions has been applied. Surely, if demonstrable positive outcomes can be achieved from sail training then the same or similar benefits should be observable in other types of total institutions, such as mental health hospitals and prisons. This dissonance has inspired me to find an alternative explanation for sail training outcomes (set out in this thesis), and to investigate further the use of Goffman’s concept.

Goffman recognised that the grouping for these different examples of ‘total institutions’ was a difficult fit, as it was:

‘not neat, exhaustive, nor of immediate analytical use. […] I would like to mention one conceptual problem: none of the elements I will describe seems peculiar to total institutions, and none seems to be shared by
every one of them; what is distinctive about total institutions is that each
exhibits to an intense degree many times in this family of attributes’

Goffman sets out this ‘family of attributes’ as:

- All aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the
  same single authority;
- Each phase of the member’s daily activity is carried on in the
  immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are
  treated alike and required to do the same thing together;
- All phases of the day’s activities are tightly scheduled. With one
  activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole
  sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of
  explicit formal rulings and a body of officials; and
- The various enforced activities are brought together into a single
  rational plan purportedly designed to fulfil the official aims of the
  institution. (ibid: 17).

In qualifying his concept in this way, Goffman appears to give those who have
used, or will use, this term a broad scope in analysing and interpreting any
environment or setting as a ‘total institution’.

In my current study, the continued acceptance of the ‘total institution’ as
a concept conflicts with my use of Rogoff’s ‘cultural community’ and requires
closer scrutiny, clarification and explanation, which I discuss below.

Relying on Goffman’s ‘family of attributes’ since the late 1960s, ships and
the ship-at-sea have been described as representing a ‘total institution’; for
example, Rediker (ante) adopts this term, without explanation, in describing ‘the
[eighteenth century] formal powers over the [labour] process, the dispensing of
food, the maintenance of health, and general social life on board the ship’
(1993: 211).

There are two authors who have proposed the ship and ship-at-sea as a
‘total institution’; the most populist reference, cited in many maritime studies, is
Erving Goffman’s Asylums (1961). However, the term was also used by Vilhelm
Aubert in *The Hidden Society* (1965). To understand how the term ‘total institution’ has been applied to the shipboard experience it has been necessary to re-visit Goffman’s and Aubert’s original works, and the arguments made towards their generalization of this concept. In doing so, I have considered the settings for Goffman’s and Aubert’s original research and contemporary reviews of their publications, as well as articles and maritime studies conducted since their publication and the current thinking about ‘total institutions’.

Whilst the works of both Goffman and Aubert can be evaluated in terms of today’s academic standards, it is, I believe, of equal relevance to consider how these publications were viewed by their contemporaries and how academic researchers have used the concept since. Both *Asylums* and *The Hidden Society* received critical review at the time of publication and both have been cited in many published texts.

As Goffman’s ‘total institution’ is the most cited work, and the only reference to have been used to describe the sail training setting, I will consider his work first. *Asylums* is a collection of essays based upon Goffman’s studies of the social world of *inmates* in an American mental hospital. These studies involved three years of observations as a visiting member of The National Institute of Mental Health, Maryland (1954 – 1957) and one year of fieldwork as a participant observer at St. Elizabeth’s Hospital, Washington D.C. (1955 – 1956), a federal hospital with 7000 inmates (Goffman, 1991 [1961]: 7). It is interesting that Goffman uses the term ‘inmate’ as opposed to ‘patient’; this term implies *compulsion* and that individuals being studied had no other option but to reside in this setting. Except for ships, the generalisation of this concept has been extended to settings having a significant degree of compulsion going beyond voluntary entry, such as prisons or concentration camps.

In recent evaluations of Goffman’s life and work (see Shalin, 2013; Archibald, Kelly and Adorjan, 2015), he is considered to have made a significant impact in the discipline of sociology and is one of the best known and most cited sociologists. However, there is increasing ‘[criticism] by his fellow sociologists for his allegedly undecipherable and sloppy methods for conducting empirical research and constructing and accumulating general theory’ (Archibald *et al.*, 2015).
2015: 38). This is a criticism that Goffman had, perhaps, anticipated when, in an interview conducted in 1980, he said ‘[…] I’m not embarrassed at all by the crude and primitive character of my work’ (Verhoeven, 1993: 328).

Contemporary reviews of *Asylums* (Pfautz, 1962; Hollingshead, 1962; Caudill, 1962) praised Goffman’s approach to the primary study within the mental hospital setting, but these reviews raised concerns about the generalisation of his concept of ‘total institutions’ to other domains or settings. For example, Pfautz praises the ‘estimable quality of the author’s scholarly command of illustrative and comparative material from other settings. […] from prisons to concentration camps and from professional social scientists to novelists’; but qualifies this praise in expressing concern that ‘Goffman seldom attempts to make explicit the limits beyond which the many descriptive postulates and propositions that are generated cease to have relevance’ (1962: 556). Caudill expressed a similar concern:

‘It is a good book, good mainly because of its clearness in looking at mental hospitals as one type of total institution […]. Such clearness is, however, muddied by the almost endless provocative descriptive comparisons of mental hospitals with jails, seedy boarding schools, poorly run ships, and so on’ (1962: 368).

I only intend to address Goffman’s generalisation of the total institution to ships-at-sea through his use of ‘provocative descriptive comparisons’ (but there may be issues not covered here that impact on its generalisation to other settings); and its subsequent use by researchers in maritime studies and, more specifically, in explaining the sail training setting. Goffman’s generalisation of the total institution to ships-at-sea, that is to be found in *Asylums*, relies upon only one source: ‘Herman Melville, *White Jacket* (New York: Grove press, n.d.), p.135’ (1991 [1961]: 39 footnote). It is unclear from this footnote, and the other fourteen references to the same source throughout the book, how significant or relevant this *undated* reference is to the generalizability of total institutions. Herman Melville can also be found as a single reference in Goffman’s 1959 publication, *The presentation of self in everyday life* (1990: 137 footnote), where the same source is dated to 1966.
In fact, Herman Melville’s (1819 – 1891) *White Jacket or, The World on a Man-of-War* is a fictionalised account of Melville’s service as an ordinary seaman aboard a naval frigate, the *USS United States*, between August 1843 and October 1844; it was first published in 1850 (see Melville, 2004 [1850]).

Herman Melville was 20 years old when he first went to sea (in 1839); he sailed on several merchantmen and a whaler, with periods of employment and time ashore (including a period in 1840s Liverpool). In 1843, Melville joined the US Navy in Hawaii, and returned to a shore-based life in 1844 (see Arvin, 1950). Between 1845 and the mid-1850s, Melville wrote a number of books about his seafaring exploits; he is most noted for his novel *Moby Dick* (published in 1851), together with a number of short stories that were published in magazines and periodicals (for a collection of these works, see Melville, 1998).

In considering the reliability of Melville’s writing to inform Goffman’s generalisation of the total institution to ships and ships-at-sea, it is important to recognise the mid-19th century as a period in American literature that relished the autobiographical and biographical tales of seafaring adventures of antebellum sailors; creating its own genre which was, for some, a very lucrative source of income (Glenn, 2014). It is interesting to note that *White Jacket* with its graphic descriptions of naval flogging, was published less than a year before the US Congress prohibited this practice as a shipboard punishment (*ibid*: 126). From Melville’s literary description of his seafaring exploits aboard the *USS United States* it could be that ships-at-sea in the 1840s met fully the ‘family of attributes’ for Goffman’s ‘total institution’, but Goffman does not present any evidence to suggest that this was the case in the latter half of the twentieth century, when he wrote and published *Asylums*.

Before moving on to consider the use of ‘total institutions’ as a concept, I will make reference to Aubert’s contribution to this discussion. Aubert’s *The Hidden Society* (1965), like Goffman’s *Asylums*, was a collection of previously published essays, some of which had been written in collaboration with others,

---

22 *Antebellum* – the term used to describe the period before the American Civil War.
and some were new manuscripts. There are two chapters dealing with the shipboard setting: *A total institution: the ship* (1965: Chapter 8, 236-258); and *On the social structure of the ship* – reporting an empirical study (first published in *Acta Sociologica* in 1959) conducted aboard four Norwegian oil tankers (although in the original 1959 article it is five vessels!) and co-written with Oddmar Arner (*ibid*: Chapter 9, 259-287).

In *A total institution: the ship*, Aubert presents a comparison of various types of total institutions, such as mental hospitals (after Goffman), prisons, boarding schools, the cloister and ships. His discussion fails to resolve the conceptual differences between the ‘community’ and the ‘total institution’, but it does imply that boundaries between the two may be confused:

‘[The total institution] is not a spontaneously grown social unit, like a family or a local community, although both families and local communities may display the same amount of isolation from the outside and operate on a long term basis’ (1965: 239).

Aubert argued that the purpose of the total institution is relevant to its function:

‘All total institutions, except possibly the ship, seem to have some kind of “training” as their purpose. They all purport, in one way or another, to change, model, and reshape individuals; [...] accompanied by notions that the change is not merely an increase in knowledge or skill – no mere change in specific capacities or attitudes, but a change which affects the whole person. The ship as a total institution is unique in this respect; it has no such explicit purpose.’ (*ibid*: 247-248).

This is in direct conflict to the antecedents of the maritime culture (*ante*); a dominant dimension to ship-board life in the ‘age of sail’ was the training of seafarers, and is the stated purpose of sail training and the extant research literature; challenging further the proposition that the sail training vessel is a ‘total institution’.

*On the social structure of the ship* (1965: Chapter 9) is not an exact reproduction of the original *Acta Sociologica* 1959 article – this may be as a result of a corruption during translation or a change in the authors’ conceptual
or theoretical positioning; so, for my current purposes, I will refer to the original article (that is, Aubert and Arner, 1959). The article is qualified with the caveat: ‘Previous sociological literature on the problem is very scant; and our data are still too limited to permit more than very tentative conclusions’ (1959: 200). The statement is made that ‘[the] ship as a ‘total institution’” (ibid), referencing Goffman, but there is no argument made by the authors to justify or explain this statement beyond the description of the structure of life aboard the oil tankers, subject of their funded study.

In considering contemporary reviews of The Hidden Society, Becker expresses the view:

‘The source material is the debris of social experiences in the mind of the writer, disciplined to a degree by references to what others have thought about similar problems, occasionally by reference to a piece of empirical work. Armchair sociology, with a vengeance!’ (1966: 50; see also Turner, 1966).

Aromaa’s review of the 1985 updated version of The Hidden Society (published in Norwegian as Det skjulte samfunn) recognises the omission of both chapters dealing with shipboard life as a total institution; concluding that these ‘themes of the 1960s influential and important in their time, have apparently been considered to have ‘done their job’” (1986: 265).

It is right to consider both Goffman’s and Aubert’s work as being relevant ‘to their time’, but some reviewers had concerns about these works at the time of their publication and since. Perry and Wilkie (1974) provide an illuminating evaluation of Goffman’s total institution in a maritime context, complemented by a comparison with Aubert’s conceptualisation. In their article, they explore the acquiescence with ‘Goffman’s apparently eccentric methodological stance’, and consider the consequences of his blending social scientific enquiry and literary insight (1974: 138). Although Perry and Wilkie discuss Goffman’s reliance upon Melville’s White Jacket in applying his concept to ships, they do not question the historical nature of this source (they themselves reference Melville to a 1963 reprint of White Jacket). The implication is that the total institution, as it has been applied to shipboard life, is more a literary concept rather than a scientific
one. In comparing both Goffman’s and Aubert’s concepts, Perry and Wilkie concluded:

‘For Aubert the monastery is the total institution *par excellence* and therefore ‘the purification of identity’ is the basic social process within such organizations. For Goffman the mental hospital is the paradigmatic case of a total institution, and he insists: The full meaning for the inmate of being ‘in’ or ‘on the inside’ does not exist apart from the special meaning of ‘getting out’ or ‘getting on the outside’ (*ibid* : 144, italics in the original).

There are published studies that describe the ship-board experience as being a ‘total institution’, applying the concept retrospectively (see, for example, Zurcher, 1965; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Kitada, 2010; see also Vives, 2016), however, I have been unable to locate any study, either in generic maritime or sail training studies, that has used the concept of ‘total institution’ as an orienting framework to inform the study.

With regards to sail training studies, McCulloch has been consistent in advocating ‘the concept of the total institution [as] a framework for thinking about relationships, practices and issues arising in such a context’ (in Pike and Beames, 2013: 75). This proposition is at the forefront of McCulloch’s journal article – *Living at sea: learning from communal life aboard sail training vessels* (2007) where he applies Goffman’s ‘total institution’ and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of ‘situated learning’ retrospectively to ethnographic voyage-based data collected in the late-1990s (2007: 290). The *situatedness* of the voyage experience is discussed by McCulloch as providing a theoretical perspective, but posits that the ‘exposure of trainees to a few days participation is insufficient to create the conditions’ of a *community of practice* (*ibid*: 300); deciding that sail training only exhibits some of the features of a community of practice (referring to the research model of Mittendorff *et al.*, 2006).

McCulloch concluded that:

‘Life at sea aboard a sail training vessel of any size and in whatever tradition is a rich and complex experience. […] Nevertheless, the evidence in respect of inescapability, of the routinisation and
interdependence of life aboard, and of the imperative driving learning of new ways of physically being in order to manage daily life, strongly support the view that it is the institutional character of the environment that must lie at the heart of any systematic explanation’ (2007: 302).

In so doing, McCulloch has not allowed for the looseness of Goffman’s original concept and its ‘family of attributes’, or the concerns regarding its generalization from mental hospitals to other domains and, in this instance, specifically to sail training vessels. This broad approach to the ‘total institution’ does not differentiate in his application of this concept between the two sail training traditions or ideologies that he describes (in McCulloch, 2004). It may be that the Tall Ship (with a greater preponderance of academic studies) with its greater hierarchical approach to the routinisation of daily life, due to the size of the vessel, and the numbers of staff and crew fulfils more of Goffman’s family of attributes. However, the Recreational or Leisure Yachting with the smaller vessel and up to 18 staff and crew, as the dominant model for sail training provision, may rest outside of this generalisation.

In summary, this literature review has highlighted the role for Outdoor Adventure Education in addressing contemporary concerns for the mental health and well-being of children and young people, and the apparent failure of mainstream education to meet their personal and social developmental needs in an increasingly complex society. Based upon the inspiration and educational accomplishments of Kurt Hahn there is a recurring proposition to include OAE, in this instance sail training, into the curriculum or at least to extend provision to children and young people as an extra-curricular activity. Sail training, with its rich sociocultural and historical heritage, presents as a unique and challenging residential experience in a cultural community (after Rogoff), as a cultural island (after Lewin) that mediates the experience of acculturation (after Csibra and Gergely, 2011) and boundary crossing (after Akkerman and Bakker, 2011; Wenger-Trayner et al., 2015) as participants move from their shore-based socio-cultural context to that of the sail training vessel. This has been shown to generate positive personal and social outcomes albeit causation has not yet been established.
Chapter 3: Research Process

3.1 Foreground

Sail training has received little attention from academic researchers, although there has been an increase in research activity in the 21st century. Many of these studies have been master’s and doctoral studies, but few have achieved formal publication (McCulloch in Humberstone et al., 2016: 240). Many extant studies have focussed on isolating, identifying and measuring individual participant outcomes often using self-report and/or established valid and reliable measures that originate from land-based studies. This reflects a research approach that often adopts the ‘singular, limited question, “Does it work?”, and which limits the potential of the knowledge that may be found in any particular research setting (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000: 97). Individual participant outcomes have been the focus of attention, with only limited attention to group-based outcomes. Some studies have demonstrated the sustainability for sail training outcomes beyond the voyage (see, for example, Allison et al., 2007; McCulloch et al., 2010; Henstock, Barker and Knijnik, 2013), although Capurso and Borsci, (2013) were unable to demonstrate such sustainability in their own study. Whether such outcomes are sustainable or not may have more to do with the participants’ return to their ‘normal’ situation or the absence of voyage-based group-support which may account for the diminishing sustainability of some beneficial voyage-based outcomes. Schijf et al. highlight the problematic methodological consequences of using participant self-report measures or similar single source data (2017: 176), and which ‘could be seen to demonstrate a lack of understanding of the complexity and subtlety of the [experience]’ (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000: 96). It is also unclear from the literature whether such individual-based measures, for example, Bracken’s (1992) Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (in Capurso and Borsci, 2013), are immediately transferable, without adjustment, to the ship-board setting.

As previously discussed, most sail training studies provide a description of their context and setting, but there has been scant attention to the processes encountered on the sail training ship-board or in the voyage-based setting: this is the focus of the current study. There are a few exceptions that have
attempted to explain or attribute causal effect to the sail training setting (see Capurso and Borsci, 2013; McCulloch, 2004, 2007; ante). Capurso and Borsci attempt to explain the voyage-based setting using Bronfenbrenner’s ecological and bio-ecological concepts in the absence of observational data – they did not sail with their study participants. Whereas McCulloch (2004, 2007), employing sociological ethnographic case studies, did sail on vessels subject of his reported study and proposed the ship-board setting as a ‘total institution’ (after Goffman). McCulloch’s approach gives the reader a detailed and, for me, a more compelling insight to the voyage setting. The extant literature, from such a small number of published studies, does not provide any precedent on how best to approach the study of a sail training voyage. Mittendorf et al. anticipated difficulties in developing a novel approach to this type of setting:

‘The problem is that those implicit or informal learning processes are difficult to detect, because people do not consciously recall and perceive this learning, and it is difficult to evaluate the outcomes’ (2006: 299).

The absence of methodological guidance has allowed me significant leeway in designing the approach to the current study, and the opportunity to draw on studies in other types of outdoor adventure education and the cultural community. The personal empowerment that this has given me in the design of this study brings with it a responsibility to set out the influences in my approach and fully describe the what, why and how of this study and its conduct; which I will do here.

The self-disclosure, set out in my ‘position statement’ (Chapter 1), provides the ‘lens’ through which I view sail training and how I will conduct this study; and I have then used the literature review (Chapter 2) to ‘polish’ this lens. The bringing together of these two components informs my epistemological stance in deciding the research questions and how this study should be conducted to answer those questions (see, for example, Allison and Pomeroy, 2000; Bryman, 2012). I did not want to repeat earlier sail training studies in identifying, isolating and measuring outcomes (see 2.3.2 ante) and, perhaps, only reinforcing what is already known. Rather I wanted to investigate the ‘process’, accepting that:
'Although this type of work does not provide the kind of statistical “facts” that many find to be reassuring, it may prove to be more useful and relevant to practitioners in the field as it offers increased understanding.' (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000: 97).

I took the view that the production of knowledge could not be the sole responsibility of the researcher; I decided that this study should actively engage with the existing members of and novice entrants to the voyage setting. This would ‘[accommodate] a relativist perspective – acknowledging multiple realities having multiple meanings, with findings that are observer dependent’ (Yin, 2014: 17; italics in original) and manifested in an ethnographic case study approach. To blend the voyage participants’ and the researcher’s own experience Allison and Pomeroy propose a:

‘constructivist epistemology, [utilising] ethnography [and] case study […] to develop understanding of experiences. These experiences are necessarily subjective and are owned by, or belong to, the individual and the collective group.’ (2000: 97).

In considering these influences I became, in this study, the “crucial measurement device’, [recognising] that [my] background, values, identity and beliefs might have a significant bearing on the nature of the data collected and the analysis of that data’ (Denscombe, 2013: 237). Reflection on the issues already discussed in this thesis (ante) has influenced the research design and methodological approach to this study. The aim of this study was to conduct a ‘systematic self-critical inquiry. […] founded in curiosity and a desire to understand; but it is stable, not a fleeting, curiosity, systematic in the sense of being sustained by a strategy’ (Stenhouse, 1981: 103).

This chapter sets out the rationale for the design and methodological approach and recognises that:

‘Reality exists in the empirical world […]. Methods are mere instruments designed to identify and analyse the obdurate character of the empirical world, and as such their value exists only in their suitability in enabling this task to be done. In this fundamental sense the procedures employed in each part of the act of scientific enquiry should and must be assessed
in terms of whether they respect the nature of the empirical world under study’ (Blumer, 1969: 27-28).

The research questions are:
1. How does the cultural community operate during a sail training voyage?
2. How might sail training community practices be developed to optimise outcomes for participants (and members)?

3.2 Research Design and methodology

3.2.1 Ethnographic approach

The design of this study has been influenced by the advice of Rogoff and Angelillo, to keep ‘an open-minded approach to methods transcending disciplinary customs, in order to more satisfactorily investigate people’s development as they participate in their cultural communities’ (2002: 224). Such an approach to the ‘messiness of social research’ is supported by Bryman, in highlighting the:

‘need for flexibility and the need for perseverance. […] at the same time, it is crucial to have an appreciation of the methodological principles and the many debates and controversies that surround them’ (2012: 16; see also Townsend and Burgess (Eds.), 2009).

With this advice in mind, I began by considering what I wanted to achieve from conducting this study: I wanted to capture the concrete, lived experience of those embarking on a sail training voyage, including those who may be considered as members or participants. I decided that I could only ever accomplish this by employing an ethnographical approach, capturing ‘a descriptive account of [the] community or culture, […] integrating both first hand empirical investigation and the theoretical and comparative interpretation of social organization’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 1). Bronfenbrenner proposed that this type of social research requires rich, detailed descriptions to elicit the subjective meaning of the voyage experience for subsequent comparison with the researcher’s own observed experience (1979: 125).

Ethnographic studies have been used throughout the 20th century to investigate childhood experiences (after Margaret Mead and Bronislaw
Malinowski in the 1920s), and are still used by current day practitioners, such as Rogoff (see LeVine, 2007). It is an approach that is ‘sensitive to the individual, and to social, group and cultural processes’ (Stan in Humberstone et al., 2016: 70).

Rogoff supports such an approach:
‘Cultural researchers usually aspire to use both the emic and derived etic approaches. They seek to understand the communities studied, adapt procedures and interpretations in light of what they learn, and modify theories to reflect the similarities and variations sensitively observed.’ (2003: 31, emphasis added).

Adopting an emic approach, I will [attempt] to represent [the] cultural insiders’ perspective on a particular community, usually by means of observation and participation in [community activities] (ibid: 30). My derived etic approach will ‘[adapt] ways of questioning, observing, and interpreting to fit the perspective of participants’ (ibid: 31); an approach requiring reflexivity (see pages 19-20 ante and 80-82 post).

There is, however, a point for discussion that requires me to consider the use of the term ethnographic to describe this study. The traditional definition of ethnography involves:
‘the […] ethnographer [immersing] him- or herself in a group for an extended period of time, observing behaviour, listening to what is said in conversations both between others and with the fieldworker, and asking questions.’ (Bryman, 2012: 432).

Although I have prior sail training experience, in the current study I used pre- and post-voyage research activities and was immersed in the research voyage-based setting for 144 hours (and shared this setting with the crew participants for 117 hours), begging the question: How does this qualify as ‘an extended period of time’ to meet this requirement for ethnography? (for a separate discussion on this point see Bryman, 2012: 465). Sampson (2013), in her study of 21st century commercial seafarers, explains her rationale for adopting a ‘new’ ethnographic approach due to the limitations affecting the subjects of her research, such as accessing and tracking transient groups of migrant seafarers.
I, therefore, need to set out the case to extend the definition of ethnography to this study. Any on-voyage study will only ever engage with the sea-staff and crew who are sailing on that particular voyage; these voyage occupants only come together for this voyage at a specific time and space. The sea-staff, having prior experience and a familiarity with the setting, and the young crew, as ‘newcomers’ to a novel environment, come together for the duration of their voyage experience. (I shall refrain from using the terms member, membership, participant and participation to describe voyage occupants, as this will be discussed later).

In the current study, the voyage represents a temporally- and spatially-bound setting for the social interaction of its occupants during the voyage experience; I will, therefore, investigate the entire life-cycle of this voyage with these occupants as they engage in their sail training experience. It is impossible for this ‘situation’ to be ever replicated; the weather and sea state will never be replicated, and all of those who take part in the voyage will be forever changed, to varying degrees, with positive or negative thoughts and feelings about their experience.

Participant’s ‘interpersonal development [may be observable, but] intrapersonal development occurs primarily through unobservable mental changes in participants’ psyches’ (Ewert and Sibthorp, 2014: 131); although some intrapersonal development may manifest in observable behaviour or may be captured in self-reporting or research tools. Regardless, the experience will make it impossible for anyone to return to their pre-voyage self. Lemke supports this view, as:

‘Our activity, our participation, our ‘cognition’ is always bound up with, co-dependent with, the participation and the activity of others, be they persons, tools, symbols, processes, or things. How we participate, what practices we come to engage in, is a function of the whole community ecology […]. As we participate, we change. Our identity-in-practice develops, for we are no longer autonomous Persons in this model, but Persons-in-Activity’ (1997: 38; see also Daniels, 2008: 97).
Also, each sail training voyage must be considered as a separate entity; notwithstanding Giddens and Sutton’s (2014: 118) proposition that community is a ‘relationship involving a shared sense of communal identity, […] this shared identity continues to exist even after people move away from the locality’ (ante), which may have implications for membership and participation beyond the voyage experience.

The impossibility for a return to a pre-embarkation or voyage self is particularly true of changes that effect or influence my own position and my approach to this study, as I:

‘gain an understanding of the research endeavour and of the phenomena studied by examining [my] own roles in the inquiry and those of the institutions in which the inquiry occurs’ (Rogoff and Chavajay, 1995: 872).

This falls within the description of reflexivity, which I will discuss later.

3.2.1.1 Case Study

This chosen approach is a case study, which is probably the most flexible of research designs, as ‘[a]t the simplest level they provide descriptive accounts, [but when] used in an intellectually rigorous manner […] they offer the strengths of experimental research within natural settings’ (Hakim, 1987: 61). The case study ‘works best when the researcher wants to investigate an issue in depth and provide an explanation that can cope with the complexity and subtlety of real life situations’ (Denscombe, 2013: 55; see also Bryman, 2012: 66; Yin, 2014: 16-17). This approach has been successfully used in maritime studies to investigate seafarers, the ship-board experience and a life-at-sea (see, for example, Sampson, 2013), and to ‘integrate real-world events’ in the collection of study data (Yin, 2014: 88).

Whilst the voyage itself was a case study, it is important to acknowledge that each participant was a case study in their own right embedded within the voyage-based case, falling within Hakim’s description of community studies (1987: 66-68; see also Yin, 2014: 13-14). There is an advantage in adopting this approach as it intentionally captures participant and participant observer data, as a variety of perspectives; the research tools used in these case studies are
described in detail at 3.5 (post). These multiple perspectives were analysed and are brought together in the findings presented in a series of vignettes in Chapter 4 Analysis and Findings.

3.2.1.2 Participant Observer

Having chosen an ethnographic approach, I decided upon the nature and extent of my engagement in fieldwork; as there are a variety of roles for the ethnographer ranging from Covert- or Overt-Member to Non-Participating Observer (see Bryman, 2012: 441-444). For this study, I chose to act as a participant observer. This was a practical choice as the size of the vessel could not accommodate a non-participating observer or passenger; and to do this overtly with the knowledge, the informed consent and cooperation of the other occupants of the vessel. This is an approach taken by other sail training researchers (for example, McCulloch, 2004; Wojcikiewicz and Mural, 2010).

Rogers, in her eight-day evaluation study of the One And All Youth Development Sail Training Program (a vessel of the Tall Ship tradition), used a ‘participant-as-observer’ approach with 24 study participants who were allocated to three ‘watch’ groups: ‘[playing] the role of participant, researcher and observer’ (2004: 21). However, during the last four days of her study, citing the pressure and competing demands of this role and the impact on her stamina, Rogers became less of a participant and more of an observer allowing her to engage with all study participants beyond those in her own immediate ‘watch’ (ibid: 20). The inescapability of this type of setting has an effect on the researcher, for example:

‘[…] the stress [for the researcher] will be particularly great where one is researching a setting from which one cannot escape at the end of each day, in which one must remain for days at a time; as for example, in ethnographic research carried out on board ship’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 89; see also Sampson, 2004).

In the study reported here, as a participant observer, there was a potential for conflict and tensions in situating myself across more than one role in the same time and space; that is, operating as both Watch Leader and
Researcher in the same setting, as a form of boundary crossing (after Wenger-Trayner et al., 2015). As Yin points out:

‘the participant role may simply require too much attention relative to the observer role. Thus, the participant-observer may not have sufficient time to take notes or to raise questions about events from different perspectives, as a good observer might.’ (2014: 117).

I was to sail as a Watch Leader and as someone who was familiar with the vessel, its routines and culture and as a complete participant: ‘not simply pretending to be a member but actually committing oneself, body and soul’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 82, after Jules-Rosette, 1978) in the day-to-day activities of the vessel; this situated me as an ‘insider’. Although I could draw upon my experience with this sail training provider to secure, albeit this required further negotiation, a berth on the study voyage; whereas McCulloch had to establish his ‘record, technical qualifications and reputation as a practitioner’ to justify occupying a voyage berth (2004: 187).

Operating as an active member of the sea-staff immediately illuminated the competing demands of individual-focus and responsibility across both roles, as McCulloch points out as he:

‘[attended] to the wants and well-being of young trainees and the achievement of particular objectives […] leaving relatively little time and energy for observing, interviewing and recording as discrete activities. An ongoing challenge […] was therefore the integration of the roles of practitioner and researcher’ (2004: 187).

This is something that I planned for (and did experience) during the study voyage (see 3.5.2.2 Field notes).

3.2.2. Insider or Outsider?

The approach of researching as an insider or outsider is not a new dilemma, and this is often presented as a binary choice for researchers:

‘In essence, outsider myths assert that only outsiders can conduct valid research on a given group; only outsiders, it is held, possess the needed objectivity and emotional distance. […] insiders invariably present their group in an unrealistically favourable light. Analogously, insider myths
assert that only insiders are capable of doing valid research in a particular group and that all outsiders are inherently incapable of appreciating the true character of the group’s life’ (Styles (1979: 148), cited by Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 86).

The balance of the insider and outsider perspectives represents the coming together of several boundaries in a complex experience. Clark et al. argue: ‘that [such] boundary experiences seem to stimulate transformation where there is some genuine reciprocity and there may be a shared boundary object but more likely parallel or intertwined objects, and neither can be achieved without the other’ (2017: 253).

McCulloch, in his reporting of the case studies of eleven sail training voyages, as ‘a member of the culture of sail training’ (but falling short of classifying himself as an insider) identified ‘the problem or risk of ‘going native’ […], losing, as a researcher [his] twin perspectives of [his] ‘own’ culture and [his] ‘research outlook” (McCulloch, 2007: 290, referring to Delamont (1992)). McCulloch relied upon recognising his positive disposition towards sail training as ‘a worthwhile experience for many young participants’ as he employed reflexivity to ‘manage [the] continual struggle between extreme immersion and hyper-reflexivity’ (ibid: 291). The researcher will tend to observe, think, interpret and describe their study using, what I have referred to as, their personal foundation of experience (McCulloch, 2007; ante), and ‘we cannot avoid relying on ‘common sense’ knowledge nor, often, can we avoid having an effect of the phenomena we study’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 15). Reflexivity is the mechanism ‘to question our attitudes, thought processes, values, assumptions, prejudices and habitual actions, to strive and understand our complex roles in relation to others [….] making aspects of the self strange’ (Bolton, 2012: 13-14).

Stenhouse objects to the implication that the insider is to be ever condemned to practitioner-based bias, suggesting that ‘the dedication of professional researchers to their theories is a more serious source of bias’ (1981: 110; see also confirmation bias and theory-induced blindness in Kahneman, 2012). Reflexivity extends to the knowledge generated during fieldwork, the collection of data and its subsequent analysis, and how a
possible- or researcher-self is constructed and re-constructed from the versions of self that I ‘brought’ to and have ‘created’ in the study (see Reinharz, 2011: 8-9). Yardley (2000) posits, in discussing proposed criteria for quality in qualitative research, that a demonstrable reflexive stance is indicative of ‘transparency and coherence’ (in Bryman, 2012: 393).

In addition to ensuring a reflexive stance, applying a derived etic approach from the outset, the novelty for me during this voyage was performing as the researcher as I observed the behaviours of and listened to those on-board as we engaged in the day-to-day activities of the voyage (an emic approach). In making explicit this reflexive stance I can describe and illuminate my own world view, and ‘enable my readers to judge for themselves […] what my testimony is worth’ (Reinharz, 2011: 2 citing Harriet Martineau (1802-1876)).

On researching a familiar setting, Hammersley and Atkinson posit:

‘[...] where he or she is researching a familiar group or setting, the participant observer is required to treat this as ‘anthropologically strange’, in an effort to make explicit the presuppositions he or she takes for granted as a cultural member’ (2007: 9).

I was comfortable with and established in my role as Watch Leader in a voyage setting; it is the role of researcher in this setting that is and was to be new and unfamiliar. I was to rely upon this alternative role, as the researcher in a familiar setting, to generate the perspective of an outsider or stranger as a form of cognitive dissonance. I did not consider this dual-role as an impediment to the purpose of this study, as ‘the researcher can […] generate creative insights out of this marginal position of being simultaneously insider-outsider’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 89, after Lofland, 1971: 97), perhaps, activating and optimising Foucault’s ship-board induced reservoir of imagination (Rabinow (2000); ante).

