The definition and characteristics of camp pedagogy – the concept of the hidden extra curriculum

Ádám Nagy

Abstract

"The camp is a special, separate world where, children want to live by their own laws, to challenge their concept of the world for the days spent together." (Jánosi, 1985, 171). Camps affect the entire childish character (Kádár, 1967). It seems that the validity of these statements has remained unchanged for 30-50 years, but has the concept of camping changed? Is there an accurate definition of camping and what can be considered as camp today? What are the basics of camping pedagogy, which educational disciplines is it part of and which is it closely connected to? How can camps be classified? So, first of all, by reviewing previous camp definitions, we are trying to provide a current one. In the second step, the characteristics of the camp and its pedagogical counterparts are considered. Third, we strive to create a usable camp typology. In the second step, the characteristics of the camp and its pedagogical counterparts are considered. Third, we strive to create a usable camp typology that is outlined along the open purpose, the target group, the involvement of participants, the dimension of transformation, the time of the camp, the locational aspect, and other pedagogically relevant dimensions. In the present study, we applied source analysis, content analysis, logical operations (analysis, synthesis, comparison). By reviewing previous camp definitions, we are trying to provide a current one on the basis of multi-day and intense togetherness, a different from home and experience-based environment and a pedagogical purpose embedded in leisure program services. Our article contains a new concept: we are trying to complete the description of camp pedagogy the concept of the hidden extracurriculum, which can help to understand the pedagogically relevant activities outside of school.

Keywords: camp pedagogy; hidden extracurriculum; camp definition; camp typology

Subject-Affiliation in New CEEOL: Social Sciences – Education – School Education

DOI: 10.36007/eruedu.2020.4.040-051

1. Camps and pedagogy – towards a full definition

Let the definition of camp be based on the activity of campers, the practice should be aligned with the theory, adapt the definition to the activity - the criticism may sound. We do not want to shape the definition to our own activities, but to create a theoretical definition that cannot be challenged as a correct and complete definition, even if we do not necessarily use all of its elements. In fact, a precise definition of the 'pedagogy camp' is still missing from the science of pedagogy.

Even those materials and authors only superficially define the subjects that are intended to be used for educational purposes. Beyond all of these elements, if we take a closer look at it, it can be clearly seen that those definitions and approaches came well before 1990, and as such, did not meet the minimum criteria of definition itself. (Baden-Powell, 2005; Nagy, 1985; Sik, 2000), or more camp type than camp definitions (Bánhidi, 2004; P. Miklós, 2003; Trencsényi, 1987).

If we want to think about camp activity from a pedagogical perspective we need to have a look on different aspects of this matter.

Multi-day and intense togetherness

Sleeping is a daily routine and if it happens in a social space, it transforms it. The relationship system is quite different in a space where there is longer but only daytime or evening-night activity without sleep, and the one where after the mutually spent night, awakening takes place mutually as well. So the focus here is not on the night, but on sleep, in which case the individual person is willing to share his or her most vulnerable state with others. This is why we challenge the rule of 5 days limit set by György Révész. The lowest time limit for camping is two days.¹ Day care camps are obviously considered to be part of day care activity rather than standard camps. These cases, due to lack of sleep and exposure of vulnerability, cannot be considered as camps because participants return to their comfort zone (home) every day. Other out-of-camp elements also reduce the impact of „camp-effect”, as the potential of intensity disappears. We would set the upper limit for multi-day camps in one-month horizon, because staying longer together means mutual lifestyle.

Intensity refers to the time actively spent together while awake, because camping is not just a shared sleep (cf. children's homes, dormitories, colleges or workers' temporary accommodations), from where everyone goes away to “do his/her job”; a common activity is also important here. During this time participants normally create a time and space limited mini- society, in which the importance of former roles would be diminished (although a full tabula rasa not always complete). This also sets a limit to the number of participants: more than 150-200 people are no longer able to behave like a Team; individuals often get lost during interactions, and acquaintances cannot be made, and as a result, interactions will be terminated without solutions. (c.f. festivals or events with thousands of people). It is rather a conscious decision to create so called sub camps under a bigger “camp umbrella”. According to the criteria mentioned previously the forest school can also be considered as camp which, by the way, hardly could meet any other criteria. This is not a surprise at all because this method considers the camp as pedagogical development sphere, putting focus on community formation, creation, cooperation and also it is activity-based.

