www.AUSTRALIANACADEMICPRESS.com.au

ARTICLE AVAILABLE ONLINE
Australian Journal of Environmental Education
Volume 27 ▮ Number 2 ▮ pp. 229–237

Environmental Myopia: The Case For Bifocals

Chris North[1] and Garrett Hutson[2]
[1] *University of Canterbury, New Zealand*
[2] *Brock University, Canada*

Domestic and international tourists have major impacts on Aotearoa/New Zealand, both positive and negative. In 2010, tourism was the biggest export earner and continues to grow. Environmental consequences of tourism are also growing. Ways of addressing the environmental impacts caused by a mobile society continue to be debated from a variety of practical and theoretical positions. Place-based approaches are a logical discussion focus in addressing these types of social and environmental problems but may be associated with environmental myopia. Tourism, mobility and the principles of environmental education programs such as Leave No Trace are all contested topics within the place-based discourse. This article discusses these tensions and proposes an expansion of place-based and cosmopolitan approaches, with the *Leave No Trace* Aotearoa/New Zealand campaign presented as an example. The article concludes with possible implications of a more bifocal approach for environmental educators.

■ **Keywords:** *Leave No Trace*, tourism, place-based approaches, cosmopolitanism, mobility

In Der Ferne (In the Distance)

Wehe dem Fliehenden,
Welt hinaus ziehenden!
— Fremde durchmessenden,
Heimat vergessenden,
Mutterhaus hassenden,
Freunde verlassenden
Folget kein Segen, ach!
Auf ihren Wegen nach!

Woe to the fugitive,
Fleeing the world!
Roaming foreign places,
Forgetting his homeland,
Hating his mother's house,
Leaving his friends
Alas, no blessing follows
Along his ways.

Ludwig Rellstab (1799–1860), translation by Celia Sgroi)

> Small campervans without onboard toilets are travelling Aotearoa/New Zealand and causing national outrage at the rubbish and toilet waste left behind. A young Swiss couple is touring in such a campervan. They park at a beach with golden sand near Nelson (at the north end of the South Island). While preparing dinner, the Swiss couple throw their dinner scraps into the bushes. Some locals in the area see the tourists throwing out waste and are not impressed with their treatment of the reserve (Moffet, 2011).

Tourists have major impacts on Aotearoa/New Zealand—impacts that are both positive and negative. In 2010, tourism was the biggest export earner, contributing $NZ9.5 billion to the country's economy and employing approximately 1 in 10 New Zealanders (Ministry of Economic Development, 2011). While the economic impacts of tourism are carefully measured, the environmental benefits and costs are more difficult to estimate (Buckley, 2008). And although the negative environmental impacts of tourism are often emphasised, there can be positive impacts. Environmental benefits of tourism include the enhancement and protection of natural areas

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Chris North, University of Canterbury College of Education, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand.
Email: chris.north@canterbury.ac.nz

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as locals seek to attract tourism business. Growth of tourism in some more remote places has also been promoted as an alternative to extractive industries such as forestry and mining. Nature-based tourism in particular can be seen as a vehicle for environmental education, with some tourists also seeking out and contributing to service projects focused on sustaining (including through restoration work) the areas they visit (Becken, 2011; Youth Hostel Association, n.d.). Tourism, in some contexts, seems as if it may benefit the environment.

However, researchers have challenged the concept that tourism can in any way benefit the environment suggesting it can be a form of 'greenwashing' that deflects critical observation away from the inherent unsustainability of tourism (Brookes, 2000). The negative environmental impacts from tourism are diverse, ranging from global (e.g. the build-up of greenhouse gases) through to national issues, such as freedom camping, and right down to specific local impacts, such as damage to an ecologically sensitive area or breaking a specific tapu. In 1996, the New Zealand Conservation Boards identified over 60 sites where visitor activities were having a detrimental impact on public lands (Department of Conservation, 1996). While many of these impacts are attributed to international tourists by media, there is evidence that New Zealanders are causing significant impact themselves (S. Sutton, personal communication, June 29, 2009; Moffet 2011). While tourism may be inherently unsustainable, 'economic imperatives' continue the drive to attract international tourists to Aotearoa/New Zealand and thus tourist numbers seem likely to grow further.

The undesirable influences of tourism and recreation on Aotearoa/New Zealand's natural settings is an area of concern attracting considerable media attention. These accounts tend to focus on the problems and call for resolution through legislation and enforcement. One alternative solution, involving an expanded understanding of certain place-based education discourses, is a primary focus of this article. Implicit in place-based approaches to education is the assumption that environmentally irresponsible behaviour is caused by a lack of connection to or a general disregard for one's local environment (Gruenwald, 2003; Sobel, 2004; Watchow & Brown, 2011). Education is often positioned as the key to changing this situation (Hungerford, 2010; Short, 2010). The focus on education as a potential solution to environmental impacts is not just affecting Aotearoa/New Zealand, but is of great concern internationally.