I have added the term ‘stranger’ here as a way of describing my researcher’s role in a familiar setting, as it creates a new perspective: ‘[As the stranger arrives] in the host society what he or she previously took for granted as knowledge about that society turns out to be unreliable, if not obviously false. In addition, areas of ignorance
previously of no importance come to take on great significance, and
overcoming them is necessary for the pursuit of important goals,
perhaps, even for the stranger’s very survival’ (Hammersley and

Schuetz23 (1944) posits that as the stranger encounters a new ‘cultural
pattern’, then he or she will rely upon their pre-existing cultural patterns for
thinking and interpretation, and their prior knowledge and conceptions of the
newly encountered ‘cultural patterns’ to think about and interpret them. The
stranger’s thinking and interpretation will be distinctly different from those who
already occupy the ‘cultural pattern’ and enables a new and emerging
perspective. The approach of the stranger may also affect those occupying the
encountered ‘cultural pattern’ (see van Gennep, 1960 [1908]). Approaching this
study as a stranger introduced a phenomenological component to the research
design. Indeed, it has been advocated that suspending the researcher’s own
common-sense beliefs minimises the impact of assumptions; and that ‘one way
of ‘bracketing off’ presuppositions is to adopt the stance of ‘the stranger’
(Denscombe, 2013: 99; see also Wood, 1934, Schuetz, 1944). The suspension
of common-sense, thinking about and interpreting the setting and experience as
a stranger manifest in a metacognitive experience, as a ‘conscious cognitive or
affective experiences that accompany and pertain to any intellectual enterprise’
(Flavell, 1979: 906).

It is from this position that I considered the identification of the study
voyage, the sea-staff and crew participants, the ethical approach, and then the
design of the three phases of fieldwork, that is, the research activities to be
conducted at pre- (T₀), on- (T¹) and post-voyage (T²); and the analysis of the
collected data. These matters are now described here and in Chapter 4
Analysis and Findings.

23 In earlier publications, the spelling of this author’s surname is cited as Alfred Schuetz, (for
example, (1944) The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology); and as Schutz, in later re-prints
and subsequent collections of his work (for example, (1970) Alfred Schutz on Phenomenology
and Social Relations. Selected writings).
3.3 The voyage and the study participants

The sail training provider\(^{24}\) who enabled the conduct of this study aboard their principal vessel, a vessel of the Recreational or Leisure tradition (ante), operates from late March to October. They provide ‘adventure under sail’ for children and young people, aged 12 to 25 years, from a diverse range of socio-economic backgrounds (as a general description of the wider population for the study sample). Weekend, five- and six-day voyages are booked in advance throughout the sailing season by schools, academies and other youth organisations (such as the Scouts, Guides, or Sea Cadets). At the beginning of and during the sailing season voyage berths are offered in a Voyage Programme on a first-come, first-served basis to the provider’s cohort of volunteer sea-staff. This allows volunteers to arrange their days off and annual leave, and organise their commitments to support voyage activities.

The vessel used in this study can accommodate up to 18 sea-staff and crew, meaning that the opportunity for a researcher to secure a voyage berth is constrained by availability. The vessel’s maximum occupancy restricts the sample size for any voyage to eighteen study participants (including the researcher); however, in the context of researching the sail training voyage as a ‘cultural community’ this sample will represent the entire population of this voyage-based community. A discussion is made later regarding any possible relationship of this sample and the wider population of those engaged in sail training activities (see Bryman, 2012: 187).

I have been a sail training volunteer for more than four years, in both voyage- and shore-based roles; this allowed me to negotiate the voyage on which to conduct this study. However, the university’s timescales for granting approval of the research proposal and for the ethical approach did not correspond to the timescales for booking a volunteer berth. I could not nominate a study-voyage before these university approvals were in place. It would have

---

\(^{24}\) The sail training provider agreed for their name to be used in the reporting of this study, however, due to the relatively small UK sail training community it would have been possible to identify individual sea-staff participants, thereby compromising the ethical undertaking to maintain their anonymity. I have, therefore, decided not to use the name of the provider or their vessel (see 3.4 Ethical Approach).
been unethical and an abuse of my relationship with this sail training provider to have speculatively booked a berth, excluding other volunteers from the opportunity to sail, on the basis that university approvals would be in place before the voyage took place. I decided, therefore, to wait until university approvals were in place before nominating and arranging the study-voyage, and then embarking on the undertakings and requirements of the ethical approval and arranging the pre-voyage activities (post).

These factors limited the scope of the voyages available and, thereby, the profile of the crew(s) that were able and willing to participate in this study. In the event, there was only one voyage that could accommodate me, that allowed sufficient time to complete the informed consent process, and the planned pre-voyage (T^0) activities (and meeting the university’s expectations for completion of the field work and submission of this thesis). The process for selecting the study-voyage and its participants was, therefore, based on opportunity; it does not meet fully any of the selection criteria set out in the research literature, but could be best described as convenience sampling (see Bryman, 2012: 201; Denscombe, 2013: 37). This approach to sampling (and the overall research design and methodology) may limit any generalisations that may be drawn from this study’s findings; the consequences of this approach to sampling and the sample size will be discussed later in the context of the analysis of the collected data and the conclusions drawn from this study (post).

The study-voyage was, therefore, an existing booking made by an independent girls’ school\(^{25}\) for twelve 12- and 13-year-old girls; they were to be accompanied by two of their teachers. The twelve crew participants were from two different year groups and not all known to each other; only three girls were members of an existing friendship group, and they did not all know the accompanying teachers. Three girls, two Nigerian and one British, were full-time boarders at the school with one teacher who was their boarding-house mistress. The crew and their teachers had been selected before any approach to

---

\(^{25}\) The (2015) *Independent Schools Inspectorate: Integrated Inspection Report* for this school recorded 779 pupils, with 206 (both UK and overseas) boarders. 119 pupils were considered to have special educational needs and/ or disabilities (SEND); and 136 pupils had English as a second language. The *ability* profile of the school was ‘above the national average’.
participate in the study was made, a process that was outside of the scope and control of the researcher.

Of the two female teachers who were to accompany the crew, one was the head of a STEM subject, an experienced recreational sailor (who was recruited to sail by the second teacher) but with no prior experience of sail training or any association with the sail training provider. The second teacher was a boarding-house mistress and teacher; an experienced sailor and a volunteer with the sail training provider, however, this was to be her first voyage with a crew from this school. This second teacher agreed to act as both a study participant and ‘gatekeeper’ (see Bryman, 2012: 151); she was extremely supportive in seeking approval from the school’s head teacher for the crew and teachers to participate in the study, acting as a liaison in disseminating information about the study to the crew and their parents and guardians, securing and collating written consents, and arranging for my access to the crew and school for the pre- and post-voyage research activities.

The three-female sea-staff for the voyage had first sailed with this sail training provider as young ‘crew participants’ and had entered the cultural community as strangers; they were all at various stages of development towards being and becoming qualified and professional seafarers. The full-time Skipper is a qualified, professional seafarer with experience of several vessels, from both the Tall Ship and Recreational or Leisure tradition; she has been the skipper of the study-vessel since 2009. The First Mate, second-in-command to the skipper, is a qualified, professional seafarer on a career trajectory towards becoming a full-time sail training skipper; at the time of the study, she was working as full-time Second Mate with a different sail training provider, and for this study-voyage was acting as a volunteer whilst on her annual leave. The Bosun, a full-time volunteer in her first year of a two-year career development post with this provider, is working towards acquiring seafaring qualifications and gaining work experience in a sail training context.

The six-day voyage took place between Monday 11th to Saturday 16th July 2016 (I joined the vessel on Sunday 10th July); and we covered a total of 204 nautical miles.
3.4 Ethical Approach

The desire to achieve the objectives of any study may blur or dilute the researcher’s commitment to considering and monitoring, for example, ‘whether there is harm to participants; a lack of informed consent; an invasion of privacy; or involves deception’ (Diener and Crandall, 1978: 17-72, italics added; see also Bryman, 2012: 135; Denscombe, 2013: 331; Yin, 2014: 78). This citation is at the core of my ethical approach and necessitates, to ensure research quality, that research is conducted within an ethical framework. A framework that is more than:

‘a series of boxes to be ticked as a set of procedural conditions, […] it is an orientation to research that is deeply embedded in those working in the field in a substantive and engaged way.’ (Groundwater-Smith and Mockler, 2007: 205).

This study has been supervised and an ethical framework was approved by the Newcastle University’s Ethical Committee within its Ethics Procedures\(^\text{26}\); and was conducted in accordance with the Code of Good Practice in Research\(^\text{27}\). The approved ethical framework described how I would:

- protect the interests of the participants;
- ensure that participation was voluntary and based on informed consent;
- avoid deception and operate with scientific integrity; and
- comply with the laws of the land.

(Denscombe, 2013: 331).

Protecting the interests of the participants, whilst always a consideration when investigating social phenomena with human subjects, was made particularly sensitive due to the ages of the young crew participants. In this regard the approach to safeguarding the welfare and well-being of the young crew came within the scope of the sail training provider’s Child Protection Policy and Code of Conduct, and any additional requirements suggested or imposed

\(^{26}\) Available at [http://www.ncl.ac.uk/res/research/ethics_governance/ethics_procedures/index.htm](http://www.ncl.ac.uk/res/research/ethics_governance/ethics_procedures/index.htm)

\(^{27}\) Available at [http://www.ncl.ac.uk/research/ethics/goodpractice.htm](http://www.ncl.ac.uk/research/ethics/goodpractice.htm)
by the school. In the event, the school accepted the sail training provider’s Child Protection Policy as being sufficient to meet their ‘duty of care’ arrangements in planning the study voyage. In addition to my policing background, as a sail training volunteer I hold an enhanced Criminal Records Bureau (CRB, now Disclosure and Barring Service or DBS) certificate, and I am a volunteer trainer with a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).

From the perspective of any possible physical risk, the vessel used in this study is coded by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) as a commercial vessel and as such, in addition to any requirements under Health and Safety at Work legislation, comes within the scope of the Merchant Shipping Act 1995. This legislation imposes strict requirements on the seafaring qualifications for the Skipper and First Mate, the on-board operating and emergency procedures, and the carrying of emergency and safety equipment. These matters are contained in the vessel’s Safety Management System (SMS), a folder with all required information for the vessel’s annual inspection regime and which requires each member of sea-staff, both full-time and volunteer, to read and sign acknowledging its contents. Compliance with this legislation is an organisational necessity for sail training providers. Safety and safety briefings are key aspects of the introductory procedures to the vessel, and are described in greater detail later.

It was never intended to collect participants’ personal data and it was agreed, both with the school and sail training provider, that participants would remain anonymous; a pseudonym or crew name was used to identify participants during research activities. Each study participant selected their own crew name and completed a short pen picture (written as a pre-voyage activity and presented at Appendix A), which was used as a unique identifier for participants. The sail training provider did agree, in a written and signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), for the reporting of their name and the details of the vessel in this thesis. However, I have concluded that such disclosure may render members of the sea-staff identifiable and it is on this basis I will not name the sail training provider or the vessel here. In making this decision I acknowledge that it is a compromise and that it may weaken the later
discussion and conclusions (at Chapter 5) (after Yin, 2014: 197); this makes the
detailed description of the research process, the tools used, field notes and
analysis in this thesis imperative. Any reference to the school or the sail training
provider has been redacted from examples of documentation included
throughout the thesis.

Participation in this study was voluntary and it was not a condition for the
participants being able to sail. A detailed briefing sheet was prepared and
circulated to all prospective participants (see Appendix B). This briefing
document set out the purpose of the study and it was made clear that, for
example, participation in the research was voluntary, written consent was
required, and that participants could withdraw from the study at any time. This
briefing sheet benefited from the review of my ethical framework, in that
withdrawal from the study could, especially for the young crew, be
communicated to the gatekeeper, the Skipper or the researcher. The MoU with
the sail training provider agreed that the Skipper could stop or suspend the
study should the research activities impact on, for example, safety or become
too intrusive or disruptive to the day-to-day operation of the vessel.

A signed consent form reiterating the mechanism to withdraw from the
study was completed for each participant (Crew: Appendix C, and Teachers/
Sea-staff: Appendix D), for those under the age of 18 this form was
countersigned by a parent/guardian or, in the case of two of the boarders, by
the teacher/gatekeeper as a representative of the school *in loco parentis*.

The conduct of this study was always planned to be *overt in a closed
setting* (see Bryman, 2012: 434), acting with the full knowledge and consent of
all voyage participants; to conduct it any other way was not considered nor,
indeed, was this feasible. The overt nature of the study and the informed
consent continued beyond the signed consent form, for example, before audio
recording at the beginning of any research activity or any naturally occurring
activity (such as the end-of-voyage-debrief) the participants were asked for their
permission to record the event before the recording device was activated. To
enable the reader to make any judgement on the scientific rigour of the methods
used in this study they are to be described, together with a rationale for their use, later.

To complement my own field (and out-of-field) notes and journal entries, access to and the use of the sail training provider’s and the vessel’s naturally occurring data, such as the Ship’s Log Book, sea-staff reports, end-of-voyage feedback, and the images taken during the voyage has been considered on a case-by-case basis. The First Mate’s Voyage Report, as an example of naturally occurring voyage data (in that it was not prepared for the study), describes our voyage (see Appendix E). The commitment to maintaining an ethical approach extends to the use of both the products of my fieldwork, such as audio recording (see 3.5.2.1 below), and any other artefacts, such as those originating from the vessel or the sail training provider (see Silverman, 2014: 153). In the reporting of this study the use or reference to any naturally occurring data from the vessel have been agreed, in writing, with the Managing Director of the sail training provider.

In respect of images taken during voyages, it is a requirement of the sail training provider’s Child Protection Policy and voyage booking process that participants are requested for written informed consent on the taking of and subsequent use of voyage-based imagery28. In this instance, the school had secured photo/video consents at the point of enrolment; and the permissions for this voyage were given by the school’s Educational Visits and Events Coordinator (email, June 2016). For images taken during this study voyage and then used in the thesis, the original digital photographic images have been processed using the GNU Image Manipulation Programme29. This processing has converted the digital photographic images to line drawings, so that the images of study participants have been sufficiently obscured and anonymised for presentation here; thereby, fulfilling the ethical commitment to maintain participant anonymity (see, for example, 4.1 Analysis). In addition, specific

---

28 The sail training provider’s approach for taking and the use of images is adapted from the NSPCC advice, available at https://www.nspcc.org.uk/preventing-abuse/safeguarding/photography-sharing-images-guidance/

29 The GNU Image Manipulation Programme (GIMP, version 2.8.18) is free-to-download software, available at: http://www.gnu.org/
written consent from the teacher/gatekeeper and the sail training provider has been sought for each of the line-drawing images that appear in this thesis.

Data is subject of the principles of Data Protection Act (no personal data was intentionally collected during this study), and any data has and will only been used for the purposes of this study and subsequent reporting. Hard copy documents, such as original documents generated as part of a research activity or copies of the sail training provider’s artefacts, and electronic data, both electronic documents and audio recordings, will be securely retained for a period of six years, at which time they will be destroyed.

In my ethical approach, I have considered the ‘complex links between purpose, ethics and quality’ (Groundwater-Smith and Mockler, 2007: 200); and I agree that quality extends to ‘matters of evidence, concerns regarding purpose and the nature of the outcomes produced’ (ibid: 206). I have already described my concerns regarding the role of insider or outsider (see 3.2.2 ante); and these concerns, especially as they relate to my ethical approach, have implications for bias in the collection and analysis of data (see 3.5 The Study and Chapter 4 Analysis and Findings, post).

3.5 The Study

The overall approach, as described above, was a qualitative, interpretive and ethnographic investigation of the lived-experience in a case study of a six-day voyage through:

- immersion in the voyage setting to collect the ‘rich and detailed descriptions’;
- participant observation of on-board behaviours of crew participants and sea staff, as an overt activity;
- listen and engage in conversations;
- conducting individual and group interviews with sea staff and crew participants to further explore issues or to clarify ambiguity;
- consider naturally occurring voyage data, such as, documentation and artefacts that ‘derive from situations which exist independently of the researcher’s intervention’ (Silverman, 2014: 316). This included
data that may be a legal or organisational requirement, such as, the Ship’s log, Skipper and First Mate reports, and end-of-voyage feedback, or incidental, such as any imagery captured during the voyage.

Adapted from Bryman (2012: 432).

I approached the sail training voyage as a case study; this was an investigation of eighteen individuals (including myself as a participant too), as we participated in a single event as part of the voyage-community. This description falls within the scope of Bryman’s descriptions of the case study (2012: 66; see also Denscombe, 2013: 52-54; Yin, 2014). While the single event and community dimensions of the sail training voyage represent the boundaries of the overall case study (see Denscombe, 2013: 56), it is recognised that each participant is an individual case study nested within this holistic and overarching case study (see 3.2.1.1 Case Study ante).

To reach beyond participant observation as a single source of data, I considered how best to design and use activities, including the use of visual methods, that would be complementary to my own fieldwork practices. These activities were intended to engage with the study participants, to elicit their thinking and interpretations of the voyage experience. The approach to these activities was also intended to enable recognition and the monitoring of my own bias.

My personal foundation of experience tends towards research activities that I was comfortable with, such as semi-structured interviews. However, having regard to the profile of the study participants, particularly the twelve young crew members, I reflected and recognised that my preferred activities may not have been the most productive with all the study participants. I was aware too, that by adopting a ‘familiar approach in a familiar setting’ may have allowed a degree of complacency with research activities, and leading to unrecognised and unintentional bias. I decided to adopt activities that were less familiar to me and, in so doing, to increase the dissonance of a researcher-as-a-stranger in the familiar setting. To this end, I was fortunate in the period that I was reflecting on this approach to be introduced to the use of visual
methodologies (see Clark et al., 2013; Rose, 2016). These events coincided, in June 2016, with my research project approval, preparations for a Progress Panel\textsuperscript{30} and the opportunity to attend a two-day ESRC doctoral training event in the use of visual methodologies.

My approach adopted Clark et al.’s (2013) advice in developing a ‘toolbox’ of research activities to provide study participants with a range of tools that could cater for their own preferences in how they might engage with this study. It was always intended that I would supervise the use of these tools during the fieldwork phase and ‘not as a substitute for the researcher’ (ibid: 16). I planned to monitor the completion of these activities so that I was ‘aware at all times of the dynamics of the group, […] and ensure] all participants [enjoyed] a positive experience and [were] able to contribute effectively’ (ibid). As these tools were not intended for unsupported or self-directed completion (see Bryman, 2012: 263) I decided not to pilot them. To have conducted a pilot study with non-voyage respondents, the identification and recruitment of a cohort with a similar profile would have been difficult if not impossible, and would have had limited utility. In the event the use of these tools relied on the individual interpretation and responses of the study participants who each developed their own approach in using these tools. Completion of each type of tool was not elective nor was it mandatory; as will be seen from the subsequent analysis, each participant approached these tools differently, such as, how they used them and what they wrote (see 4.1 Analysis). The visual tools were not always used as research data in themselves; some activities were employed to capture data, such as the Plus, Minus, Interesting and Fortune Lines (examples of both tools are contained in the Voyage Pack at Appendix F), and have been analysed without reference back to the respondents. Whereas, the Photoelicitation activity used naturally occurring images of the voyage as the catalyst for discussion in the post-voyage sessions (some of the images selected by participants in this activity are at figures 6, 7 and 11, together with participant and researcher narratives in Chapter 4 Analysis and Findings). Using study

\textsuperscript{30} A Progress Panel is a ‘formal assessment’ with two members of University staff (not supervisors) to discuss progress to date, provide feedback and suggestions on the research proposal and approve the continued support of the university.
data, primarily the photo-elicitation, as the catalyst for interviews and focus groups gave participants the opportunity to ‘talk about different things, things that researchers hadn’t thought about’ (Rose, 2016: 315). However, time constraints (particularly in respect of the young crew and their teachers) limited opportunities to fully explore this aspect of the study. The pre- and post-voyage activities were ‘squeezed’ into the time available in the school; this time was precious and was all that could be expected so as not to disrupt the daily routine of the study participants and the school.

This was also true of the on-voyage activities; these were limited by the setting as I strived to minimise the disruption to the vessel’s normal routines – this was an ongoing compromise throughout the fieldwork phases of this study. For the sea-staff, it was possible to explore issues or themes raised in the data in the post-voyage semi-structured interviews; however, the post-voyage activities were not temporally proximate to the completion of the pre- and on-voyage data.

This design manifested in a flexible approach to the collection of data. The tools that were adopted for this study and their use in each phase ($T^0$, $T^1$ and $T^2$) of fieldwork are described below.

**3.5.1 Pre-voyage ($T^0$)**

The pre-voyage fieldwork allowed me, initially, to build on the information provided to participants in the study briefing sheet (as a component of the ethical approach), and to introduce the participants to some of the study tools that they would encounter during the study. It also provided an opportunity to capture baseline pre-voyage data.

For the young crew and the teachers, a pre-voyage session was arranged by the teacher/gatekeeper, however, the second teacher was unable to attend this session. This session took place during the last week of the summer term at their school and six days before the voyage. Although most teaching activity at the school had ceased it was still difficult to get all the crew together for this session; this was only achieved with the intervention of and
negotiation within the school by the gatekeeper. This pre-voyage activity comprised a group session during which two activities were conducted:

*Pen picture*: this was used as an introductory activity to allow the participants to select their own *crew name* to be used as an identifier on future written-tools, and to write (without any instructions as to style or content) a short ‘pen-picture’ or profile of themselves (see Appendix A).

*Plus, Minus, Interesting* (after Clark *et al.*, 2013): this tool was employed across the three phases of fieldwork; it provided a standard framework for participants to list and describe aspects of their voyage that they considered to be a plus, minus or interesting, using the everyday meaning and no additional guidance was given to participants. A prepared template was provided with the question: *What will your voyage be like?* (for an example of this template see Appendix F).

This session took place in a conservatory adjoining a boarding house within the school grounds. At the start of the session the group were asked for their consent to record this session using a digital voice recorder. Consent was given, however, the acoustics of this venue and with the participants talking over each other the recording was rendered unusable – this influenced my overall approach to audio recording described below (see 3.5.2.1 Audio recording). The responses to all the *Plus, Minus, Interesting* activities are collated at Appendix G.

The pre-voyage session with the sea-staff, using the same activities, took place on the first day of the voyage in the vessel’s saloon but before the crew and teachers joined us. The session was not audio recorded. The data collected in this session included the selection of crew name and pen picture (see Appendix A) and the first *Plus, Minus, Interesting* (see Appendix G), these were complemented by my field notes.

### 3.5.2 On-voyage (T1)

The arrangements for the on-voyage fieldwork comprised preparations for activities with the sea-staff, teachers and crew participants; and for my own recording keeping, such as observational field notes. I will describe, first, the
arrangements for the study participants in the preparation of a *Voyage Pack* (see Appendix F) with planned research activities, comprising:

*What did you learn today?* this represented an opportunity for participants to record one thing per day that they had learned; to reflect how they had learned it; and how that learning made them feel. The intention of this activity was to facilitate participant-reflection, to encourage them to think about how they had learned something and how that made them feel.

*Fortune Lines* (after Clark *et al.*, 2013): this tool was used to invite participants to indicate their feelings, using a ten-point scale between a non-smiley and smiley-face, about two dimensions of the voyage experience: 1. being a crew member; and 2. the sea-staff and other crew members on a vertical axis. Time was placed on the horizontal axis (see Figure 1).

*Figure 1. Fortune Line - example of becoming a crew member*

A free text area was provided for participants to describe the event(s) that had prompted these *feelings*. This activity helped to capture individual reported feelings, and was never intended to be shared between participants (see Clark *et al.*, 2013: 14). In addition to analysing these data (see 4.1 Analysis), this was a useful tool to support my own
reflection-in-action to identify themes, trends and emerging issues in the social interactions which, due to the limitations of the setting (in that I could not be everywhere at every time), I may not have observed.

Plus, Minus, Interesting: this tool, as a template to be used across the three phases of fieldwork, was again provided for participants to list and describe aspects of their voyage that they considered to be a plus, minus or interesting. The question: What is your voyage like?

The Voyage Pack was individual to each participant, identified by their crew name, and standardised the presentation of the on-voyage research tools (see Yin, 2014: 89). The pack was issued for each ‘research session’ which took place in the vessel’s saloon area, and was then collected in at the end of each session to be stored securely in my cabin. Due to the closeness of the on-board situation, I was aware that any accidental or inappropriate disclosure of a participant’s responses may disrupt the dynamic of the voyage and any relationships between the crew.

3.5.2.1 Audio recording

My approach to audio recording evolved during the voyage, from a clear plan at the beginning, as I equipped myself with three digital voice recorders and variety of microphones, to a more flexible and ad hoc approach as the voyage went on. It should also be noted that an audio recording is an incomplete record; although a recording may be better than reliance upon the researcher’s memory the audio recording only ever captures the audible dimension of a social interaction. It does not capture, for example, the non-verbal communication or the context of the interaction, so can only ever be knowledge that is ‘partial and contextual’ (Coates in Humberstone et al., 2016: 73; see also Denscombe, 2013: 86). Detailed field notes would complement any audio recordings (post).

A part of my plan was to overtly wear a recording device with a clip-on lapel microphone to capture my interactions with sea-staff and crew members as we enjoyed our voyage. However, this led to some personal ethical angst on the issue of ongoing consent as participants might have forgotten that
recordings were being made and while I relished the opportunity to record authentic in-the-field exchanges I was concerned that these may include unguarded comments. In the event, the technical capability of the device proved to be unworkable; this was due to the nature of the on-board outdoor setting, including the wearing of waterproof clothing and lifejackets, wind and other extraneous noise.

From my experience, in attempting to record the pre-voyage session at the school, I found that another device using a 360° microphone to record group-activity struggled to capture individual contributions as multiple participants talked over each other. Although some group activities were recorded, these opportunities needed a reminder to the young crew regarding their behaviour and respecting each other’s contribution. A third device was specifically purchased for use as an ‘audio diary’. Although this device was chosen as it would not allow individual recordings to be deleted by contributors, it did allow users to playback and listen to each other’s recordings. Having discussed this with the teacher/gatekeeper it was agreed that this could disrupt the dynamic of the voyage, for example, if one crew member made a recording that was critical of a fellow crew member and this was then replayed or overheard – this device was not used.

In the event, the only usable audio recordings were the end-of-voyage debrief session conducted on the last day of the voyage; and the four post-voyage sessions. These recordings, despite the attempted use of audio-to-text software (which struggled to translate colloquialisms and dialects), I later transcribed manually. There was a benefit in adopting this manual approach as I found the process brought me back in to contact with the event and its memories, as Rebecca Barnes describes:

‘[…] whilst it is an arduous and very time consuming task, [transcription] offered great benefits in terms of bringing me closer to the data, and encouraging me to start to identify key themes, and to become aware of similarities between different participants’ accounts’ (in Bryman, 2012: 486).
3.5.2.2 Field notes

The decisions relating to audio recording affected the conduct of the other on-voyage fieldwork, as it increased the importance and relevance of notes made during this fieldwork. This provided the opportunity for fieldwork note-taking to add to the partial and contextual knowledge captured through audio recording (ante), however, I was to continually question my thinking and decision making in this regard. It was an ongoing concern whether I was recording sufficient detail in my field notes (after Bryman, 2012: 447-448). I resisted the temptation to digitally record these notes as, due to the nature of the environment, it was almost impossible to make recordings without being overheard and, thereby, possibly contaminating the thinking of other participants. This is a further example of the setting influencing the research approach.

My experience as a police officer informed my approach to field notes, adapting the role of the officer’s Pocket Note Book (PNB) in which I would have recorded contemporaneously, or as soon after the event as possible, any primary evidence, exceptional items or significant events, such as incidents I may have witnessed, a description of a crime scene, or a first account of an incident from a suspected perpetrator or a witness. These PNB notes were then made available for future reference and to refresh recollections. The PNB, as an evidential record for use in the criminal justice system, was intentionally devoid of reflective thought or personal opinion. My field notes have followed PNB principles, however, these were adapted to meet the unique character and the demands of the setting and, of course, incorporated reflection and interpretation of my observations. In my preparations for the voyage, I purchased a variety of notebooks to provide me with flexibility in developing an approach to note-taking.

I carried a small notebook for contemporaneous notes in the large thigh pocket on my waterproof salopettes, however, to keep this jotted note-taking (Bryman, 2012: 450) as unobtrusive as possible I would often ‘go below’ to the saloon or to my cabin to make notes in private. From these contemporaneous notes, when time allowed, I wrote a more detailed account of the day’s events in
a larger notebook as a second iteration, adding contextual detail and reflective or interpretational comment; falling within Bryman's description of *full field notes* (*ibid*). This second iteration of my handwritten field notes was completed whilst I will still in the *milieu* of the voyage. However, the brevity of these *jotted and full field notes* lacked contextual detail, such as technical descriptions (for example, the detailed procedure for hoisting or lowering a sail, or the description of helming practices), meant that these handwritten field notes required a third iteration. These third-iteration notes were written on a laptop in the week following the voyage using the earlier iterations of notes and adding contextual information, reflective comment and interpretation. Rendering these notes in an electronic format enabled analysis using searches for words or phrases.

I use the term *out-of-field notes* to describe the third iteration of field notes, after Delamont's practice in note-keeping in the field (in Walford, 2009: 121); a similar approach was adopted for pre- and post-voyage field notes. All three iterations of these field notes are available sources of data; they provide an insight as my thinking and interpretation of the observational data developed during this study.

The field and out-of-field notes were completed before conducting any detailed review or analysis of the pre-and on-voyage study activities (such as the Voyage Pack or listening to or transcribing the audio recordings), to limit ‘contamination’ of my own thinking. The out-of-field notes were completed before the post-voyage phase of data collection in the crew-group and sea-staff semi-structured interviews. Extracts from the out-of-field notes have been used in the body of this thesis to complement other collected data; further extracts have been included at Appendix H.

### 3.5.3 Post-voyage (T²)

The post-voyage phase of this study allowed me to re-visit the emergent self, interpersonal and community dimensions from the pre- and on-voyage phases (see 4.1 Analysis). Using out-of-field notes and audio transcripts to inform this phase I adopted two different approaches, one for the sea-staff and an alternative approach for the crew and teachers. For the three sea-staff, the opportunity to conduct semi-structured one-to-one interviews arose (for the First
Mate and Bosun: \( T^2 = T^1 + 14 \) weeks; and for the Skipper: \( T^2 = T^1 + 15 \) weeks); these were overtly audio recorded with permission (see schedule at Appendix I).

The arrangements of the post-voyage session with the crew and teachers were made by the teacher/ gatekeeper. There was difficulty in identifying an opportunity to abstract the crew from different classes, lessons, year groups and their timetable, and to match this with the availability of the two teachers. A 60-minute session was arranged (\( T^2 = T^1 + 17 \) weeks; see Appendix I) that brought these participants together as a focus group, attended by the two teachers and ten crew members (one crew member was ill and not in school on the day; and another, an overseas boarder, had not returned to the school for the new academic year). This session took place in a ‘quiet study’ room within the school library and was, with the permission of the participants, audio recorded. To aid with the transcription of this recording, I asked for participants to respect each other and not to talk all at once.

The crew focus group began with a third version of:

*Plus, Minus, Interesting:* this device was again provided for participants to list and describe aspects of their voyage that they retrospectively considered to be a plus, minus or interesting. The question: *What was your voyage like?* (see Appendix G for a composite of pre-, on- and post-voyage responses).

Additionally, for both the sea-staff and crew/ teacher group semi-structured interviews I used *photo-elicitation* to act as a catalyst for, what turned out to be, a relaxed discussion about the voyage (images from this activity can be found at figures 6, 7 and 11 in Chapter 4 Analysis and Findings). There was an ethical consideration that arose in the use of imagery in this activity that I shall explain here.

During the voyage, a ‘boat-camera’ was provided for the use of all sea-staff and crew to capture events as they occurred; there were no directions as to the type of images that could or should have been captured – these are *naturally occurring* images taken during the voyage (after Silverman, 2014). Although the images were taken without direction, they were ‘made as part of..."
the research project’ by the study participants and as such represent research data (Rose, 2016: 307). In addition to providing an electronic copy of these images to the teacher/ gatekeeper at the end of the voyage, these images were posted, in accordance with the consents obtained from the school, on a public-access social media platform used by the sail training provider for a wide selection of their voyage-based imagery captured with the 'boat camera’. The selection of images to be posted on social media was made by the sea-staff from each voyage. It was from these sixty-four publicly available images of their study voyage that participants were invited to select an image that ‘represented their voyage’ (for example, see figures 6, 7 and 11). Study participants were also able to use an image from their own album to act as the catalyst for these sessions. I should reiterate, however, that the purpose of the image was primarily to mediate and facilitate the discussion about participants’ voyage memories (see Clark et al., 2013: 9); however, the content of some of the chosen images is discussed later (post).
Chapter 4 Analysis and Findings

4.1 Analysis

Whilst analysis appears after the description of this study it has, however, been an iterative process that has been activated throughout this study; from the initial concept, writing the research proposal, and its subsequent development and implementation. Hammersley and Atkinson propose:

‘[…] analysis of data is not a distinct stage of research. […] it begins in the pre-fieldwork phase, in the formulation and clarification of research problems, and continues through the process of writing reports, articles and books. Formally, it starts to take shape in analytical notes and memoranda; informally, it is embodied in the ethnographic ideas and hunches’ (2007: 158).

In considering the general approach to the analysis of the collected data, I have accepted Rapley’s position that:

‘all [methods of data analysis] start with a close inspection of a sample of data about a specific issue. This close inspection is used to discover, explore and generate an increasingly refined conceptual description of the phenomena. The resulting conceptual description therefore emerges from, is based on, or is grounded in the data about the phenomena’ (in Silverman (Ed.), 2011: 276).

The analysis has involved both a structured examination of the data and, concurrently, the development of an emerging narrative as I interpreted the data towards meaning-making. This reflects the suggestion that:

‘[analytical] and interpretive processes work in the construction of meaning. […] that analysis carries with it connotations of acts that are ‘cautious, controlled …methodological,’ whereas interpretation connotes the ‘freewheeling …unbounded, generative’ (Wolcott, 1994: 23).