It is typical, but not necessary, that the minimum level of accommodation and meals should be provided by the organizer. The intensity may be stronger in a self-supporting nomadic type of camp where, for example, participants bring their own tent and build it on their own.

---

¹ Think about e.g. prechildhood.

Different from home and experience-based environment

It is necessary to leave your comfort zone for camping both physically (not sleeping in your own bed, strange physical environment, self-care, self-support within certain limits, tent hitting, potato peeling etc.) and socially (different rules, different intimates). It is not a requirement, but definitely better to have the location of the camp in different places than the home. (cf.: the largest children operated small railway, the Hűvösvölgy Children's Railroads Camp is in Budapest and also offers summer camps for Budapest children's). A different place of residence does not necessarily mean natural environment (although it could be undoubtedly a usual and useful camp location).

Pedagogical purpose embedded in leisure program services (i.e. the camp's "hidden curriculum")

Basically camping is fundamentally differentiated from other leisure activities (such as festivals) by its pedagogical purpose, on the other hand, the nature of leisure services also means that there is no frontal teaching type of education within its framework, and it declares freedom in choice (Trencsényi, 2017b; Nagy, 2013), the possibility of voluntarily joining to different programs.²

Practically there are no traditional and intensive socialization processes in a camp (community formation through experience-based activities, development of a role play inventory that is not in every day's life etc.). The pedagogical development means that this spontaneous process (which happens even in the absence of the declared improvement goal) – could build or destroy personality.

In this sense, one of the most important, not necessarily declared, indirect developmental goal is to support the development of community. Indirect, because it is not us, the organizers, who build the community, but rather provide the framework for experience, thus facilitating the processing of these elements – the experience will be created within the camp itself, autonomy, new role play learning and more. At the same time, we can say that the impacts of the experiences are hidden, since the functioning of the targeted mechanisms can only be observed by the development of the group and the study of the dynamics.

We shall elaborate on this idea more deeply. It is not difficult to see that all camps, even the ones with therapeutic intention, are permeated with the undeclared and hidden developmental goals and impact the system described above. The declared purpose of the camp is always different from the hidden purpose, in fact, the two are independent from each other. In a riding camp, children can learn how to ride a horse, in a language camp the surface "target" is to learn English, in a chess camp to play chess - this is the goal that appears in the flyers. However, not these ones are the biggest differentiators – more important things are the unpublished, undeclared, hidden pedagogical goals and the covered effects that reach the difference among other leisure activities (such as recreation) that do not pursue these development goals.

² Of course, it is problematic to miss out all activities, but on the one hand, skipping some program elements can not cause a catastrophe (as it does with someone who may spoil your stomach or sprain your leg) and on the other hand, we have very limited means of influence: the participant can only be motivated, and there are no more tools for the organiser.

These goals and effects are the hallmarks of the camp. At the same time, due to its nature, it arises that this is actually the “hidden curriculum” of the camp, namely the hidden extra curriculum. The hidden curriculum is similar to the hidden extra-curriculum of schools (Szabó, 1988; Szabó, 1999). It is true for both that in the “hidden curriculum” and the hidden extra curriculum there are pre-declared purposes (sometimes clearly pedagogical, like in schools, sometimes more pedagogical³ than in the camp), and although the essential elements of both processes are part of the socialization process, in camps it is far more an occurring effect than a planned one.

Children and youth are not part of the definition of the camp, because in the camps other age groups can take part, although it is not typical. “Work is a major factor in childhood self-administration,” says Sackij (Sackij, 1997, 216), but neither settlement nor labor school is included in our definition. The roots of camping, no matter how connected they are, are not camps, because they become a familiar, comfort-zone environment for participants.