In response to the growing body of scientific evidence, the international community has, over the latter part of the 20th century and on into the 21st become more united about global environmental challenges and humanity's responsibility toward global environmental problems. In the early 1970s, UNESCO developed a series of international initiatives directed at addressing the concern that 'cultural heritage and the natural heritage are increasingly threatened' (UNESCO, 1972). These efforts led, in part, to the Belgrade Charter, which sought to 'develop … a world population that is aware of and concerned about the environment' (UNESCO, 1976, p. 2). More recently, in 2010, 34 years after the Belgrade Charter, UNESCO re-asserted that education must 'promote reflection on new lifestyles which combine wellbeing, quality of life and respect for nature and other people' (UNESCO, 2010, p. 4). Clearly, human-based environmental impacts continue to be a concern to the international community.

In addition to governmental bodies such as the United Nations taking up the call for sustainability initiatives, non-governmental organisations have been founded in order to advocate for specific causes. For example, Greenpeace (n.d) aims 'to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace'. The World Wildlife Fund's mission is to 'stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature' (World Wildlife Fund, n.d.). Other environmental organisations with a narrower focus have also been established, such as *Leave No Trace*, which aims to promote and inspire responsible travel and outdoor recreation through education, research and its sustainability ethos (*Leave No Trace* Centre for Outdoor Ethics, 2008). Many organisations at different levels are involved in different aspects of environmental education and each has its own focus and approach.

Although there are multiple approaches to educating about environmentally responsible behaviour (Hampton & Cole, 2003; Oskamp, 2002; Vaske & Kobrin, 2001), our purpose in this article is to propose an expansion to place-based approaches by bringing a cosmopolitan (also known as universal, global, international) perspective to the local and a local perspective to the cosmopolitan with respect to conducting more effective environmental education. We use a recontextualisation of *Leave No Trace* (LNT) Aotearo/New Zealand as a case study to illuminate the benefits and tensions created by combining these two approaches. We also suggest how influences of both cosmopolitan and place-based approaches to LNT, despite the tension, might provide a way forward for effective environmental education for travellers and tourists.

The LNT program was chosen as the context for this article for several reasons. Both authors are familiar with the LNT program and it is an international phenomenon that is well known both in theory and practice within a wide array of organisations and contexts. Furthermore, the framework of the LNT principles was designed to be implemented in a variety of local environments, making LNT a logical point of discussion to suggest an expansion of place-based approaches.

Specifically, LNT Aotearoa /New Zealand is a not-for-profit educational organisation, which promotes the

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

minimisation of outdoor recreation impacts through the utilisation of a curriculum united by the following seven principles:

- Plan ahead and prepare
- Travel and camp on durable ground
- Dispose of waste properly
- Leave what you find
- Minimise the effects of fire
- Respect wildlife and farm animals
- Be considerate of others.

LNT has often been accepted 'best practice' for promoting outdoor ethics for many outdoor recreation programs globally (*Leave No Trace* New Zealand, 2009). The LNT curriculum is based on broad principles which provide a framework for decision making, rather than a set of rules. *Leave No Trace* has its roots in recreation ecology, which is 'the study of ecological interrelationships between humans and the environment in recreation/tourism contexts' (Leung & Marion, 2000 p. 24). The LNT program began in wilderness and backcountry settings in the 1970s in the United States. From there, it grew to include front-country (urban/suburban) environments and implementation in more than 25 countries. Since 2000, Australia, Ireland, Canada, and Aotearoa /New Zealand have all established national branches of LNT (For further information about the history of LNT see Marion and Reid (2007) and its application in Aotearoa /New Zealand see North (2011)).

While the discussion to this point has presented information on LNT uncritically, LNT and aligned initiatives have been critiqued. These critiques include those of education initiatives emanating out of land management agencies, for example park interpretation, and have some relevance for LNT as they have similar origins. Ontologically, Brookes (2000) considers that park interpretation presents nature as unproblematic, real and preserved in national parks. Park interpretation's representation of nature contrasts with more critically aware presentations of nature (see for example Gough & Whitehouse, 2003). In addition those holding liberal philosophical positions on education may also find fault as the outcome of the LNT education program is predetermined as promoting specific behaviours to minimise recreational impacts (for a discussion of this see Ferreira, 2009). Environmental education initiatives in the general vein of LNT have been and continue to be contested.

