

Loynes, Christopher (1992) Is it right to be safe? Annual Review of Environmental Education .

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/794/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Is it Right to be Safe?

by Chris Loynes

Whenever safety is in the spotlight reactions can be, at times, extreme. After the Cairngorm tragedy one LEA prescribed that no one would go over 1,000' without a Mountain Leadership Certificate. As a result one head had to telephone the authority to ask if he could open his school that morning as it was built at 1,200' above sea level! We are a little wiser now even though one youth club of which I know was forced to stop canoeing on the canal out the back of the centre this year because no one was a senior instructor.

The current spotlight has come about largely through the occurrence of the Lime Regis tragedy in which 4 girls were killed whilst canoeing as part of the programme of a school visit to an outdoor centre. As a result many organisations have been reviewing their safety policies.

It is encouraging to see, therefore, 2 major documents published recently on this subject. I also think it is heartening to read their attitudes to risk and safety. **Outdoor Education, Safety and Good Practice** (2), or Guidelines for Guidelines as it has become known, was produced by a panel representing all the national organisations in the field. The second is the revised DES booklet **Safety in Outdoor Education** (3). For me, the booklets make 2 key statements. The first is that both booklets acknowledge that Outdoor Education can be, by its nature, hazardous; there can be real risks involved. What's more, that part of the educative process may be the active engagement by the student with these real risks, appropriately supervised.

Secondly, both booklets go on to point out the diversity of activities and locations now used by outdoor educators. They emphasise the impossibility of prescriptive rules about staffing ratios, etc in such a dynamic field. Instead, they adopt an approach that requires leaders to develop their own guidelines in any given situation. Both booklets then go on to give some of the questions that should be asked. Central to all the questions is 'do you have a right to place students at risk?'

Are you working with risk?

Outdoor situations all contain risks, just like the laboratory or the walk to school. What is important to decide is whether these risks are faced as a means to achieve something else or whether they are part of the educative process you are arranging. The Cairngorm tragedy happened to a party that deliberately set out to traverse the mountains in those conditions. The risk taking was intentional as part of the experience. In 2 recent enquiries, Lands End (4) and Altwood (1), the risks were encountered because of the location visited but it was not intended as part of the programme. Whatever, both sets of risks need to be recognised and appropriately managed.

What hazards do we face?

After the Cairngorm tragedy and other such mountain incidents with youth groups great emphasis was placed on obtaining the Mountain Leadership Certificate before leading groups in the hills. It raised the awareness of leaders in the nature of the hazards present in the mountain environment, gave them skills to cope and insisted on experience to develop sound judgement. It was an effective strategy in bringing down the number of incidents despite a continuing increase in the number of visits.

The MLC dealt effectively with one field of hazards, the environmental ones. However, it throws less emphasis on the second set, the human hazards. A risk is only encountered when the environmental hazards interact with the human ones and it is as important for a leader to be aware of the nature of these human hazards as it is to know about the environment. This is emphasised by the Altwood enquiry which criticised the nature of the supervision of the group rather than their presence on the mountain.

It is easy to imagine some of the hazards a group of students might represent; their level of skill or knowledge, their physical fitness, their readiness to be their, their eagerness to be somewhere else, their willingness to follow instructions, etc. It is also important to recognise the hazards you represent.

The enquiry into a recent American tragedy on Mount Hood (5) in which students and staff died of exposure during an attempt on the peak concluded that the judgement of the leader was impaired. He had made the ascent many times before and often turned back. On this occasion he didn't.

It was concluded that, for some reason, he particularly wanted the students to achieve the summit and that this, together with his own physiological reaction to the cold, clouded his judgement. Perhaps, also familiarity leads to complacency in such situations.

So, human hazards include the students, yourself and other leaders and, of course, other people at the site, over which you have little control.

It will be interesting to see if an awareness of these dimensions of leadership appear in the various award schemes as methods for training people in such topics as group management or decision making become more widely known and accepted. The work of Phipps (6) in the USA demonstrates that specific training can improve competence in decision making in the outdoors. The world wide research of Priest (7) gives us a progressive model on which to base these possible developments.

One canoeing coach recently told me that, in his advanced assessments, he sets students progressively harder challenges not, as it would seem at first, to see how good they are on the water, but to see if they will recognise that, despite their competence as a paddler, there is a limit to what you can do until you know the group you are paddling with better. You are relying on their performance if things go wrong and you need to trust that they will deliver. So change is taking place. Group dynamics is being recognised as a necessary part of a leader's awareness. It will be interesting to see how the Basic Expedition Training Award (BETA) develops. Aimed at training leaders operating in open country it includes many of these 'soft' leadership skills in its syllabus.

What sort of risk is it?

Colin Mortlock (8) has identified one way to classify risks that is helpful when selecting activities and venues for programmes. He recognises two types; objective and subjective.

Objective risks are those that are beyond management and involve the crossing of fingers! They include environmental hazards such as slopes in avalanche condition, human hazards such as activities where it is not possible to back up the consequences of a mistake such as some airborne activities; or levels of activity in which the participant does not have the skills to perform or the experience to make correct judgements. The freak wave involved at Lands End is in this class of hazard. They are not justifiable in educational situations and so the only way to manage them is to avoid them.

Subjective risks are those that can be managed by exercising skills or good judgement and are the arena of educational programmes. There is still a risk of harm but the participant has the ability to cope and back up safety systems can operate where a mistake might lead to serious harm eg a rope in climbing.