To sum up these unique characteristics, camping is a multi-day, intensive (1) set up at another place than home and based on that experience (2) a service based program with hidden pedagogical effects (3).

2. Characteristics and affiliate areas of camp pedagogy

Camp pedagogy is a pedagogical practice of camp education and its theoretical reflection⁴.

Camp pedagogy deals with, among many other things, the specifics of camps, organizing camps, the methodology of the camp, the variety of types and its age-specificity. Because camp-pedagogy forms some kind of pedagogical methodology and content along these lines, we should try to place it into the nomenclature of education.

From a theoretical point of view, camp education can actually be derived from leisure pedagogy. According to its scenes, socialization has special macro-spheres. They are characterized by their specificity of scope, time and intensity, and set of rules. There are three such prominent spaces:

- the family and its pedagogical processes from pre-modernity,
- the school and its pedagogical constructions from modernity, and
- the leisure time and pedagogical entities of postmodernism (Nagy, 2013).

In this three folded pedagogical taxonomy, camp pedagogy can be interpreted as a part of leisure pedagogy, indicating the activity-based and the socialization effect of the peer groups.

The classical school world should be exceeding and focusing on the small com-

3 Chess camps, English-language camps, climbing camps set declared pedagogical goals, while in a construction camp the declared goal is not learning-centered, although participants will probably learn to dig at the end of the camp.

4 Although we consider adult camps to be camps, we do not discuss them in detail. In this case, we should no longer talk about camp pedagogy, but camp andragogy. or even more about camp anthropology.

munity phenomenon, as well as the open-ended approach and lack of commitment to results - are among the characteristics of camp pedagogy. Based on this, camp pedagogy can be classified as a part of a postmodern social pedagogy⁵, whose 21st century European narrative can be called youth affairs (Nagy, 2017). The legitimacy of this is supported by Bradford's view that youth clubs, events and camps belong to the latter of the three directions - therapeutic, educational and recreational - of youth work (2011). Similarly, the European Union takes the view that the most common areas of youth work are: youth centers, offices, points and outreach youth work; youth projects, youth camps; and informal youth groups, youth organizations, youth movements (European Commission, 2015).

2.1.Characteristics of camp pedagogy

The pedagogical purpose of camp pedagogy is open-ended because, although it has a predetermined pedagogical purpose, it does not have clear connection to which the success of the pedagogical process. That is only a recommended content or form, without any kind of "guidance without dictation" (Verschelden et al., 2009).

Its approach is non-directive, in other words the intended goals do not appear directly in the pedagogical process⁶. It is situational and non-formal learning. Beside the individual, he emphasizes small community cooperation.

Its methods are much more about independent decision-making based on lais-

---

5 While the social pedagogy anglosaxon approach is social work with children, we are arguing another social pedagogy phenomenon: the social extension of the pedagogical space. According to the pedagogical vision, the subject of social pedagogy is every child-young person, either by understanding that everyone in the society is at risk or by taking the view that non-endangered people need also this approach (Trencsényi-Nagy, 2017). The notion of social idea does not outline the paradigm of voluntary participation, whereas in the pedagogical approach the lack of compulsion, including the absence of abstract compulsion, is presumably much more open to indiscriminate inclusion. Pedagogical socio-pedagogy does not require the role of an authority, but only of the service provider, because it considers the individual's right of choice in the field of leisure (cf. voluntary participation) and social normality (obligatory would violate the „free choice“ nature of free time). The pedagogical interpretation does not think of school-age children, but uses its own definition of youth: responsible childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood (Trencsényi, 2011; Nagy, 2013), with strong intergenerational relationships. While the availability of social work interpretation has evolved in a bottom-up approach, that is, first to help those in need, and then gradually to less marginalized people, low threshold is one of the most important pedagogical principles, offering its service to everyone (even if the design of the service may include the presence of disadvantaged people).