In the process of meaning-making I relied upon the advice of Pring:

‘[…] just as things, activities, bodies of knowledge do not have value independently of people finding value in them, so too propositions, theories, arguments do not have meaning unless people find them meaningful’ (2004: 90).
This collective advice has informed my approach to the data collected across all phases of this study, and extends to those data that I have termed ‘naturally occurring’. The reading, and re-reading, of participant contributions to this study has been:

‘an iterative process in which ideas [have been] used to make sense of data, and data [have been] used to change [my] ideas. [Involving] movement back and forth between ideas and data’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 159).

In this process, I have remained cognisant of Rogoff’s three co-dependent planes of analysis, that is the personal, interpersonal and community (in Wertsch et al., 1995). My early experiences, focussing on identifying or, more accurately, recognising themes, patterns and issues tended to confirm the co-dependency of Rogoff’s planes of analysis as ‘integrated constellations of community practices’ (ante).

My initial analysis considered the content of the data, such as, the contributions from Plus/ Minus/ Interesting, the Voyage Pack and the post-voyage focus group and interviews, specifically looking to attribute the characteristics of personal (self), interpersonal (relationships) and community to participant responses. All Plus/ Minus/ Interesting responses across the three phases of data collection have been collated in a composite Word document; the navigation function allowed for better access to and interrogation of the data (attached at Appendix G). By making this data available to the reader allows you to make your own judgement on my interpretation of the responses and furthers the dialogue.

The Plus/ Minus/ Interesting responses were manually coded to differentiate between my interpretation of inferences to the conceptual planes of self, relationships and community. It was necessary to interpret these responses as there were very few explicit references to self, relationships or community. The result of this manual coding of the Plus/ Minus/ Interesting was then used to inform the searching across the other sources of collected data; cross referencing and contextualising responses and the emergent themes from
other types of data, such as the semi-structured and focus group interviews, and the reviewed literature.

From my analysis, I could recognise individual stories that gave a participant’s narrative of their voyage experience and demonstrated the role of apprenticeship and guided participation. It was possible to weave some of these individual stories with those of other voyage participants; in some instances, the stories related to the same event or interaction, or a common theme. To organise my emergent findings, in addition to the participants’ stories, I collated recurrent themes identified in the Plus/Minus/Interesting bringing together the information from all sources of data into a template; representing the study data, complemented with descriptive statistics or the frequency of a particular theme and, where appropriate, references to the literature. Examples of my approach are attached as analysis templates for self-amalgamating tape (Appendix J) and seasickness (Appendix K).

The collation of the data from different research tools provides the opportunity to compare or triangulate that data. Triangulation derives from the practices found in navigation, in that a more accurate position can be estimated by using a greater number of bearings; this has implications for credibility and validity (Silverman, 2014: 91; see also Yin, 2014: 203-204). In the current study, the research tools have collected a range of responses from participants, and it has been possible to compare these with each other and to then be referenced against my own observations. Moisander and Valtonen suggest that:

‘by looking at an object from more than one perspective, it is possible to produce a more true and certain representation of the object. […] But in cultural research, which focuses on social reality, the object of knowledge is different from different perspectives. And the different points of view cannot be merged, into a single, ‘true’ and ‘certain’ representation of the object’ (2006: 45).

This process allowed me to consider and reflect upon the data, often finding it difficult as this relied too heavily upon my interpretation of the ‘intent’ of the respondent’s written and verbal utterances. Throughout this study, I have been vigilant for the influence of my own bias as it may have affected my
observations, the design of research activities and collection of data, and now in its potential impact in the analysis of data.

This emergent approach sought to distil the ‘facts’ contained within the data and to generate understanding of the ‘whole’ of the cultural process at play. Sacks (1992) argues that ‘in everyday life we determine what is a ‘fact’ by first seeing if there is some convincing explanation around’ (in Silverman, 2014: 112). However, Pring proposes a difficulty when dealing with facts:

‘in associating the ‘facts’ with discrete events, which correspond to the discrete statements supposedly mirroring or picturing them. […] Facts, therefore, are not sorts of things which one observes independently of a particular way of describing the world’ (2004: 216-217).

This gives greater importance to providing any reader with an insight to my personal foundation of experience and describing how I interpret and value ‘facts’.

My determination to make explicit this study’s participants’ contributions and minimise any researcher-bias (see Yin, 2014: 204) found me returning to the advice for investigators of ‘integrated constellations of community practices’:

‘If dominant methods of analysis are assumed to reflect ‘reality’ or to be the only appropriate way to investigate cultural phenomena, this would unduly limit understanding of cultural processes’ (Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002: 213).

I, therefore, returned to the purpose of this study; that is, to explore the sail training voyage as a cultural community (as discussed in Chapter 2); towards comparing it as an orienting framework and the experiences of those who sailed on this voyage as captured and explored through the collected data. As the extant literature is largely silent on how the sail training voyage operates (although it incorporates a residential experience aboard a sailing vessel as described in 2.3 Sail Training), then it would be inappropriate to adopt or limit an analytical approach that may unintentionally constrain (rather than liberate) meaning from this complex research setting; so as to ‘undermine the opportunity to come to a broader understanding of cultural aspects of human development’ (Rogoff and Angelillo, 2002: 218).
4.2 Findings

To present my analysis I have prepared five vignettes. Although these are named after individual participants they incorporate the contributions of other voyage participants on a theme or photo-elicitation image, complemented with detail from my out-of-field notes – these are the stories that I found in my study data. A final section (at 4.2.6) describes the role of seasickness.

Whilst I provide my own perspective, I have endeavoured to prepare each vignette so that it provides, in their own words, the thoughts and feelings of the principal characters and blends contributions from other characters to provide contextual or additional detail. An interpretive narrative has been composed as a bridge ‘to make sense or to give meaning’ to the utterances of these participants, the events and happenings of the voyage to explain the relevance of these vignettes to the research questions (see Bruner, 1990: 48).

The vignettes each have merit and contribute to the widest possible description and explanation of this sail training voyage. As I have selected these stories, drawn from the range of collected data, they exemplify my own interpretation within the orienting framework of the cultural community. The vignettes bring together the richness of participant contributions as ‘cogent and compelling single-case [studies] to raise awareness [and] provide insight’ (Yin, 2014: 182) to the voyage-based experience.

At this point I will remind readers that the pseudonyms used in these vignettes are the crew names that were chosen by the study participants in their pre-voyage session, described in 3.5.1 ante (see also Appendix A).

4.2.1 Seal's Story

I will begin with Seal's Story. Seal has sailed with this sail training provider for the last six years; she first sailed as a crew participant, then returned as a volunteer Watch Leader and, having graduated from university and gained sailing qualifications, was employed as the full-time Second Mate with another sail training provider. It is interesting to note, that Seal has kept a daily photo-diary of her sailing exploits for the last seven years, explaining that:
‘My big sister started doing it, so I copied her. [...] she kept it on and when we were living together we both did it quite a lot. [...] and then it became a bit of sibling rivalry and one of us can’t stop because then the other will beaten. But now it’s, you know, it’s just like brushing your teeth; it’s just something that happens. I keep thinking because it’s getting harder and harder to keep up with it but there are so many more adventures that are on their way I don’t want to stop. Don’t want to stop recording them.’ (Post-voyage interview, lines 75-83).

I am privileged that she has shared with me her entries from this voyage, excerpts are included in the vignette below.

On this voyage, Seal was sailing as the First Mate whilst on leave from her full-time post; this was a role that utilises her qualifications and that she had performed several times before, however, she had not sailed aboard the study vessel for about twelve months.

**Seal’s Story**


(Self-description from Pre-voyage: Pen Picture; see Appendix A).

In looking forward to her voyage, Seal considered her return to sail with friends, and to learn and practise her sailing and sail training skills as a Plus and an Interesting prospect. Seasickness, in common with other voyage participants, was her only pre-voyage Minus (Pre-voyage: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting).

Seal’s record of learning throughout the voyage (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today?) focussed on her own abilities and performance as a professional seafarer. Her return to this vessel, having been away and working aboard another sail training vessel, caused her some concern and activated reflective thought, as she felt:

‘Frustrated that I’m not at the same level I used to be. Anxious [because] I feel out of my comfort zone. This boat used to feel
so much like home, that it was automatic. Now, I have to really think about it. But at the end of the day it’s good for me. Makes me notice bad habits I’ve got in to, challenges me. Makes me a better sailor. And I haven’t been such a busy [First] Mate for ages (new boat [I] don’t have to do as much). Gives me points to work on. And it makes me really think about what I want for my future’. (Voyage Pack: What did you learn on Tuesday? How does this make you feel?).

This personal frustration is described further in her own notes:

‘But if I’m honest I don’t want to be here [at the moment]. I’m out of my comfort zone. Stressed. Feel like I’m doing a shite job. And I’m pushed to do more, like decide where to go. When I’m not at the same place I left, which is so frustrating. I’m just trying to catch back up, let alone progress. I guess now I know what it feels like for many of our volunteers.’

(Personal Photo Diary: Monday).

As one of the more experienced sea-staff aboard this vessel, Seal reflected on her own performance:

Monday: Stressed out [and] out my comfort zone. Busy sorting lots of briefs. Feel really rusty [and] I used to be really good at it, [and] I just don’t feel like I have been doing my job on the boat to the best of my ability.

Tuesday: Got out sailing. Getting in the swing of it. Practicing my job and not perfect but going OK. Just don’t have confidence [and] trust myself as much. But as day went on got more confident […] started to feel more natural.

Wednesday: Had a good chat/ debrief with Skipper, talking through what I’m thinking and feeling. […] A well done/ good work at the end of the day.

Thursday: Overall just good day. Spent the day on watch keeping an eye on the boat, keeping it safe. Left in responsibility [and] became confident in knowing boat without being stood at chart table/ companionway/ deck. Doing job well. Could do other things too.
Friday: *Got off to a bad start today. Not doing enough communication* [and] *I was frustrated at myself as I know better.*

(Voyage Pack: Fortune Line/ Being a crew member).

![Figure 2: Seal at the helm with crew winching in the headsail.](image)

Despite this early trepidation, *Seal* soon began to embrace the challenge and overcame her initial thoughts:

‘*And out to sea we went. […] It’s nice to be left in charge of a navigational watch again, though I don’t feel at home doing it and was on edge most of the time. I’m glad we have good watch leaders, that takes some of the pressure off.*’ (Personal Photo Diary: Tuesday).

The ongoing support and encouragement from the Skipper enhanced her emerging positive attitude:

‘[*[…] got to chat over frustrations and how it is being back [with this Skipper]. How I’m doing. Good to talk over everything I’ve been thinking and so I felt a bit better. Turns out she has no concerns and is pleased, when I’ve not been on [board for] a year, but she will always push.*’

(Personal Photo Diary: Wednesday).
By Thursday, Seal noted; ‘actually feel like a [First Mate] again and that I can do my job, as I did it all day. […] I just felt comfortable with the boat, comfortable with doing my job’ (Personal Photo Diary: Thursday).

As a sail training graduate (that is, having ‘come through the ranks’ from a crew participant), Seal recognised that her experiences have changed her attitudes to many things, including her approach to learning:

Researcher: How would you describe your attitude to learning then?

Seal: I love it. I get bored from standing still. It frustrates me if I’m not learning something, because you can always learn something.

Researcher: If you think back before you even became a volunteer with the [sail training provider], can you recognise a change in yourself?

Seal: Yeah. Before I was even a volunteer I was setting off on my first voyage I hated meeting new people; I was terrified. The reason that I was doing it is because I wanted to go sailing. I certainly didn’t realise that sailing was just the tip of the iceberg, with all of the other things going on. I was quiet as a mouse; didn’t really stand up and take charge, I was just invisible in the background. Then now it’s actually, I really enjoy meeting new people. Yeah, and I expected that to be a big part of my new job.

Researcher: What do you think it is, [about] being involved in sail training that has made that difference?

Seal: Constantly, kind of, being put through those challenges and seeing if you can do it. Because you’ve got to do it and then, yes, the first time you’re scared but then you see that you can and it’s building that confidence.

(Post-voyage interview, lines 46-65).
It is not just her approach to learning the technical sailing skills of the role, Seal described how she felt about the relationships that developed during a voyage:

Resear...h. In respect of when you are working on the boat, how important do you think those are?

Seal: Really important, because it’s [about] helping each other out and being there, and things like that with the volunteers, but it’s also if you don’t build up that sort of relationship with the kids then that means they have a rubbish week. It was when I was starting and learning as a volunteer, that’s when I had the quietness beaten out of me, because if you were just sat there quietly, yes you might be alright, but the kids are just sat there, miserable. It’s kind of building a bit of fun and relationships with them, it kind of helps them during the week.

Resear... Do you think [that it is] because you are being encouraged to do that, or do you think it is just a naturally occurring thing that happens, because you are on a boat?

Seal: I think when I first started I was encouraged more because I was [pause] just because I am naturally, I would naturally go away from people. I wasn’t a people person, but these days it’s just what happens. Sometimes, you know, you do think about it and try and make an extra special effort with this one particular young person, who you can see is not in the group or is struggling a bit more – you might make more of an effort to include them but otherwise it’s just [pause] it happens.

Resear... Have you been in other environments, whether it’s at university or back at school, […] where you’ve had the same situation with someone, who has been quiet, and have you done anything to encourage their participation?

Seal: It was the day that I moved in at uni, there was a girl in the flat below and she was [pause] there was a big group of us going around to explore and things, and I noticed that she
was along with us, but she was quiet as a mouse. So, I went up and started talking to her because I knew what it was like to be that person. I was just scared and quiet as a mouse. And in the end, I ended up living with her for two years.

Researcher: Is that a consequence of what you have learned about yourself in sail training and have been able to transfer it elsewhere?

Seal: I think it is as a consequence of me and how I have changed, that I have had the confidence to not be that person – sitting as quiet as a mouse, and talk to someone and start a conversation. And me knowing what it was like to be that way.

(Post-voyage interview, lines 107-146).

Asked how her involvement in sail training might have manifested in personal change, she offered one explanation as to why this may be the case:

‘[Pause] I don’t know. [Pause] A big part of that is probably the people that were training me […]. And I think, a big part of it was doing things that scared me, and then realising that I can do it. Because when I first started volunteering, every time I went I thought what the hell am I doing, and we’d go out and I would be absolutely terrified but once I got on the boat I knew that I’d be alright.’

(Post-voyage interview, lines 149-158).

Adding, the most important dimension of a sail training voyage is:

‘People. People, and the time those people give and the time that they’ve allowed me to be sailing with them. [In the last year] I feel like I have made no progress […] I’ve done a lot of just standing still and doing my job, so the things that are different is the people, and the way the organisation is working with those people. And for the training and development, and the fun really, as well.’ (Post-voyage interview, lines 232-241).

On this voyage, Seal was, in returning to this familiar setting together with some people that she knew, looking to advance her vocational learning and
experience as a professional seafarer. Although she benefits from this familiarity with the setting, there is always the uncertainty and challenge of the external variables, such as the sea state and weather. On her first ever sail training voyage *Seal* had experienced severe seasickness, and her return to sail again and volunteer with the sail training provider had been unexpected (personal correspondence). Seasickness remains a pre-voyage anxiety for many sailing novices and experts alike; this is discussed in more detail later (see 4.2.6), however, see also Rogers, 2004; Finkelstein and Goodwin, 2006; McCulloch, 2004, 2007; White *et al.*, 2013; Hayhurst *et al.*, 2015; Kafka *et al.*, 2016.

I propose that *Seal*’s frustration at her perceived loss of skill, even though she is working full-time in a sail training setting, arises from her return to the familiar *culture* of this vessel, and its ‘shared sense of communal identity’ (Giddens and Sutton, 2014: 118); as she differentiates the *communal identity* of her full-time vessel and the study vessel. In recognising that ‘*I know what it feels like for many of our volunteers*’ (Personal Photo Diary: Monday) demonstrates empathy for others (albeit she was a volunteer herself, and this appears to be a more recent reflection). *Seal*’s perceived loss of skill was not observable, as I had noted:

[The First Mate] is just getting on with things that she can see need to be done, whereas I require direction […] We then prepare for a rigging check. [The First Mate] dons a safety harness to climb/ be hauled up the mast and arranges a small collection of tools, such as pliers, mousing wire and self-amalgamating tape, that she may require. […] Under the [First Mate’s] direction, the [Bosun] and I take in the slack on the lines as she climbs the mast, occasionally stopping and asking for us to make fast as she checks around the mast. […] It is really impressive to see the [First Mate] dangling from the safety line, moving around the mast looking for possible defects or issues. I am sure that I wouldn’t be so confident working 20 metres or so above the deck and water! This check took us about 30-40 minutes. (Out-of-field notes (Monday): pages 5-6).
Throughout the voyage, *Seal* demonstrated her commitment to the community. She relied upon the support of our skipper as she refreshed her skills, and learned new ones; and, in turn, supported the other sea-staff, and the young crew, as we all engaged in an *apprenticeship*, in the voyage-based ‘culturally organized activities’ towards ‘mature participation in the activity by the less experienced people’ (Wertsch *et al.*, 1995: 142).

By the Thursday, of this voyage, *Seal* was much more confident, as she:

‘[…] *just felt comfortable with the boat, comfortable with doing my job*’
(Personal Photo Diary: Thursday);

‘*Spent the day on watch keeping an eye on the boat, keeping it safe. Left in responsibility [and] became confident in knowing boat without being stood at chart table/ companionway/ deck. Doing job well, could do other things too.*’ (Voyage Pack: Fortune Line – about being a crew member).

This resonates with Griffiths and Mack’s proposition that seafaring is a multisensory experience, as:

‘a sailor’s body and mind calibrate with shifting complexities of rhythmic oceans and weather. Seeing, hearing, and smelling, touching, and tasting a ship’s vital signs, the seafarer becomes an integral member of the shipboard environment.’ (2007: 268).

The description of her experience at university and how she supported a fellow ‘quiet as a mouse’ student is evidence of *Seal*’s transfer of social skills, which she attributes to her sail training experiences and her own personal and social development.

### 4.2.2 Doormat’s Story

*Seal* was a returning member and participant of the community; *Doormat*, however, is a genuine novice providing an opportunity to compare the descriptions of their two experiences. It is important to note, however, that although the same data collection tools have been used for all study participants, the way these tools have been used differs, thereby, stimulating a variety of contributions.
Doormat’s Story

‘My name is doormat (sic). I am 12-year-old. I like cooking and [herpetology] (Self-description from Pre-voyage: Pen Picture; see Appendix A).

The voyage booking process collected additional information, such as medical conditions or where additional support may be required. In this information, Doormat was described as: ‘dyslexic and dyspraxic, […]. She may, for example, struggle with long lists of instructions. […] She communicates well with adults but struggles to interact with other children.’ (Voyage Manifest).

In the pre-voyage activities, Doormat indicated that ‘learning to sail and navigate’ were both Plus and Interesting. ‘Seasickness’ and ‘not getting enough sleep’ were a Minus; she cited ‘more independence’ as a Plus (Pre-voyage: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting).

On arrival at the marina, Doormat was quiet, in comparison to some of her more excited crew mates, but she actively engaged in the process of getting aboard, finding a bunk and stowing her gear. As we were later seated at the saloon table during the introductory session, including the ‘name game’, Doormat was ‘playing’ with a golf-ball sized piece of blue coloured adhesive putty (Field notes: Monday). The boat had been advised that this was a coping strategy and as adhesive putty, along with chewing gum, is prohibited from the boat an exemption had been sought by the school and this had been granted.

On our first day at sea, Doormat did suffer from seasickness (figure 3), and at one point retired to her bunk remarking, after she had been tucked up with a sick-bucket tied-up alongside her: ‘This is delightful’.

31 Herpetology is the study of amphibians and reptiles.
Figure 3: *Doormat*, and the debilitating effects of seasickness.

Retiring to a bunk is one way of coping with seasickness, however, all sufferers are encouraged to stay on deck and to remain active, such as, being involved in keeping lookout or taking the helm (see 4.2.6 Seasickness, *post*). *Doormat* took this advice, and later took the helm (see figure 4):

![Figure 4: *Doormat* at the helm – a cure for seasickness?](image)

She later reflected that:

‘*It wasn’t very much fun when I was being sick and trying to steer ...well I wasn’t being sick but trying to stop from being sick*’
and trying to steer […] it made you stand up which was really good if you were feeling sick.’

(Post-voyage Crew focus group; lines 444-457).

At the end of our first day at sea at our daily debrief, as we were again all seated around the saloon table, Doormat’s piece of adhesive putty was now only pea-sized. We did not see the adhesive putty again until the final day of our voyage at the end-of-voyage debrief, as we discussed the crew’s return train journey a golf-ball sized piece of adhesive putty re-appeared (see comment below).

Seasickness remained a Minus for Doormat, however, she added ‘[meeting] new people’ as a Plus, and ‘living in close confines with other people’ as an Interesting dimension of her voyage experience (Voyage Pack: Plus/Minus/Interesting).

During the voyage, I observed that everyone’s approach to tasks and problem solving evolved. In this excerpt, as we sailed from Porth Wen back towards the Isle of Man, the wind direction and strength provided us with the opportunity to hoist another sail. This activity involved Doormat:

The [First Mate] looked around at those sitting in the cockpit who could help; she asked Doormat to reach up (about five feet above the deck) and lower the line securing the port-side stack pack. Doormat stood up, she was clipped on to the [cockpit] jack-stay which restricted her movement – it would have been so easy for her to admit defeat, however, she looked around and re-clipped on to the jack-stay running in front of the mizzen mast [giving her another two or three feet of scope on her safety line] and asked a fellow crew mate [who was seated in the cockpit] to unclip her original clip, this gave her the extra scope [on her safety line] to stand on the cockpit combing and winch to reach up to complete her task. Another [crew member] was

32 The stack pack is a device, attached to the boom that makes sail handling easier.
asked to do the same task on the starboard side. The [First Mate] then allocated them to the next stage of the process; she gave detailed instructions and sequence – [the First Mate] continued to communicate using the crew member’s names as they proceeded giving them support, encouragement and praise, as necessary. Within 8 minutes they had hoisted the mizzen sail. […] the [First Mate] was standing alongside the two crew members in quite an intimate interaction; no shouting required.

(Out-of-field notes page 49; lines 5-31).

In the planned research activities, Doormat described what and how she had learned throughout her voyage; meeting her pre-voyage aspirations to ‘learn how to sail and navigate’. This included how the lifejackets work, the different types of knots used, what to do on an anchor (sic) watch, a ‘man over board’ practis (sic) is more complicated than it seems, and in poor visibility you need to keep a closer eye out for other boats. She described how this learning had occurred through her active participation in the voyage activities, by being shown, practising and through experience (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today?).

In considering her voyage experience, Doormat compared her school and voyage approaches to learning:

‘It was quite interesting learning all of the different parts of the boat and you remembered them all because you had to use them. Whereas if we were learning how to find the area of a prism …you’ve never used it. [pause] …but when we were on the sailing trip we needed to know how to […] which rope to use to hoist up the sail.’

(Post-voyage Crew focus group; lines 378-382).

By the end of her voyage, captured in the end-of-voyage feedback, Doormat recognised some change in herself; in that she was more confident about ‘talking to people [her own] age’ and that
‘[she] will be more independent and more able to form [her] own opinion (sic) at home’ (End-of-voyage feedback).

The accommodation of and differentiation for the needs of crew members to engage and enjoy their voyage is common practice with this sail training provider, such as, *Doormat*’s need to use adhesive putty as a coping strategy. This enabling and inclusive culture was described by the skipper:

‘[…],* so, you get a group of youngsters, and whatever we are going to try do with them has got to be achievable. Even in the first instance of them walking down the pontoon, to how they then get on board, you either know whether they are going to be bouncing-like-a-box-of-frogs, or they’re really timid, lacking confidence. So, bouncing-like-a-box-of-frogs [they] would probably benefit from maybe going out and […] they’re going to be seasick for six hours; whereas the less confident we’ll probably do a little short hop to build their confidence, and take them in before they become seasick, or even just short trips. […] tailoring it so it becomes achievable and everyone can take part, and then through the week, as it goes, make the milestones bigger. You get some, […] just sitting around the table is a big enough challenge as it is, where then if that is the challenge of sitting around the table and being civil, then that’s where you are at.’

(Post-voyage: Interview with Skipper, lines 39-53).

Seasickness, in common with most voyage crew, concerned *Doormat* across all phases of her contributions to this study, however, she showed a great deal of resilience in overcoming this debilitating experience, and without resort to her adhesive putty. The research activities were not sufficiently sensitive to investigate the changes in her coping strategy, but I was reassured that despite the challenges of the voyage, especially seasickness (discussed further at 4.2.6), she could cope without her adhesive putty (this may or may not be significant and is not within the scope of this study). This change in her behaviour could indicate enhanced resilience, ‘the ability to react to adversity and
challenge in an adaptive and productive way’ (Hayhurst et al, 2015: 40); and that this may ‘not only promote skills and strengths that help youth adapt to past and present adversity, but also decrease the likelihood of future difficulties’ (ibid: 41).

As Doormat became more confident during our voyage, she embraced the ‘culturally organized activities’; her learning related to these activities and had occurred through guided participation, ‘[involving] individuals and their social partners, communicating and coordinating their involvement as they participate in socioculturally structured collective activity’ (Rogoff in Wertsch et al., 1995: 146). The observations of her involvement in releasing the stack pack and hoisting of the sail (described in the vignette above), showed how she solved the problem, that is, the restrictive scope of her safety line to respond to the request for assistance from the First Mate as she cooperated in the valued activity of hoisting the mizzen sail.

Doormat made an interesting comparison of her voyage-based and her school-based social experiences and learning, which relate closely to Dewey’s (1916) occupations as education: ‘[leveraging] the interests and industries of the (always social) child, as well as orient these to increasingly complex and widening forms of mature, social activity’ (in Quay and Seaman, 2013: 88). The utility of the learning was a theme in her response, in that the learning had a temporal and spatial relevance to her active participation in the voyage experience.

In reviewing end-of-voyage feedback from this and other voyages, it is common to find responses relating to tying knots, hoisting sails (see figure 5) or cooking and cleaning; these being the cultural activities and endeavours of the community. However, in her written responses in the end-of-voyage feedback questionnaire, Doormat recognised that her social relationships with her peers had changed, adding to her established repertoire of relationships with adults (as cited in the voyage booking information), in responding to the statement:
I feel more confident about what I can do.
Response: *talking to people my age*
(End-of-Voyage feedback).

![Figure 5: Hoisting the mainsail](image)

In her daily report of learning (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today?), *Doormat* cited the cultural activities of the vessel, however, in the end-of-voyage feedback questionnaire she described a more socially oriented aspect of her learning:

Q6: Tell us about one thing that you learned during your voyage?
Response: *living in close confines with other people is not horrible*
Q7: How did you learn about your answer to 6. Above?
Response: *by living in close confines with other people.*
(End-of-voyage feedback).

This demonstrates how the characteristics of the vessel, that is the confinement and enforced social interactions, shaped her learning from the voyage experience.

### 4.2.3 *Salmon’s Story*

A second novice to this setting was *Salmon*. In addition to the presentation of her collective contributions to this study this vignette describes her *discovery* of self-amalgamating tape, a weather-proof, rubberised-silicon adhesive tape that relies upon its chemical properties to
bond to itself, rather than a tacky adhesive, that acquired a cult-status with some members of the crew.

Salmon’s Story

‘I am Salmon 13 years old sporty - football, tennis, karate. I have a cat and two fish. I am scared of spiders [and] clowns. I have a brother. I am half Scottish quarter Finnish quarter Hungarian. I don’t like cheese. I go to [school]. I like art.’

(Self-description from Pre-voyage: Pen Picture; see Appendix A).

In the pre-voyage activities, Salmon considered ‘meeting new people, making new friends and new experiences’ to be a Plus. ‘Seasickness’ was a Minus (although, in the event, this was not an issue for her); and ‘How the boat works’ was an Interesting aspect of her forthcoming voyage (Pre-voyage: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting).

Salmon stated that her early, on-voyage learning included being safe on and off the boat, changing the headsail and the introduction to self-amalgamating tape. Describing how this learning occurred:

Monday: One of the crew members explained why it was important and demonstrated it before we had a chance to try it ourselves.

Tuesday: The crew members told us how to do it as we were going because there was not time to brief us about it.

Wednesday: [Bosun] took us on to the bow and we taped sharp [bits].

(Voyage Pack; What did you learn today?)

On Wednesday, Salmon learned ‘that self-amalgamating tape is the best thing in the world’. Self-amalgamating tape was used, in this instance, to wrap the sharp edges of split- and cotter pin fixings to prevent them from causing injury or snagging clothing. Salmon felt ‘EXTREMELY HAPPY! (emphasis in original)’ about her new discovery. (Voyage Pack; What did you learn today?).

The circumstances for this learning occurred when the Bosun, as part of her routine maintenance duties, announced that she was to
go forward to check and adjust any fastenings forward of the main mast. Three of the young crew, including Salmon, asked if they could accompany her to the bow. These volunteers all clipped-on to the starboard jackstay, and they made their way forward to the bow, in company with the Bosun.

Salmon, together with one other crew member and the Bosun, picked this image (Post-voyage Crew focus group: Photo-elicitation. figure 6):

Figure 6: Salmon with two of her crew mates, and self-amalgamating tape, on the bow.

She gave this rationale for her choice:

‘I picked the same one as [crew member Paul] and it's just the same the waves coming crashing over. And I like it because it's when we first met self-amalgamating tape.

Researcher: [How] did you learn about self-amalgamating tape?

Salmon: Well we went [pause] some of us went on to the bow with [the Bosun] and we were self-amalgamating these little things that were sticking out so that no-one got their trousers caught. […] I bought some and so did [crew member Matilda]

Researcher: What colour?
Salmon: Red and blue…
Researcher: …so is that now a prized possession?
Salmon: Yes.'

(Post-voyage Crew focus group, lines 35-54).

The Bosun gave a more detailed rationale for her choice of the same image (Photo-elicitation):

‘[…] there was three of them up on the bow with me and we were getting splashed with waves, and they were having a great time, and that was when they got introduced to the self-amalgamating tape. Yes, up at the bow, they were just so interested in everything so willing to learn about stuff. I really liked that. Having so much fun. They were quite a young group, so like everything was so new and exciting to them so [pause], they were just interested to learn because they are so young as well. Yeah, they were always asking questions as well. [Self-amalgamating tape] is really cool, it’s a tape, black tape but I think you can get it in different colours, […] it has a plastic backing on it and it sticks to itself when you stretch it, so in order to apply you have to stretch it round and it kind of like shrinks …we use it on split pins and stuff around the boat so that they don’t catch on people or on clothing and stuff…

Researcher: Why were they so interested in that then?
Bosun: […] because it was something that they’d never seen before I think. It is pretty cool and they got to do it themselves, I showed them how to use it and they got to put it on the boat, which was quite cool. I think they enjoyed that. […] I think I might have shown one of the girls before and then I said that I was going to use some, and then a few of them like ‘Ooh, can we come and see?’. So yes, they clipped on and came up. So, I think they wanted to come up and have a look.

Researcher: You mentioned that you actually showed them how you use it and what it is used for, and then let them have a go. What effect did that have, do you think?
Bosun: It wasn’t just them sitting and watching me do it, they got to be active and have a part in all of the stuff on board.

Researcher: You mentioned about the waves splashing them, when they are sitting on the bow. […] What effect do you think that has?

Bosun: Well it’s just a completely new experience again, that they have never had before, and it is pretty cool, all three sitting up there and getting absolutely soaked […] Yeah, it is fun.’

(Post-voyage interview with Bosun, lines 2-49).

There had only been three crew members involved in the self-amalgamating tape experience, however, on the same day (Wednesday), seven crew members cited self-amalgamating tape as the subject of their learning that day; two crew members attributed their learning to Salmon:

Cat: Self-amalgamating tape is great. [Salmon] told me. Amazed.

Lottie: Self-amalgamating tape is amazing. It bonds to itself. [Salmon] told me what it does on our night watch. I haven’t seen it yet. [Excited] to use self-amalgamating tape.

(Voyage pack: What did you learn on Wednesday?).

On this voyage, the initial learning involved larger- and whole-group interactions in the safety briefings; this introduced participants to the dominant approach to learning used during the voyage, that is, Explain, Demonstrate, Imitate and Practice or EDIP (this is discussed as another way of learning in Chapter 5). For example, ‘One of the crew members explained why it was important and demonstrated it before we had a chance to try it ourselves’ (Voyage Pack; What did you learn today?).

This vignette also demonstrates the potential for guided participation in cascading or the sharing of learning by those from the ‘primary’ experience, creating a ‘secondary’ transformative experience for their peers. The discovery of self-amalgamating tape, an artefact of the organizational activities of the vessel, presented as a social interaction
between the Bosun and the three crew members; which I will term the ‘primary’ experience. The crew participants in this social interaction had volunteered to participate, they were keen to learn about the Bosun’s job, on the bow with the ‘waves coming crashing over’. This guided participation, as the Bosun (the ‘expert’) engaged Salmon, and her crew mates, in the ‘activities of [the] community’ (Rogoff, 1990: 8); that is, the use of self-amalgamating tape. This routine activity, used as an example of guided participation, relied upon the social interaction of its participants, the willingness of the Bosun to share her expertise, and the eagerness and motivation of the young crew members to engage in the activity.