The distinction between objective and subjective hazards is not therefore absolute but depends on the condition of the environment or the ability of the participants' and their instructor. A freeze thaw cycle may stabilise a dangerous slope; a skills training programme may allow activities that were previously unsuitable; the development of new equipment might change the nature of the hazard eg the development of kayak construction materials from lath and canvas to fibre glass and now plastic has changed the nature of white water canoeing considerably.

What are the big risks?

A way of examining safety stems from the work of Alan Hale in North America (9). He has collected data from many outdoor programmes and publishes his findings each year. Many of his insights stand crossing the Atlantic.

It is not always the apparently big risks where the danger actually lies. Ask an insurance company what they consider to be risky from the list of outdoor activities and they might pick out climbing. It certainly pushes my premiums up! Yet statistics demonstrate that climbing is very safe because experience has taught us how to be safe in this situation. So what is the highest risk activity? -walking; at least in America. The serious accident rate to people walking caused by various slips and trips comes top of the list.

It is not just on the real high risk activities that Alan Hale is shedding light. Other factors are in play. For example, by far the majority of accidents occur just before lunch and supper. The inference is that energy levels are low and so concentration is affected. Yet the end of a session is often when students attempt the most demanding challenges. A most recent concern was that the majority of injuries to adults were re-injuries to old accident sites. This indicates the possible value of collecting such information on medical forms before courses start.

Alan's work is food for thought and it would be good to see his methods being tried out here.

How do I manage risks?

First, it is important to recognise that there are objective hazards you just don't want to mix with. They need to be avoided. This can be done initially in your selection of venue. It is also important to remember the human dimension and be selective about your participants.

Rules can be established. The problem with rules is that you are dealing with a dynamic situations, the outdoor environment and human behaviour, and so they may be ignored or circumstances may change. When they are made evidence suggests a positive framing makes a difference. For instance "we wear helmets when we go climbing to protect your head" is more likely to produce the required response than "you must wear a helmet when we go climbing."

One apparent incongruity in the accident figures may help to support a positive approach to safety management whether dealing with groups that are deliberately risk taking or ones that are simply taking risks to be somewhere. Although self reliant groups often get lost they rarely have accidents. It seems that most accidents that happen to students occur when they are accompanied. This suggests that maybe students are more likely to concentrate when the responsibility is there's and that, when faced with a decision, they tend to ere on the cautious side.

A possible strategy, then, is for us all to take a positive attitude to risks. Rather than avoid them or simply make all the risky decisions ourselves it would be better to adopt an approach that briefs the students fully on the nature of their situation and gives them the skills and resources to manage them for themselves. This is, after all, how we all get to learn to cross the road.

How do I know what is prudent exposure to risk?

Prudent is what we, as professionals, are meant to be. Prudent behaviour in law is defined by what is considered to be good practice by the professional's peer group. In court, this is determined, in part, by case law and specialist witnesses. It might be relatively easy to establish when the matter under consideration is, for instance, the type of rope to use. It will not be so easy if you are debating whether the student had the competence to undertake a risk at the level of supervision you were offering.

It will always be the hardest decision to make. When is a student ready to make his or her own decisions in hazardous situations. I have sweated profusely watching from below whilst a student of mine has coolly made his first lead on rock. You may choose never to place yourself in quite that position but we are all there in degrees every time we lead a group outdoors.

A friend with a daughter at school recently reported to me that the outdoor education staff had sent a letter home stating that certain activities they would be doing, such as orienteering, would not be supervised! This, I suspect, is not quite what they meant. Rather, they perhaps meant to indicate that the students would not be directly accompanied. The letter then asked for parental consent for this unsupervised risk taking. The result was a very anxious student and even more wary parents. The risks

incurred in driving a car are accepted by most because they are known and the activity valued. If we want risk taking in the outdoors to be acceptable when properly led we have a major communications job to undertake.

What is ethically acceptable as a level of risk to which to expose students and what is the appropriate level of supervision in those circumstances is the core of the debate on which we have now entered. Personally, I believe it is a debate that should never be concluded. Partly, this is because I believe it is healthy to air these matters continuously for our own profession's development; mainly because what is right should remain a constant debate between leader, student, employer and parent. There is a relationship between the educational worth of an experience and the degree of risk entered into. The balance can only be found through debate and mutual agreement for each situation. And one of the biggest parts of that situation is each of our attitudes to life. Most of us in the profession believe in the value of taking risks in our own development. Many of our students and their parents would agree with us. Some will not, especially after the event.

References

1. Berkshire County Council, **Report of of the Altwood School Enquiry Panel**, Royal County of Berkshire, 1989.
2. AHOEC, NAOE, NAFSO, OEAP, SAP, **Outdoor Education, Safety and Good Practice: Guidelines for Guidelines**, D of E Award, 1988.
3. DES **Safety in Outdoor Education**, HMSO, 1989.
4. Buckinghamshire County Council, **School Visit to Cornwall by Stoke Poges County Middle School**, Bucks. CC, 1985.
5. Williams J, The Mount Hood Accident, in **Adventure Education** vol IV no 3, 1987.
6. Priest S, An International Model for Preparing Effective Outdoor Leaders, in **Adventure Education** Vol V, no 1, 1988.
7. Maurice Phipps
8. Mortlock C, **The Adventure Alternative**, Cicerone Press, 1981.
9. Hale A, **North American National Safety Network Annual Review**, National Safety Network, 1988. PO Box, Bellefontaine, Ohio, 43311, USA.
10. Overton M, A UK Safety Network, in **Adventure Education** Vol VI no 3, 1989.

First published in:

Loynes, C. (1992) Is It Right to be Safe? Annual Review of Environmental Education; Council for Environmental Education.

Copyright: 1992, Chris Loynes.