6 The essence of the non-directive approach is illustrated by Limbos (Udvardi Lakos, 1983): "... The youth group can be compared to a crowd wandering through a dark night in a park full of statues, thick trees, lush vegetation, rocks, rocks, ditches and all kinds of other obstacles that hinder free movement. Everyone moves slowly, in complete uncertainty, because there are no sure points, everyone is afraid of getting hurt, hitting someone or getting lost. The animator can be likened to a person who lights up the lights and reflectors: from that point on, everyone can see clearly and move safely; will find the path that suits him best and is most comfortable for him. Essentially, the park, the environment, remains the same: the animator has not violently altered anything, has not commanded, directed anyone anywhere: s/he has only helped to illuminate the situation, the problem (including the difficulties and opportunities) - and let the group find it themselves your goal and direction. That's the way it is in the lives of communities in society."

sez-faire pedagogy. The pedagogically authorized person has no direct effect and exclusive influence on the processes, and the socialization interactions is not as a traditional teacher-student model. The laissez-faire method relies on the 'take it or leave it' approach, the normative role of the community environment and the importance of self-esteem. Methodological feature of camp pedagogy is also in creative activity basis, and because of its informal and situational nature and its activities, its development content cannot be acquired in a structured way.

Camp pedagogy uses mostly close-to-nature, easy-to-access tools, and the principle behind this is the sustainability.

Camp pedagogical evaluation is not performance-based, although performance measurement is not necessarily avoided. At the same time, because of informality and situation dependency, performance measurement is perceived in a completely different way than in traditional institutional pedagogical contexts.

Youth camps (or even multi-day programs) are characterized by a two-level socialization, with a declared target group of program participants and the hidden latent target group of organizers and animators. The participants also socialize, learn, from advocacy techniques through project management to game pedagogy; and experience a sense of togetherness through shared experiences. But the latent processes "converts" the organizer himself. After all, a program wishes and delivers a great deal of joy - but the ability to re-live childhood or adolescence, or to re-live in a younger environment, is only for the creators, organizers of the camp. This is often the motivation for adult people to make camp for younger ones.

2.2. Affiliate areas

Experience pedagogy, environmental pedagogy, animation and the aforementioned leisure and social pedagogy are definitely important pedagogical partners of camp pedagogy.

Common features of social pedagogy and camp pedagogy are open learning approaches.

Common features of leisure time pedagogy is the daily, weekly, and annual leisure cycles.

In experience pedagogy and camp pedagogy there is an overlap keeping distance from comfort zone, and the intense of togetherness (when there is no "regeneration period" from the others), what cannot be replaced by anything else.

Symbiotic relationship with the nature is the primary link to environmental pedagogy. The camps are located largely beyond, or at least on the periphery of the built physical environment, which has a romantic root of a kind of Rousseau, "back to nature," or more elegantly, an ecologically constructive learning concept.

Camp pedagogy and non-directive animation puts small communities at the center of its approach, and can (primarily) capture the transformation of society in relation to communities and the social environment. In both cases, small community activity has the latent goal of counteracting the tendencies of alienation, manipulation, and exclusion.

Overall, camp pedagogy is rooted in social pedagogy and leisure pedagogy, and is open-ended, non-directive, situational, small-community and activity-based, laissez-faire, nature-based, non-performance-oriented, learning (and not teaching) centered pedagogical area, which is affiliates of animation, experience-pedagogy and environmental pedagogy.

3. Typology of camps

After defining the concept, features and related areas of camping and camp pedagogy, the next step is to map the internal structure of it. In this case, there are many more classifications, but rather professional than scientific (Bodor, 2006, 2014; Dorka; Mandák, 2010; Tóth, 2015; Heimann, 2006). The divisions are indeed diverse, but neither divides the camps into some sort of logically justifiable dimension, so here, while based on them, we disregard the details. We are trying to create a typology in the dimensions of a declared purpose; target group; participants; structure; time; place and other pedagogical relevant criteria

3.1. Classification according to the declared purpose of the camp

As mentioned earlier, one of the cornerstones of camping is its (at least) latent pedagogical work, developmental purpose, but it can declare very diverse goals. Below we will be grouping camps along these types of targets

