Outdoor Leadership
Course Code: OXP315113

The report for Part 1 and Part 4 of the exam should be read in alongside the exam paper and the marking tool, which is included as an appendix. 260 candidates sat the examination this year.

Part 1

Criterion 2	Demonstrate understanding of leadership theory.
Criterion 8	Communicate ideas and information in a variety of forms.

This part of the paper required candidates to write an extended response. The interpretation of the question and formation of response drew on a candidate's knowledge of Leadership Theories and their application, drawing on personal knowledge and experiences.

An award of; A+,A,A-, B+,B,B-, C+,C,C-, D+,D,D- or t was attributed to the question for Criteria 2 and 8. The question, while allowing some rote learnt responses for general descriptions of the theories, allowed for a variety of responses. Higher level answers were ones which discussed the effectiveness of the selected theory in dealing with the outdoor situation, as well as the similarities and differences between the two selected theories. The question offered good scope for a range of variables to be discussed (either explicit or implied) impacting on the decision making within the scenario.

A majority of the responses chose Conditional Outdoor Leadership Theory (COLT), Transactional, Transformational, and Situational Leadership, with COLT being the most popular. Quite a few used Servant Leadership, Styles of Leadership, and a handful chose Feminist Leadership Theory.

The best answers tended to use COLT and gave a thorough explanation of their two chosen theories, linking them well to outcomes and examples in their chosen situation. They provided a clear and concise description of each of the theories, considered the appropriateness of theories to the outdoor situation and considered the decision-making required.

The students who chose a theory with less description (i.e. Servant, Feminist) tended to struggle to link it well to the situation, and as a result these responses tended to lack substance. On occasion students also inappropriately overlapped COLT and Style Leadership Theory (i.e. COLT/telling, selling, participating, delegating) which caused inconsistency. While most students accurately described the theories, weaker responses made assertions but didn't explain or analyse them, or assumed understanding of the theories. Commonly students performed less well when applying the theory to their chosen outdoor situation – especially when identifying similarities and differences in outcomes, and commenting on the effectiveness of each theory in dealing with the outdoor situation. Because application of the theories to the outdoor situation was an essential element of the question, students who either didn't include an outdoor situation or provided limited discussion on it performed poorly.

For Criterion 8, the grammar, terminology and language were generally above average and overall students demonstrated sound essay writing structure (there was a notable improvement from previous years). Strong responses provided clear and logical organisation of information, had strong introductions that addressed the set question and attributed theories to developers. Use of grammar, punctuation and specialised terminology was also sound. Excellent responses were able to weave theoretical information and the scenario into a cohesive discussion, developing relevant ideas and avoiding over generalising or repetition.

Some common issues noted by markers were:
- syntax (including run-on sentences, incomplete sentences and fragment sentences); spelling and unsophisticated vocabulary
- responses not attributing creators of theories or concepts

- abbreviations: if they are going to be used, they must be spelled out in full first, and explained. Text/concept creators should be referred to, the first time, in full, and thereafter shortened to surname; never referred to as Kate or Jeff etc.
- vague responses were a common problem and suggested lack of knowledge
- handwriting at times obscured a candidate's intended meaning.

Part 2

Criterion 3   Demonstrate understanding of leadership qualities and skills.

This part of the exam paper comprised four questions, requiring candidates to give a short response to each question. At times there was a degree of ambiguity in the questions and as such the scope of acceptable responses was broadened to allow for different interpretations of certain phrases or terminology used. Responses still had to address the set criteria in order to be successful. Marks were attributed through this part of the exam paper by appointing marks for each of the minutes suggested on each question. The marks were tallied by combining all marks for questions 2, 3, 4, and 5, then converted to an award of; A+,A,A-, B+,B,B-, C+,C,C-, D+,D,D- or t.

Question 2

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- considerations necessary for leaders of Outdoor Activities e.g. Risk assessment, best practice/safe guard, legal liability/negligence, goals and objectives of activities, planning,
- the discussion and consideration of why leaders should apply these policies.

Most students focussed on safety, risk, legal liability, equity and environmental impact. Better answers also discussed the guidelines in the context of overall planning and common community standards for outdoor education.

Question 3

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- identification of a leadership style, power base or task/relationship orientation
- definition of an identified concept from the above list
- linking to flexible leadership style or adjusting personal approach when leading.

Stronger responses provided clear discussion/examples of how they adjusted their leadership approach or how a leader could adjust their approach to changing conditions/scenarios. Some responses used conditional favourability as a way to link this with theoretical concepts.