LNT has also received direct critique. As the LNT program has gained prominence in various countries (USA, Canada, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand) seeking to adapt the initiative to their local cultures and ecosystems, LNT has come to the attention of academics who have highlighted potentially problematic aspects of the program. The LNT approach to environmental education has been critiqued for a variety of reasons including alignment with consumer culture (Turner, 2002), fetishising the remote and pristine, and advocating the adoption of a special ethical stance inside arbitrarily defined areas (Simon & Alagona, 2009). Acknowledging this critique, we consider the LNT program is still a worthwhile initiative worthy of exploration. While aware of some limitations of the LNT program, we do not believe that pathologising LNT is helpful. LNT has achieved some successes in environmental education and been implicated in reduced negative outdoor recreation impacts (Marion & Reid, 2007). Therefore, in this article, we use LNT as an example of a program recontextualised into both cosmopolitan and place-based approaches to environmental care education.

In order to ground this article, a variety of sources have been used including books, peer reviewed journals, radio broadcasts, magazines, and some web based material. This is partly in response to Payne (2005) who critiques abstracted and technologically mediated intellectual exchange resulting in decontextualised and disembodied research. Additionally, Kelsey (1999) notes that to rely solely on academic peer reviewed literature is to rely on often outdated ideas because of the time associated with the peer review process. The use of public ideas has been important to this article because these ideas demonstrate a standpoint in relation to environment taken by people in the public arena (as distinct to academics in peer reviewed literature). Secondary sources allow for discussion grounded in reality of the speaker or the community they represent, and are an attempt to contextualise and embody this article.

Furthermore, Payne (2005) recommends that social researchers and environmental educators have a fundamental role in identifying and revealing what paradigm underpins environmental relations. This article is also informed by our experiences. Both of the authors have rarely spent more than six years in any one location. We have travelled internationally as children and adults, have lived in other countries, and yet still feel strong connections to places. We have felt disenfranchised by some of the rhetoric that accompanies some place-based approaches to environmental education due to our transience. But the mobility that we have experienced is not just the province of the minority. It is practically enshrined within Antipodean youth culture through what is called the 'OE' or 'overseas experience', wherein many young Australasians (and increasingly older adults and retirees from these countries) travel and work around the world. And it leads us to ask questions: How does a mobile population find a way to connect with places that does not require generations of dwelling in a particular place? Is the connectedness to place that mobile individuals experience less or more cogent than what the deeply and locally connected experience?

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Our questions are also underpinned by our concern at the apparent general lack of knowledge of local places and contexts that we have observed among the populace of our home cities and among the university students we teach.

Our experiences of the *Leave No Trace* program have been influential in our approaches to environmental education. As a consequence, the first author has spent several years working to adapt the program to the cultural diversity and ecology of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The authors have found LNT to be a helpful platform from which to begin discussions of many diverse scales of environmental education. Accordingly, in this article, we suggest that programs that support all levels of environmental care education—from local through global—are more likely to be successful in promoting environmentally responsible behaviour among people, whether at home or travelling nationally or internationally. We begin with a discussion of some local approaches to environmental education.

Place-Based Approaches

Place-based approaches to environmental education arose from the perception that environmental education had become overly focused on global, abstract issues, such as global warming, that are often poorly understood and have little relevance to students' everyday perceptions and actions (Eijck, 2010). Many place-based educators also argue that relationships to local landscapes have lost their context and have become too universalised (for Australasian critiques, see Hutson, 2010; Nakagawa & Payne, 2011; Plumwood, 2000; Stewart, 2004; Wattchow, 2006). Geertz's (1996) comment that 'We do not live in the 'World in general" (p. 262) articulates the frustrations that some place-based educators feel when faced with globalised tourism and fast travel.

Many place-based approaches have their roots in the work of Yi-Fu Tuan (1977), who emphasised the importance of particular and local place connections over universalising place into a nebulous concept. This dominant theme within place-based educational perspectives challenges the possibilities for caring for places in today's predominantly mobile society. This same mobility means that many people 'simply do not live long enough in one place to develop intimate relationships to place' (Gruenewald & Smith, 2008, p. xvi), which is why some place-based theorists label such transient people as 'placeless'. Place-based approaches have countered this transience and placelessness by creating possibilities for renewed engagement and connection between real people and real places (Brown, 2008). A recontextualisation of *Leave No Trace* (LNT), as proposed in this article, into both cosmopolitan and place-based approaches is one such attempt. Although LNT has been in place for several decades, it has some potential to illuminate the just-cited issue of connection in a recreation context and may offer an effective form of place-based environmental education (Hutson, in press). As Hutson points out, LNT fulfils place-based educational criteria set out by Sobel (2004) because it endeavours to connect learners to local environments by requiring them to respond to the particular needs of specific places. For example, Hutson (in press, p. 12) highlights that 'camping and travelling on durable ground (LNT principle 2) helps people to confront their impacts and to see and have a direct relationship to certain environments.' Overall, LNT seeks to promote and inspire responsible travel and outdoor recreation through education, research and partnerships, and it has in place initiatives that educate visitors in how to identify and use practices to enhance positive experiences and avoid or minimise negative environmental impacts in a variety of specific settings.

