

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

The Department of Agricultural and Extension Education

**THE CONTRIBUTION OF A SUMMER CAMPING PROGRAM TO
PARTICIPATION ASPIRATIONS FOR A YOUTH'S USE OF LEISURE TIME**

A Thesis in

Youth and Family Education

by

Brandon S. Rubenstein

© 2008 by Brandon S. Rubenstein

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Education

August 2008

The thesis of Brandon S. Rubenstein was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Jacklyn A. Bruce
Assistant Professor of Agricultural and Extension Education
Thesis Co-Advisor

Constance A. Flanagan
Professor of Agricultural and Extension Education
Thesis Co-Advisor

Sanford S. Smith
Lecturer in Forest Resources and Natural Resources and Youth Extension Specialist
School of Forest Resources

Joan S. Thomson
Associate Professor of Agricultural Communications
Graduate Program Officer for Youth and Family Education

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Summer camps promote many positive developmental outcomes for the youth who attend them, including exposure to a wide variety of positive activities that result in an eagerness to try new activities. This outcome may be particularly beneficial to certain at-risk populations who choose to spend their out-of-school leisure time participating in activities associated with negative outcomes (e.g., youth of low socioeconomic status; SES) or show a developmental decline in leisure time activity participation (e.g., post-pubertal girls). Youth, especially high-risk populations, need education in the form of exposure to positive leisure time activities that promote positive, meaningful outcomes. Summer camps can provide this exposure because campers participate in a wide variety of activities during the summer. The aim of the present study was to examine whether the summer camp experience is associated with an increase in aspirations to participate in positive leisure time activities during year-round leisure time. Participants (N=249) included a diverse SES sample of campers attending an overnight, coed summer camp in Pennsylvania. Pre- and post-test assessments were given to campers ages 11 to 15 years at the beginning and end of the camp session. Paired sample t-tests were used to compare reported participation in organized activities before camp with aspirations to participate in organized activities after camp. Statistically significant increases in activities that were emphasized during the camp program were found for the entire population, and the following specific groups: girls, low-income girls, and youth of high SES. The findings suggest that summer camps can provide education about positive uses of leisure time to youth, and camp programs should therefore intentionally emphasize and foster positive uses of leisure time by their campers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background	1
Summer Camps and Developmental Outcomes	1
Leisure Time Activities and Positive Youth Development	3
Summer Camps and Special Populations	5
Low Income Youth	6
Sex Differences and Leisure Time.....	8
Specific Aims.....	9
Specific Aim #1: The Difference Between Camper Aspirations and Reported Behavior	9
Specific Aim #2: The Difference Between Camper Aspirations and Reported Behavior By Sex, SES, and Sex and SES Groups	10
Chapter 2: METHODS AND RESULTS	11
Methods.....	11
Participants.....	11
Measures	12
Statistical Analyses	16
Results.....	17
Background Information	17
Specific Aim #1: The Difference Between Camper Aspirations and Reported Behavior	20
Specific Aim #2: The Difference Between Camper Aspirations and Reported Behavior By Sex, SES, and Sex and SES Groups	21
Chapter 3: DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES CITED.....	40
APPENDIX A.....	46
APPENDIX B	47

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1 <i>Solution for Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Activities and Groups</i>	15
2 <i>Demographic Characteristics of Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N = 249)</i>	19
3 <i>Age and Summers at Camp by Sex/SES Groups for Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N = 249)</i>	20
4 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Total Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N=249)</i>	21
5 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=111)</i>	22
6 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=138)</i>	23
7 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Youth of Low Socioeconomic Status attending OSC in 2007 (N=183)</i>	24
8 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Youth of Higher Socioeconomic Status attending OSC in 2007 (N=66)</i>	25
9 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Low Income Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=85)</i>	26
10 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Low Income Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=98)</i>	27
11 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Higher Income Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=26)</i>	28
12 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Higher Income Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=40)</i>	29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my committee members, Drs. Bruce, Flanagan, and Smith, for providing your support, guidance, and expertise throughout my whole thesis adventure. Your understanding of the research process and patience in explaining it helped me fill in the holes and obtain a better view of the whole picture. Your feedback and kind words during our meetings for milestones such as comps and thesis defense often provided the boost of confidence and motivation necessary for me to plug along to the next step in the process.