Many students used adaption of leadership style, by naming the style and providing a discussion on what they did or what this looked like – it would have been good to have some more specific definitions around what different styles/power bases etc., were.

Weaker responses provided general comments about the need for flexibility but did not explain in detail different leadership styles and provide a link with task/relationship. Better answers used effective examples from activities they had led to illustrate their argument.

Question 4

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- provide two problem solving techniques, decision making methods or conflict resolution techniques (gathering, weeding, organising, weighting, choosing, brainstorm, extended effort, attribute listening, compare/contrast, new ideas)
- provide a definition/description of the chosen techniques
- provide an explanation and application of the chosen techniques to a practical example.

Students took a wide range of approaches to answering this question, with various approaches deemed acceptable. A high number of students answered the question using decision making models, such as the Analytic, Creative and Natural models discussed in *Cashel et. al*. A smaller number of respondents used conflict resolution techniques, such as: Accommodation, Avoidance, Compromise, Collaboration and Competition to answer the question.

Other students chose to discuss problem solving techniques, such as Brainstorming, Extended Effort, Attribute Listing, Compare/Contrast and New Ideas. This was much less prevalent than students who addressed the question using decision making or conflict resolution techniques.

The final group of respondents, simply went through a basic summary of how they would solve a problem using a scenario. These answers generally stated: 'Sit the student down and discuss what is the problem, discuss different options or goals that they could aim for, have another attempt and re-evaluate'. Students who answered the questions in this manner achieved marks for relevant steps/information, but often did not achieve high results. Overall, only a minority of students explicitly discussed problem solving techniques and interpreted the question more generally to include decision making models and conflict resolution strategies. These were generally outlined well but more marks could have been gained by using examples from their own leadership experience.

Question 5

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- provide several (4) core competencies or skills
- provide a description of each competency/skill listed
- apply each competency/skill to emergency situations

There were two main ways that students responded to Question 5. The first was a discussion of the core competencies, while the second approach was to go through Risk Assessment and Management Strategies in detail.

Stronger responses made reference to how the chosen knowledge/skill base actually reduced the chance of an incident occurring, helped the leader identify issues to predict/prevent an emergency or assisted with a leader's ability to respond to an emergency.

Mid-range scores were given to respondents who correctly identified knowledge and skill bases that a leader should have, but made limited references to how the knowledge/skill assisted the leader to predict, identify, respond to an emergency.

Weaker responses tended to either re-write the question or only list some skills or knowledge. These responses generally did not discuss/describe any reasoning behind why a leader should have this knowledge/skill in order to prevent or respond to an emergency. In general, most students focused very closely on the prediction and management of an emergency and neglected to place this in the context of an overall description of leadership competencies.

Part 3

Criterion 5   Demonstrate understanding of group management and work collaboratively with others.

This part of the exam paper was divided into two sections, requiring candidates to give a short response to the given questions in both sections.

Ratings were attributed to this part of the exam paper, appointing marks for each of the minutes suggested for each of the questions. At times there was a degree of ambiguity in the questions and as such the scope of acceptable responses was broadened to allow for different interpretations of certain phrases or terminology used. Responses still had to address the set criteria in order to be successful. The marks were tallied by combining all marks for questions 6, 7, 8, and 9, then converted to an award of; A+,A,A-, B+,B,B-, C+,C,C-, D+,D,D- or t.

Question 6

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
• setting goals – collaboration, SMART
• achieving goals – communication, facilitation, brief/debrief, traits and qualities

Stronger responses discussed how outdoor leaders should ensure goals are *set* collaboratively so that groups have a sense of ownership of them, improving the likelihood of their commitment to them and motivation to achieve them. Full value contracts were also a legitimate pre-goal setting strategy. Students could also look at the construction of goals using the S.M.A.R.T acronym, which can act as a checklist to see if the goals fit several criteria. If goals are seen as the 'what' of an activity, using objectives can show the 'how' of achieving them.

Stronger responses explored strategies to assist a group in *achieving* their group goals, including:
• using effective communication
• employing conflict resolution techniques
• fostering positive group dynamics
• building trust and confidence
• being enthusiastic, encouraging and flexible
• using of reward power
• using briefing skills to prepare and motivate the group
• providing ongoing feedback, and seeking feedback from participants
• being flexible to adjust and possibly change goals.

Many candidates addressed strategies that assist in **setting** the goal only, i.e.: SMART and failed to address the strategies an OL leader would use to **assist in the achievement** of goals. Better answers referred to the traits and qualities used by a leader to ensure achievement.