The place responsiveness component of LNT is evident in its framework, which comprises the seven principles of environmentally responsible practice (see *Leave No Trace* New Zealand, 2009) for a fuller discussion of the specifics of the principles. These principles, in turn, give guidance about behaviour in very localised, place-based contexts, such as examining the local flora and soils to choose a suitable site for a tent (Hampton & Cole, 2003), or disposing of human waste appropriately in different settings (North, 2008). LNT also focuses on developing an ethic of environmental care that is informed by a high level of local knowledge and sensitivity. We consider, however, that place responsiveness to the extent evident in LNT is unlikely or difficult to inculcate among the members of various de-territorialised populations, such as tourists. International tourists visiting Aotearoa /New Zealand, for example, are highly mobile. They stay, on average, 20 days in the country (Ministry of Economic Development, 2011), and during that time are almost constantly 'on the go', travelling nearly every day to visit the key tourist destinations of the North and South Islands. A tourist who is travelling many hours daily is unlikely to have the time or the appreciation for the more nuanced aspects of place. He or she is likely to view 'scenery' through a vehicle window and have little thought—beyond romantic ideals of a 'mosaic of scenic landscapes' (Straker, 2010, p. 104)—for the ecology and culture of each passing or transiently visited place (Park, 2006). Within this context, how can a place-based approach to environmental education mitigate the growing problem of environmental degradation brought about by increasing influxes of visitors, both national and international, and enhance connection to place? We suggest part of the answer may exist within the LNT framework if recontextualised and used as an intentional response to environmental obtuseness. The following section addresses some challenges to place-responsiveness in mobile populations.

Global Citizenry: A Response to Environmental Myopia?

Some commentators argue that place-based approaches to environmental education and, from there, sustainability, is of limited value because the place-based discourse has tended to privilege aspects of place that are no longer accessible or even relevant to most people. As Heise (2008), for example, explains, '… the local itself is thor-

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

oughly unfamiliar to many individuals, and may be epistemologically as unfathomable in its entirety as larger entities such as the nation or the globe' (Heise, 2008, p. 41). Heise critiques the largely unexamined commitment of place-based approaches to an 'ethic of proximity' (p. 32). Having argued that this ethic marginalises the potential of mediated experiences (such as through the internet and media) and of intellectual engagement, she claims that 'the challenge is to shift the core of environmental thinking from a sense of place, to a less territorial and more systemic sense of planet' (Heise, 2008, p. 56). Thomashow (2002) similarly states that there is no such thing as a local environmental problem. For him, all environmental problems are regional and/or global in nature rather than specific to one small place, for example, a particular neighbourhood park.

LNT has also been critiqued as too specific and local in focus. Simon and Alagona (2009) are among a number of commentators who argue that LNT focuses too narrowly on specific localities and contexts. While not denying that LNT is effective in terms of those contexts, they argue that LNT should broaden its focus to encompass broader, more global social and environmental issues. This emphasis, they maintain, would see a greater appreciation of environmental impacts beyond, say, national park boundaries or even national boundaries.

In essence, Simon and Alagona's (2009) critique suggests that too much focus on a place may result in a form of environmental myopia. With this consideration in mind, let us consider the notion of environmentally hyperopic (long-sighted) tourists and travellers. Travellers and tourists, simply because they are mobile, have access to a larger environmental purview than a localised dweller. Their transience can thus be seen not so much as a deficit as a strength. Gustafson (2009) studied the effect of mobility on place attachment and found that transience was not necessarily related to a lack of place attachment, but rather that transience related to the scale of place attachment. Individuals who travelled further tended to see themselves as more attached to supranational places (e.g., Europe), as opposed to attachment to one specific neighbourhood or community. Does this mean a cosmopolitan or more planetary approach will be superior to place-based approaches for tourists? Another look at LNT may help us answer this question.