An added benefit from this learning was Salmon’s role in cascading her experience and learning to crew mates, that were not involved in the original interaction, as she became the ‘expert’ in ‘secondary’ guided participation. This was evidenced by the fact that, although only three crew were involved in the ‘primary’ experience, by the end of the day seven crew members gave ‘self-amalgamating tape’ as an example of their learning. This cascading, sharing or crossover of learning to other crew mates, through further guided participation, was attributed to Salmon; even though Lottie admitted that she had not yet seen self-amalgamating tape. It could be that Salmon acted as a socio-cultural broker by introducing and interpreting the characteristics of this cultural artefact (self-amalgamating tape) for her crew mates (after Haslberger and Brewster, 2008: 334). The power of this cultural community experience is, perhaps, further evidenced by some crew member’s post-voyage purchase of self-amalgamating tape.

4.2.4 Donald Duck’s Story

Donald Duck joined the voyage as a senior teacher from the girls’ school, and an experienced recreational sailor aboard sailing vessels, but she had no experience of sail training or a sail training vessel. This prior experience placed Donald Duck in a different position, or point of entry, to that of the younger novice crew. There is no pre-voyage data for Donald Duck, as she was unable
to attend the pre-voyage session; meaning that this vignette relies upon on- and post-voyage contributions to this study.

Donald Duck’s Story

Donald Duck is an experienced teacher, the school’s lead for a STEM subject; although she does not teach any of the crew on this voyage. An experienced recreational sailor, she knew (or, at least, expected) that she would experience seasickness in the early part of a voyage.

As the crew and teachers first arrived (after a six-hour train journey) alongside the boat in the marina, and as the crew loaded their luggage on board. This was the first time that I had met her and so I introduced myself; we discussed that we would be sharing a cabin for the week. I offered the upper bunk, if she would prefer it to the lower bunk. She was content with the lower bunk.

Once the crew had located their own bunks and stowed their gear, the Skipper began the introductory session, with us all seated at the saloon table. In the ‘name game’ both teachers, sailing as Watch Leaders, preferred the ‘girls to use a more formal Miss or Mrs’ (Out-of-field notes: page 11, lines 26-29).

Following the initial briefings, the First Mate and Bosun took the crew ashore; this allowed the two teachers to discuss the plans for the voyage with the Skipper and, using their pre-existing, albeit in some cases limited, knowledge of the girls, they allocated the crew members to one of three watches, and the separate meal rota. Each watch of four girls and a Watch Leader would take responsibility for the sailing of the vessel; the meal rota involved a staff-leader and two crew taking responsibility for the preparation of a meal (that is, breakfast, lunch and dinner), on each day and clearing up afterwards. The watches and meal rota blended the sea-staff and crew members in to different permutations. The watches and meal rota were then written on laminated sheets to be promulgated on the notice board. Donald Duck
and I were appointed as joint-watch leaders for our watch of four girls, but had separate meal rota responsibilities.

In her Voyage Pack, Donald Duck indicated that learning and refreshing sailing skills, and the ‘chance to get to know the girls whom I don’t teach yet’ as a Plus. The opportunity to become more ‘involved with navigation, etc. but don’t feel that I can ask’ and ‘feeling apart from all sides neither one thing nor another’ were a Minus (and these would become recurring thoughts). Interesting aspects of the voyage included: visiting new places, finding out more about how [the sail training provider] works, the career paths of the [sea-staff] on board, and finding out [her] own capabilities, remarking ‘I still don’t push myself too far beyond what I know, but I’ve done a few things that I don’t feel comfortable with’ (Voyage Pack: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting).

Donald Duck worked to engage and motivate our watch in the day-to-day operation of the vessel; during the early part of the voyage this was particularly difficult, as she looked after our novice crew as they were introduced to and experienced seasickness, whilst struggling with it herself.

Donald Duck reflected on her learning:
Tuesday: That I don’t know as much as I thought about sailing a large yacht. It’s not like anything I’ve done previously in some ways, but it is in others.
Wednesday: That girls recover quickly and adapt more easily than older women – a gross generalisation but I’m constantly amazed by the girls I teach. I don’t have a huge ability to comfort girls who I don’t know well. It’s quite sobering how you find out that you’re not as good as you think.
Thursday: That I am still challenging myself but can’t quite make the grade with some things.

(Voyage pack: What did you learn today?).
Donald Duck described her sense of belonging, as a member of the crew: ‘still having to ask’; ‘Not feeling part of anything – neither crew nor girl’ (Voyage Pack: Fortune Lines). However, when she contributed to teaching one of the Competent Crew sessions on Friday morning, she: ‘felt much more useful today, able to help with some teaching’ (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today? How does that make you feel?).

The positive experience of sailing with the novice crew was countered by the uncertainty of Donald Duck’s position:

‘My most memorable moment was when we were sailing with all of the sails up, and the fact that you guys had worked so hard in putting them all up and then working as a team together. It was really something to make the boat go really fast, and we were flying along. And least memorable moment, me personally, feeling utterly useless not knowing what to do right at the beginning. Not knowing where anything is even though I’ve been on a boat before but not on this boat before so it is quite hard to take not knowing what to do in that situation.’

(End-of-voyage debrief, lines 215-223).

In the post-voyage activities, the voyage experience, getting to know new people, the positive effect on the crew and how they coped with the environment were cited as a Plus. Seasickness, and being positioned between the young crew and the sea-staff were a Minus. Learning about the boat, in common with some of the novice crew, and ‘getting used to living in close quarters with others’ was Interesting. (Post-voyage: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting).

In selecting this image (see figure 7) from the voyage Donald Duck gave her rationale:

‘[…] it is a good photo of everybody, absolutely everybody …but also every single person on there is smiling, and I just thought that represented the whole spirit of the trip. Even though they might not have been feeling quite up to it …to get
a smile on your face. That was great [...]. (Photoelicitation in Post-voyage Crew focus group, lines 132-140).

Figure 7: Group image of the crew in the cockpit.

This image was selected by another three voyage participants, each with a similar rationale:

*Dolphin:* ‘I chose it because the sky is bright and it was like a lousy day, and you can tell from everyone’s face that everyone’s really tired but they are still smiling and it kind of just reminds me of the week. I didn’t have a shower every day, my hair looked awful and it just like …even though it wasn’t the brightest day everybody was still smiling and having fun’

(Post-voyage Crew focus group, lines 156-161);

*Penguin*: ‘I chose this photo because it’s all [...] like everyone that went on the voyage, and I am the one that is doing the steering. I think it was the last day of our trip that I liked, before we did the night sail, and I was quite sad that we had to end it [recording too faint].’

(Post-voyage Crew focus group, lines 95-98).
Seal, the First Mate:

‘It’s just a great photo of everyone around in the cockpit. […] On a nice sunny day. […] I was tempted by other photos that had a lot of pretty boat, sunsets and dolphins and things like that but what I actually remember about the voyage, this is the one that I looked at and it reminded me what actually happened on the voyage, who was on it. It’s what made the voyage different from other ones. I’ve got so many photos of pretty sunsets, pretty few of dolphins and things like that. This is what actually reminded me of who was on it, what actually happened.’

(Post-voyage interview, lines 2-11).

Donald Duck found the voyage experience had, perhaps, changed her relationship with those who had sailed with her:

‘I’d like to say that it was really good to be with all of you on this voyage, and as you said we got know each other quickly, in a small confined space. I was really pleased how well you all took to it because I wasn’t sure how it would go down really and you were all so cheerful for most of the time even though it was quite difficult for you in an environment that I don’t think any of you had been in before.’

(Post-voyage Crew focus group, lines 360-366).

Donald Duck’s situation differed from that of the young crew and her fellow teacher/watch leader; having embarked upon the voyage with some concept of possible selves (after Bruner). Her prior experience, both as a teacher and recreational sailor, allowed for reflection on her ‘current’ experience and that which she had envisaged pre-voyage, for example, seasickness was a familiar anxiety (see 4.2.6 below). This situation privileges a unique perspective and allowed for differentiation between the ‘true’ novice, such as the young crew, and the ‘more experienced’ novice. Donald Duck’s contributions imply she was encountering a liminal space,
and was ‘betwixt and between’ a known and an unknown place (after Foucault in Rabinow (2000); post):

‘That I don’t know as much as I thought about sailing a large yacht. It’s not like anything I’ve done previously in some ways, but it is in others.’ (Voyage pack: What did you learn on Tuesday?);


I would argue this gives credence to Foucault’s statement that, as a liminal space, ‘the ship […] is the greatest reservoir of imagination’ (adapted from Rabinow, 2000: 184-185; ante).

As an experienced teacher, it may be that Donald Duck was more sensitive, than her younger crew, to the liminality of the voyage space and exercised her reflective thought to different effect. There is evidence that reflective thought went beyond her sailing skills, engaging reflection on her social relationships, for example:

Wednesday: […] I don’t have a huge ability to comfort girls who I don’t know well. It’s quite sobering how you find out that you’re not as good as you think.

Thursday: That I am still challenging myself but can’t quite make the grade with some things.

(Voyage pack: What did you learn today?).

It was evident that Donald Duck was more at ease when back in her comfort zone, teaching a session from the Competent Crew syllabus as she ‘felt much more useful today, able to help with some teaching’ (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today? How does that make you feel?). The selection of the same group image (at figure 7) by Donald Duck and the other three participants (photo-elicitation) demonstrates a strong case for the sense of belonging and relationships that developed during our voyage.

The four vignettes set out above provide a narrative for the positive aspects of the voyage experience, however there were two aspects of this voyage that described less positive aspects of the experience. One situation, perhaps more significant for those crew members who were involved, was a
perceived breach of confidence, by the Skipper, when she disclosed that some
girls had been gossiping – even though the content of their conversation was
not disclosed (see 4.2.5 Salmon and Paul's Story). Seasickness was cited as a
rather negative experience; however, this was an experience affecting the
everging relationships between voyage participants (see 4.2.6 Seasickness).

4.2.5 Salmon and Paul's Story

A situation that disrupted, albeit for a short time, the on-board
relationships was a case of 'eavesdropping' (by the Skipper to a
conversation that the participants thought was secret) which is described
in this vignette. The 'situation' involved three or four girls, who were sitting-
on-the-rail (see figure 8, although this image was not taken during the
situation described in the vignette), and the skipper, however, it had such
significance for two of the girls, Salmon and Paul, that the incident was
subject of their contributions to the Voyage Pack.

Figure 8: An example of sitting-on-the-rail.
Salmon and Paul’s Story

You have already met Salmon above. Paul describes herself as:

‘I am nearly 14 years old and have two elder siblings. I live in [city] but was born in Abu Dhabi (UAE). I play football for a club. I am the goalie.’ (Self-description from Pre-voyage: Pen Picture; see Appendix A).

On the fourth day of the voyage, the novice crew became more accustomed to the movement of the vessel-under-sail and, whilst clipped-on, were better able to move around the boat. As we sailed back to the Isle of Man, three or four of the crew, including Salmon and Paul, were given permission to make their way forward, where they sat with their legs dangling over the side of the boat – they were ‘sitting on the rail’. They were ‘on the rail’ for more than two hours; and during this time the Skipper worked on the tender, a small rigid inflatable boat (RIB) situated adjacent to the girls sitting-on-the-rail. From my position in the saloon, as I was writing up my field notes, I could see the skipper working about one metre behind the crew; it transpired that those sitting-on-the-rail did not know the skipper was there.

Later in the day, the Skipper commented that the crew, who had been sitting-on-the-rail, had been gossiping and that she had overheard part of the conversation as she had worked on the tender; albeit the content of this conversation was not disclosed. At the end-of-day de-brief session, as everyone completed their Voyage Pack, the ‘gossip’ became an issue, not so much as what was said but that gossip had taken place.

For Salmon and Paul, this was captured in their responses to research activities, as they indicated that the ‘gossiping session’ had been a Plus, however, their perceived breach of confidence by the Skipper, was cited as a Minus (Voyage Pack: Plus/Minus/Interesting).

Salmon declared that she had learned ‘that [the Skipper] can’t keep a secret’, having assumed, erroneously, the content of the
‘gossip’ had been shared with the other voyage participants. *Paul ‘learnt that [the Skipper] is great at eavesdropping’, and had also assumed that the conversation had been shared; she was, however, unsure how she felt about this. (Voyage Pack: What did you learn today?). In the event, although the fact that the crew ‘sitting on the rail’ had been gossiping, the content of the conversation had not been shared.

This event was raised at the Crew focus group; *Salmon*’s perception was that the Skipper had breached their confidence, even though the content of their conversation had not been disclosed; this was confirmed by their teacher, *Sherlock*:

> Researcher: [...] one thing was mentioned about [the skipper] overhearing some gossip [pause] now I don’t know what the gossip was, but how did that make you feel?  
> *Salmon*: [pause] *it was a bit* [pause] *because you couldn’t really talk about something in private because there was always someone there*…

> Researcher: [...] but that’s a consequence of living in a small space, isn’t it?  
> *Penguin*: *We didn’t know that she was there otherwise we wouldn’t have*…  
> *Salmon*: [...] *she didn’t hear the whole story*…

> Researcher: [...] but I am not aware that she said what she’d heard. She mentioned that there was gossip, but didn’t mention what exactly was said…  
> *Sherlock*: *I don’t know what it was*…  
> *Salmon*: *Ahh* [laughter] [pause] *No, it’s fine.* [laughter].

(Post-voyage Crew focus group lines 318-340).

This episode demonstrates the restrictive characteristics of the on-board setting, in that ‘*you couldn’t really talk about something in private because there was always someone there’* (*Salmon* in Post-voyage Crew focus group). The
nature of the social environment manifests in a living experience where participants have:

‘to deal with different people that [they] wouldn’t usually deal with, or live with, or even spend any time with, or communicate; just that whole living aspect of being in that one boat that then moves around, shakes you up like a don’t know what. You are sleeping there, you are eating there, you’re going to the toilet – all of them sort of aspects.’

(Post-voyage interview with Skipper; lines 265-272).

This skipper was particularly sensitive for the need for good communication, and her approach to the crew and sea-staff:

‘[…] sailing really isn’t rocket-science, but managing the people is, managing them, how you are with them and how you are, and how you communicate with them affects what you get back. […] you can see it sometimes if you’re rude, or maybe talk to them in a certain manner [affects] the response you get, and then […] because you don’t know each other as soon as you have something like that, that negative, a negative will grow and it is very hard to claw back once you’re started going down that road of negativity […]’

(Post-voyage interview; lines 90-99).

Figure 9: Paul’s Voyage Fortune Line
Despite *Salmon* and *Paul*’s initial responses in their study Voyage Packs, this situation was not referred to again (until I raised it in the post-voyage crew focus group). *Paul*’s voyage Fortune Line (see figure 9), dealing with her feelings towards the sea-staff and crew, showed a ‘dip’ in her response on Thursday, giving the explanation as ‘People are good at eavesdropping’ (Voyage Pack).

There is no evidence that this event undermined the authority of the skipper, or had any lasting impact on the relationship between the crew, and especially *Salmon* and *Paul*, and the skipper. Salmon’s Fortune Line shows a very positive upward trend on Thursday; and no decline in her feeling towards the sea-staff or crew (see figure 10), despite the ‘eavesdropping’ event; there is no explanation for the ‘dip’ on Tuesday/ Wednesday.

Along with their fellow crew mates, both *Salmon* and *Paul* expressed a wish to embark on another voyage (Post-voyage Crew focus group). This, perhaps, demonstrates the overwhelming emotional bond and resonance of this setting, with its supportive social structure enabling participation in the endeavours of the community as that of a *primal band* and the survival-driven need for understanding and cooperation (Goleman *et al.*, 2013: 218, *ante*).

Figure 10: *Salmon*’s Voyage Fortune Line
It may also have been relevant that this young crew were all girls, with a predominantly female sea-staff. This study has not explored the role of single-sex programmes, but there is evidence that infers single-sex programmes ‘facilitate greater participation in skill acquisition and self-expression for girls’ (Whittington et al., 2011: 4; see also Budbill, 2008; McKenney, 1996). The confidence of Salmon and Paul’s self-expression in raising the ‘eavesdropping’ event with the Skipper, albeit short-lived, may have been a positive outcome for this all-girl crew. The voyage-based setting does appear, through its naturally-occurring structure, to meet some of the requirements for girl-only adventure, including:

‘intentional relationship building activities, creating an inclusive environment, proactive and creative group management, teaching communication and conflict resolution skills, self-expression activities, and strong adult leadership with diverse role models.’ (Whittington et al., 2011:11).

These vignettes demonstrate the supportive structure of the on-board cultural setting as we engaged in the valued endeavours of the community, that is, sailing the vessel from one location to another. The themes were dominated by the roles of self, relationships and the environment/ community as ‘integrated constellations’ (after Rogoff in Wertsch et al., 1995).

4.2.6 Seasickness

Seasickness was a theme in this study, it has been cited as a factor in other sail training studies and merits further consideration as to its effect on the overall sail training experience. Indeed, Kurt Hahn proposed that seasickness may have unique and beneficial characteristics:

‘I remember so well my dispute with an eminent man representing the educational section of a famous Foundation. He challenged me to explain what sailing in a schooner could do for international education. In reply, I said we had at that moment the application before us for a future king of an Arab country to enter Gordonstoun. I happened to have at the school some Jews representing the best type of their race. If the Arab and one of
these Jews were to go out sailing on our schooner, the Prince Louis, perhaps in a Northeasterly (sic) gale, and if they were become thoroughly seasick together, I would have done something for international education.’ (Hahn, 1954: 2).

Seasickness is a type of motion sickness or kenetose; it is a condition that particularly affects teenagers and young adults and which is compounded by the inescapability of the ship-board setting, and is complicated by dehydration and exposure. Symptoms include ‘pallor, cold sweat, nausea, and sickness’; and extend to secondary behavioural and mood indicators:

‘weakness, dry mouth, headache, fatigue, need for fresh air, feeling of coldness, sensitivity to smell, apathy, the desire to be alone, indifference to companions, lack of motivation, lack of interest, spatial disorientation, anxiety and depression. […] [Behavioural] differences include: reduced spontaneity, carelessness, reduced muscle co-ordination and motor performance, poorer temporal judgement, and impaired mathematical ability’ (Stadler, 1984: 59-60).

These symptoms, behaviours and moods have an effect on the crew, however, the effect quickly fades, like flicking a switch, once a vessel is back in port.

For this study’s participants, seasickness was a common pre-voyage anxiety; 69% (n=11) of crew cited seasickness as a Minus (Pre-voyage: Plus/Minus/Interesting); and remained a Minus for 53% (n=8) of participants (Post-voyage: Plus/Minus/Interesting). On-voyage 23% (n=4) and post-voyage 20% (n=3) seasickness was a Plus for some participants, in particular, those who had not suffered from it at all or who had recovered (Voyage Pack: Plus/Minus/Interesting).

Seasickness and overcoming its affects has featured in many seafaring texts, for example:

‘I now began to feel unsettled and ill at ease about the stomach, as if matters were all topsy-turvy there; and felt strange and giddy about the head and so I made no doubt that this was the beginning of the dreadful thing the seasickness is.’ (Melville, 2016 [1849]: 28);
'Soon we regretted the sumptuous breakfast [...] Between the constant rolling and pitching as we motored southward [...] seasickness was rampant. I had never before, nor have I ever since, suffered from *mal de mer*. [A crew man] jokingly pointed out that I should not fear dying from seasickness as I was ‘too sick to die’. I drew little comfort from his attempts to cheer me and ate no food for thirty-six hours.' (Stillwaggon (2012) in Gould (Ed.), 2012: 6, italics in original).

Seasickness is reported as an influencing factor in sail training studies too, for example:

‘Most people showed signs of tiredness and exhaustion on the first few days due to seasickness, the amount of new information that had to be absorbed, the 24-hour watch system, and the continual disturbance of sleep from tacking calls and participants chatting in the cabin area. I was fortunate enough not to suffer seasickness but those who did were unable to eat or sleep, and I saw and heard from them that they felt dreadful.’ (Rogers, 2004: 22-23);

‘For the youth crew, the voyage on the ship also involves a challenging physical environment; they must adapt to life on board, which means dealing with possible adverse weather conditions, disrupted sleep patterns, and the debilitation of sea-sickness (*sic*). The assumption at work here is that learning to manage physically and socially demanding conditions will lead to the enhancement of a variety of individual and interpersonal competencies.’ (Finkelstein and Goodwin, 2006: 7).

Many seafarers will become seasick at the beginning of their voyage and how they are encouraged to cope with this unpleasant experience is distinctly situated in the voyage setting. The Skipper of this voyage describes her approach to seasickness:

‘It’s there, they’ve got to do it and we, sort of, make it into the way they then choose to [deal with] it which I think is [...] a big milestone for their heads really. They’re going to drag themselves out of bed, after a little bit of [coaxing], when they’re feeling ill. I think however much seasickness is not particularly nice, but really you don’t get that in any other sport, [...]
because if you were at home, or if you were in a residential centre you would be sent to bed, you would be looked after, you might be sent to the doctors, you need a day off school [...] Where on a boat that doesn’t happen – it’s like, you’re ill, OK [...] it’s only seasickness and you are not going to die. Drink water, try and eat something and right, it’s time for your watch. Bring your bucket with you, or take it to the toilet with you. It’s just it might come across as being quite cruel sometimes, but I think what they get from actually getting through it is something quite powerful as well. Working when they are not feeling their best. Some people just go blatantly ‘No, I’m dead, I’m not going to do anything’, but for those who do get through it I think the achievement like on debriefings and such at the end of the day or two days, whatever, that ‘I wasn’t sick’ or that ‘I was sick but I still did this’ is quite powerful as well. I think they’re the sort of people that become your leaders.’

(Skipper Post-voyage interview, lines 275-296).

A crew suffering from seasickness is a limiting factor to any planned voyage as their capability, as active members of the crew, will ebb and flow subject to their susceptibility to its effects. There is advice for modern-day skippers and their crews on how best to deal with seasickness (see, for example, Cunliffe, 2008: 244); however, ‘[it] is important that people suffering from seasickness are not unconditionally released from all duties on board but are assigned quite specific tasks’ (Stadler, 1984: 60). This is age-old advice, as Redburn, the principal character of the ‘autobiographical novel, based on Herman Melville’s] first seafaring voyage [in 1839]’ (Glenn, 2014: 25) found:

‘Feeling worse and worse, I told one of the sailors how it was with me, and begged him to make my excuses very civilly to the chief mate, for I thought I would go below and spend the night in my bunk. But he only laughed at me [...]’ (Melville, 2016 [1849]: 28, emphasis added).

It is testimony to this matter-of-fact cultural attitude to seasickness that it is only in extreme circumstances that sufferers are excused duties; as it is better that they are assigned to tasks requiring movement, such as coiling ropes, as ‘when the body is in motion and both hands are employed, active compensatory
movements have to be made against the boat’s movement in order to keep one’s balance’ (Stadler, 1984: 69).

As we saw with Doormat (ante), helming proved to be an effective activity-focussed antidote that enabled her to overcome the effects of seasickness. Stadler suggests that:

‘it is the helmsman who is least at risk from seasickness. [...] having to hold a course [they are] similarly inclined to make active counter movements with the rudder against the yawing of the boat’ (1984: 70).

Helming and its possible contribution to positive voyage outcomes are described elsewhere (see Fletcher and Prince, 2017), however, for this crew, in addition to Doormat, there were other positive reports in its role in overcoming seasickness:

Lottie: ‘I think there is something quite therapeutic about steering, holding the wheel and especially when we were all feeling sick it was helming that made you feel better.’ (Post-voyage Crew focus group).

The Bosun also recognised the benefit of helming as a means to supporting crew through their seasickness; this was discussed in her post-voyage interview as she set out her rationale for selecting an image (see figure 11) of a young crew member, Mickey Mouse, on the helm as she helped her overcome the effects of seasickness. This was an experience with significance for her too:

Bosun: ‘This is a girl and I, and she was suffering from seasickness and she, throughout the beginning of the week she really didn’t want to helm and she wasn’t particularly [...] when we were out on deck she was suffering from seasickness a bit and then she got on the helm and she was smiling and enjoying it. It was good that I persisted and got her to helm. That was quite rewarding.

Researcher: [...] so, you encouraged her to come on the helm?

Bosun: Yeah, because throughout she was ‘no, no I just don’t want to do it’ and I kept, [...] yeah, kept [pause] every now and again, I would ask her again and she would ‘Oh no, in a minute’. It changed from ‘no I don’t want to’ to ‘maybe later’, ‘in a minute’ and then, yeah.’

(Post-voyage interview: Photo-elicitation).
It is, perhaps, that seasickness presents an authentic situation which enables crew members with an opportunity to provide support to each other; that activates a new type of social interaction, for example:

**Sluggy**: ‘On Tuesday I was sick twice and all of the other crew members were nice about it. We had a laugh about it and they were always kind and supportive’ (Voyage Pack: Fortune Lines).

**Pumpkin**: ‘Seasickness gets better if you eat something and get on with something. I saw other people feeling ill but when they ate and did something they got better. [I feel] happy because now other people feel better than they did. Now I can help people or myself if they or I feel seasick.’ (Voyage Pack: what did you learn today?).

**Dolphin**: ‘On Tuesday when I was sick everyone helped and got me tissues and food.’ (Voyage Pack: Fortune Lines); and

‘Well when I was like really seasick and I slept through lunch [Pumpkin] brought me fish sticks …fish fingers, and me and [Pumpkin] are best friends now.’ (Post-voyage Crew focus group).

**Suzan**: ‘Carrying on when I was seasick. They have been really nice while I was seasick and have cured me of it.’ (Voyage Pack: Fortune Lines).
On our first day at sea, as we approached the Isle of Man, we had music playing through the loudspeakers in the cockpit. Those on-watch were helming and keeping a lookout as they were introduced to the ‘culturally valued activity’ of sailing. Others, who were off-watch, had remained in the cockpit and some were equipped with their personal-issue seasick-bucket. A specific moment was captured as we were all listening to the song *Macarena*: ‘There is some sing-along and dancing in the cockpit – even those who are still hugging their sick-bucket are joining in!’ (Out-of-field notes; page 30, lines 31-32). The First Mate, who wasn’t exempt from feeling sick, as her ‘[…] not-so-memorable moment [pause] probably, maybe, making that fusilli pasta, which is my absolutely favourite lunch, but I only ate half of it because I was feeling sick.’ (End-of-voyage debrief, line 138-139), noticed this event too:

It was a long day with many girls succumbing to seasickness. However, their attitude towards it was brilliant. They just got on with it, helped each other out and looking after each other. And they even danced to the Macarena, while pausing to be sick in the middle and carried on. They were determined to keep spirits high and have fun, which meant many of the girls got over their seasickness once we got into the shelter of the Isle of Man. (First Mate’s Voyage Report).

These observations are not uncommon. On *our* voyage, it only took a few hours to adjust to the voyage environment, however, for Rogers’ crew, the ‘turnaround’ took a little longer:

‘Overcoming seasickness was something that nearly everyone needed to do and participants learned to manage it by following the example of the Watch Leaders and other crew, as the participants saw they too were suffering. Crew did not complain or feel sorry for themselves; rather, everyone continued regardless. We were told that the best way to overcome it was to be on deck as much as possible and to keep ourselves active. During the first three days people became overtired and so felt dreadful. This, combined with seasickness, left many wondering what they had got themselves into and how they were going to get through the next four days. But then, miraculously, on the fourth day, everyone was in high spirits, chatting, laughing and working together. This “turnaround”, as it is known, was astounding to witness.’ (2004: 50).
Seasickness is a great leveller, there can be no guarantee that even the most-seasoned seafarer will not succumb to its effects. Stadler posits that this may be an evolutionary safeguard that encourages human beings ‘to avoid conditions under which seasickness [occurs] – the sea, [as a] particularly unpredictable and dangerous environment’ (1984: 57).

In summary, these vignettes and the above section about seasickness, together with the narrative bring together my analysis of data collected during this study. This analysis now informs the discussion and conclusions set out in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

In this final chapter, I will discuss how this study, the collected data, its analysis and findings, and participant observations have informed my current thinking, and how this has shaped the rationale to support the view that the sail training voyage does, in fact, operate as a cultural community (after Rogoff). However, the cultural community is not experienced in the same way as those settings studied by Rogoff, as the original concept relates to those members and participants born to and growing up in indigenous cultural communities. For those who embark upon a sail training voyage, they are approaching the sail training cultural community as strangers and they are received by the ‘community’ as such. This alters the character of the experience and the subsequent social interactions, manifesting as a form of acculturation, and requiring the stranger to adapt to their new host community, albeit they cross the boundary and only occupy this potentially liminal space for a short period of time. Thus, allowing for a process of adaptation and activating a natural pedagogy from their past that supports the participants’ approach to cultural learning.

5.1 The sail training voyage as a cultural community

As set out in Chapter 2, Rogoff’s primary research was conducted in indigenous communities in the Americas. The focus of her studies explored the role of infants and children who had been born as members of those communities, as they became active participants in the mature and culturally valued activities of their community (ante). In Rogoff’s cultural community, the apprenticeship of the novice is supported by an expert; their apprenticeship is mediated through guided participation in the sociocultural and historical activities of the community. In most cases, the pre-existing social relationship, often familial, between the novice and expert is central to the social inclusion of children in these community endeavours (Rogoff, 2014: 73). This positions the indigenous infant or child as an existing member within the established boundary of the cultural community (Rogoff, 2003: 83; see also Phelan et al., 1991). Kozulin argues that this approach to mediating cultural experiences may enable future movement across boundaries: ‘Individuals who have received adequate [mediated learning experiences] in their native culture are expected to
develop sufficient learning potential for a relatively unproblematic transition to their new culture’ (1998: 103).

Most entrants to the contemporary sail training cultural community do so as novice-participants. It is only after initial and subsequent voyages that novice-participants in an apprenticeship become increasingly competent participants acquiring expertise, and then do they work towards the voluntary status of member. This was the experience of our Skipper, First Mate and Bosun as they first sailed as crew, returning as volunteers, and then embarking on a trajectory towards becoming qualified professional seafarers. Rogoff proposes a ‘more dynamic concept of participation, rather than a categorical concept of membership’ (ibid). This study has demonstrated ongoing guided participation, not only in the mediated activities with the young crew but also with the more-experienced sea-staff supporting the development of their less-experienced colleagues. The following are a few examples of this ongoing approach:

‘[… got to chat over frustrations and how it is being back with [the Skipper]. How I'm doing. Good to talk over everything I've been thinking and so I felt a bit better. Turns out she has no concerns and is pleased when I've not been on a year, but she will always push. […] Then I got a quick 'Good work today’ from [the Skipper] before bed. So quick I'm not sure I even heard right but I'm taking it anyway!’ (First Mate’s Personal Photo Diary: 13th July); and

‘I go below […], the [Skipper] and [Bosun] are in conversation seated at the saloon table. […] There is an issue with the starboard heads pump – there has been some disquiet about the state of the heads, as they are not being flushed correctly or, on occasions, at all, this is generating an unpleasant smell of urine. […] The [Skipper] gives a tutorial on heads pump replacement, with anecdotes of her own experience, as she was left to her devices by one of her training skippers, with a trial and error approach and resultant consequences, most involving human waste. The [Skipper]’s approach was supportive and talked the [Bosun] through the process and ‘tricks of the trade’ (Out-of-field notes, page 50, line 1-18).
These exchanges relate to the day-to-day operation of the vessel, but highlight the nature and importance of the relationships between the sea-staff. There is a tangible sense of belonging as we enjoy our voyage (see figure 12).

Figure 12: Most of the crew in the cockpit.

The social relationships between infants, children and their community guides, in the context of the cultural community, develops a specific approach to learning that becomes very familiar; this approach to learning is then employed in subsequent learning-oriented interactions. Coppens et al. posit that '[children] of indigenous-heritage American backgrounds often are especially alert observers of ongoing events in which they are not directly involved, learning from observing and listening in on surrounding events’ (2014: 156). In her recent writing, Rogoff (2014) seeks to better explain her earlier concepts of apprenticeship and guided participation in the cultural community, by proposing the mechanism as Learning by Observing and Pitching In to family and community endeavours (or LOPI); this is explored below.

5.1.1 Another way for learning

LOPI, as a form of informal learning, contrasts with types of formal learning that are often found in Westernised schooling (Rogoff, 2014: 70; Kozulin, 1998: 103-111; see figure 13). Coppens et al. suggest that introducing (or re-introducing) LOPI to non-indigenous communities and their schooling may be challenging (2014: 158); Rogoff now proposes a paradigm shift in
adopting participation using the LOPI model is ‘based in a transactional worldview, unlike the approach that is common in Western schooling […] based on an interactional worldview’ (2016: 184).

Figure 13: Rogoff’s Learning by Observing and Pitching In.

It should be noted that informal learning is not the polar-opposite of formal learning, with each positioned at either end of a continuum but, rather, it is another way for learning (ibid). Rogoff, in promoting the concept of LOPI, explains how it may be ‘observed to be important in any domain of learning’, in comparing it with Assembly-Line Instruction as one type of formal learning and where ‘extensive research has shown Assembly-Line Instruction to have severe shortcomings in promoting conceptual understanding’ (2014: 72; see also Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 1999).

The situatedness of LOPI, in the seamless nature of cultural endeavours of the family and/ or their community ‘in some indigenous communities of the Americas, can inspire efforts to improve educational opportunities in school and
out of school’ (*ibid*: 76). The learner’s participation in the endeavours of the family or community is key to the concept of LOPI and presents a user-friendly framework by which I will compare the sail training voyage. LOPI comprises seven features or facets:

1. Community organization *incorporates* children in a range of ongoing [endeavours] […] as regular participants in the community, with expectations and opportunities to *contribute* according to their interests and skills, like everyone else.

2. Learners are eager *to contribute and belong* as valued members of their families and communities. [Engaging] with initiative, to fulfil valued roles [in *accomplishing*] the activity at hand.