Question 7

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
• display an understanding of Tuckman's Group Development Theory, particularly the 'Storming' stage
• link Tuckman's to conflict resolution strategies such as avoidance, accommodation, competition, compromise and collaboration
• acknowledge that conflict is a normal part of group development that can lead to positive outcomes

Some responses commenced began by acknowledging that conflict is not always a bad thing and depending on how it is handled, it can actually be a positive in a group's development. This cleverly then led better students onto a discussion of Tuckman's Theory of Group Development, where it was acknowledged that conflict would most likely characterize the storming phase of development. Thus, a leader would broadly act in a democratic way to deal with conflict. Conflict resolution techniques such as:
• avoidance
• accommodation
• competition
• compromise
• collaboration

were discussed by most candidates. Weaker responses simply regurgitated a description of the five strategies without really contextualising their response to fit the question asked.

Stronger answers addressed the '**effectively** deal with conflict' element of the question by discussing that the latter two strategies were likely to be the most effective. For collaboration, potentially the most effective conflict resolution strategy, they noted that the leader must be assertive, a skilled communicator, and that the students involved must be motivated to work together for mutual benefit. Cooperation from the conflicting parties is required. It was noted that it can be time-consuming and not appropriate for all conflicts.

Question 8

A broad ranges of responses were accepted for this question. To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- effective communication techniques:
    - o   sending and receiving
    - o   verbal and non-verbal communication
    - o   active listening and observation
    - o   anticipation of how message will be interpreted
- feedback to communication
- limiting barriers to communication → clarification of understanding and 2-way communication
- minimising overload and external noise

Explanations needed to be comprehensive and detailed to achieve maximum results.

Question 9

To achieve the marks a candidate's response should include, but was not limited to, the following:
- consideration of the following essential listening skills:
    - o   show genuine interest and courtesy
    - o   attentive observation
    - o   use of feedback and clarification
    - o   block out distractions
    - o   put aside personal bias
    - o   give feedback
- demonstrate appropriate support and care for student
- seek feedback on cause of distress and homesickness
- seek resolution to remove stress and use techniques to encourage student to feel a valued member of the group
- display
    - o   reassurance
    - o   empathy
    - o   understanding
    - o   genuine Interest

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs could be discussed but responses doing so would need to explain what techniques would be used to deal with the situation and ensure needs are being met. Many students referred to social/belonging stages not being met.

Part 4

The report for Part 4 should be read in alongside the marking tool, which is included as an appendix.

Criterion 7	Demonstrate understanding of ways in which people experience and relate to the natural environment.
Criterion 8	Communicate ideas and information in a variety of forms.

This part of the exam paper was divided into two sections, requiring candidates to give an extended response in both sections. It is vital that students carefully read the question and understand the criteria being responded to – in this case it was necessary to talk explicitly about human-nature relationships.

An award of; A+,A,A-, B+,B,B-, C+,C,C-, D+,D,D- or t was attributed to the question for Criteria 7 and 8.

Question 10

In response to Question 10, markers were looking for:

- an understanding of Human–Nature Relationships, demonstrated by concepts such as
  - worldviews – anthropocentric, biocentric, ecocentric
  - Peter Martin's Signposts – alienated, travelling, caring, integrated
  - metaphors – gymnasium, museum, cathedral, friend, self, nature as object vs subject
  - place and space
  - kinship, worship, worthship
    values – aesthetic, recreational, intrinsic, spiritual, etc used in relation to Human Nature Relationships
  - (Maslow's Hierarchy contributing to self-actualisation in terms of connection or relationship with nature)

- details of how their experience may influence Human–Nature Relationships (i.e. connection)
  - proximity, reciprocity, mode of thinking
  - influence of values –recreational, aesthetic, social, economic, intrinsic, scientific, cultural, spiritual, educational
  - time in nature, solo time, extended experiences, contemplation, reflection, positive experiences, education, outdoor living skills

- likely outcomes of those experiences
  - moving 'up' Peter Martin's signposts
  - changing world view
  - developing sense of place
  - appreciating a greater range of values

It was helpful to have a plausible starting point in terms of relationship with nature, highlight influences and indicate a likely outcome on human nature relationships.

Many responses were too general in nature, using phrases such as 'develop a positive connection to nature'. Such responses were not considered sufficient evidence of understanding human–nature relationships. Even if they had reasonable reasons for why the experience was positive or negative, without further detail of the nature of the 'connection' (i.e. relationship) they were limited to the D range.