- Camps with specific project objectives. These may include camps that perform some sort of tangible task at the end of the camp (e.g. camping for the purpose of setting up a theater performance, renovating a building, exploring an archaeological area etc.).
- Thematic camps. These camps place themselves within a given framework and carry out development activities. They may be more objective (e.g. riding, language, Red Cross, environmental, study, artistic, sporting, traffic or other hobby activities), or less objective (e.g., self-knowledge, communication, leadership, international exchange or entrepreneurship camps).
- Leisure camps: mainly holiday camps that focus on the relaxation of the participants and where specific, declared goals are less prominent. It may even include a large variety of leisure activities, but it does not follow a coherent theme.

3.2. Target group classification

There are basically four groups that can be targeted in terms of camping, and the first three cases are based on age.

- Responsible childhood. In the case of those who are in the process of biological maturity, they are the target group most accessible by toys and role-playing games.
- Adolescents. After biological maturity, those who are in search for identity can be targeted mainly through self-reflection and self-awareness situations.
- Young adults. According to their current life cycle, they can be targeted primarily with the topic of future planning.
- Narrower target groups. For example, disadvantaged young people, diseased children. As in public education, the integration/inclusivity into the camp pedagogy is also an important issue.
- Other target groups (adults, dads, families, unemployed, preschool hood etc.) are also conceivable, but based on the profile of the participants, it is the youth groups that are most likely to camp.

3.3. Classification by correlation among the participants

This dimension is quite simple.

- Groups that. exists before the camp: In this case, there's is already a group whose member is largely familiar with each other (e.g. class, camp of similar composition last year).
- New communities. In this case, most of the group members meet for the first time during camping or get to know each other in greater depth.

3.4. The dimension of transformation

This dimension shows how much the camp organizers intend to „break” the participant´s daily lives: to what extent the camp organizer or the group of camp participants creates specific rules, rituals, frameworks, or the camp stays on the basis of the habits, behaviors and formulas of everyday camps. „Rituals play a very important role in the formation of a sense of togetherness. We lose a lot of the mood of a camp if we ignore these seemingly less important moments (compared to the program). In the camps the events organized around the frame story, we find ourselves in a story, in a situation or in an era. [...] The best known manifestations of this are the Indian camps, but it can be a fairy tale camp, a knight camp, a renaissance camp, an uninhabited island, an Olympic camp, a camp related to an important event of the year, etc. Those who have been involved in this have obviously had a life-long experience. [...] The character played here remains a nickname that

accompanies many for life. "(Mandák, 2010) In this dimension, a scale can be outlined at one end, completely ordinary regulations. At the other end, there is a maximally redesigned set of rules where possible.

3.5. Classification by camp time

This dimension also seems simple:

- summer camps (these are the most typical);
- camps organized at different times (winter camps, autumn and spring forest schools).

3.6. Classification according to the camp location

We distinguish according to the location of the camp:

- Not mobile camp places;
- Mobile camps (in this case, the accommodation varies during the duration of the camp; the most common are camps for walking, water or cycling).

3.7. Pedagogically relevant additional dimensions

These include, for example, the duration of the camp (from a few days to several weeks) or the number of participants (from a few to approx. two hundred).

3.8. Other dimensions that are less pedagogically relevant

Although these are important from an infrastructural and organizational theory point of view, we may not have included pedagogically less important aspects in these dimensions. For example, the quality of the accommodation (tent or building), the classification according to the meal (i.e. what special needs the camp can be served) or the type of organizer (school, student council, NGO, cultural institution, municipality, association).

4. epilogue – CAMPS IN THE POSTMODERN SOCIETY

With regard to the Z-generation screenagers and the Y-generation youths of the plazas and festivals, many question of the current legitimacy of camps can be raised (Nagy and Tibori, 2016). Undoubtedly, the former two-week camps (Kádár, 1967) have now been reduced to a few days, but the data do not support the above assumption. For example in Hungary in 2015, we counted approximately 20,000 camp beds and approximately 500,000 guest nights. The camps are mostly sum-

mer (2/3 of all guest nights are related to summer), the character of the campers is mostly young, domestic; 95% of the guests and overnight stays are domestic (KSH, 2016).