3. The social organization of [endeavours] involves *collaborative engagement as an ensemble*, with *flexible leadership* […] as everyone fluidly blends their ideas and agendas in a calm mutual place.

4. The goal of learning is to *transforming participation* to contribute to and belong to the community. […] *learning to collaborate with consideration and responsibility*, as well as gaining information and skills.

5. Learning involves *wide, keen attention*, in anticipation of or during *contribution* to the [endeavour] at hand.

6. Communication is based on coordination among participants that builds on the *shared reference* available in their mutual [endeavours]. […] when explanation occurs, it is nested within the shared [endeavours], providing information to carry out or understand the ongoing or anticipated activity.

7. Assessment includes appraisal of the success of the *support* for the learner as well as of the learner’s *progress towards mastery*. The purpose of assessment is *to aid* the learners’ contributions, and it occurs *during the [endeavour]*. *Feedback is available from the outcomes* of learners’ efforts to contribute to the [endeavour] and others’ acceptance, appreciation, or correction of the efforts as productive contributions.

Adapted from Rogoff (2014: 74, italics in original).

I will describe here how these facets manifest in the approach to learning observed and reported by study participants during this sail training voyage. The approaches to learning have slightly different implications for individuals
depending on whether they are a novice crew participant, an inexperienced or more experienced member of sea-staff, and the ship-board community operating as a group.

In the analysis of the *Plus, Minus, Interesting* activity, which was the common research tool for collecting data across this study (at $T_0$, $T_1$ and $T_2$), the words *learn* and *learning* were to be found in the Plus and Interesting sections but never in the Minus! The expectations for learning from the sea-staff and two teacher/watch leaders were more general in their nature, referring to personal development and expressing an interest in how the crew would develop. The crew participants’ responses, however, were focussed on learning to sail, parts of the boat and tying knots (these are culturally valued activities of community endeavours); although one respondent, *Mickey Mouse*, saw a Plus in learning ‘new life skills’ (see Appendix G).

Embarking upon a sail training voyage, regardless of role, everyone was *incorporated* into the cultural community of the vessel; the Skipper leads, and is supported by the First Mate and Bosun, benefiting from their prior experience of the ship-board community, with support from the watch leaders. The endeavour of this newly formed voyage-based community to sail from one port or anchorage to another can only be accomplished by *incorporating* the novices and less experienced voyage participants in the practices and operations of the vessel, fulfilling Facet 1. The entire structure and operation of the voyage experience is founded in the active participation of all of those on board; there are no passengers.

The voyage-based community creates a Vygotskian *zone of proximal development* (ZPD) as children, both *novices* and *experts* (of varying degrees of *expertise*), are brought together to ‘use the tools for thinking provided by culture through their interactions with more skilled partners’ (Rogoff, 2003: 50). Vygotsky posited that learning in the *zone of proximal development*:

‘[…] awakens a variety of internal development processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in [their] environment and in cooperation with peers. Once these processes are
internalized, they become part of the child’s independent developmental achievement’ (1978: 90).

It is also important to acknowledge that the community’s endeavours come within the Deweyian concept of *occupations* or ‘work activities that are informed by shared educational values and where the intellectual and moral content of values are clearly described and pursued together in social learning environments’ (Thorburn and Allison, 2017: 111). These occur as an aesthetic and reflective experience, including, for example, ‘[outdoor] excursions, gardening, cooking, sewing, printing, book-binding, weaving, painting, drawing, singing, dramatization, story-telling, reading […]’ (Dewey, 1916: 230). Dewey drew a distinction between play and work, in that work ‘is enriched by the sense that it leads somewhere, that it amounts to something’ (2012 [1910]: 164).

Although the term *occupations* may imply adult-work or vocational education (which has caused some confusion in the application of Dewey’s use of the term), Quay and Seaman posit that:

‘[…] an occupation is much more than just a job or topic of study or a method of teaching; an occupation is a living aesthetic whole purpose and inherent structure organizes both doing (method) and knowing (subject matter)’ (2013: 87, italics in original).

The relevance of this type of learning and learner perceptions are reflected in this discussion between members of this voyage-crew, as they support *Doormat*’s thoughts on learning (ante):

*Dolphin*: On the boat, you kind of learn more […] like things in everyday-life, when at school you learn like maths and English […] and things you learn to use to get a job and stuff, so it is different.

*Paul*: At school like you learn about something, but you won’t experience it; in history, you will learn about something […] I don’t know, about something but you won’t get to experience it, while on the boat you are experiencing what we were learning, while we were learning it.

*Pumpkin*: I think at school you don’t normally get to do the things you are taught, like on the sailing trip we got to do everything. I think you learn much more by doing the stuff than at school […]
Researcher: Do you think that is going to change your approach to working in school, and learning in school?

Pumpkin: Like I probably will try to do more things that whilst I am learning instead of just writing stuff down […]

Salmon: It’s, when you’re on the boat you don’t really realise that you are learning stuff, whereas when you are in school you know you are meant to learn […]

Penguin: Well at school you are almost like you have a plan and you have to […] it’s not forced but you have to learn that, but when you were sailing you choose to learn it. Also, you are not sitting down at a table and you write it down. It was just fun learning.

Lottie: I think it was definitely the things we learnt it wasn’t just what we learnt […] like what all the parts of the boat were and how everything worked, it was more like …we even learnt like …the true meaning of friendship […]

(Post-voyage focus group with crew and teachers; lines 244-271).

This exchange implies that these crew members were clearly able to differentiate the extrinsic approach to learning, that is often found in the school-based setting, and the intrinsic experience of their voyage-based learning. This study did not investigate the approach used at the crew’s school, but this may reflect their perception of Assembly-Line Instruction (ante). Interestingly, Pumpkin indicated, in this excerpt, how she might transfer this voyage-based way of learning to her school work.

On most sail training vessels, and particularly on the vessel subject of this study, the arrival of voyage participants, as an experience, is an induction involving ritual(s). This ritual includes a welcome aboard, the opportunity for the crew to select their bunk and stow their gear, followed by an introductory session. This introductory session took place with everyone sitting around the saloon table; and was the first opportunity for our crew to come together:

‘[The] welcoming ritual takes the form of inviting those present to state their name in the ‘name game’, to declare their expectations for the voyage and a super-hero power they would like to have, and why. The name game requires each person to state their name, and as we
proceed around the table you have to recall/ recite the name of those who have gone before. This performs several functions, it allows the sea-staff to get to know the names of the crew by way of repetition, and it is fun!' (Out-of-field notes, page 11; lines 10-18).

A similar ritual, aboard *Taikoo* (a vessel of the Recreational or Leisure tradition), is described by McCulloch:

‘Tom, the Skipper for this trip, made a very short speech welcoming everyone aboard and introduced a "name game", with each person around the table having to give their own name, say "what I am looking forward to about the trip" and repeat all the names that came before their own, in order.’ (2004: 192).

These descriptions of the induction ritual, aboard vessels of the Recreational or Leisure tradition, are not as austere as the more formal ‘admission procedure’ found on vessels of the Tall Ship tradition. The Tall Ship ritual as set out by McCulloch (2007: 297) may, indeed, meet family of attributes for Goffman’s ‘total institution’ and result in the participant’s *disculturation* (Goffman, 1991 [1961]: 23).

This welcoming and scene setting provides participants with a sense of the positive social environment, as:

‘[it] allows each crew member to declare ‘who they are’ and helps to reinforce individual identity, as well as giving the opportunity for crew members to raise any concerns they may have.’

(Out-of-field notes, page 11; line 30 to page 12; line 2).

This practice contributes to satisfying the lower order *needs* (that is, the *physiological, safety and belonging*) of Abraham Maslow’s (1970) *Hierarchy of Human Needs* (see, for example, Reece and Walker, 2000: 100). This introductory session is key in allowing the individual to move towards, what Maslow described as, ‘self-actualisation’ and creating the conditions for optimising an individual’s potential within the experience (see Mortlock, 1994: 115). These lower order needs are satisfied further during the subsequent safety briefings and as relationships begin to develop between the voyage-participants, regardless of their *novice* or *expert* status. The openness of this
session encourages everyone, particularly novices, to seek help from their fellow crew mates and sea-staff. The willingness to seek help, but falling short of dependency, is ‘a viable cognitive strategy [which promotes] resilience […] and] is more likely to be seen in students who present with strong levels of intrinsic motivation’ (Hattie and Yates, 2014: 29).

The session continued with an introduction to the chart of the sea area in which we will be sailing and a description of our possible, and most probable, ports of call. It was during this session that the external factors, such as the tide, sea state and weather, were introduced to the crew, in an inclusive interaction, as the limitations for the planning of our voyage. The whole approach to this induction phase was set and adapted by the leader of our community, the Skipper, for this new crew. By creating this positive, supportive and enthusiastic environment, and encouraging help-seeking behaviours whenever needed or in doubt influences the crew’s rating of ‘approachability, fairness and trust’ (see Hattie and Yates, 2014: 30) of the Skipper and the sea-staff. This inspired the entire crew so that they were motivated and ‘eager to contribute and belong as valued members of the [community]’ – we are, quite literally, in the same boat! This fulfils facet 2. and goes some way to meeting the requirement of facet 3. in the LOPI framework.

The established social organisation of the vessel and the Skipper’s ability, based upon her personal foundation of experience (ante), allows her to differentiate the individual needs of the voyage participants. This manifests in her flexible leadership as she engages in the preparations for our voyage and the management of the introductory session. Most skippers, not just those engaged in sail training, will consider the same factors and make judgements to their leadership approach; the ability of any crew is a limiting factor for any skipper planning for and embarking upon a voyage. Stadler (1984) proposes that a good skipper ‘is one who gets to know the individual needs, interests and problems of [their] crew and makes allowances for these in the division of labour’, and demonstrates certain behavioural and, I would propose, socio-cultural and historical characteristics, including:
• strict adherents to group standards, such as conscientious participation across all voyage activities and observations of safety standards;
• an inclusive approach to decision making, where possible, consulting and discussing with the crew what needs to be done;
• delegation of tasks and, as far as possible, allowing less experienced crew to learn and develop their skills in more difficult aspects of sailing. (Adapted from Stadler, 1984: 109-110).

Indeed, these behaviours are commended in the instructional guidance for modern-day recreational or leisure skippers; for example, Cunliffe suggests that:

‘The inherent, quiet authority of an able skipper often places [them] in the position of a father- [or mother-] figure with the family that his crew rapidly becomes. […] This state of affairs is natural and entirely beneficial to the well-being of all on-board.’ (2008: 7).

Coppens et al. posit ‘the use of patience and a calm, measured pace (even when working quickly) as an intriguing aspect of guidance in LOPI’ (2014: 157, italics in original). These characteristics are to be found aboard the sailing and sail training vessel.

As the sea-staff and crew completed the introductory sessions there was a change in the character of the social interaction; opportunities were presented for voyage-participants to engage with each other and cooperate to reach both individual and group goals. For example, the issue of weatherproof clothing and lifejackets took place in the first few hours of joining the vessel; this satisfies further Maslow needs. The allocation of weatherproof clothing, although a relatively simple task of selecting the appropriate size and trying them on, requires the novice crew to interact with the sea-staff and their peers. The interaction engaged each crew member as they tried on their clothing (each numbered for identification purposes), adjusted the straps and fastenings, reported their allocated items to the sea-staff (to be recorded on a laminated sheet), and then stowing their jacket and salopettes in a wet-locker. This apparently over-bureaucratic procedure ensures that each crew member takes responsibility for their allocated clothing, and they begin to find their way around
the boat. This is an authentic multifaceted activity requiring all involved, crew and sea-staff, to communicate with each other, there is the asking of questions and discussion as everyone completes their goal. In this context, I use the word authentic to describe a social interaction that occurs in the routine course of community endeavours, rather than as a contrived interaction conducted ‘for the sake of conversation or entertainment or achievement of immediate practical goals but may not be regarded by the participants as a lesson’ (Rogoff, 1990: 95).

Lifejackets are stowed in a pocket designed for the purpose at the end of each crew member’s bunk. Where weatherproof clothing can be an approximate fit, it is essential that lifejackets are fitted correctly. On this voyage, some of the crew were small in stature so it was necessary to issue a smaller version of the standard-issue lifejacket.

The Bosun took charge of this session (I later learned that this was her first time to lead on this session); she instructed all crew, including the watch leaders, to take ourselves and our lifejackets to the cockpit. We then proceeded to help each other in donning our lifejackets and adjusting the harness straps, and other fittings to ensure that they were fitted correctly; this was achieved by lots of adult-to-child and child-to-child interaction. This process manifested in wide, keen attention (facet 5), perhaps, resulting from their own individual assessment of risk (or perceived risk). Once we were all satisfied that our lifejackets were adjusted correctly, and this had been checked by more experienced sea-staff, we returned our attention to the Bosun:

The [Bosun] waits to get their attention, as some of the crew are comparing the appearance of the standard and smaller-sized lifejackets. She has a number of laminated sheets to use as a guide for this briefing […]. The [Bosun] has a demonstration lifejacket, that is out of its cover to show the various features of the lifejacket; and she qualifies this by explaining that both sizes of lifejacket operate in the same manner. She explains the operation of the automatic gas canister, methods for manual inflation, spray hood, light and whistle. There is a simple knowledge check, as she uses open questioning to check for knowledge and
understanding, as well as asking for any questions from the crew. Each lifejacket [incorporates] a safety harness and has two safety lines attached each with a spring-loaded clip.

She explains that having to use a lifejacket is the worst-case scenario, and that the aim at all times is to stay on the boat, which leads to a briefing on ‘jack-stays’ (these are sheathed cables that are strategically placed [around the boat] to allow a crew member to be attached to the boat anywhere above deck); using the description that ‘Jack’ was the name used to describe sailors, and that ‘stays’ referring to ‘staying on the boat’ – whether the historical antecedents of this term are accurate or not, this is a useful way to remember the term and its function. As this crew are young and small in stature, it is a policy decision that when the vessel is underway (that is, it is not connected to the shore or pontoon, or anchored to the seabed) then the crew will be clipped on to the jack-stay, whenever on deck. This leads to an activity – with the crew allocated to two groups, based upon which side of the cockpit they were seated on; they are tasked to clip on to the jack-stay in the cockpit, and to then to make their way forward to the bow, down each side of the boat and return to the cockpit, ensuring they are clipped on at all times. This requires some individual and team problem solving, as they negotiate deck fixtures and lines. I took up a position at the bow, as this is where they have to change over from the port to starboard jack-stay (or vice versa), causing congestion as they must cooperate and compromise to accomplish their task. There is a mix of individualistic behaviours with some girls doing their own thing, but two or three cooperate to change clips together; there is some who offer to unclip or clip on others to help them – I remind them that they should be clipped on at all times, and not to unclip before using the second clip to clip-on, especially if you are asking someone else to help. Once we are all back in the cockpit, the crew are again asked if they have any questions, some clarification is required as to when they should clip on – there are a mix of peer and sea-staff responses to bring clarity.

(Out-of-field notes page 14, line 28 to page 16, line 11).
In considering facets 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the LOPI framework, the approach to this session on the use of lifejacket and harness and jack-stays demonstrates a model for learning that I find familiar: Explain, Demonstrate, Imitate and Practice or EDIP\(^{33}\). This is a model that I have used as a police trainer to develop practical skills, and that I have observed in many aspects of the sail training experience, as novices are introduced to seamanship skills used in the community’s endeavours, such as coiling a line, tying on a fender or helming the vessel.

The EDIP model resonates with Charles Allen’s (1919) four-stage model for industrial or vocational instructors: Preparation, Presentation, Application and Inspection. Allen’s model was developed, in post-1918 America, to improve the training of shipbuilding workers and increase productivity. This is a model that brings clarity to the process, and has relevance to Dewey’s *occupations* (*ante*) and the novice crew member’s approach to learning.

In presenting this model, I will use the components of EDIP, but will use Allen’s words to describe the process:

Explain: ‘to establish what may be called a foundation for the teaching of the new idea […]. [Getting] the learner to think about some things which [s/he] already knows which have something to do with the problem which [s/he] is to be taught. [They have in their] mind all sorts of recollections of past experiences and observations, most of which have nothing to do with the subject of the lesson in hand, but [which may] a bearing’ (1919: 132).

The bridging of the gap between the *known* and the *unknown* is referred to, by Hattie and Yates, as *advance organisers* ‘which serve to activate prior knowledge and so enable us to acquire new information efficiently’ (2014: 115).

In the case of the novice crew participant of a sail training voyage they may not have any first-hand prior knowledge or experience of the ‘lesson’ at hand, but they may have read a book or watched a TV programme or movie about sailing that will stimulate a state of mindfulness, as they consider and approach the

\(^{33}\) It has not been possible to attribute the EDIP model to an individual author, model or theory of learning.
new learning experience. Rogoff proposes that ‘bridging from the known to the new necessarily involves both initial differences in perspective and attempts to reach a common ground for communication’ (1990: 72); this enhances the quality of social interaction between participants in the learning experience.

Demonstrate: ‘Having brought a learner to the point where [they] are thinking about such portions of [their] previous experiences or knowledge as will be of value in the teaching of the proposed lesson, […] The next step is […] to add to the ideas embodied in the learner’s mind the new ideas […] of the lesson’ (Allen, 1919: 136).

In the lifejacket session, described above, the crew were provided with an explanation for the purpose and use of the lifejacket and its safety harness. This was supported with a demonstration-lifejacket with its innards and accoutrements (such as the automatic gas canister, bright green inflatable bladder and reflective striping, whistle, and light) exposed for all to see. This blended the Explain and Demonstrate components of this model, as the crew were encouraged (without activating their own device!) to identify parts of their own lifejacket, and to check each other for personal fitting and adjustment. As the session moved on to explain and demonstrate the use of the safety harness, and clipping-on to the jack-stays, the crew were given the opportunity to Imitate what they had learned so far. Allen makes the case that:

‘Since what the [learner] has learned is of no value unless [s/he] can apply it, […] it is equally important […] to check up the degree to which [they] have grasped all points in the lesson which has been taught’ (1919: 139).

As this session moved on to the jack-stay activity, the sea-staff observed and guided the crew in their imitation (or the application) of their learning, as they made their way around the boat, clipping-on to the jack-stays as they went. This is Rogoff’s guided participation in action (ante). As the two teams of crew made their way forward to the bow, where I had positioned myself, they had to communicate and cooperate with each other. The requirement for cooperation, in accomplishing this simple goal, introduced them to a way of learning, that would become familiar during their voyage. Rogoff suggests mainstream schooling (particularly in the United States) is predominated by competitive
behaviours, and that more cooperative behaviours may benefit the individual’s attitude and approach to learning (1990: 229).

As the crew congregated in a log-jam at the bow, as the port and starboard teams met, I prompted them as to how they might cooperate and problem-solve as they transferred from one jack-stay to the other, making such modifications, communicating and coordinating towards a greater understanding between themselves (see Rogoff, 2003: 285). Rogoff proposes this as a demonstration of cognitive development, as the crew were encouraged to:

‘[change] their ways of understanding, perceiving, noticing, thinking, remembering, classifying, reflecting, problem setting and solving, planning [...] in shared endeavours with other people building on the cultural practices and traditions of [this community] (ibid: 237).

It also demonstrated an approach to scaffolding, as a means for ‘orienting [the crew’s] attention and actions on the steps required to handle subgoals of the problem. [Taking] responsibility for managing and segmenting the problem-solving effort’ (Rogoff, 1990: 93). This approach was employed throughout the voyage; scaffolding was continuously revised to respond to our individual needs, this adaptation included the sea-staff, as we engaged in the endeavours of the community (ibid: 94).

This apparently simple session, involving the segmented activities of donning of a lifejacket, explanation on its component parts, and then moving around the stationary vessel clipped-on to the jack-stays is a socio-cultural activity requiring increasingly complex communication between its participants. As it occurred during the induction ritual, taking place at the beginning of every voyage, it set the scene for what was to come.

This brings us to the final element of the EDIP model – Practice. In the context of Allen’s original text, where his learners were ‘tested’ by way of an inspection of their work; however, in the voyage setting, the Practice (of the learner) was observed to ensure that the learner is applying their learning. This is achieved through observation, with the opportunity for the ‘expert’ to correct ineffective practice or to coach the ‘novice’ towards improvement. This type of
informal (and formative) assessment presents as a further opportunity for an 
authentic social interaction between participants in a learning situation (see 
Coppens et al., 2014: 157). This also allowed the Bosun (in this situation – the 
‘expert’) to check for understanding, and consider and reflect on the 
effectiveness of her session.

The lifejacket/ jack-stay session was then immediately followed by the 
First Mate’s session on Man-Over-Board (MOB); as she talked about falling 
overboard, risk of hypothermia, and drowning to a group of 12- and 13-year old 
girls, and through this narrative she quickly secured the attention of this novice 
crew:

The [First Mate] then takes over, standing at the wheel, and begins the 
Man-Over-Board briefing. […] As she began and mentioned someone 
falling over overboard, asking a reason why someone might fall 
overboard […] several of the crew shout ‘They were not clipped-on!’ – 
reinforcing the prior [lifejacket] briefing’s learning.

(Out-of-field notes page 16; lines 12-19).
The segmentation of the lifejacket/ jack-stay session, and then the MOB 
session, manifests in alert attention from the crew, a behaviour that may 
overflow in to other, imminent community endeavours ‘in which they are not 
directly involved, learning from observing and listening in on surrounding 
events’ (Coppens et al., 2014: 156).

As our voyage began, and we left port the following morning, I 
recognised evidence that this lesson had been learned, albeit the message 
needed occasional reinforcement but not by the sea-staff, it was by the novice 
crew themselves:

The crew are moving between the cockpit and companionway. As they 
return to the cockpit most are forgetting to clip-on and are quickly 
reminded by their fellow crew.

(Out-of-field notes page 28; lines 3-6).

Adaptation to these sessions continued as the crew reminded each other to 
clip-on throughout the voyage (with this note from day 4):
Most of the crew are remembering to clip-on as they return to the cockpit [...] those that do not clip-on are immediately reminded by their crew mates sitting in the cockpit.

(Out-of-field notes page 48; line 33 to page 49; line 4).

The on-board structure and practices mediated everyone’s learning, not just the novice crew. During the afternoon of our first day at sea I was preparing dinner, and:

As I stand in the saloon and prepare the meal, the [Skipper] is debriefing [the Bosun] and cannot help but eavesdrop; this is when I realise that the lifejacket briefing was her first solo session – I wouldn’t have known this [from what I had observed]. The [Skipper] uses open questions to explore how the [Bosun] felt the session had gone; this was a good debrief supporting her reflective practice. The discussion extends to the [Bosun]’s general progression and development.

(Out-of-field notes page 31; lines 12-19).

This approach to learning has become a recurring theme of my entire sail training experience, as I became more involved in the endeavours of the sail training community.

5.2 The stranger approaching the cultural community

The nature of membership and participation (as discussed at 1.2 Position Statement) in a sail training voyage as a cultural community is different from those communities studied and written about by Rogoff. Rogoff’s apprentices were pre-existing members, by birth, of their cultural communities; their learning for and transition from a rather passive membership to a more active and participatory membership is the key concept of her writing. This reflects Phelan et al.’s description of boundary crossing in a Congruent World/Smooth Transition, where ‘[although] the circumstances of daily contexts change, [participants] barely perceive boundaries […]. Movement from one setting to another is seen as harmonious and uncomplicated’ (1991: 229). For those joining the sail training cultural community, as members or participants, their approach to this new ‘host society’ is as a stranger (after Schutz) (as discussed at 3.2.2 Insider or Outsider?). They are not born in to this community; they arrive with their personal foundation of experience from their ‘heritage-society’.
The attitude of the sail training community, as members of the ‘host society’, in receiving the *stranger* adds a new dimension to the social interaction. This is an interaction that is not found in Rogoff’s cultural communities. However, Phelan *et al.* describe this as type of boundary crossing as *Different Worlds/ Boundary Crossing Managed* where ‘worlds are different (with respect to culture, ethnicity, socioeconomic status or religion), thereby requiring adjustment and reorientation as movement between contexts occurs’ (1991: 232). In the case of the sail training voyage the boundary between the shore-based and voyage-based contexts is clearly demarcated as participants board the vessel, and *boundary crossing* is mediated by the sea-staff so that the ‘perceptions of boundaries between worlds do not prevent [participants] from managing crossings or adapting to different settings’ (*ibid*). A third type of boundary crossing involving friction and unease (after Phelan *et al.*) is *Different Worlds/ Boundary Crossing Hazardous*; this is more dependent upon the character of the mediated support provided by the ‘members of the host society’ (*ante*) and may manifest in various degrees of success, thereby manifesting in variable outcomes (*ibid*: 237). In the past, and for many cultures, the approaching stranger often carried a special significance; the approaching stranger would be subject of a cultural procedure as a rite: ‘The basic procedure is always the same, […] they must stop, wait, go through a transitional period, enter, be incorporated’ (van Gennep, 1960 [1908]: 28).

In the seafaring culture, which evolved from the days of exploration and discovery in the 17th and 18th centuries (*ante*), the crews of Captain John Smith and, particularly, Captain James Cook (in the exploration of Polynesia by the crew of the *Endeavour*) encountered indigenous communities as strangers. These seafarers of the past after just ‘a few weeks or even days’ found themselves ‘adapting to and absorbing’ newly encountered, indigenous cultural traits (Adler, 2008: 61). The duration of the contact is significant, as the sail training voyage is often no more than fourteen days. Bargatzky described these seafaring explorers as ‘transculturites’:

---

34 Phelan, Davidson and Cao (1991) propose four types of boundaries; three are described in the context of sail training here; the fourth more problematic type is *Borders Impenetrable/ Boundary Crossing Insurmountable*. 

---
‘[…] a stranger. […] permanently or temporarily separated from their original culture; they enter the network of sociocultural roles of another culture and are influenced by its customs, behaviour patterns in general, ideas and values. […] dependent] on [the] host society for survival, subsistence, shelter and status’ (1980: 93).

This was not always a one-sided interaction. There is evidence that seafarers and indigenous communities traded their valued cultural ideas, values and artefacts. For example, as James Cook’s crew encountered Polynesian communities they introduced these cultures to metal working technologies (Edwards, 2003); and they, in turn, adopted the Polynesian practice of tattooing (Adler, 2008). However, the motivations for these cultural trades were different. Native communities valued metal tools, such as hatchets, and metal working as a new technology (Kitson, 2015 [1912]); and the seafarers adopted tattooing as a requirement for status or advancement in those native communities, as they desired integration within the newly encountered social structure (Adler, 2008).

It is often the case, that individuals who are competent or experienced in more than one cultural setting may benefit from such experiences by providing them with the opportunity to reflect and adopt a new or alternative perspective. Such experiences may be sufficiently disorientating to activate meta-cognition, as ‘one’s knowledge concerning one’s own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them […] to the active monitoring and consequent regulation and orchestration of these processes’ (Flavell (1976) in Moseley et al., 2005: 13). This enables an individual to compare their known culture and the newly encountered culture. Rogoff refers to this situation as culture shock as ‘their new setting works in ways that conflict with what they have always assumed, and it may be unsettling to reflect on their own cultural ways as an option rather than the ‘natural’ way’ (2003: 13-14).

In considering immigrant children in new cultural settings, Sam and Berry posit that:

‘The recurring question […] is whether acculturating children and youth should be viewed as ‘normal’ children, similar to their national peers when it comes to how they deal with developmental tasks, or whether
they are special in that their acculturation experiences may have special impact on how they resolve developmental tasks’ (2010: 476).

This may also apply to the children of expatriate families, however, the circumstances of their entry to and temporary accommodation in the host society may be different (see, for example, Haslberger and Brewster, 2008). It is important to acknowledge that the exchange of cultural ‘customs, behaviour patterns in general, ideas and values’ is two-way, and benefits are accrued by both the host and approached cultures. Sam and Berry describe this exchange, as the ‘process of cultural and psychological change [resulting from] the meeting between cultures’; this is acculturation (2010: 472).

Acculturation is defined further as the ‘phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come in to first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups’ (ibid: 473). This is distinct from assimilation; which may have more resonance with the mechanisms found in the ‘total institution’ (after Goffman). Acculturation relies upon reciprocity, adjustment and adaptation, as Adler posits:

‘The mode, tone and outcome of contact events are not determined simply by one group’s interaction with another on the basis of its own preconceived ideas, but result from a complex interaction between socially heterogenous parties, each of which brings its own social divisions and plurality of cultural experience to the encounters’ (2008: 62).

Acculturation has implications for the diversity of both group and individual outcomes as ‘[not] every group or individual enters into, participates in, or changes in the same way during their acculturation’, even though the individual (or group) may share the same cultural heritage, and have experienced acculturation in the same temporal and spatial setting (Sam and Berry, 2010: 473). Importantly, in the current context, adaptation to the approached culture ‘can be psychological (e.g. sense of well-being or self-esteem) or socioculturally (e.g. acquiring a new language)’ (citing Ward (1996) in Sam and Berry, 2010: 474). In describing cultural learning, Jerome Bruner argues:

‘One enters it or is enabled by it, or […] is constituted by it. Culture is not a set of responses to be mastered, but a way of knowing, of construing
the world and others. To enter culture is not to add some element to one's natural repertory, but to be transformed.' (in Tomasello, Kruger and Ratner, 1993: 515).

Sam and Berry posit further, that the nature of changes arising from an acculturation experience manifest in several dimensions, these are the affective, behavioural and cognitive. The affective changes ‘[emphasize] the emotional aspects of acculturation and focusses on such issues as psychological well-being and life satisfaction’ (Sam and Berry, 2010: 474). The extant sail training literature demonstrates the enhancement of self-concepts, across the range of well-being; these may be a consequence of acculturation through a sail training voyage.

The sail training voyage requires all participants, but particularly novices, to confront this novel setting and apply their existing repertoire of performance, based upon their heritage-culture. It is proposed that the behavioural changes arising from acculturation are a consequence of the individual’s lack of necessary skills needed to engage with the new culture (see Sam and Berry, 2010: 475). As the individual enters the new culture, their ‘cultural learning approach entails gaining an understanding in intercultural communication styles, including its verbal and nonverbal components, as well as rules, conventions, and norms’ (ibid).

Fiske posits that ‘people learn their cultures in large by observation, imitation, and incremental participation’, without the need for specifically designed teaching strategies (1997: 12), resonating with Rogoff’s LOPI (also Phelan et al., 1991; ante). For example, in Japan, a philosophy for education and discipline adopts a ‘let the children learn’ approach rather than ‘teach the children’; created in Ibasho or ‘a space where each child is watched over and where he or she is valued’ (Bamba and Haight, 2008: 431; see also, Bamba and Haigh, 2009). During the sail training voyage the gradual adaptation of voyage participants occurs in a novel and, some may argue, pressurised setting; activating attitudes and behaviours of reliance upon others towards

---

35 The original text uses the US spelling: behavioral.
survival and meeting voyage-based goals. These attitudes and behaviours may not be activated otherwise.

I have already proposed that the sail training voyage, through its novel setting and the day-to-day activities, activates meta-cognition. This finds support from Sam and Berry’s third dimension of acculturation – cognition:

‘how [they] perceive and think about themselves and others in the face of intercultural encounters. […] how [they] process information about their own group (ingroup) and about other groups (outgroup)’ (2010: 475).

As the individual compares their new host and their heritage cultures they enter a liminal space, reflecting Foucault’s description of the ship-board experience (Rabinow (2000); ante). This was a recurrent theme in Donald Duck’s study contributions; for example, as she found herself ‘amongst a crew of experts and beginners but not fitting in with either’ (Voyage Pack: What did you learn on Tuesday?); and ‘feeling apart from all sides, neither one thing nor the other’ (Voyage Pack: Plus/ Minus/ Interesting). The questions ‘Who am I? to Which group do I belong?’ are common to those experiencing acculturation (Berry, 1997); and are questions that I recognise, albeit only from more recent times, arising from my own cultural experiences and boundary crossing as I left policing and entered the sail training and academic cultures.

It is interesting to note, that the younger crew members did not report any feelings of liminality, the feeling of being ‘between and betwixt’ situations or cultures; this was not something that this study was looking for. That liminality was not explicitly reported by most study participants could have been a consequence of liminality not being part of their experience, or they did not recognise they were experiencing a liminal space, or they failed to report it in the research tools used in this study.

When considering the experience of acculturation, many studies have largely focussed on the experiences of immigrants as they enter a new host society. The age of the immigrant child or young person has been considered to be relevant to their experience by some studies, for example, in their study of Chinese immigrants in Canada, Cheung, Chudek and Heine concluded ‘acculturation occurs most rapidly at younger ages, a pattern that provides
evidence for a sensitive period of acculturation’ (2011: 150); the ‘most-sensitive’ age for acculturation was found to be 14.5 years (ibid: 149). It is noted that this sensitive period coincides with the physiological changes in brain plasticity occurring during adolescence (see Blakemore and Frith, 2005; Geake, 2009; Howard-Jones, 2010). Vygotsky may provide an explanation for this increased adolescent sensitivity: ‘For the young child, to think is to recall; but for the adolescent to recall is to think’ (1978: 51, italics in original) as cognitive ability is better able to relate concrete experience with abstract concepts.

‘At a later age children extend the boundaries of their understanding by integrating socially elaborate symbols (such as social values and beliefs, the cumulative knowledge of their culture, [...] into their own consciousness’ (John-Steiner and Souberman in Vygotsky, 1978: 126). This coincidence may or may not be significant to sail training participants, however, it does provide a consideration for future studies.