To the 2007 administrators, campers, and staff of Overnight Summer Camp: thank you for your cooperation and commitment to this project, which has finally reached its fruition and hopefully helped shed some insight for future researchers interested in summer camps. To my friends, family, colleagues, former campers, and former counselors at Overnight Summer Camp: thank you for helping me build such a strong foundation for my life, and for fostering in me such a strong desire to further studying the benefits of camping.

To Sean and Ali: one paragraph can only begin to express how grateful I am to have had two amazingly intelligent, diligent, and fun resources to guide me through this adventure. I could not have completed this thesis – or my master’s program – without your support, whether it be brainstorming, proofreading, censoring, or blowing off steam at Burger Night or Singstarr, DDR, GuitarHero, etc. You have both made me a better student, a better researcher, a better friend, a better significant other, and a better person.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Summer Camps and Developmental Outcomes

Parents want their children to grow, develop, and have fun in a safe and secure environment (Forum for Youth Investment, 2004; Henderson, Whitaker, Bialeschki, Scanlin, & Thurber, 2007; Scales, Benson, Roehlkepartain, Hintz, Sullivan, & Mannes, 2004), something that is typically achieved ten months out of the year through children's attendance in schools and participation in community-based organizations. During the summer, when schools are not in session and some community-based organizations take a hiatus, many parents recognize that summer camps can fulfill their desires for their children's growth and development. In fact, the American Camp Association reports approximately 11 million children attend summer camp per year, with enrollment increasing by approximately 2% between 2004 and 2005 (2008).

Research has suggested that the summer camp industry may be one of the largest organized interventions for children other than schools and churches (Bialeschki et al., 2007). Like schools and churches, summer camps provide opportunities for youth to become active, contributing members of a community, and share with schools and churches a common commitment to youth's physical, emotional, and educational growth

(Nicholson, Collins, & Holmer, 2004). Bialeschki and colleagues have theorized that the unique structure of camps, which create a community for youth in outdoor recreational settings, seems to “accelerate youth development beyond what could be expected by maturation alone (2007, p. 780).” Research has identified specific social and identity-based developmental outcomes and benefits to youth who attend a summer camp (Allen, Cox, & Cooper, 2006; ACA, 2005; ACA, 2006; Arnold, Bourdeau, & Nagele, 2005; Bialeschki, Henderson, & James, 2007; Klem, 2006; Readdick & Schaller, 2005; Yuen, Pedlar, & Mannell, 2005).

Summer camps achieve the aforementioned benefits through their respective programs, which generally emphasize youth’s participation in activities ranging from athletic, like basketball, swim, or tennis, to hobbies, such as arts and crafts, photography, and woodshop. In addition to providing a setting for the development of social and identity-based outcomes, the activities that comprise the programs of summer camps also provide an opportunity for skill building, which research has identified as essential to positive youth development (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; National Academy of Sciences, 2001). While many youth who attend summer camp are likely to be familiar with some of these activities, it is also likely that most youth are exposed to new activities through their camp experience. Research has confirmed that youth who attend a summer camp do indeed learn new activities, but also aspire to try more new things after the summer (Arnold et al., 2005).

While Arnold and colleagues show that campers learn new activities at camp and then aspire to continue an experimental approach to learning additional new activities after camp (2005), they do not assess whether participation in the new activities learned

during the summer is continued throughout the rest of the year. Therefore, this research raises another question: With so many campers exposed to and participating in so many activities during the summer, could an increase in year-round leisure time activity participation be another positive outcome of camps?

Leisure Time Activities and Positive Youth Development

The time available to youth is often broken into two categories (Goodin, Rice, Bittman, & Saunders, 2005). The first category is compulsory time, which includes essential, necessary activities like eating, sleeping, and fulfilling other obligations and responsibilities. For youth, compulsory time includes attending school, doing chores or completing homework. The second category is referred to as leisure, discretionary, or free time. For the purpose of this study, the term *leisure time* will be used. Leisure time is the time that remains after compulsory activities are completed, and is defined as time that has no specific obligations and is available for an individual to spend however they may like (Goodin et al., 2005).