Weaker responses focused too heavily on describing the experience that participants were likely to have without making the connection to the effect on human–nature relationships.

Most responses considered the bushwalk to be positive, providing a good experience for participants and therefore having a positive impact on human–nature relationships. Some responses considered the bushwalk in a negative manner, indicating that development would have a negative effect on human–nature relationships. Some responses considered the potential for both positive and negative effects on human-nature relationships.

Stronger responses considered limitations of the experience for developing human–nature relationships (i.e. that they could only experience a limited degree of proximity when on a formed track and sleeping in a cabin). Some responses indicated that the Three Capes Track was a good starting point and a positive experience and was likely to encourage participants to go on to more challenging walks where they would be immersed deeper into nature and able to develop human–nature relationships further. This type of experience, due to its unique location, highlights and 'ease of walking' and camping, may facilitate a connection (greater) to nature and may result in
  - a growing appreciation and understanding of the value of such natural places
  - an increase in values people hold for the natural environment, and a corresponding change in behavior and attitudes towards these environments.

Question 11

Many students answered this question by describing the historical and/or contemporary events rather than making links between these issues and how they have influenced this change in values towards the natural environment in Tasmania.

Markers were looking for:
- contemporary **and** historical issues
- a description of change in values over time – prior to and after the issue or event (how they had changed). Many discussed the Lake Pedder and Franklin Dam events, logging, mining, Mt Wellington and Cradle Mountain Cable Car, media, Global Warming and increased awareness of climate change
- an understanding of how values are influenced by culture and experience
- an understanding of how the change in values, attitudes and environmental world views impacted the relationship and connections people had with the natural environment
- a discussion of concepts such as Peter Martin's Signposts and metaphorical images.

A lot of responses focussed on describing events/issues, with very little content covering how these issues actually influenced the change.

Weaker answers did not link the values and attitudes to relationships, whether using Peter Martin's Sign Posts or such concepts as metaphorical images of nature. Many students wrote very little about how relationships and values have changed, then added a sentence on the end 'therefore values have changed' (yet they had not actually explained with any evidence of theory).

Stronger responses did manage to describe both a historical and contemporary issue, discuss the values and the change in values, including why this occurred, then link this to a change in attitude towards and relationship with the natural environment.

Question 12

Comprehensive answers included a strong analysis of both values and attitudes held by Aboriginal people as well as personal values. They then went on to discuss how an increased understanding of Aboriginal values may impact their own understanding, experience and relationship with nature.

When looking at Aboriginal values students should discuss why the natural environment is significant to Indigenous people and how this occurs; for example, Indigenous spiritual relationships. Values could be explored through the consideration of Indigenous peoples and their connection to the natural environment through spiritual, aesthetic, and economic values (trade). These values could then be compared to personal values of the respondent which may be more focussed on recreational, resource, scientific, educational values.

Stronger answers described the specifics of 'a sense of place' and how it may be developed. Peter Martin's signposts should be cited to show the way Aboriginal Australians seek to be integrated with nature (though some responses noted the changing relationships Aboriginal people have with nature brought about by modernity) and how this compares to other ways people approach nature – alienated, travelling through, caring. Concepts of reciprocity and proximity could also be explored as could ecocentric vs biocentric vs anthropocentric attitudes as well as the notions of Kinship, Worship and Worthship.

While there were some very good papers, generally speaking responses were often general in nature with some mistakenly talking about a respect for Aboriginal family values rather than maintaining a focus on nature.

For **Criterion 8** students generally demonstrated a logical progression of ideas. Strong responses provided clear organisation of information, had strong introductions that addressed the set question and attributed concepts to developers. Use of grammar, punctuation and specialised terminology was sound within stronger responses. Excellent responses were able to weave theoretical information and personal understanding of their own relationship with nature into a cohesive discussion, developing relevant ideas and avoiding over generalising or repetition.

Some common issues noted by markers were:
- syntax (including run-on sentences, incomplete sentences and fragment sentences); spelling and unsophisticated vocabulary

- responses not attributing creators of theories or concepts – e.g. Peter Martin's Signposts to Human Nature Relationships: text/concept creators should be referred to, the first time, in full, and thereafter shortened to surname; never referred to as Peter etc.
- acronyms: if they are going to be used, they must be spelled out in full first, and explained.
- abbreviations and contractions should be avoided.
- vague responses were a common problem and suggested lack of knowledge
- handwriting that at times obscured a candidate's intended meaning.