The identification of a sensitive period for the experience of acculturation implies a quality in the child or young person’s approach to their social learning in a cultural setting. Csibra and Gergely propose ‘cognitive mechanisms that enable the transmission of cultural knowledge by communication between individuals constitute a system of ‘natural pedagogy’ [...] and represent an evolutionary adaptation’ (2011: 1149, italics in original). Whilst the inference is for the genetic evolution of a natural pedagogy, Heyes posits that ‘where there is evidence that a component has been shaped by genetic evolution, there is also evidence that [natural pedagogy] was adapted, not for teaching, but for social bonding’ (2016: 292, see also Vygotsky, 1978: 46); and supporting the findings of Bamba and Haight (2008, 2009, ante). Csibra and Gergely posit that natural pedagogy is universal:

‘[…] all human cultures rely on communication to transmit to novices a variety of different types of cultural knowledge, including information about artefact kinds, conventional behaviours, arbitrary referential symbols, cognitively opaque skills and know-how embedded in means and actions’ (2011: 1149).

The inference is that this pedagogy is natural; that it occurs between adults and children (particularly as children learn their first language), but also between
children without conscious thought (ibid: 1152; see also Rogoff, 2016: 185). In the sail training setting much of the intentional learning relates to the cultural community’s endeavours of sailing the vessel and its day-to-day operation, such as hoisting sails or helming, however, the socially oriented outcomes evidenced by the extant literature may arise from such a natural pedagogy. The participants’ sensitivity to living and working in close proximity (see Doormat’s Story) in this novel vessel-bound environment may contribute to these socially oriented outcomes (after Stadler’s (1984) ‘second period’ of socialization, ante) as:

‘they go about their normal business looking at events that interest them, and reacting warmly to [behaviour] simply because they find it pleasing – the effect of their actions is to promote the development of psychological tendencies that make children teachable; that make them into pupils. Whether the adults know it or not, their actions are contributing to the cultural inheritance of cultural learning.’ (Heyes, 2016: 292; see also Heyes, 2012).

There is a view that the experts, representing those participants and practitioners with more experience of the voyage-based cultural setting, do not fully appreciate the impact that they have on the other sea-staff and younger crew members. As our Skipper pointed out, when asked whether she thought sea-staff, in particular the volunteers, realised the difference they made:

‘No. I think, […] because you do so much, and you’re always busy. I think some will, some who can reflect on what they do, […] when I was coming through it I didn’t really think anything about it to be fair. […] That they enjoy it and have fun, but then they’ve still got the aspect of looking after the youngsters, and then they want to be there […]’

(Post voyage interview, lines 314-327).

The competing demands of this setting may result in sea-staff (both full-time and volunteers) being pre-occupied with the cultural endeavours of sailing (as the authentic and valued activities of the community), resulting in the social dimensions of the voyage experience passing unnoticed. A simple review of this sail training provider’s end-of-voyage feedback, for this and other voyages, demonstrated a respondent-focus on the cultural endeavour of sailing. When asked ‘what they had learnt?’ most respondents referred to tying knots or
hoisting and lowering the sails. There were very few responses, like that provided by *Doormat (ante)*, which indicated a recognition of personal or social development. That is not to say that personal and social development did not occur but rather that such development may not have been recognised by respondents at the time of completing their feedback, or their focus related to the overtly ‘valued activities’ of the experience, that is, the sailing and voyage-based oriented behaviours and outcomes. This has implications for *which* sail training behaviours and outcomes should be measured and *how* they should be measured; this is discussed further in 5.3 Conclusion.

5.3 Conclusions

This study set out to explore the sail training voyage as a cultural community (after Rogoff). In considering the cultural component of Rogoff’s concept the literature review (Chapter 2) has demonstrated that sail training has rich social, cultural and historical traditions with origins which are to be found in the age of sail and, more generally, the practices of sailors and seafarers. These social, cultural and historical traditions are found in contemporary sail training practices. Whilst I have investigated the antecedents of contemporary sail training practices and its culture, many sail training practitioners are not aware of the origins of its culture, practices and unique argot. The uniqueness of this culture combines the environmental challenges of ‘man and nature’, and its significant influence on those aboard a sailing vessel-at-sea and the ‘man and man’ interaction in this environment (after Elias). It is the enforced social interaction of ‘man and man’ in the voyage setting, arising from necessity towards continued survival of the community which creates and develops it, as those aboard the vessel confront the challenges of ‘going to sea’. Dewey argued that:

‘[the] social environment […] is truly educative in its effects in the degree in which an individual shares or participates in some conjoint activity. By doing his [or her] share in the associated activity, the individual appropriates the purpose which actuates it, becomes familiar with its methods and subject matters, acquires needed skill, and is saturated with its emotional spirt.’ (1916: 26).
Rogoff’s concept of cultural community involving apprenticeship and guided participation is founded in the experience of infants and children who have been born in to their communities. They build upon and exploit pre-existing (often familial) social relationships as they move from an immature and passive form of membership of their community, to a more active participation in the valued cultural endeavours of the community; for example, caring for younger children, weaving or tending garden or animals. These community experiences are types of boundary crossing, often as the child’s ‘worlds are merged by their common sociocultural components rather than bounded by conspicuous differences (Phelan et al., 1991: 229). Those embarking on the sail training voyage are not born to, nor have they grown up in, the ship-bound community. Rather they are newcomers or ‘novices’; they approach the sail training voyage-based community as strangers and they are received as such by the ‘experts’ who already occupy the setting (after van Gennep) and their boundary crossing is mediated by the sea-staff and more experienced crew. In this instance, expertise is subjective as it only requires the slightest differential in knowledge, understanding and skill between the novice and the expert. As novices and experts come together for their voyage they encounter an opportunity to develop new relationships in the community-based interests as they go-to-sea.

The ship-board cultural community includes many familiar features; for example, the galley looks like a kitchen, it has a hob and oven, a sink with hot and cold water taps, and storage for foodstuffs but it is different. The ‘head’ looks and smells like a shore-based toilet but it operates differently. I propose that this ship-board setting is sufficiently strange to create dissonance, requiring the novice voyage-participant to reflect on their existing knowledge and understanding, and adapt their repertoire of performance (after Goffman’s presentation of self) to this novel setting. The experience of dissonance in the ever changing being at sea environment reflects Burton, Brown and Fischer’s (1984) proposition that:

‘[…] sudden unexpected change in the environment requires higher-order error correcting and debugging skills to cope with the deviations. If
the [environment is] too friendly, they may suppress the development of these higher order skills’ (in Rogoff and Lave (Eds.), 1984: 146).

This applies to existing practitioners already familiar with this setting as each novice crew member presents with different needs for their forthcoming apprenticeship, requiring alternative approaches to their guided participation; albeit any approach is founded in the origins of the cultural community.

That the sail training setting is a cultural community leads to the novice entering as an approaching stranger (after Schutz), and embarking upon a process of acculturation as they adapt to this new familiar-but-different milieu. Dillon proposes that such ‘[boundary] encounters occur as people interact across boundaries. They may be interpersonal, or mediated by artefacts (i.e. tools). Boundary crossings are the flow of ideas, constructs and innovations across boundaries’ (2008: 259, italics in original). The approaching stranger is to be found in the 16th and 17th century experience of seafaring explorers in their encounters with native communities; these encounters contributed to the creation and development of the sailing community’s culture.

The sail training setting is, for some, a liminal space (after Donald Duck’s experience; see 4.2.4), albeit others, particularly younger crew, may not be sensitive to or able to recognise this liminality. In the process of adapting to the host culture of the sail training voyage it may be that an earlier and more familiar pre-verbal pedagogy (or natural pedagogy after Csibra and Gergely) is re-activated; as younger participants adopt and adapt their boundary crossing experiences and behaviours to the voyage-based setting (after Phelan et al.). Indeed, Rogoff proposes:

‘Young children appear to come equipped with ways of ensuring proximity to and involvement with more experienced members of society, and of becoming involved with their physical and cultural surroundings. The infants’ strategies […] appear similar to those appropriate for anyone learning in an unfamiliar culture: stay near a trusted guide, watch the guide’s activities and get involved in the activities when possible, and attend to any instruction the guide provides’ (1990: 17).
Vygotsky speculated that ‘the child’s mind contains all stages of future intellectual development; they exist in complete form, awaiting the proper moment to emerge’ (1978: 24).

Sail training has huge potential for further research, especially in exploring the ‘how’ and ‘why’ it incubates personal and social development, as well as identifying and measuring voyage outcomes. McCulloch proposes several opportunities for future sail training research (in Humberstone et al., 2016: 241), however, in considering these opportunities there are a number of dilemmas. The current study has focussed on the process for change, following Vygotsky’s proposition, that ‘we need to concentrate not on the product of development but on the very process by which higher forms are established’ (1978: 64, italics in original). This approach, however, creates a tension between understanding the sail training process(es), the improvement of provision and practice of such extra-curricular interventions to meet the shortcomings of compulsory education; and the demand from policy makers, and sponsors and funders for evidence-based evaluations of sail training voyage outcomes. There has been an apparent lack of interest in the outcomes for those paid full-time or volunteer sea-staff who support sail training voyages.

This situation has specific relevance to the sail training voyage. A large number of published studies have been conducted on vessels of the Tall Ship tradition or ideology, despite the predominant model for sail training provision, both globally and in the UK, is the Recreational or Leisure tradition or ideology (after McCulloch). Whilst the participant outcomes may be similar for both sail training traditions or ideologies (after McCulloch et al., 2010), the process in how these outcomes come about may be distinctly different. For example, this study has confirmed that the sail training experience on this smaller vessel meets fully the description of Rogoff’s cultural community, the operation of the larger vessels would benefit from an investigation using Rogoff’s work as a lens through which to view their operation. Tall Ship vessels may still only meet some of the ‘family of attributes’ for Goffman’s ‘total institution’ (albeit I question Goffman’s generalisation of his concept to this setting).
Whilst access to the bigger vessels may be easier, in their ability to carry supernumerary or non-participant researchers, improved access to the larger population of smaller vessels (of the Recreational and Leisure tradition) and their communities of members and participants would enable a better understanding of the process for personal and social development. For example, mobilising and enabling practitioners-as-researchers might overcome the issues of accessibility to the voyage setting aboard smaller vessels. A solution may be found in Hall et al., (2006) as a model for supporting and engaging practitioners in action research (in their very own Vygotskian zone of proximal development); a model which could be adapted to meet the challenges of accessibility to this setting.

As a relatively new field for academic research, sail training presents opportunities to develop and refine the research design and methodology to further investigate this setting to ‘[allow] for a greater understanding of the complexity of lived experience and an awareness of the researcher’s role in the process’ (Coates in Humberstone et al., 2016: 73). The ethnographic approach employed in the case study reported here captured the lived experience of the seventeen participants and I (as participant-observer) in a six-day voyage. The use of unfamiliar research tools, such as Plus, Minus, Interesting and Fortune Lines, to complement my observations took me out of my comfort zone and activated my own reflective and reflexive thinking (see extracts from my out-of-field notes at Appendix H). The design and use of these tools was informal and flexible, as an ‘[opportunity for participants] to engage in a meaningful and relevant way’ (Clark et al., 2013: 4) to the research process, and to complement my observations. Although there were only 18 occupants in the vessel, measuring 22 metres long by 5 metres wide, it was impossible, due to the nature of this setting, for me to be privy to and observe every activity and social interaction thereby manifesting in only partial and contextually limited knowledge. These research tools afforded access to the lived experience of voyage participants; however, I do think that video and audio recording would have enhanced the quantity and quality of the collected data (but adding a consequential complexity to the analysis).
In respect of outcomes, I question whether the extant studies have identified and measured relevant outcomes (for example, the disputed concept of self-esteem; see Scrutton and Beames (2015) and Baumeister et al. (2003) on pages 40 and 41 respectively), which have a long-term impact for voyage participants (both crew participants and members of sea-staff). I have argued, elsewhere, that it would be more appropriate to consider how such outcomes are ‘consolidated and re-branded within the definitions of well-being; however, it is unclear how these multi-dimensional components are, or may be, laminated to create and strengthen well-being and character.’ (Fletcher and Prince, 2017: 3). Scrutton and Beames (2015) discuss the issues of ‘measuring the unmeasurable’ of personal and social outcomes in greater detail.

This study provides a new way to look at the sail training voyage and its effect on the sea-staff and young crew. The challenge of being at sea creates an authentic residential experience in a restrictive environment requiring voyage participants to take an active role in the day-to-day operation of the sailing vessel. The nature and purpose of this cultural community requires participants, regardless of their status (age, gender, novice or expert) to engage in an authentic and complex social interaction as they make a valued contribution to the legitimate endeavours of the community. The purpose of sail training is not just taking young people sailing or teaching them to sail (although this may be one outcome). Rather sail training introduces participants to a cultural community that allows:

‘an individual [to become] aware of him or herself only in and through interactions with others. [In a human experience that] is always present in two different planes – the plane of actual occurrences and the plane of their internal cognitive schematizations’ (Kozulin, 1998: 10)

as a means of personal and social development.

5.4 Implications

5.4.1 For Sail Training practitioners and providers

In conducting this study, I understand better the processes of the sail training voyage and which make the voyage a beneficial educative experience for participants. This thesis proposes an explanation for the beneficial outcomes
which have been identified and measured in earlier sail training studies. I have benefited from my reflections during this and other sail training voyages, enabling the development my own practice and sharing my experiences and reflections with colleagues. As Seal, our First Mate, highlighted:

‘The reason that I was doing it is because I wanted to go sailing. I certainly didn’t realise that sailing was just the tip of the iceberg, with all of the other things going on.’ (Page 11 ante).

Sail training practitioners would benefit by engaging with this and other thinking concerning their practice, so that they too can reflect and enter in to a dialogue within the sail training community to develop further our practice and enhance sail training programmes.

There are clear benefits in encouraging practitioners-as-researchers; this would allow greater access to the voyage-based setting, particularly smaller vessels, and facilitate a new type of boundary crossing for practitioners in this setting.

5.4.2 For policy makers and funders

The drive to improve the well-being and character of children and young people sits outside of mainstream education (see Chapter 1); this has seen policy makers and funders (mainly from the charitable and voluntary sector) move to a What works? mindset to inform policy decisions or the provision of funding for this or that initiative.

As a residential experience, sail training, in common with many other OAE programmes, must compete with non-residential interventions which claim to achieve the same types of outcome for the available but limited funding. This has created a demand for and reliance on self-report or single-measure data (for example, see Fiennes et al., 2015; Schijf et al., 2017) to make decisions easier and provide over-simplistic measures of outcomes, effectiveness and value-for-money. This requires a concerted effort to change this.

5.4.3 For researchers

I would encourage future researchers across all aspects of outdoor adventure education to focus on the processes for change, rather than
defaulting to the identification and measurement of isolated personal and social developmental concepts. If we are to understand better or at least propose the processes for or theories of change found in sail training, and other OAE programmes, then we must engage in a productive dialogue for the benefit future participants. As I have proposed for practitioners to engage as practitioners-as-researchers, I would also encourage academic researchers to engage with the OAE sector, however, this is difficult without funding. The posting of academic research on the Sail Training International (STI) and Association of Sail Training Organisation (ASTO) websites, and recent establishment of the Institute for Outdoor Learning Research Hub structure\textsuperscript{36} are welcome moves to bring together the multiple strands of research and practice. To contribute to these initiatives and to add to the growing body of literature I would encourage researchers, particularly post graduate and early-career researchers, to publish their studies and to make their findings more accessible to practitioners, policy makers, funders and other researchers.

\textsuperscript{36} For more information, see https://www.outdoor-learning-research.org/Research/Research-Reports and https://www.outdoor-learning-research.org/Research/Research-Hub
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crew Name</th>
<th>Pen Picture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skipper: Pip</td>
<td>Fun out going individual who likes challenges and going on adventures with family and friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosun: Millie</td>
<td>I am a new big boat sailor, but I have sailed lots of dinghies previously. The highlight of my dinghy sailing career was coming 12th at [International competition].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1/ Watch</td>
<td>Unable to attend pre-voyage session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader: Donald Duck</td>
<td>My name is Sherlock. I am 40 yrs old (nearly 41!) and am [teacher] at [school]. I love singing and am in a group called 'Soul Train' and I enjoy sailing. I have two daughters and a husband who loves motorbikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Paul</td>
<td>I am Paul. I am nearly 14 years old and have two elder siblings. I live in [city] but was born in Abu Dhabi (UAE). I play football for a club. I am the goalie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Doormat</td>
<td>My name is doormat. I am 12-year-old. I like cooking and [herpetology]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Sluggy</td>
<td>My name is Sluggy. I am a 12-year-old girl. I enjoy cooking and music. I am scared of heights. I have friends from different schools. I also like rowing and many other types of sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Pumpkin</td>
<td>I am Pumpkin. I come from [city]. I am a rower. I like chatting to people and making them feel welcome. I am nearly 13 and have 2 brothers. I would like to be an Olympic rower or a material scientist/ researcher. I like to swim uncompetitively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Matilda</td>
<td>I am 13 years old. I am right handed. I row/ cox and I can sail. I have sailed Picos on the sea in Poole, Dorset and the biggest boat I have sailed could fit 4 people. I can NOT spell and I only speak 1 language. I am very annoying some times and I love magic because i love the reaction on people’s faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: Salmon</td>
<td>I am Salmon 13 years old sporty - football, tennis, karate. I have a cat and two fish. I am scared of spiders + clowns. I have a brother. I am half Scottish quarter Finnish quarter Hungarian. I don't like cheese. I go to [school]. I like art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Dolphin</em></td>
<td>I am Dolphin. I am 12 years old. I am afraid of most animals but I want to conquer my fear. I love fashion but want to be a lawyer. I am from [country]. I have a brother and lots of cousins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Cat</em></td>
<td>I am Cat. I am 12 years old and like art and swimming. I also like music. I have a dog and a cat. I am scared of big spiders and snakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Lottie</em></td>
<td>I am 12 years old and I am a weekly boarder. My crew name is Lottie. I love to read, and my favourite lesson is Latin. I also like to watch movies and when I'm older I want to be a film editor. I have two older sisters in their late twenties and I live in [city]. My parents are divorced so every other weekend I stay with my dad, who lives in Islington in London. I am afraid of spiders crawling on me and lobsters and terrorists, but I'm vegetarian and I come from a vegan family so I don't want to kill spiders or lobsters. I know some of the people in the sailing group, mainly [Y7s], but I do know some of the [Y8s].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Penguin</em></td>
<td>My name is Penguin, I am 12 years old. I am afraid of spiders and heights but I enjoy rowing, tennis and watching telly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Suzan</em></td>
<td>I am Suzan. I am 12. I like to row and draw. I would like to be a cinematic engineer. I also have 2 cats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew: <em>Mickey Mouse</em></td>
<td>Hi, I'm Mickey. I love nature and trying new things. I also like dancing, singing and acting. Although I just turned 12 I have high hopes for the future to be successful and give my children a privileged life. I also want to boost my confidence level so that I can socialize more although I am really loud. I am also afraid of drowning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Briefing Sheet: Exploring the sail training voyage as a cultural community.

This briefing sheet is for the information of the [sail training provider] and [the School].

My name is Eric Fletcher and I am a doctoral candidate at Newcastle University. I am conducting a study to investigate how a sail training voyage operates and consider how it may support personal and social development. Existing research has shown that participation in a voyage can develop ‘notions of self confidence, self esteem, motivation, tolerance and the opportunity to display talents’. These benefits fall within the general description of wellbeing, and may contribute towards future academic and life-long success.

You are booked on a voyage with the [sail training provider] aboard [their sail training vessel] the James Cook, a yacht specifically designed for the purpose of sail training. I am an experienced volunteer […] and will be sailing with you. The [vessel] is operated by up to six sea staff, comprising a full-time Skipper and First Mate supported by volunteers, and can accommodate up to twelve crew members.

Research Methods

This research will include pre-and post-voyage sessions; these will involve individual and group activities and/ or interviews. During our voyage, I will observe the day-to-day of life aboard the James Cook, taking part in all aspects of the voyage; I will listen to and engage in conversations with everyone on board to collect your thoughts and feelings about your voyage experience.

Ethical Issues

This study will comply with the Newcastle University Ethical Approval and will follow these principles:

- The safety, welfare and wellbeing of participants is paramount;
- All participants will be provided with as much information about this study as possible;
- The informed written consent of the participants (including parent or guardian and the school, as appropriate) will be obtained;
- Participation is not compulsory and you may withdraw from this study at any time;
- The participants in observations, conversations and interviews will be anonymous, you will not be named;
- No personal data will be collected during this study.

If you would like to know more about this research, then please do contact me at e.j.fletcher2@newcastle.ac.uk

---

37 Details about Newcastle University’s ethical approach to research can be found at [http://www.ncl.ac.uk/res/research/ethics_governance/ethics_procedures/ethics-in-university/index.htm](http://www.ncl.ac.uk/res/research/ethics_governance/ethics_procedures/ethics-in-university/index.htm)
Consent Form

Study Title: Exploring the sail training voyage as a cultural community.

Research questions:
1. How does the cultural community operate during a sail training voyage?
2. How might sail training community practices be developed to optimise outcomes for participants?

Ethical Statement
I have been provided with the Research Briefing Sheet outlining the purpose of this research. I understand that I do not have to participate in any or all aspects of this study and that this is not a condition of my sailing on the voyage. I have been told that I can withdraw from this study at any time, either by speaking to [Teacher/ Gatekeeper] whilst ashore or [Skipper] when at sea.

I understand that any information provided by me will be anonymous, and will be managed and stored in confidence.

This form will NOT form part of the research reporting. Any references to observations, conversations or interviews with participants will be anonymous.

Signed (Participant):
Date:

Signed (Parent/ Guardian):
Please print name here: ______________________________________
Date:

Countersigned on behalf of [school]:
Please print name here:
Appendix D

Consent Form

Study Title: Exploring the sail training voyage as a cultural community.

Research questions:

1. How does the cultural community operate during a sail training voyage?
2. How might sail training community practices be developed to optimise outcomes for participants?

Name of participant:

Ethical Statement
I have been provided with the Research Briefing Sheet outlining the purpose of this research. I understand that I do not have to participate in any or all aspects of this study and that this is not a condition of my sailing on the voyage. I have been told that I can withdraw from this study at any time, either by speaking to [the Researcher] or [the Skipper] when at sea.

I understand that any information provided by me will be anonymous, and will be managed and stored in confidence.

This form will NOT form part of the research reporting. Any references to observations, conversations or interviews with participants will be anonymous.

Signed (Participant):

Date:
First Mate's Voyage Report

On Monday, a group of excited girls joined [the vessel] […]. They settled in to the boat, choosing their bunks and getting to know everyone during introductions round the table. Before cracking on with safety briefs they went for an explore round Whitehaven to stretch their legs. At this point at the beginning of the week, the girls stuck to their own friendship groups as they’d come from different year groups, so didn’t know everyone that well. Back at the boat we went through the safety briefs getting comfortable with how the boat works, had delicious fajitas for dinner and got an early night, as it was going to be an early start to catch the tides.

On Tuesday, we got up at 5am, got the boat ready and headed straight out of Whitehaven, hoisting the main and no 2 Yankee before breakfast. It was a long day with many girls succumbing to seasickness. However, their attitude towards it was brilliant. They just got on with it, helped each other out and looking after each other. And they even danced to the Macarena while pausing to be sick in the middle and carried on. They were determined to keep spirits high and have fun, which meant many of the girls got over their seasickness once we got into the shelter of the Isle of Man. We had a lovely sail, and even once the winds began to die down, the girls all worked together to swap the number 2 for the big Wind-seeker, so we still made good progress. We arrived at Port St Mary greeted by dolphins which caused much excitement. And much to everyone’s relief, we were in in time for dinner.

On Wednesday, we started by going for an explore round Port St Mary, and sending postcards home. We left and had a lovely sail down to Porth Wen in Anglesey. Today all the girls pulled together, pulling up the main sail as one big team, and getting it up much quicker than before. Seasickness was a thing of the past. And they loved sitting with their legs over the high side of the boat. Everyone was starting to get the hang of steering. And we learnt lots of useful knots as the girls were really keen to keep learning more. We anchored in Porth Wen and went ashore for a lovely BBQ. By this point in the week the girls were really beginning to gel together. The year group divide was no longer visible and
we were all just one big team. They did anchor watch during the night, where everyone took it in turns to keep an eye on the boat and that we were safe.

Thursday morning began with a morning swim off the boat. It was very cold so we were all wide awake after! So we warmed up with a shower using the hose attached to our taps which meant we had a shower with the best view. After breakfast we lifted the anchor and set sail towards the Isle of Man. It was a cracking sail, bombing along at 8 knots in the sunshine with all 4 sails up. Just lots of fun was had by all. The girls had grown much more confident with what they were doing on the boat. We did two man over board drills, one under sail and one under engine to practice, and so the girls could learn how we could recover an MOB. They remembered all their briefings from the beginning of the week and did their job well, keeping a really important eye on the buoy in the water. We anchored for the night at Laxey, and again the girls did anchor watch. This time they were much more confident and were able to just crack on with the job [without] much input from the staff.

On Friday, we had a morning of competent crew lessons, learning about buoyage, parts of the boat, manners and customs, meteorology, safety equipment and firefighting. The girls were really enthusiastic about learning and would ask lots of questions. We then hopped around the corner to Douglas to have some time to explore ashore and an ice cream. That night we had a lovely curry for dinner and were in hysterics playing the chocolate mousse game.

At 1am on Saturday we got up, got the boat ready and set sail for Whitehaven. The girls were really excited to be night sailing. The sea was just as wavy as the first day, but now the girls had grown used to it and more confident it wasn’t a big deal. They saw a beautiful sunrise. And one watch [was] greeted by a massive pod of dolphins. What an amazing sight! There was some impressive steering going on, with the girls showing determination to keep practicing and get the knack of it. We arrived into Whitehaven where the girls worked really well together to do an efficient end of voyage clean up, since there was no time to waste before their train home. It’s been a really good week. The girls really gelled as a team, getting to know each other and helping each other out. They said themselves that they got a lot out of it just by having to do things for
themselves. And they had gained so much confidence over the week. At the beginning they were nervous just climbing on to the boat, but now as they left they were jumping on and off the boat without batting an eyelid.
Exploring the sail training voyage as a cultural community

Voyage Pack

Crew Name:

This pack contains a number of activities to prompt you to think about your voyage experience and record your thoughts and feelings. It is important to remember that there is no right or wrong answer to any particular question or a correct or incorrect solution to an activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn today?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell me about <strong>one</strong> thing that you learned today:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell me about how you learned:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this make you feel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fortune Lines

Your crew name: ______________________

**This is about being a crew member.** Each day think about how you feel about becoming or being a member of the crew. Then please use the space below to record any particular event or activity that made you feel this way.

![Emoticon with smiling face]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your crew name: ______________________

**This is about the sea-staff and other crew members.** Please use this fortune line graph to record your thinking and feelings about the sea-staff and crew members.

![Emoticon with neutral face]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your voyage like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plus/ Minus/ Interesting

Presented here are the collated responses to the Plus/ Minus/ Interesting activities completed across the three frames of the study (pre-voyage: $T^0$; on-voyage: $T^1$; and post-voyage: $T^2$). Some entries have been corrected for spelling and study crew names have been substituted for any real names; otherwise they are verbatim responses and any emphasis is in the original.

Composite for *Cat*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | • New friends  
|       | • New people  
|       | • Wildlife  
|       | • Sunshine (hopefully)  
|       | • Places  
|       | • Early wake up  
|       | • Sea sickness  
|       | • The wildlife  
|       | • The boat  
|       | • How to sail  
| $T^1$ | • Learning new things  
|       | • Visiting new places  
|       | • Isle of Man  
|       | • Not being sick  
|       | • Learning how the boat works  
|       | • DOLPHINS!!!!!!  
|       | • Food  
|       | • People  
|       | • Self-amalgamating tape  
|       | • Knots  
|       | • Ice cream  
|       | • Navigation  
|       | • Feeling sick  
|       | • Tiny bunks  
|       | • No showers / baths  
|       | • Can't keep the self-amalgamating tape  
|       | • Helming  
|       | • Putting a sail up  
|       | • Knots  
|       | • Ireland  
|       | • Wales  
|       | • Sails/ sail covers on/off  
|       | • Flares  
|       | • Grab bag  
|       | • Navigation  
| $T^2$ | • New friends  
|       | • Not being sick  
|       | • Seeing new places  
|       | • Dolphins  
|       | • Beach BBQ  
|       | • Feeling sick  
|       | • Jellyfish  
|       | • Cold  
|       | • Steering the boat  
|       | • Learning the parts of the boat  
|       | • Map reading  
|       | • Plotting the course  


## Composite for *Dolphin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | • Being with your friends  
• Beautiful sceneries for pictures  
• Learning to cook and sail  
• Finding out more about people | • Not being able to use my phone as much  
• Waking up early  
• Sea sickness  
• If it rains | • Looking at wildlife from a different angle  
• Living with other people |
| $T^1$ | • Being with friends  
• Dancing and singing  
• Seeing dolphins  
• Having barbeques on beaches  
• Swimming | • Being sea sick | • I would like to see a pirate seal and killer ship  
• Seeing different sceneries |
| $T^2$ | • Dolphins  
• Swimming  
• Beach/ barbeque  
• Going shopping | • Seasickness | |

## Composite for *Donald Duck*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T^0$</td>
<td>Unable to attend session - No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $T^1$ | • The opportunity to learn a lot  
• To recap on previous knowledge too  
• Chance to get to know the girls whom I don't teach yet | • I'd like to be more involved with navigation, etc but don’t feel that I can ask  
• Feeling apart from all sides neither one thing nor another | • Visiting new places  
• Finding out more about how [the charity] works and about the career paths of the girls on board  
• Finding out my own capabilities. I still don't push myself too far beyond what I know but I’ve done a few things that I don’t feel comfortable with |
| $T^2$ | • An interesting experience  
• Good to get to know new people  
• Lots of laughs with girls  
• The girls did really well – better than I'd expected and made it a positive experience | • Feeling seasick  
• Not knowing how to be helpful  
• Realising that my patience wears thin when I got tired | • Learning how the boat works  
• Getting used to living in close quarters with others |
Composite for **Doormat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | - Learning how to sail  
- Learning how to navigate  
- More independence | - Sea sickness  
- Not getting enough sleep | - Learning how to sail and navigate |

| $T^1$ | - Going to other [countries]  
- Meeting new people | - Sea sickness | - The boat has strange toilets  
- Living in close confines with other people  
- There is an upside-down chess set in the saloon |

| $T^2$ | - Seeing dolphins in the wild  
- Coldness  
- New friends  
- Food  
- Other people’s reaction to self-amalgamating tape  
- Team work | - Boat-water  
- Cleaning toilets  
- Seasick  
- Minute bunks  
- Anchor watch  
- Winching sails | - Learning about flags and parts of the boat  
- Night sailing |

Composite for **Lottie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | - Making more friends or stronger bonds with people I already know  
- Learning to sail  
- Being out at sea  
- Going to beaches  
- Watching dolphins  
- Spending time with my friends  
- The sights of the sunrise, etc  
- All the activities | - Missing some of the summer holiday – I just moved house and I haven’t been there yet  
- Having to tidy up  
- Not wearing nice clothes  
- Some people I don’t know might not turn out to be nice  
- Not having our phones  
- Getting up early  
- Fishing | - The PhD research will be interesting to take part in  
- Learning about the ship |
| T¹ | • Visiting the Isle of Man  
    • Climbing around the boat  
    • Sailing!  
    • Getting sprayed by the sea  
    • Dangling legs out  
    • Making friends  
    • Steering the ship  
    • The food!  
    • Comfy beds  
    • Chapstick  
    • The chocolate mousse game  
    • Cool places  
    • Going to places I’ve never been before  
    • Making friends!  
    • Wearing French plaits  
    • Huge waves  
    • Bedtime story  
    • Magic tricks  
    • Ice cream!  
    • Being seasick  
    • Not having showers  
    • Claustrophobic bunks  
    • Having to wear oilies and a lifejacket on deck  
    • Being clipped on all the time  
    • No land-water  
    • Chapped lips  
    • Creepy anchor watch  
    • Annoying people  
    • Being tired  
| T² | • Land-water  
    • New friends  
    • Nice teachers  
    • Food  
    • Night sailing  
    • Dolphins  
    • Bonding  
    • Sailing  
    • Sitting on the side  
    • Singing hymns  
    • Singing Mama Mia  
    • Sleeping  
    • Going to the Isle of Man  
    • Going to Anglesey  
    • SELF-AMALGAMATING TAPE  
    • Getting a certificate  
    • Getting land-water at the Isle of Man  
    • Getting more confident  
    • Doing the health and safety thing  
    • Tricking [Mickey Mouse]  
    • [Dolphin] doing the Macarena  
    • Boat-water  
    • Cleaning boat  
    • Coldness  
    • Gross clothes  
    • Anchor watch  
    • Food  
    • Waking up  
    • Squash  
    • Bunks  
    • No phones  
    • Cooking  
    • Washing up  
    • Being sick  
    • Putting down sails  
    • Winching  
    • Almost losing [the MOB Marker]  
    • Wearing oilies  
    • Learning about parts of the boat  
    • Learning about flags  
    • PhD study  
    • Hot chocolate looks the same when it’s been in your stomach  
    • Getting a certificate
• Getting to know people
• Getting over seasickness
• Seeing what hot chocolate sick look like
• Going in the abandoned bay and having BBQ
• Exploring the bay
• Going in the dinghy
• Not showering
• Eating free Twix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite for <strong>Matilda</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T² | • Finding new skills  
  • Making new friends  
  • New experiences | • Might not get on with people  
  • Being tired  
  • Sleeping  
  • Feeling sick  
  • What the boat looks like  
  • How it works  
  • How much energy it takes out of you | |
| T¹ | • The space  
  • The chess on the [ceiling]  
  • Dinner time  
  • Self-[amalgamating] tape  
  • Swimming  
  • Beds  
  • We can’t take the self-[amalgamating] tape home  
  • The water was cold  
  • Helping put up the sails | |
| T² | *Did not attend post-voyage session* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite for <strong>Mickey Mouse</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T⁰</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T¹ | • Learning new things on the boat like knot tying and safety rules  
  • Working [collaboratively] and getting others involved in events  
  • When we don’t get to communicate with our parents thousands of miles away  
  • Waking up at the right time for high water or low water so that we can set [off] at the right time | | • Putting up sails  
  • Getting to know some new people  
  • Doing a drill for man overboard |
• No Wi-Fi in this technologically developed era