For youth, leisure time is most commonly spent engaging in social activities, such as team sports, family interactions, and other structured and unstructured activities (Kleiber, Caldwell, & Shaw, 1993), similar to the activities offered through the programs of most summer camps. Using leisure time positively – that is, using it to engage in activities with positive outcomes – is not the only option youth have for their leisure time. The social activities in which youth participate can lead to both positive and negative consequences and outcomes. Positive use of leisure time can contribute to healthy development outcomes, an idea at the very foundation of programs such as the *TimeWise*:

Learning Lifelong Leisure Skills intervention (see Caldwell et al., 2004) and summer camps in general. On the other end of the spectrum is the negative use of leisure time, which occurs when youth participate in destructive activities linked to negative outcomes. Using leisure time to participate in activities with negative outcomes such as drugs, alcohol, crime, and bullying occurs particularly if youth are bored and seek their own approaches to filling their time (Caldwell et al., 2004; Caldwell & Smith, 1995; Irby & Tolman, 2002; Levin, Smith, Caldwell, & Kimbrough, 1995).

Simply filling time is not enough for a leisure activity to effectively promote healthy development; the time spent participating in leisurely activities should include tasks that build skills, create challenges, and provide fulfilling and engaging experiences (Caldwell et al., 2004; Carnegie Council, 1992; Zill, Nord, & Loomis, 1995) – much like many of the outcomes identified for the summer camp experience (ACA, 2005; Bialeschki et al., 2007). Additionally, Caldwell and colleagues argue that modern technology and personal media, such as video games, television, personal mp3 players, and personal computers, dominate the leisure time of contemporary youth; thus, contemporary youth are uneducated about how to utilize their leisure time to participate in meaningful and developmentally beneficial activities linked to meaningful and developmentally beneficial social and interpersonal outcomes (2004). Summer camps have the potential to provide youth with this type of social education regarding uses of their leisure time, as Arnold and colleagues have found that summer camps expose youth to new activities in which participation provides meaningful and developmentally beneficial outcomes (2005), as well as alternatives to participation in developmentally destructive activities.

Summer Camps and Special Populations

Summer camps are similar to schools and churches in that they offer youth opportunities for growth, development, and fun in a safe and secure environment. Unlike schools and churches, however, camps are not restricted to geographic areas or rules against segregation when recruiting youth participants. This flexibility in recruitment allows individual camps to draw from a wide demographic area, which fosters a significant range of demographics among camps.

Some summer camps target a special population around which their programs are designed. For example, some camps inadvertently target youth from families possessing higher income, or high socioeconomic status (SES). Note that for the purpose of this study, the term *youth of higher SES* will be used when referring to this group of youth. These camps target youth of higher SES by charging high tuition fees or requiring campers to bring uncommon and expensive equipment, materials, or clothing. These camps are typically privately owned camps and include both specialty camps (i.e., camps that specialize in a particular skill like horseback riding, one or multiple sports, technology, health and lifestyle, or creative arts) and recreational camps that offer a variety of activities. These camps may serve their target population very well but are unlikely to serve youth from low SES families, or campers who may lack exposure to the specialty activity due to cost or cultural differences.

Fortunately, some summer camps exist that target disadvantaged youth and youth from low SES families. Note that for this purpose of this study, the term *youth of low SES* will be used to refer to this group of youth. These camps typically target youth of low SES by charging lower fees. Municipalities, churches, religious groups, and non-

profit organizations often run these types of camps. Camps that serve youth of low SES employ methods such as grant writing or extensive fundraising throughout the year to generate funding, which allows them to offer scholarships or reduced tuition to youth of low SES, especially if they serve both youth of low and higher SES.

When camps introduce campers to an activity, two obstacles to participation may typically exist. The first obstacle is an individual's ability and skills, or lack thereof, in that activity. The second obstacle is having the equipment, facilities, or materials necessary to participate in that activity (Pedersen & Seidman, 2005). Camp programs generally address the first obstacle, with skilled leaders working with campers and guiding them through participation in each activity (Bialeschki et al., 2007).