Although the LNT program primarily targets backcountry impacts, its ethos is about enhancing connections to the natural world as a whole (Hampton & Cole, 2003; Hutson, in press). Due to the increasing mobility of society, the people reached by the LNT program will likely travel to different places and apply the principles to broader areas. From his analysis of the efficacy of the LNT program, Hutson (in press, p. 7) concludes that the principles of LNT 'rely on implicit notions that LNT should become part of one's larger relationship to nature both in and out of the backcountry'.

But what happens in one location in a specific social context is not, of course, necessarily universally transferable (Brookes, 2004; Brown & Fraser, 2009); nor is what happens in one place necessarily completely isolated from other places and contexts either in the mind (Casey, 2001) or in practice. Those aspects of environmental education and sustainability programs and approaches that can be transferred from the local to the global and back to the local and how this transference might be accomplished are areas for future consideration and research. In the meantime, we consider that LNT's seven principles provide travellers with a framework of environmentally sustainable practice that they can apply to any context. If applied with rigour, LNT has the potential to confront tourists with both universal and local sustainability challenges requiring actions of care.

One potential pitfall with a more cosmopolitan or more universal approach is superficiality or the 'sloganising' of environmental education efforts. If travellers are present in a place for only a brief period of time, what message are they most likely to readily process and apply? One answer might be a concise message that gives key points. Fully addressing efficient messaging and communication as a means of education or behaviour change is beyond the scope of this article. Suffice to say here that the statement '*Leave No Trace*' is designed to be memorable but it should not be seen as a remedy. Environmental education reduced to a mere slogan is tokenistic. If all that a tourist hears about environmental ethics is '*Leave No Trace*', their behaviour is unlikely to be responsive to the subtleties, or even the not so subtle aspects, of a place.

We concur with Garrard (2010), who argues that this level of place responsiveness is best developed through exploration of environmental ethics. Garrard critiques the discourse on environmental ethics that Orr puts forward in his 2004 publication, *Earth in Mind*. According, to Garrard, Orr treats environmental ethics as if it is a self-evident truth that can simply be transmitted without any disciplinary grounding or debate. A level of engagement involving sustained debate and disciplinary grounding is unlikely to be achieved in tourist encounters. Considering Garrard's critique of Orr, we wonder how much more critical he would be about a two-minute encounter with a tourist that attempts to instil a useful understanding (useful in the sense of being applied in practice) of environmental ethics. Encounters with tourists are often by nature brief and can either be disregarded as worthless or perceived as an opportunity in terms of environmental education. In the following section we examine the area of tension between place and cosmopolitan approaches to explore whether there might be some opportunity for environmental education with mobile tourists

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Seeing Between Place and the Universe: A Case For Bifocals

'People often construct a narrative of stark binary choices in order to emphasise a point, call attention to a problematic situation, and provoke others into choosing sides' (Kriegman, 2006, p. 14). We have been guilty thus far in this article of taking this stance. A truly binary perspective would result in place-based approaches dismissing the cosmopolitan approaches as a form of neo-colonialism and of being simplistic and superficial in tenor. The cosmopolites, in turn, would dismiss place-based approaches as xenophobic, parochial and not relevant to today's society. The worst outcome of the place-based versus cosmopolitan debate would be universalist globalised approaches having as little relevance for local (rural, urban, national) dwellers as place-based approaches have for international travellers. Buell (1995) makes this point when he says, '… if we idealise the sense of place as a panacea for the disaffections of modern uprootedness, we run almost as great a risk of cultural narcissism as when we accept the myth of place-free, objective enquiry' (p. 253). Somewhere in the middle is the place that is informed by both perspectives. Through this article, we wish to illuminate some of the tensions and contradictions of drawing binaries; and we wish to explore the possibilities of inhabiting an integrated space that we propose lies somewhere between the specific and the universal (see Table 1). We are proposing that it is only through having some sense of—or perspective on—our roots that we can look out and understand broader global implications. Likewise, knowledge of the broader environmental picture better informs us about our sense of place.

There are different ways of developing place-meanings and also scales of place attachment. Table 1 shows some of the different strengths of experiencing place from both specific and universal perspectives. Place-based and cosmopolitan approaches are not necessarily antagonistic, but could be considered on the same continuum. Part of our hope in writing this article has been to share a pragmatic approach—an approach that contributes to the place-based education discourse by combining these elements while also recognising that the area on the continuum between these two is both an area of tension and an area of cohesion and collaboration.

Taking a stance that seeks to draw out the strengths of each approach requires a process of negotiation. This process sits in a contested space, with resolution resting on a shared belief that building a more integrated approach is vital to environmental sustainability at all levels of place. This shared belief is vital because it is necessary to maintain dialogue in the face of having to resolve conflicts relating to priorities and goals.