T²  Has left school. Did not attend post voyage session

Composite for *Millie*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T⁰    | • Funny, jokes, good memories  
      • Meeting new people  
      • Sailing with different sea staff  
      • Learn new skills/ improve on current skills | • Might have problems with sea sickness and tired people from watch sailing  
      • May be homesick due to age | • Going to new places  
      • Seeing crew develop in boat confidence over the week  
      • Haven’t sailed with such a young crew before |
| T¹    | • Some people working together already helping each other when they were seasick  
      • Crew feeling a lot more comfortable on the boat now with helming, some knots  
      • How quickly this group picks up skills  
      • Seeing them all get along well and becoming closer  
      • Seeing them be interested in lessons  
      • They’re starting to teach each other things, both sailing related and external, i.e. magic tricks | | • What sticks out in their mind the most at ‘most memorable part of the day’  
      • How they’re not really phone obsessed, happy to go without it |
| T²    | • Full of fun  
      • Visited lots of cool places, my favourite was Porth Wen  
      • Taught the young people knots, about boat maintenance (inc. self-amalgamating tape)  
      • Great to meet some very interesting young people | | • Learning about their upbringing and life in comparison to other young people we have on board  
      • How they all thought being seasick would be a problem but they got over it.  
      • How willing they were to learn |
### Composite for *Paul*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | - Friends  
- Learning to sail | - Cold and wet  
- Possible lack of sleep | - Learning to sail |
| $T^1$ | - Going places  
- Dolphins  
- Some people are very gullible  
- Self-amalgamating tape  
- Gossiping for 2 1/2 hours  
- Jumping [off] the boat  
- Spending time with people | - Sea sickness  
- Bunk beds are tiny  
- I can’t go below deck when we’re sailing  
- I can’t take the self-amalgamating tape home  
- People are good at eavesdropping | - Toilet  
- Working the boat  
- Self-amalgamating tape  
- Big waves  
- Log book  
- Plan route  
- Navigation  
- Emergencies |
| $T^2$ | - New friends  
- Big waves  
- Dolphins  
- Self-amalgamating tape  
- When the vending machine gave me two Twirls  
- Swimming  
- Barbeque  
- Views  
- The ‘watch’  
- Eggy bread | - Cold  
- Wind  
- Clean the toilet  
- Being seasick  
- Having to change what we were attached to every time we had to move around the boat | - Learning about the boat  
- Learning about sea code  
- The beds |

### Composite for *Penguin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | - Making new friends  
- Waking up early  
- Animals  
- Learning how to sail | - Waking up early  
- Not having […] beds or facilities  
- Being away from home  
- Not having your phone the whole time  
- Sea sick | - [Where] we are going  
- Animals  
- Living with other people |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | • Fun  
• Adventures  
• Being with friends  
• Visiting different places  
• Seeing young people achieve even when [they are] having a bad time  
• Meeting new people  
• Having a laugh | • Expectations of crew/leaders | • 12 girls from an all-girls school how will they help each other  
• Seeing how the relief mate does  
• Meeting expectations with the weather we have and staff |
| $T^1$ | • Development of staff & seeing staff develop  
• Very good and enjoying the company  
• Crew working well together  
• Having fun and adventure  
• Nothing seems to be fazing them  
• Seeing staff succeed | • Girls hair everywhere  
• Some people not giving it a go with the crew  
• A few of the crew stepping back in helping each other | • How people have developed with having been away  
• What some crew parents do for a job in talking to them  
• Seeing the little social groups coming together  
• Who has started to come out of their shells |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T₂    | • Dolphins  
• Youngsters really grew together as friends  
• Good sailing  
• How excited the three girls were on the bow – memories forever  
• Seeing friends again – *Sherlock, Seal*  
• How *Seal* has developed | • Some social groups and minorities happened through the week  
• [*Doormat*] really detached and in a bad place  
• Lack of wind so distances sail was short  
• How on leaving, maybe *Seal* is [being] held back | • How the others dealt with [*Doormat*] and dealing with her needs – some really good, others really bad |

**Composite for Pumpkin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T₀    | • Learning to sail  
• Meeting new people  
• Getting ‘hands-on’  
• Exciting | • Cold and wet  
• No shower  
• Possibly not much sleep | • Living with lots of people in a small space  
• Learning to sail  
• Cooking food |
| T₁    | • I haven’t been seasick  
• I have been to a different country  
• Learning how to helm the boat  
• Seeing dolphins  
• Splashing big waves  
• Going swimming/jumping in  
• Really big waves | • The bunk beds are small  
• I haven’t seen my parents/family  
• Getting wet  
• Getting my shoes wet  
• Coping with some annoying crew members  
• People not flushing the loo | • Using a weird toilet  
• How long days feel  
• Getting cold  
• Walking around on a moving boat  
• Learning how to tie knots  
• Not being able to talk to my family  
• Really big waves |
| T₂    | • New friends  
• Not cleaning the toilet  
• Going to places that I hadn’t been before  
• Not being seasick  
• The whole experience  
• BBQ on the beach  
• Swimming  
• Views  
• Dolphins  
• Chocolate mousse game  
• Eggy bread | • Having to get on with each other  
• It was cold | • Learning about the boat  
• We were all in really close quarters but we all coped |
### Composite for *Salmon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T⁰</td>
<td>• Meeting new people</td>
<td>• Not much personal space</td>
<td>• How the boat works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being around the sea</td>
<td>• Sea sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sunrise</td>
<td>• Sleeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making new friends</td>
<td>• Early mornings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controlling the boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T¹</td>
<td>• Not feeling sea sick</td>
<td>• Bed space</td>
<td>• Not feeling sea sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lots of free time</td>
<td>• Storage</td>
<td>• How we have to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• [steering] the boat</td>
<td>• It is very hard to move around the deck when the boat is moving</td>
<td>where we go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-amalgamating tape</td>
<td>• Space</td>
<td>according to the wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2-hour gossip non-stop session</td>
<td>• Can’t find my shoes</td>
<td>Log book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free land-water</td>
<td>• The ‘G’ and ‘L’ word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• [mousse] game</td>
<td>• The lifejackets are hard to get on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T²</td>
<td>• Fun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning about parts of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting new people</td>
<td></td>
<td>the boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning how to sail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seeing more of the British Isles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-amalgamating tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning how to sail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helming the boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overnight sail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-amalgamating tape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land-water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jelly fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not being seasick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The chocolate mousse game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Small sleeping space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard to organise stuff in the top bunk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cold at times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Boat-water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cleaning toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Composite for *Seal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T⁰</td>
<td>• Catch up with friends</td>
<td>• Will probably vomit</td>
<td>• Not been on the boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have a laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>for a while so remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get challenged and pushed so learn lots</td>
<td></td>
<td>everything will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get to practice sailing as 1st Mate</td>
<td></td>
<td>interesting. Feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoy doing bits of sail training I’ve missed like games +</td>
<td></td>
<td>rather rusty!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching working with and getting to know kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeing the new main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sail and how well the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boat sails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most likely will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stressful at times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T'      | • Learning my job on-board again  
|        | • Challenging me  
|        | • Showing me bad habits I’ve got in to  
|        | • Learning lots. Confidence in being able to pick up on side I want with MOB something I’ve struggled with for ages  
|        | • Having fun with friends  
|        | • Getting a cold  
|        | • Make me think about my future in sailing and what I want  
|        | • Trying to do MOBs, particularly under sail  
|        | • Getting to know new people  
|        | • Learning how things have changed on board + suggestions from other boat thinking of improvements  
| T²     | • Good fun  
|        | • Visited pretty places  
|        | • Learnt lots + gave me lots to think about  
|        | • Was pushed out of my comfort zone  
|        | • Seeing friends  
|        | • Made quite a few stupid mistakes, wasn’t as good as I wanted to be  
|        | • Thinking about future to make decision of what next  
|        | • The kids, sailing with another private school  

Composite for *Sherlock*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| T⁰    | • Get to go sailing!  
|       | • See friends and catch up  
|       | • New school – intro to [sail training]  
|       | • Remember how to be a watch leader  
|       | • Learn new skills  
|       | • Sea sickness  
|       | • Tiredness  
|       | • Voyage clean up on my birthday then 6hrs travel  
|       | • A lot to remember – that mizzen sail  
|       | • Interaction between girls  
|       | • New places  
|       | • Exploring  
|       | • Seeing how girls cope being outside their comfort zone  
| T¹    | • Sailing with new people  
|       | • Challenging myself to relearn watch leader role  
|       | • Challenging myself to relearn YM cards  
|       | • Fun – silly games  
|       | • Observing team work  
|       | • Tiredness – maybe not a great idea to come at end of term as I feel weary and not as fun as I would like to be  
|       | • Kids getting giddy/ silly and no space to get away  
|       | • Visiting new places  
|       | • Watching interaction  
|       | • MOB  
|       | • Learning new info – YachtMaster quiz  
|       | • Watching others teach  
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### Composite for Sluggy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $T^0$ | • Making friends  
• Seeing new sights  
• Waking up early | • Waking up early  
• Sea sickness  
• Hurting yourself | • Waking up early  
• Seeing new sights |
| $T^1$ | • Waking up early  
• Seeing dolphins  
• Seeing new places  
• Hanging our legs off the edge of the boat | • Waking up early  
• Throwing up being sea sick  
• Getting cold | • Waking up early  
• Putting up sails  
• Seeing new places |
| $T^2$ | • Dolphins  
• BBQ on the beach  
• Anchor watch  
• Self-amalgamating tape  
• Teamwork  
• Night sailing | • Seasick  
• Blisters  
• Cutting myself | • Waking up early  
• Map reading |
## Composite for **Suzan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T⁰</td>
<td>• Food</td>
<td>• Sea sickness</td>
<td>• Learning sea terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning how to [sail]</td>
<td>• Home sickness</td>
<td>• Seeing the Irish Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dolphins</td>
<td>• Getting cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sleeping</td>
<td>• Train journey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waking up early in the morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jumping in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Navigating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T¹</td>
<td>• Learning to sail</td>
<td>• Sea sickness</td>
<td>• Learning things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tying knots</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jumping in the sea</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grab bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chocolate mousse game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T²</td>
<td>• Dolphins</td>
<td>• Seasickness</td>
<td>• Learning knots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ice cream</td>
<td>• Cutting my hands</td>
<td>• Learning to sail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ocean breeze</td>
<td>• Water</td>
<td>• Meeting new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• [Porth Wen]</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Going new places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-amalgamating tape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anchor watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Night sailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Extracts from the out-of-field notes

These extracts are taken from the out-of-field notes; these are based on the original contemporaneous and second-iteration handwritten field notes. The notes presented here reflect the pre-, on- and post-voyage research activities, and are in addition to any reference to these notes in the main body of this manuscript. Crew names have been substituted for any reference to real-names.

Pre-voyage: crew and teachers

The timeline for my visit to the school to meet the young crew members for a voyage w/c Monday 11th July 2016, formally began on the 19th May 2016 with an e mail to Sherlock. [...] Sherlock [is] a teacher at the school and a volunteer with the sail training [provider]; as such she is a member of both the school community and the vessel’s community; and had agreed to act as ‘gatekeeper’.

I had originally envisaged a half-day session with the young crew and two teachers to provide me with the opportunity to introduce the study and complete some study activities. It was only when I engaged with Sherlock that it was apparent that my expectations were unrealistic. At [the time of the pre-voyage session] the school was approaching the end-of-term, completing end-of-year assessments and preparing for their end-of-year social events. The competing demands of the school’s expectations set against my own required a reality check on my part, so I reviewed what I would like to achieve and what I must achieve in this pre-voyage session.

[...] I had already had an e mail exchange with Sherlock as to the dress code for my visit – [I] decided on a suit, shirt and tie – this reminds me of my visit to [the university, and after a] meeting [I had been] advised that I should ‘lose the suit and tie’.

[...] I arrived at the school, a very grand (Victorian?) brick built building; gardeners were working on the grassed areas [outside]. I was aware that as the last week of term that there are a number of events planned. Students were all dressed in a smart uniform with school ties and blazers sporting the school crest. [...] At
reception, I explained the purpose of my visit – to meet Sherlock (who was on rest-day but was contactable); I signed in and was given a visitor’s pass, then invited to wait in the corridor outside the school’s main hall, a main thoroughfare – wooden panels with details of the school’s achievers and alumni since the 1920s adorning the walls. As I waited, smartly dressed staff and students in uniform were busily going about their business.

About 1.50pm I was met by Sherlock, and was taken to the staff room to wait until the appointed time. […] At 2pm a bell rang and we made our way back to the reception/ corridor outside the main hall, where a number of girls had congregated; they greeted Sherlock addressing her as ‘Miss’.

[…] The crew participants are a mix of girls, aged 11 to 13 years, three are boarders and others are day-pupils. In our initial introductions it was established that, with the exception of the three boarders, they were not in any established friendship groups. I wanted to record this session and sought their permission to do so, setting up the equipment once they had agreed. In my pre-session discussion with Sherlock, she felt that there might be an issue in getting them to talk so was very conscious to put them at their ease. I described the research design, that it would comprise pre-, on- and post-voyage sessions and activities […] although in hindsight I do not know how much of this was heard as they underwent the process of establishing themselves as a group.

I had planned three activities to complete in this 90-minute session. The first activity was an invitation for the crew members to select a crew name”; I explained that I wanted to track their individual progress as they completed the pre-, on- and post-voyage activities, but wanted to keep this data anonymous (I am also conscious that I do want to use research terms, such as data, data collection, analysis). I was very conscious that this explanation should not dilute their own identity (a process to be found in Goffman’s total institution); and that this was only for use in written activities – that we would use our ‘real’ names for all other aspects of the voyage. In addition to the ‘crew name’, I invited the crew to write a short ‘pen picture’ to describe themselves – this was intended to allow participants to provide some description of their existing identity or what they valued. There was some discussion about what could or should be included in
this pen picture, I was non-committal and let the girls decide. I do not plan to
analyse what names were chosen, but I did notice they included the names of
animals or cartoon characters, but one doormat did alert me to the fact that the
choice of a name may indicate some deeper meaning.

[We then moved on to] the 'plus, minus and interesting' activity, taken from the
Visual Methods guidance, and I provided a commentary and what the frame was
intended to accomplish but did not give any direction on what they should write.
I intended that this activity would provide a consistent frame for analysis across
the study. […] Having completed their responses, I collected them in. Sherlock
then produced a large box of multi-coloured hoodies, each with the school crest
and voyage details on the front and each crew members’ real or nick-name (not
related in any way to their study ‘crew name’) on the back […]. The group then
eagerly tried on their hoodie – what contribution does this item of branded clothing
make to the individual and group identity?

My arrival at the boat

On my journey to the port I have lots of time to think about the week and how I
might combine my dual roles. Although I regard myself as a member of the
‘community’ (whatever that actually means?) and the voyage-based setting the
plan for this study adds a new dimension to my ‘character’. I am anxious that I
will be able to collect as much data as I will need, to do justice to the crew/ sea
staff, the [sail training provider], the university and myself. These competing
demands and concerns make this voyage feel like it is my first time all over again!

I arrived at the marina at 4.20pm. I could recognise the boat’s masts as I
approached, and once in the marina I could see the boat moored up. I know that
I need a car parking permit but the marina office closed at 4pm. I require a pass
code to access the marina pontoons so I called the boat mobile phone, which
went direct to voicemail. I then call the Skipper – she is still in Newcastle and
there is no-one on board the boat; her eta is about 6pm, but sends me […] the
pass codes for the marina pontoon and toilet facilities.

[…] I make my way the boat and board her and I carry my bags down below. This
is the first time I have arrived at the boat without anyone being aboard. What do
I do first? I move my bags to the crew quarters and hesitate to claim a bunk ‘as mine’ in the sea staff cabin – have I been allocated a bunk?

I decide to make a coffee – I check the shore power; the water pump does not kick in as I turn the tap to fill the kettle. Is the water pump turned off? Is there a water tank turned on? I check the power supply, then turn to the switch panel, and the water tank cocks to be sure everything is working. It has taken about ten minutes of problem solving just to fill the kettle – I am not as familiar with this setting as I thought I was! It feels like I am trespassing – this is so unusual; I feel a strange sense of loneliness – I only know this setting as one that is occupied by people! After I have got the FM radio working I sit drinking my coffee and notice the slate sign above the steps leading to the crew quarters ‘Enter as strangers – leave as friends’ – how true.

**Pre-voyage: sea-staff**

[The Skipper proposed that] after lunch is cleared away then it may be a good time to conduct their pre-voyage study session.

I begin by checking the consent forms, although I had sent these by e mail I did not have signed copies. I had brought blank forms with me and these were completed before I explained my plan: the crew name/ pen picture and plus, minus and interesting, and [then I mention] mention the Voyage Pack. I decide not to record this session – I am realising that recording on-board is going to be difficult. I am aware that over the last three years I have discussed my thinking about how a voyage may generate change in both sea-staff and crews; [Pip, the skipper] has been the skipper on most of my voyages – I like her leadership style and how she manages both the sea-staff and young crews. [Seal, the First Mate] was Watch Leader on my first voyage, initially she seemed quite quiet but she now exudes a real confidence and I note that she uses expressions that I have heard Pip use. I am conscious that I do not want to further contaminate their responses in completing these activities; so after introducing the activities I remain silent, only responding to questions they have as they complete each part of the [pre-voyage] activity.
The crew’s arrival at the boat
About 3.45pm [the Skipper, First Mate and Bosun and I] make our way out of the marina and walk up to the railway station. We take one trolley to help with any heavy luggage. I know from my earlier conversation with Sherlock that the crew had left their home town about 9.30am [this morning] and that they would have changed trains twice en-route to the boat. As Pip, Seal and Millie (the Bosun) make their way to the platform I stay with the trolley in the station entrance. I see a train arrive; closely followed by the crew, Sherlock and the other teacher, Donald Duck emerge from the platform with the skipper and sea-staff. The girls are all wearing their branded hoodies. On seeing the trolley some of the girls rushed to offload their baggage; the first few managed to offload all of their bags, whereas others were left disappointed – we, perhaps, should have brought another trolley or two. I am aware that they do not know how far they will have to walk to the boat with their bags. We re-arrange the trolley a little to allow optimum use for the heavier bags and then Sherlock and Donald Duck encourage the girls to share the remaining load that has to be carried. There are one or two reluctant to carry anything! Pip, Seal and Millie and I offer to help. They are all chatty and appear to be excited to have arrived, albeit they are not yet on-board. We walk along the quayside and are able to look down on the boat moored in the marina; their first sight of their home for the next week.

We arrive at the marina […] We all arrive at the boat and within minutes Seal and Millie have arranged the girls in to a human-chain to load their baggage on to the boat. Some load it on to the deck as others are tasked to pass it down the forward hatch to the crew quarters. Instructions are given for them to locate a bunk and unpack and stow their belongings in the spaces provided alongside each bunk. This is the usual method of getting everyone on-board; it has turned what could have been a very individualistic activity into an authentic group activity; if each had been responsible for their own unloading/loading then this would have taken more time, this group approach enables completion in a more efficient manner and is a marked contrast to the apparent self-interest observed at the railway station [and the loading of the trolley]. It has also got them talking about voyage-specific considerations, such as the practicalities of occupying the bottom, middle or top bunk. Is this the beginning of a ‘mindfulness’ and consideration for each
other? Individuals clumsily pick their way across the deck of the boat, which rocks with the movement of its occupants.

As all of this activity is taking place I see the deck hatches open, there is lots of chatter and laughter from below – this is how I remember the boat and is a distinct contrast to how I felt on my arrival on Sunday.

On-voyage

Monday 11th July: Within thirty minutes the ‘dust has settled’; we are all, all 18 of us, sitting around the saloon table. The saloon is an area about 5 metres square with ‘U’ shaped seating around two sections of table. The sections of table can be folded out to make to make one large table. Two bench seats are placed in the thoroughfare to make sufficient room for everyone to sit down around the table. The table top is half red and half green, to denote port and starboard. This is the main area where we eat and conduct most of the inside briefings. We are offered a drink of squash: orange, blackcurrant and a ‘mix’ of the two. Pip, the skipper, then begins her initial welcome on-board and some basics about safety, such as not running on pontoons, if you don’t then ‘ask’. I had intended to record this briefing but it happened so quickly that I didn’t have time to get the equipment ready, and asking for permission would had interrupted the flow – besides although they are paying attention there is a lot of discussion between individuals and small groups. This welcoming ritual (which I recall from my own initial voyage and every voyage since) takes the form of inviting those present to state their name (their real name) in the ‘name game’, to declare their expectations for the voyage and a super-hero power they would like to have and why. The name game requires each person to state their name, and as we proceed around the table you have to recite everyone’s name that has gone before. This performs several functions, it allows the sea-staff to get to know the names of the crew by way of repetition and it is fun!

[…] At 7.15pm we resume the briefings. The crew are divided in to two groups of six, each will have either Seal or Millie for these briefings […] ; the session will cover the safe use of the headsail winches (situated in the cockpit), and the life raft/ abandon ship and OXO/ pin-rail and ‘round-turn-and-two-half-hitches’ fender knot.
I decide to observe the winch briefing that will take place in the cockpit. The first is led by Seal who uses a teaching method that I will describe as ‘Explain – Demonstrate – Imitate – Practice’ (EDIP). [She] explains the working principles of the winch, the sail it is used to control and how it is important that it is used safely. (Explain); she then uses a line (the running forestay) to demonstrate how to load a line on to the winch, by placing a couple of turns [around the winch and then] pull in by hand with safety precautions (little fingers towards the winch at arm’s length), and then loading with four turns and run through self-tailing jaws before using winch handle to tension the line, with one or two people helping to ‘tail’ the line, then make safe with two safety turns (two loose turns around the winch to prevent accidental release of the tension); then how to release the tension by using a flat hand on the winch to slowly release line and the as it becomes slack to release the line (Demonstration). The winch is used in tacking or gybing (moving the headsail from one side of the boat to the other by either turning the bow through or the stern across the wind); these are coordinated activities used whilst sailing. Each crew member then imitates this practical demonstration (Imitate) under the guidance of Seal and is allowed to practice (Practice); Seal uses both winches to allow for this practice. This process is repeated a several times until all six girls have been able to complete at least one practice, and in doing so they discuss and provide each other with advice and guidance, even though the differential between ‘novice’ and ‘expert’ is not so great.

At 7.35pm the groups change over so that Millie brings her group to the cockpit. She conducts the session in exactly the same manner as Seal, using the principles of EDIP – this is very formulaic and perhaps, is an example of ‘you teach as you learned’ as a consequence of the community’s approach, however, when it comes to allowing the girls to practice she uses only one winch, perhaps allowing her to give more attention to the activity, as opposed to dividing it by using two winches as the more experienced Seal did.

This is an activity that is very much situated on the boat, tacking and gybing in solely situated in the context of sailing, whether it be on a large yacht, dinghy, sail-board or even land-based activities that use the principles of sailing (such as
land-yacht). It also has a safety component which may lead to further developing the perception of risk and act as a Maslow factor.

**Tuesday 12th July:** [5.30am] The day starts with music being played through the boat. [...] *Millie* is completing her engine checks, part of her daily routine; the engine is accessed via lift up panels in the saloon floor which has been roped off for safety purposes. Within five minutes or so everyone is in the process of getting up and getting ready. There are one or two complaints about it being so early or not being able to find their things. *Seal* is coordinating everyone – she clearly has plan. We arrive on deck fully kitted out with waterproofs and lifejackets. Some crew are taking off the sail covers (heavy duty covers that are used protect the sails from the weather and UV light; there are three – the staysail, mainsail and mizzen). *Seal* tasks my/Donald Duck’s watch to adjust the stern spring to a slipping stern line; *Sherlock*’s watch is completing a similar task at the bow; this is coordinated by *Millie*’s watch who are on the pontoon helping to adjust the lines. Once the ‘slip’ lines are in place we let go the large ‘black & hairy’ bow and stern lines. I notice that the engine is running and, in no time at all, we are about ready to leave. I explain to two of my watch that ‘on command’ we will let go one ‘side’ of the slipping stern line and then will haul this back on board as quickly as possible so that it doesn’t foul the propeller.

Each watch has been given their task, *Millie*’s watch is back on board having completed helping to rig ‘slipping’ bow and stern lines – this means that all lines can be managed from on-board the boat. *Seal* checks that the bow and stern watches are ready and then commands the bow watch to ‘let go the bow’ – I can see from my vantage point on the stern that they are completing the command. *Pip* is standing in the companionway watching the activity and giving *Seal* ‘pointers’ as we go. The stern then moves closer to the pontoon as *Seal* manoeuvres the boat so that the bow ‘springs’ out from the pontoon. We now have a roving fender (a large round fender that is held in the hand so that its position can be adjusted quickly) on the stern to protect the hull as it moves toward the pontoon. On command we slip the stern, my two watch members work together to both release one part of the line and haul it back on board.
I am a little rusty and seek some reassurance from Pip and Seal that we are doing the right thing, at the right time. These are perishable skills but they come flooding back as I am reminded of the drills. I wonder what the young crew think about me asking for reassurance or being told what to do by Pip and Seal – how does this set an example. I am learning too.

[…] As we enter the Irish Sea all of the crew are busy – they are told to clip on. [Everyone is involved in hoisting the mainsail and headsail, and as I return to] the cockpit I notice that there are several orange-coloured sick-buckets in use. We are sailing and the motion of the boat is making it difficult for the ‘novice’ crew to move around. Is this another example of making the familiar (moving about the boat whilst stationary) more difficult (moving about when the boat is sailing, heeled over and moving through the waves). There is an increasing incidence of sea-sickness – is this a ‘cascade’ effect? At the same time, for those who want it, we are offered breakfast on the go – toast, and for those who prefer it, cereal in a stainless-steel bowl referred to as ‘dog bowls’. This is a strange social interaction; some crew members have their heads stuck in their sick-bucket whilst sitting alongside another tucking in to toast or cereal but they are all, to varying degrees, involved in conversation.

In stowing lines and fenders, preparing for and hoisting sails and preparing for breakfast have been conducted concurrently with crew members and sea-staff moving between activities to enable the overarching activity of ‘getting us sailing’! It all seems to have been seamless, although I have had my occasional – what do I do next?

The crew are moving between the cockpit and companionway. As they return to the cockpit most are forgetting to clip on and are quickly reminded by their fellow crew (peer-to-peer guidance).

[…] When my watch takes over we are briefed about our course, both a compass course-to-steer and a general direction towards a landmark – we are approaching the Isle of Man. I initially take the helm, and I am joined by my watch, including Donald Duck, in the cockpit, getting a feel for the point of sail. After a short time, I invite a member of the watch to take over – it is my plan to get every member of the watch to rotate on the helm. […]
I use EDIP. I first explain the course-to-steer and point out landmarks and hazards, and a brief description of how the steering works and the expected delay between turning the wheel and seeing/feeling a change in direction; this is combined with a demonstration. I ask if the crew member is ready and step aside— they take the wheel, which for some is taller than [they are]! I guide them in the initial stage of their ‘imitation’. [...] Once we are on course I encourage the helmsman to look for a landmark and to reference that with a point on the boat, such as the guardrail or the navigation light boxes. Once we have covered these basics I leave the helmsmen to it, stepping to one side and observing so that I may step in if we go drastically off course. In addition to the pointers I give, there are other sensual cues to being-off-course, such as, balance as the heel of the boat changes; visual as the bow comes across the horizon and its relationship to landmarks/other vessel, audible as the sails lose their efficiency and they flap increasing the noise, feeling the wind against the face. I can see the white-knuckled grip on the wheel and anxious look on their face turn to a smile as the ‘novice’ helmsman begins to ‘get it’. We spend about 20 or 30 minutes on the wheel at a time so that everyone can take the helm. As I supervise the helmsman I become aware of the cockpit conversations and interaction—I pick one theme of ‘extreme toileting’ in describing using the heads—perhaps indicative of the ‘making the familiar strange or difficult’.

[...] 1.30pm and it is lunchtime; fish finger and salad wraps. Most of us enjoy lunch in the cockpit, again those who are feeling sick are seated alongside those who are eating. [...] The watch system, although dividing the crew into three groups of four, has created a new type of dynamic and I notice that my watch is joined in the cockpit by members of the other watches. They are chatting together in both small and larger groups, those who are still feeling sick are being asked how they are? Do they want anything to eat or drink? This has a really good ‘feel’ to it—they have been on board less than 24 hours. Do the teachers notice any change in the girls? Could this be a manifestation of the isolation of being on-board? How does this relate to total institutions?
**Wednesday 13th July:** At 7.30am the boat is awoken to the sound of music. *Millie* is doing her engine checks and has the engine access hatches open with the saloon roped off. The boat slowly comes alive with increasing levels of noise; I can hear the girls reflecting on the previous day and their night’s sleep – someone had been snoring!

[...] I have noticed lots of individual one-to-one and group interactions/discussions, mainly to do with the voyage experience. There is some reference to the ‘present’ and referencing to what they would or could be doing at home. For example, talking about what they would have had for breakfast or what time they would have got out of bed. I notice that there is a confidence about the girls in asking for help [...]. Some girls are asking a question of the group and sometimes they will ask an individual crew member. There was one example in stowing the cutlery and one girl volunteered advice/guidance to those who were doing it for the first time. As I do not know these girls I am left thinking whether this ‘mindfulness’ is a new behaviour or whether it was pre-existing.

I am also better able to recognise how the sea-staff apply, add and remove ‘scaffolding’ – this applies to me too! The more experienced sea-staff are checking my degree of confidence as I am tasked; I am also providing support to my own watch members and others I am working with. I am reminded of Dewey’s proposition that an experience becomes more relevant when it is related to ‘work’. Most of the activities we have done so far are all related to the day-to-day operation of the vessel; to get us from one port of call to the next. For example, hoisting and setting the sail has a purpose – to provide a means of propulsion to achieve this objective. My perception of the on-board atmosphere is that it provides for ‘expert-to-novice’ and ‘peer-to-peer’ interactions and support, and that this is naturally occurring adding to the cohesiveness of the groups as ‘we get things done’.

[...] [As we leave Port St Mary, Isle of Man we get ready to hoist the mainsail]. We get 8 or 9 crew members sitting on the starboard foredeck looking toward the stern (as if they were rowing). The mainsail halyard is run forward so that each crew member can haul on it. [...] The boat is turned in to the wind and on command we begin to hoist the sail, we encourage the crew to use the chant ‘2, 6 heave!’ as they go. As they are looking toward the stern they can see the sail
rise as a consequence of their efforts (How might this relate to gratification?). As this crew are quite small they required some help so Millie and I help by sweating on the halyard.

[As we get ready to hoist the headsail] the shout comes from the cockpit ‘Who wants beans?’ – someone is beginning to prepare lunch: pies with or without baked beans. Millie then instructs us in hoisting the headsail, she does not presume any prior knowledge or experience is comprehensive in these instructions. Within a few more minutes we have both the main and head sails set and we are sailing! […] One of the crew remarks ‘This is much better than yesterday’. I ask ‘Why?’ and she responds: ‘We are going faster and there’s foam’ (indicating to the spray coming up from the bow as it cuts through the water).

At 1pm we are all in the cockpit or down below and it is lunchtime. Pies with or without baked beans served in ‘dog bowls’. I am not on watch so go below to have my lunch. In the saloon, Pip and Seal are engaged in a professional discussion; Seal works for a sail training provider which employs a stricter hierarchy, [she] feels that she does not get the opportunities to practice and develop her skills, as she does as a volunteer on this vessel. Although I comprehend some of this discussion I am not a professional seafarer so some of it ‘goes over my head’. Pip’s approach is best described as ‘mentoring’, asking questions and getting Seal to problem solve rather than just proposing solutions.

[…] I ask [Pip and Seal] if there is anything that I could do differently in the study sessions, especially with regard to audio recording. Both had noticed that some of the crew had been shielding their answers as they completed the Voyage Pack – I had not noticed this! Am I an effective observer?

[We sail to an anchorage at Porth Wen, Anglesey, and enjoy a BBQ ashore]. We are at anchor and we need to maintain an ‘anchor watch’. During the night, we will have two crew members, with a member of sea-staff on-call, on a rota to conduct an anchor watch to monitor, every ten minutes, our position using latitude and longitude, depth of water and ensure that our anchor light is lit. Although proximity alarms are set to monitor the movement of the vessel via GPS, this activity gives the young crew the responsibility for the safety of the vessel whilst
at anchor at night. Each pair of watch-keepers, who were nominated by Sherlock, maintain a log […] to record the readings from the electronics. […]

At 11.50pm Pip began the anchor watch briefing; she outlined what was required. Tonight, each watch will last 80 minutes and it is their responsibility to wake up the next pair and their nominated watch leader/member of sea-staff ten minutes before their watch is due to start. They will then brief the on-coming watch with what they are meant to do. Watches will begin at 12.30am – another 17-hour day.