Criterion 2 – Demonstrate understanding of leadership theory			
A+ A A-	B+ B B-	C+ C C-	D+ D D-[1]
provides a comprehensive and accurate description of the two theories, with minimal if any errors in the explanation	sound knowledge and mostly accurate description of the two theories, without major errors in the explanation.	demonstrates a basic knowledge of two theories OR sound knowledge of one theory PLUS some explanation of the second.	struggles to show any understanding of leadership theories
provides a comprehensive application of each theory to the scenario	correctly applies each theory to the scenario	correctly applies an element or parts of either theory to the scenario.	struggles to apply theory to the scenario
analyses, using several examples, clear and plausible differences and any similarities in the approach to the same outdoor situation based on the two theories selected.	compares, using at least one example, differences and any similarities in the approach to the same outdoor situation based on the two theories selected.	outlines a difference and/or similarity in approach to the same outdoor situation, which may have limited connection to the two theories selected.	does not make any comparison between theories or comparison is made between different outdoor situations.
comments on the effectiveness of each theory in dealing with the selected outdoor situation.	comments on the effectiveness of each theory in dealing with the selected outdoor situation. This may not be a balanced response.	comments on the effectiveness of at least one leadership theory in dealing with the outdoor situation.	does not comment on the effectiveness of either theory in dealing with the outdoor situation.

Criterion 8 – Communicate ideas and information in a variety of forms*			
A+ A A-	B+ B B-	C+ C C-	D+ D D-
communicates fluently and expressively using precise and nuanced language	communicates ideas effectively using controlled language and structure	communicates ideas adequately using clear language and structure	demonstrates elementary control of language and structure that compromises meaning
accurately uses grammatical conventions, punctuation and spelling to achieve effect	accurately uses grammatical conventions, punctuation and spelling	uses grammatical conventions, punctuation and spelling to achieve adequate clarity	frequent errors compromise meaning
correctly uses a wide range of specialised terminology relevant to the theories	correctly uses specialised terminology relevant to the theories	shows some use of specialised terminology	no use of specialised terminology
adapts text structures to skilfully develop ideas, forming a complex, cohesive argument	uses text structures to appropriately, effectively and logically develop ideas	uses text structures to communicate ideas	does not use appropriate structures
clearly and accurately identifies the sources of ideas and words of others used in the learner's work[2]	clearly identifies the sources of ideas and words of others used in the learner's work	usually identifies the sources of ideas and words of others used in the learner's work	sources of others ideas and words are not identified

---

[1] Response could be too brief and/or incomplete – less than 150 words. In this case the candidate should be limited to the D range on all criteria for the relevant response.

* Responses should be assessed as a first draft and expectations of accuracy, sophistication, coherence etc. should take into consideration what can be reasonably expected when writing under exam conditions. For example, some minor errors should still be accepted in the A range.

[2] Only simplified referencing techniques are expected in exam conditions. For example, quotations are indicated using inverted commas and sources are referenced by title and/or author etc. Acknowledgement required for A+, otherwise only use if advantageous to students' ratings.

Criterion 7 – Demonstrate understanding of ways in which people experience and relate to the natural environment			
A+ A A-	B+ B B-	C+ C C-	D+ D D-[3]
critically analyses why people may hold particular values for the natural environment and how values shape attitudes.	describes why people may hold particular values for the natural environment and how values shape attitudes.	makes some attempt to show why people may hold particular values for the natural environment and how values shape attitudes.	struggles to show any understanding that values for the natural environment may vary and that values shape attitudes
critically analyse how issues relating to the natural environment impact on Human-Nature relationships (where applicable to Qn).	explains how issues relating to the natural environment impact on Human-Nature relationships (where applicable to Qn).	attempts to show how issues relating to the natural environment may impact on Human-Nature relationships (where applicable to Qn).	does not make any connection between issues and relationships
comprehensively describes how human interactions with natural environments change over time[3]	describes how human interactions with natural environments change over time	considers how human interactions with natural environments change over time	does not make any mention of how relationships change
accurately and comprehensively applies concepts to describe Human-Nature relationships	applies concepts to describe Human-Nature relationships	makes some attempt to apply concepts to describe Human-Nature relationships	fails to describe Human-Nature relationships
skilfully responds to all aspects of the set question	consistently addresses the set question	addresses part of the set question	does not address the set question

---

[3] Response could be too brief and/or incomplete – less than 1 paragraph. In this case the candidate should be limited to the D range on all criteria for the relevant response.