What we mean here can be exemplified by the tension evident in the amount of context-specific information a place-based approach advocates and the simplicity of a message that a tourist can process and hopefully apply somewhat or somehow in practice. The LNT program responds to this tension to some extent because it attempts to address different levels of education through various messages, trainings and knowledge transfer. These may be as minimal as the *Leave No Trace* slogan itself, require individuals to spend a few minutes or hours (e.g., reading posters and brochures or attending awareness workshops), or extend through to a five-day full-immersion backcountry course (*Leave No Trace* New Zealand, 2009). LNT's approach allows individuals either to be exposed to or to choose levels of information and education that they want or realistically have time for.

While, with respect to the impact of tourists, a few-minutes' educational encounter may not be optimal in terms of serving environmental sustainability, compulsory and/or lengthier sessions are unlikely to serve this purpose either. In general, tourists are unlikely to respond favourably to legislation and compulsory sessions and will probably respond more to education programs offered in various accessible

TABLE 1

Strengths Comparison of Specific and Cosmopolitan (Universal) Place-Based Approaches to Environmental Education

Area of tension yet possible integration	
Specific	Universal
• Specific within context	• Transferable to new contexts
• Place-based	• General
• Deeper knowledge (rich and varied)	• Broader knowledge (facts and broad truths)
• Context looking for someone with skills, attitude and knowledge	• Skills, attitude and knowledge looking for a context
• Lifestyles of people who are settled, agrarian	• Lifestyles of explorers, traders, pilgrims
• Promoted by concepts such as *tangata whenua**, rural towns or alternative lifestyles, connectedness, intimacy, attachment, advocacy, community and *whanau**	• Promoted by concepts of experiencing widely, having your eyes opened, broadening horizons
• Emotionally engaged with place	• Emotionally engaged with challenge and exploration

Note: **Tangata whenua* is translated as 'local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land — people born of the whenua, i.e. of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried' (Te Ipukarea/National Māori Language Institute, n.d.)

**Whānāu* is translated as 'extended family, family group, a familiar term of address to a number of people' (National Māori Language Institute, n.d.)

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

guises, such as interpretation boards at a national park (Marion & Reid, 2007; Sutton, 2002). Also, compulsory training usually works only in 'captive' contexts. For example, Alaskan mountaineers have a compulsory orientation session before they are allowed to make a summit attempt on Denali (National Park Service Alaska, n.d.).

Overall, we consider that combining place-based and cosmopolitan approaches to tourism place-based experiences begins to more thoroughly address and utilise the myriad ways people relate to places and to bring about understandings and appreciation of how places are impacted by people. We consider that LNT may provide a valuable interim tool for environmental educators to use not only because it allows for this combination of local and cosmopolitan but also because it can be adapted to allow both the local dweller and the traveller to perceive and appreciate each other's sense of and valuing of place. The next section attempts to tease out the 'so what?' of this article.

Conclusion and Implications

This article opened with an extract from a radio documentary that depicted tourists throwing dinner scraps into the bushes of a New Zealand beach and the locals feeling outrage. The documentary went on to explore this encounter further. What emerged was the deep sense of affection the locals held for their beach and their sense of outrage at tourists throwing rubbish into the bushes. However, the tourists expressed dismay on finding out they were expected to throw their pumpkin seeds and peel into a rubbish bin, the contents of which would then be transported to a landfill or burned. Used to composting organic waste in their home country, they found it nonsensical to have no green-waste composting facilities at the beach. In short, they, too, felt a strong sense of environmental responsibility. The difference between the locals and the travellers was one of perception, and perhaps perception is at the crux of the place-based versus the cosmopolitan debate. Taking a bifocal approach brings the two perspectives together expanding our understanding of connections between local and global and hopes to enhance the effectiveness of environmental education. As such, it may provide a new vigour to the type of environmental education needed to bring about the coherent planetary environmental connectedness that Heise (2008) envisions.

By combining aspects of place-based and cosmopolitan discourses, environmental educators may begin to more thoroughly realise the efficacy of place responsiveness in both universal and local contexts. This combination could begin to more broadly address and utilise the myriad ways people and places relate. And LNT, when recontextualised within this discourse, may be a valuable tool for educators to consider in attempts to put environmental care education into practice.

Endnotes

1 *Tapu* is the Māori word for sacred, prohibited, restricted, set apart, forbidden, under protection (Te Ipukarea/National Māori Language Institute, n.d.).

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Paula Wagemaker for her help with editing and the reviewers for their helpful comments.