Organized camping can be seen as a traditional form (in terms of organizational affiliation, the theory is more general: it concerns the whole spectrum of youth participation, not just camping, see Komássy and Nagy, 2009). In this case, the organization expects its members to identify, membership, and symbolize (such as mass organizations of children and youth in the 20th century) in exchange for a sense of community and opportunity for activity within a latent psychological content. However, nowadays, the participant is less and less entitled to the name of the organization (see the expectation of large children's organizations), less willing to promote the symbolism of a community, and more and more often rejects its "tie for legitimacy" hidden psychological contract. They increasingly use services, attend events, organize programs at a higher level of collaboration, and participate in collaborative programs. Its connection and identity is weaker, yet it is more complex. In addition, the group's symbolic emphasis (such as Harry Potter scarves and Star Wars badges) has changed. These non-membership opportunities can be summarized as the postmodern form of camping, and we can see that more and more youth communities are transcending the boundaries of organizations.

Camping also undoubtedly has to adapt to social change: the hidden psychic contract of membership seems to have to be replaced by a service-based approach. After all, camping is a form of participation, and postmodern society does not favor traditional forms of these ones (Oross, 2016; Révész, 2017), because most of them do not find a community experience that would have a meaningful impact on their lives (Kárpáti, 2010). Several analyses have shown that while young people are distrustful of traditional institutional forms, they are more receptive to "alternative" activities that provide non-traditional participation (social network ad-hoc initiatives, protest movements, etc.). However, this does not mean that they are repelled by puritanical circumstances. (A good example of this is the multiplicity of festivals.)

However, do not think that camping should be forgotten, and that instead, only the service-based form is justified. The question is how camping can fit into the era of postmodernism.

References

- Baden-Powell, R. (2005): *Scouting for boys: a handbook for instruction in good citizenship*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bánhidi, A (2004): *A vándortáborozás fogalma*. In *Vándortáborozási kézikönyv*. Budapest: Mobilitás.
- Bodor, T. (2006): *Táborszervezés, táborvezetés ifjúságsegítőknél és érdeklődőknek*. Szombathely: Megyei Művelődési és Ifjúsági Központ.