**Thursday 14th July:** My anchor watch will start at 2.10am; I go to bed and set my alarm for 2am. I wake up before my alarm goes off, and get up at 2am. The boat is illuminated with red lights to protect our night vision. The off-going watch are just waking up my, on-coming watch. There are biscuits and squash provided. By 2.10am they are in the saloon and whispering as they are briefed as to what to do. I check that they know what is required […] I sit with them in the saloon until 0300 writing my [second iteration] field notes. I am impressed that the two watch-keepers are still enthusiastic at this time of the morning, after their busy day and short sleep.

[…] I sleep through to 7.30am to be woken by the music playing through the boat. Millie is doing her engine checks as usual. The crew are motivated to get up to jump off the boat and go swimming. It is a really nice morning; the weather is fine and there is a slight swell coming in to the bay. Pip asks me to man the RIB as a safety boat whilst they have their swim. I don my lifejacket and make ready; I am joined by Seal who will be taking photos and we make our way to a position about 10 metres away from the boat. There is lots of excited chatter from the crew, there is some concern that the water may be too cold and some are having second thoughts. Pip, Sherlock and Millie are ready to go – all to be synchronised for the photograph. There is screaming and laughter as they re-surface after jumping in; there is lots of splashing and some get out of the water immediately. A hose-pipe shower, with warm water from the galley taps, is jury-rigged in the cockpit. Some of the reluctant crew members then appear on deck and clearly want to be a part of this activity. Some are getting out [of the water] and jumping back in. There is a growing queue for the hose-pipe shower as they take turns and then disappear down below to get changed.
After breakfast Pip asked me to take the helm and drive us off the anchor. It is sometime since I have done this so she gives me a short briefing. Seal gives me a refresh on the hand signals she will use as she will be at the bow as the anchor is lifted. Pip is now briefing the rest of the crew so that we can get the sails ready once we ready – there is lots going on simultaneously and we are operating as a ‘whole ship’. The engine is on tick over, then on command Seal begins to pick up the anchor [using the powered windlass]; I steer in response to her directions and hand signals steering towards the anchor so that all the weight is not taken up by the windlass. Once the anchor breaks the surface we begin to ‘make way’ towards the open sea. The crew are clipped on.

I steer as directed by Pip as she supervises the hoisting of [the sails] – we are sailing. There are no reports of sea-sickness. The feeling on board is very positive.

Later] as I sit in the saloon making my notes I reflect on the voyage so far. The decision not to [audio] record the routine activity due to the environment is still at the forefront of my mind. I am realising that there is so much activity going on at the same time, that I am finding it difficult to keep up with everything. I had not appreciated how many concurrent activities take place at any one time in different parts of the vessel – it is only 22 metres long by 5 metres wide! Each of these activities has a role which adds to the day-to-day operation of the vessel. I am left asking myself whether my field notes will provide sufficient insight to this ‘community’. I do believe that I am paying more attention to the activities, and I am more sensitive to the behaviour of the crew, both crew and sea-staff, for example, there are increased instances of the crew asking for help: at mealtimes – these are very sociable interactions from the preparation, the cooking and consumption of the meal, even down to the collective clearing and washing up; whilst sailing they are reminding each other to clip-on as fellow crew mates leave the safety of the companionway; in the knot tying sessions, those who have succeeded in tying a particular knot are helping those who are struggling. I am unsure as to whether this observed behaviour is pre-existing or as a result of the voyage experience – although I had not noticed this behaviour earlier; for example, on their arrival at the railway station, or it may be that I am more sensitised in looking for this type of behaviour.
[After dinner] the crew are then instructed to get ready for bed and to return to the table for their anchor watch briefing.

At 9.45pm we are back at the saloon table. The requirements are the same as last night but Sherlock has changed the pairings and their nominated member of sea-staff. Each watch period will last 90 minutes, starting at 10.30pm. [...] My watch starts at midnight so I decide to stay up in the saloon to write up my notes. The saloon is illuminated by a soft red (to protect our night vision). As the watch periods begin Millie goes down to the crew quarters and reads one or two Roald Dahl short stories. From 11pm there is total silence, apart from the sea slapping against the hull. The two girls on watch are very quiet as they whisper and move about the boat showing a great deal of consideration for their crew mates. At 11.50pm one of them goes down to wake the on-coming watch (my watch); they conduct a briefing in whispers before going off to bed. I check that my anchor watch is confident that they know what they need to do and after five or ten minutes I go to bed.

**Friday 15th July:** I wake at 7am to the sound of the sea against the hull. There is a bit more movement from the swell – this is quite therapeutic. At 7.30am I hear Millie begin her engine checks and then hear the music playing throughout the boat. The volume of chatter increases as the crew awakes – this is their last sailing day.

[After breakfast and some instructional sessions for the crew’s Royal Yachting Association (RYA) Competent Crew award, we set sail for Douglas, Isle of Man]. As we arrive off Douglas the weather is improving and the sun is shining. Pip takes the helm to bring us in to the harbour (which is also a busy ferry terminal). As we approach the command ‘lines and fenders’ is given, with little more than this the crew are getting the fenders from the lazerette, and getting the mooring and the ‘black & hairy’ lines out of the pig-pen. The fenders are attached to the starboard side with round-turn-and-two-half-hitches; a little direction is required for the crew to ‘figure-of-eight’ the mooring and ‘black & hairy’ lines ready for use at the bow and stern. We come alongside a high harbour wall; Millie makes good the mid-ship’s line and we drive on this line to allow Seal to step ashore, up a flight of steps partly covered in slippery seaweed. The crew are managing to feed
the lines through the ‘panamas’ and getting them ashore – monitored by the watch leaders but they only need fine-tuning – this does look like ‘side-by-side’ interaction.

We tidy the deck; the crew are set at the task of sail covers. This is completed with minimal direction, only needing sea-staff to climb up the main mast to reach the highest [of the sail] cover clips. We change from wet waterproofs and lifejackets into going-ashore gear. The crew are excited about the prospect of an ice cream and some souvenir shopping.

[After a run ashore, we returned to the boat, had dinner and completed the research activities and end-of-voyage feedback]. We clear the tables and benches away and the crew get ready for bed; the plan is to go to bed, lights out by 10.15pm and then get up at 1am to night-sail back to Whitehaven. Sherlock reads another Roald Dahl story to the crew before lights out.

Saturday 16th July: At 1 am we awake to the sound of music, as we have experienced all week. Within ten minutes we are all on deck in warm clothing, waterproofs and lifejackets. As they come up on deck the crew are tasked to do various tasks, such as sail covers, whilst others begin preparing the mooring lines with direction from their watch leaders.

[We leave Douglas and set sail for Whitehaven under headsail only]. It is Sherlock’s birthday and we have a cake; we all gather in the cockpit to wish her Happy Birthday – at full volume. Lots of laughing and giggling – it is now 1.45am with the prospect of a lumpy night sail to Whitehaven. The watches will be Millie, then Sherlock and then [Donald Duck and I]. Although some of the crew remark about the rolling motion of the boat there are no complaints about their early (or is it late?) start or the weather conditions. […] As we are operating watches, two hours on, my watch is not due to start until 7.30am. We go off to bed.

Other than the occasional bang or sound from up on deck I sleep through until sometime about 5am there is shout from Pip that we are surrounded by a pod of dolphins – I do not get up and I am not sure if anyone else does. I lie awake, reflecting on the week, and wonder whether my decision not to audio record as
much as I had planned will impact on my study. I have no (or very little) direct speech!

At 6am, I decide to get up, we cannot be too far away from Whitehaven. I learn that the watches have been brought forward an hour so that my watch will start at 6.30am. we make sure that my watch are awoken ready to take over from [Sherlock’s watch]. Within about ten minutes we have all of [my] watch on deck and ready.

[We arrive at Whitehaven and negotiate the lock into the marina basin]. As we approach [our berth] there is an effect of the wind being deflected around the harbour walls which is pushing us away from where we want to go. It takes a couple of attempts before we are reversing on to our berth – from where we had left on Tuesday morning. […] The watches are involved in rigging and passing lines ashore to make us secure. It is 10.10am.

The feeling on board is one of ‘job done’, perhaps [the crew] do not realise that there is a lot of work to do – tidying the deck, packing their belongings, Happy Hour [the name for the end-of-voyage clean up] – a false summit? The crew are sent below to stow their lifejackets and hang up their waterproofs in the wet locker for the last time. They are then instructed to pack their belongings and move their bags on to the pontoon.

[As we embark on Happy Hour] the boat is humming with activity, some crew are standing around – two ask for jobs to do and one or two are clearly avoiding eye contact. This does not last for long as everyone is allocated to help other teams or are given new tasks. The ‘galley’ crew are busily completing the tasks on their list; I am finished so go forward to help Seal and her team in the crew quarters – this is more quality control in ensuring that the boat is as clean as it was when [this crew] arrived. I return to the galley and check that ‘we’ have completed all of the items on our list – job done!

By 11.50am the boat has been cleaned from stem to stern, the crew have their baggage standing on the pontoon and we are all seated around the saloon table ready for the end-of-voyage debrief. […]

242
[I] would like to record the end-of-voyage debrief [this is a naturally occurring end-of-voyage event]; this was agreed in principle but I will still ask for permission [to record] – this was given by everyone sitting at the table. [transcript]. Each voyage participant is invited to reflect on their week, this is done one at a time and makes the prospect for recording is much better.

[…] At 12.30pm we have three trolleys alongside the boat on the pontoon and the girls begin to load their luggage; there is still not enough space for everyone’s luggage so some bags have to carried. They load the [heavier] bags and prepare to carry the lighter bags, such as sleeping bags and carrier bags containing souvenirs – this burden is being shared and is in distinct contrast to their behaviour on arrival; there is a tangible group dynamic where there is a willingness to help each other.

[Having accompanied the crew to the railway station, and returned to the boat, the sea-staff and I have lunch]. I am asked about my study but hesitate to give too much detail as their will be a post-voyage session and I am still concerned about corrupting any future data. I am positive about the data that I believe I have collected; only time will tell. [I have completed 47 pages of contemporaneous (#1) notes (plus additional entries); and 83 pages of #2 notes (plus additional notes)]. I am lacking audio recordings but have some [recordings] to transcribe; to have recorded every aspect of the voyage may have been too intrusive, in not recording many participants may have forgotten about the study rendering my observations of greater value.

[…] I then go to my cabin to pack my own gear before saying my own goodbyes and leaving at 3.45pm. I arrived home at 7.30pm, on the journey home I find myself reflecting on the week, not so much about my study but thinking about how the crew had evolved during the week, the sea-sickness, the group dynamic, their ‘give-it-a-go’ attitude, the BBQ and swim at Porth Wen – I catch myself smiling!

Post-voyage
The arrangements for the [post-voyage] session began with an e mail to Sherlock on 8th September 2016. This e mail outlined my aspirations for the session, but I am ever conscious that the privilege of access to the crew will always be
tempered by the opportunity for the least disruption to the girls, teachers and the school routine. The arrangements for a single 90 to 120-minute session at the school on 8th November were confirmed on 13th October 2016.

Arrangements for the sea-staff interviews were easier to confirm. The one-to-one semi-structured interviews with Seal and Millie were confirmed for 19th October; and for Pip on 28th October.

The post-voyage sessions commenced with a photo-elicitation activity for participants to select an image to reflect their voyage, this then led to a discussion of our voyage; these sessions were audio recorded.
## Schedule of post-voyage semi-structured interviews/ focus group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>19 October 2016</td>
<td>11.09am to 11.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>19 October 2016</td>
<td>1.20pm to 1.40pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pip</td>
<td>28 October 2016</td>
<td>11.40am to 12.47pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew/ Teachers</td>
<td>8 November 2016</td>
<td>1.22pm to 2.02pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Analysis: Self-amalgamating tape

Plus/ Minus/ Interesting (PMI)

Incidences of seasickness listed (percentages adjusted for the number of respondents, i.e. \(T^0: n=16\), \(T^1: n=17\), \(T^2: n=15\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus (Note 1)</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-voyage ((T^0))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-voyage ((T^1))</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-voyage ((T^2))</td>
<td>7 (46%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Minus = not being able to take self-amalgamating tape away with them.

\textit{Millie}: ‘Plus’ on \(T^2\)

\textit{Doormat}: ‘Plus’ on \(T^2\) ‘other people’s reaction to self-amalgamating tape’

Extracts from Sea-staff interviews/ Crew focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who said it…</th>
<th>What was said…</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Salmon} Researcher</td>
<td>\textit{I picked the same one as [Paul] and it’s just the same the waves coming crashing over. And I like it because it’s when we first met self-amalgamating tape.}</td>
<td>Crew. Lines 35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Salmon} Researcher</td>
<td>Self-amalgamating tape, now there has been a lot of discussion in some of the things that you have written that I have read about self-amalgamating tape. Tell me about self-amalgamating tape…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Salmon} Researcher</td>
<td>\textit{Well, it is tape that sticks to itself…} \textit{…and how did you learn about self-amalgamating tape?}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Salmon} Researcher</td>
<td>\textit{Well we went …some of us went on to the bow with [Millie] and we were self-amalgamating these little things that were sticking out so that no-one got their trousers caught…}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>And has anybody put it on their Christmas list …for self-amalgamating tape?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td><em>I bought some and so did [Matilda]…</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>…so where did you buy your self-amalgamating tape from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>Amazon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>What colour?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td><em>Red and blue…</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>…so is that now a prized possession?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Millie</th>
<th><em>So the first one is a picture of …there was three of them up on the bow with me and we were getting splashed with waves and they were having a great time, and that was when they got introduced to the self-amalgamating tape. Yes, up at the bow, they were just so interested in everything so willing to learn about stuff. I really liked that. Having so much fun.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>…when you say they were so interested in learning, why do you think that was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td><em>They were quite a young group so like everything was so new and exciting to them so …they were just interested to learn because they are so young as well. Yeah, they were always asking questions as well.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>So self-amalgamating tape gets an awful amount of mention in the books that we filled in. so tell me about self-amalgamating tape…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>…<em>it’s, it is really cool, it’s a tape, black tape but I think you can get it in different colours, we decided on the voyage and it has a plastic backing on it and it sticks to itself when you stretch it so in order to apply you have to stretch it round and it kind of like</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview. Lines 2-49
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>shrinks ...we use it on split pins and stuff around the boat so that they don’t catch on people or on clothing and stuff…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Why were they so interested in that then? ...because it was something that they’d never seen before I think. It is pretty cool and they got to do it themselves, I showed them how to use it and they got to put it on the boat which was quite cool. I think they enjoyed that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>...you were sent forward to make sure that all of the split pins and stuff were safe, because I’ve cut my hands on the pins before and they had went forward with you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>I cannot remember, were they invited to go with you or did they volunteer? Did they ask to go with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>I think I might have shown one of the girls before and then I said that I was going to use some, and then a few of them like ‘Ooh, can we come and see?’. So yes, they clipped on and came up. So it think they wanted to come up and have a look.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>So you mentioned that you actually showed them how it, how you use it and what it is used for and then let them have a go. What effect did that have you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>It wasn’t just them sitting and watching me do it, they got to be active and have a part in all of the stuff on board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>You mentioned about the waves splashing them when they are sitting on the bow. Do you think is a positive thing? What effect do you think that has?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Millie     | Well it’s just a completely new experience again that they have never had before and it is pretty cool, all
three sitting up there and getting absolutely soaked and it is like the Titanic I suppose ...everyone that comes on board does the Titanic pose. Yeah, it is fun.

Out-of-field notes:
Thurs 14/07
There were two main topics that were discussed as the VPs were completed:
Self-amalgamating tape: the [Bosun], as part of her routine maintenance, had been checking for sharp edges and unprotected split pins; she uses self-amalgamating tape to protect these edges/ pins. The girls were fascinated by the properties of the tape – I am sure it will find its way on the Christmas lists!

No mention of self-amalgamating tape by Pip, Seal, Millie, Donald Duck, Sherlock, Doormat, Pumpkin, Penguin, Suzan, Mickey Mouse.

Paul
What did you learn today? (Wed)
I learned that self-amalgamating tape is the coolest thing in the world.
We had to fix things with [Millie].
I want to get some.

Sluggy
What did you learn today? (Thurs)
I learned that self-amalgamating tape is the coolest thing in the world, apart from self-amalgamating rubber.
[Millie] did a demonstration on some metal.
It was so cool and we made her keep doing it.

Matilda
What did you learn today? (Wed)
I learned about self-amalgamating tape.
[Millie] told us about it.
Very happy. (emphasis in original)
Fortune line (Wed):
I found self-emalumating (sic) tape.
| **Salmon** | What did you learn today? (Wed)  
*I learned that self-amalgamating tape is the best thing in the world.*  
*[Millie] took us onto the bow and we taped a sharp bit.*  
*EXTREMELY HAPPY! (emphasis in original)* | Voyage pack |
| **Dolphin** | What did you learn today? (Wed)  
*I learned about self-amalgamating tape.*  
*[Millie] showed us.*  
*Happy.* | Voyage pack |
| **Cat** | What did you learn today? (Wed)  
*Self-amalgamating tape is great.*  
*[Salmon] told me.*  
*Amazed.* | Voyage pack |
| **Lottie** | What did you learn today? (Wed)  
*Self-amalgamating tape is amazing. It bonds to itself.*  
*[Salmon] told me what it does on our night watch. I haven’t seen it yet.*  
*[Excited] to use self-amalgamating tape.* | Voyage pack |
Appendix K

Analysis: Seasickness
Plus/ Minus/ Interesting (PMI)

Incidences of seasickness listed (percentages adjusted for the number of respondents, i.e. $T^0: n=16$, $T^1: n=17$; $T^2: n=15$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Minus</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-voyage ($T^0$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-voyage ($T^1$)</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-voyage ($T^2$)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Those indicating seasickness as a ‘plus’ or ‘interesting’ were those who were not seasick or who had recovered.

Extracts from Sea-staff interviews/ Crew focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who said it...</th>
<th>What was said...</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td><em>I chose this picture of me like lying down because it was happy because I wasn’t seasick anymore...</em></td>
<td>Crew. Lines 72-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td>...so you were lying down. Where were you lying down?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td><em>...I was in the cockpit [recording too faint]</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td>...is there anybody else in the photograph?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td><em>I think [Doormat] is in the background.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td>So you were recovering from seasickness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td><em>Yeah. I had just stopped being sick...</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td>...being seasick, what was that like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Researcher</td>
<td><em>Not nice.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td>Out of everybody, how many were seasick? [after show of hands and a short discussion – it was estimated that eight people had been seasick] someone stole my bucket. It was hanging by my bed side and I had threw up in it and then...</td>
<td>Crew. Lines 84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dolphin</strong></td>
<td>Did you not find out who had stolen your bucket? No. I didn’t, ...because I was sleeping and I was in my bed and it was tied ...and [the Bosun] put me down ...and when I woke it wasn’t there... [...] I was sick in a hanging bucket but [the Bosun] got rid of it...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td>I picked a picture of some dolphins [recording too faint] ...so did that make up for being sick? Yes.</td>
<td>Crew. Lines 123-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doormat</strong></td>
<td>What was the biggest challenge for you then, ...when you were on the boat? ...being seasick, a lot... ...but you got over that didn’t you? I still felt sick but I didn’t throw up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dolphin</strong></td>
<td>Well when I was like really seasick and I slept through lunch [Pumpkin] brought me fish sticks ...fish fingers, and me and ...[Pumpkin] are best friends now.</td>
<td>Crew. Lines 349-351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doormat</strong></td>
<td>It wasn’t very much fun when I was being sick and trying to steer ...well I wasn’t being sick but trying to stop from being sick and trying to steer... I think that is called multi-tasking... I think there is something quite therapeutic about steering, holding the wheel and especially when we were all feeling sick it was helming that made you feel better. ...it made you stand up which was really good if you were feeling sick...</td>
<td>Crew. Lines 444-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td>I think that I have run out of questions. I think that I have just got to thank you for participating and actually it was a very good voyage. It was good fun and I agree with [Sherlock] that everybody is smiling. I think there are some images of you smiling even if you’re hugging a sick bucket.</td>
<td>Skipper. Lines 39-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pip</strong></td>
<td>...so you get a group of youngsters and whatever we are going to try do with them has got to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
achievable. Even in the first instance of them walking down the pontoon to how they then get on board you either know whether they are going to be bouncing like a box of frogs or they're really timid, lacking confidence. So bouncing like a box of frogs would probably benefit from maybe going out and making them, well not making them but they're going to be sea-sick for six hours whereas the less confident we'll probably do a little short hop to build their confidence and take them in before they become sea-sick or even just short trips. And so tailoring it so it becomes achievable and everyone can take part and then through the week, as it goes, make the milestones bigger.

Pip

...but we would have been going out that night, possibly if the weather was alright. Where you can see the shock on their faces and sometimes that really does put them into their panic zones. And then they get sea-sick and then it's not really very nice, usually nine hours... …we got the headsail up and when we came back to the cockpit we had about three quarters of them were holding a bucket. Some more than others.

...and that is a lot of it is purely shock I think, and you've got the sea-sick aspect of it but I think a lot of it is shock. And the realisation that they cannot get off, which they probably want to get off ...but they're in this and then we set them in to a watch rota is like a massive sort of impact that you have in that first half an hour or an hour. You know they are still moving around the boat but it's started to move so it's heeling over so not only are they trying to look after themselves but they are trying to look after each other, and also work as well.

Pip

It’s there, they’ve got to do it and we sort of make it into the way they then choose to do it which I think is a big problem ...not a problem, a big milestone for their heads really. They’re going to drag themselves out of bed after a little bit of coax when they’re feeling ill. I think however
much sea-sickness is not particularly nice but really you don’t get that in any other sport and I think the aspect of someone being sick …because if you were at home or if you were in a residential centre you would be sent to bed, you would be looked after, you might be sent to the doctors, you need a day off school all that sort of stuff. Where on a boat that doesn’t happen – it’s like you’re ill, OK …it’s only sea-sickness and you are not going to die. Drink water, try and eat something and right, it’s time for your watch. Bring your bucket with you or take it to the toilet with you. It’s just …it might come across a being quite cruel sometimes but I think what they get from actually getting through it is something quite powerful as well. working when they are not feeling their best. Some people just go blatantly ‘No, I’m dead I’m not going to do anything’ but for those who do get through it I think the achievement …like on debriefings and such at the end of the day or two days, whatever, that ‘I wasn’t sick’ or that ‘I was sick but I still did this’ is quite powerful as well. I think they’re the sort of people that become your leaders.

Pip

I went to a talk the other night about a boat going to Antarctica and talking to the guy there, doing the talk they said they really enjoyed the trip but they’d never do it again because they went through the Drake Passage and there were waves coming across, absolutely humungous and there was loads of people seasick and the Captain, he did actually mention that the Captain was sick and that stuck out, that the Captain was sick and he wasn’t doing anything so obviously it was like the worst place in the world because the captain’s vomiting. But you think it’s not meant to happen.

Skipper.
Lines 692-701

Seal
No mention

Millie
This is a girl and I, and she was suffering from seasickness and she, throughout the beginning of the week she really didn’t want to helm and she wasn’t particularly …when we were out on deck she was suffering from seasickness a bit and

Bosun.
Lines 51-61
then she got on the helm and she was smiling and enjoying it. It was good that I persisted and got her to helm. That was quite rewarding. R: …so you encouraged her to come on the helm… Yeah, because throughout she was ‘no, no I just don’t want to do it’ and I kept, …yeah, kept …every now and again I would ask her again and she would ‘Oh no, in a minute’. It changed from ‘no I don’t want to’ to ‘maybe later’, ‘in a minute’ and then, yeah…

Seal …so my memorable moment would be when we were coming in to Laxey doing all of those Man-Over-Boards, that was good fun, working like crazy, lots of pulling in sails, letting them out again, pulling them in. I haven’t had so much exercise for a very long time. And my not-so-memorable moment …probably, maybe, making that fusilli pasta which is my absolutely favourite lunch but I only ate half of it because I was feeling sick.

C: My memorable moment will probably be seeing the dolphins, and my not-so-most memorable moment would be being the seasick

C: My memorable moment was when I was seasick but still dancing to the Macarena. And my least memorable would be when I slept through the whole day when I was sick.

C: My memorable moment was probably seeing the dolphins for the first time, because I’ve never seen dolphins, like ever. And then my not-so-memorable moment was when we set off and I felt really, really seasick and I thought that I was going to be really sick.

C: My memorable moment was seeing the dolphins, they were this far away and you could see them, like, under the water. One like jumped up. My least memorable moment was being seasick on the first day because I really didn’t think that I would be seasick, and then I was, but then I got better…

Researcher: …until this morning?
...until this morning when I was sick again. But then I was first and last to be sick…
C: My most memorable moment was seeing the dolphins. Least memorable would be being seasick.
NB: It was not possible to differentiate between individual crew members in this recording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal</th>
<th>And out to sea we went. Twas a nice sail to Port St Marys. Lots seasick though. But dancing in between which was funny and good to see. They are a good bunch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Mate’s Report</td>
<td>Tuesday (12/07): […] we got up at 5am, got the boat ready and headed straight out of Whitehaven, hoisting the main and no 2 yankee before breakfast. It was a long day with many girls succumbing to seasickness. However, their attitude towards it was brilliant. They just got on with it, helped each other out and looking after each other. And they even danced to the Macarena while pausing to be sick in the middle and carried on. They were determined to keep spirits high and have fun, which meant many of the girls got over their seasickness once we got into the shelter of the Isle of Man. Wednesday: Seasickness was a thing of the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References from the literature

Page 6. Rogers proposes that the confinement of a vessel at sea, creates unavoidable challenges such as living in close quarters, seasickness and other discomforts, that oblige trainees to draw upon their “true selves”, abandoning social pretences. Rogers suggests that this removal of “masks” is a key factor in establishing a sense of trust and community, a positive outcome that is widely reported in the sail training literature.

Page 12. In pre voyage interviews several people voiced misgivings about being at sea and the possibility of seasickness
I’ve been thinking about the sea… if it’s rough, I’m thinking (laughs) what are we going to do? I know they’ve (the professional crew) had years of experience but… [Liz]
(Do you have any worries?)… Just seasickness because it does turn people; it does turn them nasty because it’s horrible [Andy]
Page 16. Voyagers discussed how being at sea entailed real risk and necessary hardship and regulation in dealing with those risks.

There were three or four of us who were very scared and seasick [but] we just got on with it.... I was scared but also awed by the ferocity of the storm [Peter].


Page 188. It's a matter of living together, and so a boy who has been a prefect at public school for instance, will suddenly realise that he gets seasick, and he is tired, this, that and the other. And a fellow who has perhaps been a borstal lad will realise that he's not worthless but in fact he has leadership qualities and so-- it's a huge balance. (Peter Love, Board Member STA, Interview, 1998).

Page 193. Tom entered from his cabin carrying a bundle of papers. "Well here we are then. How was it for you?" A few voices said "Great" "Tiring" "Wicked". Tom went on "Just a quick chat before we all go." He opened the chart and engaged the two nearest trainees to trace the week's journey. Most people contributed some detail to the narrative, this was where we had the barbecue, that was where we saw a whale, this was where some people were seasick.


Page 292. One group of key concepts in analysis were concerned with trainees’ accounts of life aboard ship, including sleeping arrangements, cooking and eating, cleaning, routines and watchkeeping, seasickness and ‘being at sea’. A second set of categories concerned social life, and required attention to communication, humor, individuation and communality, symbols and traditions as well as leadership, power and responsibility.

Page 298. There are significantly differing approaches, for example in relation to the most appropriate response to young people’s seasickness, and in relation to the particular benefits derived from the experience of communal living. These differences are broadly consistent with the different approaches and emphases expressed in different traditions of sail training.


Page 578/579. The onboard programme promotes inclusion, support and self-efficacy. These qualities are imparted via group based processes (which invoke belonging, interdependence and cooperation), positive encouragement and the successful completion of the many A 10-day developmental voyage challenges encountered during the voyage (e.g., being away from home, making new
friends, the daily 6 a.m. swim around the vessel, cooking, cleaning the toilets, climbing the rigging, completing one’s duties regardless of seasickness, tiredness, rolling ocean swells, or rough weather, working with others, living in a confined space, and eventually sailing the ship without help from the crew).


Page 43. The onboard programme emphasises communal living, teamwork, cooperation, problem-solving ability, social communication and self-esteem. These qualities are imparted via positive encouragement and the successful completion of the many challenges encountered during the voyage (e.g. being away from home, making new friends, the daily 6:00 a.m. swim around the vessel, cooking, cleaning the toilets, climbing the rigging, completing one’s duties regardless of seasickness, tiredness, rolling ocean swells, or inclement weather, working with others, living in a confined space and eventually sailing the ship without help from the crew).


Page 22/23. Most people showed signs of tiredness and exhaustion on the first few days due to seasickness, the amount of new information that had to be absorbed, the 24-hour watch system, and the continual disturbance of sleep from tacking calls and participants chatting in the cabin area. I was fortunate enough not to suffer seasickness but those who did were unable to eat or sleep, and I saw and heard from them that they felt dreadful.

Page 47. Three of the most striking challenges on board were: the stamina to keep going when physically or mentally disinterested or exhausted, the tolerance required to be constantly in the company of others, and the ability to overcome seasickness. Consequently, these challenges meant that masks came off and true selves were exposed; thus we all found ourselves in a reciprocal trust situation.

Page 50. Overcoming seasickness was something that nearly everyone needed to do and participants learned to manage it by following the example of the Watch Leaders and other crew, as the participants saw they too were suffering. Crew did not complain or feel sorry for themselves; rather, everyone continued regardless. We were told that the best way to overcome it was to be on deck as much as possible and to keep ourselves active. During the first three days people became overtired and so felt dreadful. This, combined with seasickness, left many wondering what they had got themselves into and how they were going to get through the next four days. But then, miraculously, on the fourth day, everyone was in high spirits, chatting, laughing and working together. This “turnaround”, as it is known, was astounding to witness.
I interviewed a boy who suffered quite severely from seasickness and asked him if the trip had had an effect on his self-esteem. He felt that on a scale of one to ten it had improved from four to about nine. Surprised, I asked him what he meant. He replied:
P: Like at the start, I was worried about the seasickness and now I have been able to get over it. I always get it. But I was able to work through it so it has changed heaps.
When asked what he got most out of the voyage he replied:
P: Getting over the seasickness. [Interview]
Many participants commented about getting over seasickness as a real achievement. I realised seasickness was another challenge that participants had to overcome and, in doing so, self-esteem was enhanced.
Page 53. The close proximity, tolerance of others, and seasickness meant the necessity of taking masks off and trusting in one another. Consequently, a sensitivity towards participants began to be developed. One of the crew commented about the complexity of our world and that these types of courses were necessary to counter the often insensitive individualistic focus of our society, where people were not learning to do things as a community.
Page 67.
P8: Yeh, when I came on board I was a bit cocky, because I had been on boats before, and I thought, I don’t get seasick and I’m not afraid of heights. And then I started to get a bit queasy. I found out that it was because I ate too much, so I don’t eat as much now. And like climbing to the top, I can do it, but getting to the top and it was swaying around, I was [clenching teeth] nervous. But now I know I can do those things, I found out I can overcome certain things. Like, the seasickness, I overcame it by working out ways I can deal with it. And like claustrophobia, I can’t stay in the bunks too long, so I have just stayed up a bit later, wait until I am as tired as hell, then conk out and get back up again and walk around. [Interviews]
Page 72. I concluded that exhaustion, seasickness, entrapment and recovery form the catalyst for the “mind-shift” that occurs in participants. There is no escape, no personal space, and you need to make the best of the strange situation. Effort must be made. In the words of one participant, “If you don’t put in, someone else will have to do extra to cover your bit.”


Page 7. For the youth crew the voyage on the ship also involves a challenging physical environment; they must adapt to life on board, which means dealing with possible adverse weather conditions, disrupted sleep patterns, and the
debilitation of sea-sickness. The assumption at work here is that learning to
manage physically and socially demanding conditions will lead to the
enhancement of a variety of individual and interpersonal competencies.

Page 15. Equally there is the profound physical experience of sea-sickness
and sleep deprivation. Both call for unusual individual responses of adaptation
and self-management as youth crew are fully expected to participate in all
activities regardless of whether they are tired, sick, unhappy or resistant.

Page 17. Seasickness plays a crucial role in the developmental outcomes of the
program. Seasickness also defines the context in which strong bonds are
forged between individual members of the youth crew. There is a
considerable degree of empathy shared between the youth crew members
that impacts on the relationships formed, and provides a context for the early
development of values of reciprocity and community building. While it may
seem a trivial and sometimes amusing feature of the sailing experience, it is
precisely the ubiquity of seasickness that makes it so significant. Almost
everybody gets seasick and how individual’s conduct themselves when sick,
how they behave towards others who are sick, and how intrusive the
seasickness is into their overall conduct, provide highly reliable insights into
the long-term significance of the voyage experience.

Seasickness pushes the youth crew to their physical and psychological limits
and produces a level of self-understanding and self-resilience that may not be
readily achieved in normal social life. Ironically this most conspicuous feature
of the YE experience, and the one which elicits a great deal of commentary
during the voyage, does not emerge from the data collected through the
telephone interviews. Yet it functions during the voyage as a measure of the
intensity of the individual’s learning experience and the likelihood that they
will carry away from the voyage a set of new social skills that will be
employed in their future lives.

Hahn, K. (1954) Gordonstoun and a European mission, American-British
Foundation for European Education.

‘I remember so well my dispute with an eminent man representing the
educational section of a famous Foundation. He challenged me to explain what
sailing in a schooner could do for international education. In reply, I said we had
at that moment the application before us for a future king of an Arab country to
enter Gordonstoun. I happened to have at the school some Jews representing
the best type of their race. If the Arab and one of these Jews were to go out
sailing on our schooner, the Prince Louis, perhaps in a Northeasterly gale, and
if they were become thoroughly seasick together, I would have done something
for international education.’