References

Becken, S. (2011). What is responsible tourism? *Tourism Business* (December/January), p.25.

Brookes, A. (2004). Astride a long-dead horse: Mainstream outdoor education theory and the central curriculum problem. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education, 8*, 22–33.

Brown, M., & Fraser, D. (2009). Re-evaluating risk and exploring educational alternatives. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning, 9*(1), 61–77.

Brown, M. (2008). Outdoor Education: Opportunities provided by a place based approach. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education, 2*(3), 7–25.

Buckley, R. (2008). Testing take-up of academic concepts in an influential commercial tourism publication. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 721–729.

Buell, L. 1995. The environmental imagination: Thoreau, nature writing, and the formation of American writing. London: Princeton University Press.

Casey, E. (2001). Body, self, and landscape. In P. S. Adams, S. Hoelscher, & K. Till (Eds.), *Textures of place: Exploring humanist geographies.* (pp. 403–425). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Department of Conservation. (1996). Visitor Strategy. Retrieved June 16, 2010, from http://www.doc.govt.nz/publications/about-doc/role/policies-and-plans/visitor-management/visitor-strategy/

Eijck, M. (2010). Place-based (science) education: Something is happening here. In D. J. Tippins, M. P. Mueller, M. Eijck, & J. D. Adams (Eds.), Cultural Studies and Environmentalism: *The Confluence of Ecojustice, Place-based Science Education, and Indigenous Knowledge Systems* (Vol. 3, pp. 187–191). New York: Springer.

Ferreira, J. (2009). Unsettling orthodoxies: Education for the environment/for sustainability. *Environmental Education Research, 15*(5), 60–620.

Garrard, G. (2010). Problems and prospects in ecocritical pedagogy. *Environmental Education Research, 16*(2), 233–245.

Geertz, C. (1996). Afterword. In S. Feld & K. Basso (Eds.), *Senses of place* (pp. 259–262). Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.

Gough, A., & Whitehouse, H. (2003). The 'Nature' of environmental education research from a feminist poststructuralist viewpoint. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 8*, 31–43.

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greenpeace. (n. d.). About Greenpeace. Retrieved May 12, 2011, from http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/about/

Gruenwald, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher, 32*(4), 3–12.

Gruenewald, D. A., & Smith, G. A. (2008). Introduction: Making room for the local. In D. A. Gruenewald & G. A. Smith (Eds.), *Place-based education in the global age.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gustafson, P. (2009). Mobility and Territorial Belonging. *Environment and Behavior, 41*(4), 490–508.

Hampton, B., & Cole, D. (2003). *Soft Paths* (3rd ed.). Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books.

Heise, U. K. (2008). *Sense of place and sense of planet: The environmental imagination of the global.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hungerford, H. R. (2010). Environmental education (EE) for the 21st century: Where have we been? Where are we now? Where are we headed? *Journal of Environmental Education, 41*(1), 1–6.

Hutson, G. (2010). Revisiting the meanings of place for New Zealand place-based outdoor education [Special issue]. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education, 2*(4), 43–61.

Hutson, G. (in press). *The seeds of Leave No Trace grow well beyond backcountry boundaries.* In M. Wagstaff & B. Martin (Eds.), Controversial issues in adventure education.

Kelsey, J. (1999). *Secondary sources.* In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding (pp. 309–315). Auckland, N.Z.: Pearson Education.

Kriegman, O. (2006). Dawn of the cosmopolitan: The hope of a global citizens movement. In O. Kriegman & P. Raskin (Eds.), *GTI Paper: Frontiers of a great transition.* Boston, MA: Tellus Institute.

Leave No Trace Center for Outdoor Ethics (2008). *Sustainability*. Retrieved from http://www.lnt.org/aboutUs/sustainability.php

Leave No Trace New Zealand (2009). *Training overview*. Retrieved May 16, 2011, from http://www.leavenotrace.org.nz/Training+Overview

Leiserowitz, A. (2007). *International public opinion, perception, and understanding of global climate change. UNDP Human Development Report Office Occasional Pa*per, p. 40. UNDP.

Leung, Y.-F., & Marion, J. L. (2000). *Recreation impacts and management in wilderness: A state-of-knowledge review.* Paper presented at the Wilderness Science in a Time of Change: Wilderness Ecosystems, Threats, and Management, Ogden, UT.

Marion, J. L., & Reid, S. (2007). Minimising visitor impacts to protected areas: The efficacy of low impact education programs. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 15*(1), 5–27.

Marion, J. L., & Reid, S. (2001). Development of the United States Leave No Trace program: A historical perspective. In M. B. Usher (Ed.), *Enjoyment and understanding of the natural heritage,* pp. 81–92. Edinburgh, Scotland: The Stationery Office Ltd, Scottish Natural Heritage.