Camps that serve youth of low SES typically provide all equipment, facilities, and materials necessary to participate in any of their activities, removing the second obstacle for participation. These camps usually have enough gloves, bats, sticks, helmets, or any other necessary equipment for each camper assigned to that activity. Providing the necessary equipment means these camps remove the division between "Haves" and "Have-nots" and provide each camper the opportunity to focus on obtaining the basic skills that staff members are hired to teach. In effect, these camps create and provide an environment where youth from all backgrounds can participate equally in the new activities to which they are exposed.

Low Income Youth

While summer camps may ensure that all youth are aware of positive ways to use their leisure time (Caldwell et al., 2004; Carnegie Council, 1992; Zill, Nord, & Loomis, 1995), youth of low SES stand to gain – or lose – more than youth of higher SES as a

result of how they utilize their leisure time. These youth are consistently exposed to a variety of risk factors, such as violence and under-resourced schools, on a daily basis (Pedersen & Seidman, 2005). These risk factors create an atmosphere where opportunities to spend leisure time engaging in activities with destructive outcomes, such as delinquency, dropping out of school, and teen pregnancy, are prevalent and easily accessible (Larson, Richard, Sims, & Dworkin, 2001; Pedersen & Seidman, 2005).

Research has shown that structured youth programs held outside of school hours provide opportunities during which positive youth development may be supported (Barber, Eccles, & Stone, 2001; Mahoney, 2000; Mahoney & Cairns, 1997). Despite this potential and the benefits of activity participation, youth of low SES spend less time participating in structured, organized leisure activities than youth of higher SES, and, in general, have low levels of participation (Larson et al., 2001). Further research is required to determine why this is the case, but one possible explanation may be that youth of low SES are unfamiliar with some of the activities offered, or lack confidence about their abilities in the activities that are offered.

Pedersen and Seidman reported that most studies surrounding the quality of leisure activities focus on youth of higher SES (2005). As a result, leisure activities offered to youth of low SES, which may protect them against risks, have been relatively under-studied, and the benefits youth of low SES may gain from participation in these activities has not yet been established (Pedersen & Seidman, 2005). The studies that have been conducted offer some hope for the benefits of participation to youth of low SES. Schinke, Orlandi, and Cole found that neighborhood groups have an impact in neighborhoods of low SES (1992). Schinke and colleagues studied the impact of Boys

and Girls Clubs in low SES neighborhoods and found that negative outcomes, such as substance abuse and drug-related arrests, were reduced after the club was introduced into the neighborhood. Reports of juvenile crime also decreased by 13% in neighborhoods with new clubs (Schinke, Orlandi and Cole, 1992). This evidence suggests that benefits of participation in positive activities, which can be fostered during the summer camp experience, can be maintained throughout the year and may not only benefit at-risk youth, but the communities in which they live as well.

Sex Differences and Leisure Time

Many camps are coeducational, meaning they serve both boys and girls, which raises the question of how leisure time and participation affect each sex. First and foremost, girls generally participate in activities less than boys throughout all stages of development (National Center for Youth Statistics, 1996; Quinn, 1995). Additionally, girls experience a decrease in their physical activity on a leisurely basis after they experience puberty (Grunbaum et al., 2004; Kimm et al., 2002). However, research has also found that girls who participate in structured, organized leisure activities have lower rates of sexual activity, thereby reducing the risk of sexually transmitted diseases or teenage pregnancy (Miller, Sabo, Farrell, Barnes, & Melnick, 1998).

Boys, on the other hand, can benefit from leisure time and participation in other ways. Fredricks & Eccles (2006) have found that involvement in sports predicted lower incidences of boys “being mean to others” or “destroying his things” and that participation in school clubs and sports during leisure time predicted lower substance abuse among boys. Roffman, Pagano, and Hirsch (2001) conducted a study of a Boys

and Girls Club, assessing many factors including the reasons participants joined the club. They found that boys who mentioned participation in activities as their reason for attending the club had higher levels of self-esteem and fewer behavior problems. Roffman and colleagues (2001) also found that boys in general had lower self-esteem than girls, but that boys who did not mention activities as a reason for joining the club had even lower self-esteem.