- Bradford, S. (2011): Modernising youth work: from the universal to the particular and back again. In: Chisholm, L.; Kovacheva, S.; Merico, M. (szerk): European youth studies – integrated research, policy and practice. Innsbruck: EYS Consortium.
- Dorka, P. (é.n.): Tábor szervezés, vezetés, természetjárás, túrázás. Retrieved from http://www.jgypk.hu/tamop13e/tananyag_html/tananyag_reki_1/index.html.
- European Commission (2015): Quality Youth Work, a common framework for the further, development of youth work, Report from the Expert Group on Youth Work, Quality Systems in the EU Member States. Brussels: European Commission, Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/youth/library/reports/quality-youth-work_en.pdf.
- Heimann, I. (2006): A táborozás. In: Heimann, I., Lénárd, S., Mészáros, Gy., Rapos N. & Trencsényi L.: Iskolán kívüli nevelés – A gyakorlati pedagógia néhány alapkérdése. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium, ELTE PPK Neveléstudományi Intézet, Retrieved from <http://mek.niif.hu/05400/05462/05462.pdf>.
- Jánosi, S (1985): 10 tanács a táborozó úttörők vidám műsoraihoz. In: Jani Lászlóné (szerk.): 600 tanács a kulturális, művészeti neveléshez, Budapest: ILK.
- Kádár, J. (1967): Gyermekeküldtetési tapasztalatok pszichológiai elemzése. Pedagógiai Szemle 17., 7-8.
- Kárpáti, Á. (2010): A civil ifjúsági szektor. In: Földi László, Nagy Ádám: Ifjúságügy, ifjúsági szakma, ifjúsági munka módszertani kézikönyv. Budapest: Mobilitás - Új Mandátum – Excenter.
- Komássy, Á. & Nagy, Á. (2008): A civil ifjúsági világ. In: Nagy Ádám (szerk.): Ifjúságügy, ifjúsági munka, ifjúsági szakma. Budapest: Palócvilág-Új Mandátum.
- KSH (2016): Jelentés a turizmus és vendéglátás éves teljesítményéről, 2015, Budapest: KSH, Retrieved from <http://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xfpt/idoszaki/jeltur/jeltur15.pdf>.
- Mandák, Cs. (2010): Táborok-intézményesült ifjúságsegítői szolgáltatásformák. In Földi László, Nagy Ádám: Ifjúságügy, ifjúsági szakma, ifjúsági munka módszertani kézikönyv. Budapest: Mobilitás - Új Mandátum – Excenter.
- Nagy, Á. (2013): Szocializációs közegek, Replika 83(2) 95-108.
- Nagy, Á. (2017): Ifjúsági munka: a XXI. század szociálpedagógiája? in Nagy Ádám (szerk.): Tizenkilencre lapot? - Szociálpedagógia a XXI. században. Kecskemét-Budapest: Pallasz Athéné Egyetem – Iuvenis Ifjúságsszakmai Műhely, Ifjúságsszakmai Társaság.
- Nagy, J. (1985, ed.): Táborozni megyünk, Budapest: ILK.
- Oross, D. (2016): A magyar ifjúságpolitika közpolitikai dinamikája, in Nagy Ádám (szerk.) 25 év – Jelentés az ifjúságügyről, Budapest: Iuvenis - Ifjúságsszakmai Műhely, Ifjúságsszakmai Együttműködési Tanácskozás,
- P. Miklós, T. (2003): Fejezetek a hazai gyermeküldtetés és ifjúsági turizmus történetéből, cserkész táborozás és turisztikai tevékenység a 20. század első felében, Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 7-8, Retrieved from <http://folyoiratok.ofi.hu/uj-pedagogiai-szemle/fejezetek-a-hazai-gyermekudultetes-es-ifjusagi-turizmus-tortenetebol>.
- Révész, Gy. (2017): „Megtalált gyermekkor”, Kultúra és Közösség 8 (1) 39-48.
- Sackij, S (1997): Az első kísérleti állomás in Trencsényi László (szerk): Korok, gyerekek, nevelők: szöveggyűjtemény, Budapest: Okker Kiadó.
- Sík, S. (2000): A cserkészlet. In A cserkészlet. Budapest: Márton Áron Kiadó.
- Szabó, L. T. (1999): A „rejtett tanterv”, in Meleg Csilla (szerk): Iskola és társadalom II., Pécs: JPTE Tanárképző Intézet Pedagógia Tanszéke.
- Szabó, L. T. (1988): A „rejtett tanterv”, Budapest: Magvető.

Tóth, Á. (2015): Táborozási ismeretek, Retrieved from <http://tamop-sport.ttk.pte.hu/tananyagfejlesztés/alternatív-környezetben-úszható-mozgasformák/taborozasi-ismeretek>.

Trencsényi, I. (1987): Merre visz az ösvény, Népművelés-Szinkép.

Trencsényi, L. (2011): Lifelong Learning – A Challenge for the Education Theory, *Pedagogika. Sk Slovenský Časopis Pre Pedagogické Vedy* 1 28-35.

Trencsényi, L. & Nagy, A. (2017): Hungarian Social Pedagogical Narratives, *Eruditio - Educatio* 12 (3) 5-22.

Trencsényi, L. (2017b): The School Culture Heritage of the Reformation, *Acta Technologica Dubnicae* 7 (1) 116-121.

Udvardi Lakos, E. (1983): Mi is az animáció, *Kultúra és Közösség*, 10 (2), 88-99.

Verschelden, G. – Coussée, F. – Van de Walle, T. & Williamson, H (2009): *The History of Youth Work in Europe - Relevance for Youth Policy Today*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.