Ministry of Economic Development. (2011). *International visitor commentary.* Retrieved April 27, 2011, from http://www.tourismresearch.govt.nz/Data—Analysis/International-tourism/International-Visitor-Arrivals/IVA-Commentary/

Moffet, G. (2011). Freedom camping. *Insight* [radio documentary]. Retrieved April 28, 2011, from http://www.radionz.co.nz/national/programs/insight/20110213

Nakagawa, Y., & Payne, P. (2011). Experiencing beach in Australia: Study abroad students' perspectives. Australian Journal of Environmental Education, 27(1), 94–108.

National Park Service Alaska. (n.d.). *Climbing registration.* Retrieved May 12, 2011, from http://www.nps.gov/dena/planyourvisit/registrationinfo.htm

North, C. (2008). Watching where you go. *The Climber*, 64, 20–21.

North, C. (2011). The sidelining of environmental care education in outdoor education programs: Why it happens, why it shouldn't and what we can do about it. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education, 2*(5), 35–50.

Oskamp, S. (2002). Environmentally responsible behavior: Teaching and promoting it effectively. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 2*(1), 173–182.

Park, G. (2006). *Theatre country: Essays on landscape and whenua.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Payne, P. (2005). Lifeworld and textualism: reassembling the researcher/ed and 'others'. [Article]. *Environmental Education Research, 11*(4), 413–431.

Plumwood, V. (2000). Belonging, naming, and decolonization, *Ecopolitics,1*(1), 90–106.

Short, P. C. (2010). Responsible environmental action: Its role and status in environmental education and environmental quality. *Journal of Environmental Education, 41*(1), 7–21.

Simon, G. L., & Alagona, P. S. (2009). Beyond Leave No Trace. *Ethics, Place and Environment, 12*(1), 17–34.

Sobel, D. (2004). *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities.* Great Barrington, MA: Orion Society.

Stewart, A. (2004). Decolonising encounters with the Murray river: Building place responsive outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education, 8*(2), 46–55.

Straker, J. (2010). Unearthing 'the outdoors' in outdoor education. *New Zealand Journal of Outdoor Education, 2*(4), 103–123.

Sutton, S. (2002, 27th – 29th August). *Impact Assessment at Department of Conservation (New Zealand)* Visitor Sites. Paper presented at the Ecotourism, Wilderness and Mountain Tourism: Issues, Strategies and Regional Development International Conference Department of Tourism, University of Otago, New Zealand.

Te Ipukarea/ National M ori Language Institute (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index.* Retrieved from http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm.

Thomashow, M. 2002. *Bringing the biosphere home: Learning to perceive global environmental change.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1972). *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage.* Retrieved April 15, 2010, from http://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1976). The Belgrade charter: A global framework for environmental education. *Connect, 1*(1), 1–9.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2003). *United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development: International implementation scheme.* Retrieved November 10, 2010, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001306/130632e.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2010). *UNESCO strategy for the second half of the United Nations decade of education for sustainable development.* Retrieved May 16, 2011, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001873/187305e.pdf

Vaske, J. J., & Kobrin, K. C. (2001). Place attachment and environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Environmental Education, 32*(4), 16–21.

Wattchow, B. (2006). *The experience of river places in outdoor education: A phenomenological study*. Unpublished Doctorate, Monash University, Melbourne.

Watchow, B., & Brown, M. & (2011). *A pedagogy of place: Outdoor education for a changing world.* Melbourne: Monash University Press.

World Wildlife Fund, (n.d.). *WWF's mission: Guiding principles and goals.* Retrieved May 12, 2011, from http://wwf.panda.org/mission_principles_goals.cfm

Youth Hostel Association of New Zealand. (n. d.). *YHA supports community projects.* Retrieved May 11, 2011, from http://www.yha.co.nz/NR/exeres/8B9293E2-A2A9-422F-B7EC-ED159E727421.htm

About the Authors

Chris North lectures in outdoor and environmental education at the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. His teaching background includes secondary and tertiary institutions in New Zealand and North America. He has worked as a tourist guide and outdoor instructor for a range of organisations. Through his research, Chris is exploring the focus on environment in outdoor education courses.

Garrett Hutson, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Recreation and Leisure Studies at Brock University in St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada. Garrett's research interests include place-based outdoor education, outdoor recreation resource policy, and Q methodology. Garrett can be reached at ghutson@brocku.ca.

https://doi.org/10.1375/ajee.27.2.229 Published online by Cambridge University Press