Specific Aims of This Study

The objective of this study is to explore how a summer camp experience affects youth's participation in activities during their leisure time. This will be accomplished by examining one specific camp. Study aims include:

1. To assess the differences in year-round leisure time activity participation before and after the camp experience.
2. To explore how the camp experience affects year-round leisure time activity participation for groups according to sex, SES, and sex/SES groups.

Specific Aim #1:

Since trained individuals will likely implement the camp program, it can be assumed that their knowledge and ability will translate into passion for their respective activities. It is hypothesized that, as a result of the instructors' passion for their respective activities and many other characteristics of the camp experience, the campers' participation in year-round leisure time activities will increase after the summer.

Specific Aim #2:

Since summer camps that target youth of low SES remove barriers to participation, it is hypothesized that this group will experience an increase in aspirations for year-round leisure time activity participation. No change is predicted for youth of higher SES, as there is evidence that they typically have access the resources and opportunities necessary to participate in activities. It is also hypothesized that girls, who Arnold, Bourdeau, and Nagele (2005) found experience an increase in willingness to try new things after participating in a summer camp program, will experience an increase in their aspirations for participation in year-round leisure time activities. Evidence (Arnold et al., 2005) suggests that boys will benefit from participating in structured activities, but there is little evidence to suggest that boys will see an increase in participation itself. Therefore, it is hypothesized that boys will experience no increase. Finally, since literature suggests that girls are most likely to try new things and that low-income youth could participate in new activities when obstacles are removed, it is hypothesized that low-income girls will experience the largest increase in participation levels of the sex and SES groups.

Chapter 2

METHODS AND RESULTS

Methods

Participants

Participants in the study ($N = 249$) were campers enrolled at an overnight summer camp (OSC) during the camping season of 2007. OSC is an ACA-accredited, non-profit, residential camp in Northeastern Pennsylvania that targets deserving children from the Delaware Valley. OSC defines “deserving children” as children coming from families with financial challenges. During the summer of 2007, 41% of the entire camper population belonged to families that reported an annual gross income of \$25,000 or less in 2006, and an additional 33% of the camper population came from families that reported an annual gross income less than \$45,000 (OSC Enrollment Coordinator, personal communication, April 6, 2007). The camp is operated by a charitable non-profit organization with strong roots in Judaism, but the camp program is non-denominational, both employing staff and serving youth from a variety of religious backgrounds. The camp offers weekly religious services for three different groups of faith: Jewish, Christian, and Non-Denominational. The three services received equal attendance each week in the summer of 2007.

Eligibility criteria for participation in the study included being between 11 and 17 years old as of July 1, 2007, and being enrolled as a camper in either one of OSC's two camping sessions, each of which was 25 days long. There were 41 campers who attended both sessions. The double-session campers took the pre- and post-test twice, but this study only used their data from the first session pre- and post-tests. The decision to exclude the double-session campers' second session data was made to eliminate any potential bias as a result of these campers receiving the treatment twice.

Counselors-in-training, who were 16 or 17 years old but considered staff members by the camp's administration were excluded from participation while campers who were 16 years old were included. Parents and guardians of enrolled campers were sent a consent form in May 2007 and provided the opportunity to opt out of including their child's data in the research study in compliance with The Pennsylvania State University's IRB regulations. Camp supervisors administered the surveys for internal program management to comply with ACA Standard PD-7: Camp Experience Evaluation, which states that "camps need multiple sources of feedback on the accomplishment of the established outcomes related to all areas of camp to help improve the quality of camp" (p.10, 2007).

Measures

Participants completed a pre-test on the first day of each of two camping sessions to establish a baseline mark for responses. On the final day of each camping session, the

participants completed a post-test. 25 days elapsed between the pre- and post-test, during which all participants continually resided at OSC.

Demographic information was collected during the pre-test administered on the first day of the camping session. Participants self-reported their sex, birthdates, race/ethnicity, and the number of summers they have been attending the camp. The participants' reported birthdates were later used to calculate their ages as of July 1, 2007. Tuition category was assessed when families submitted their income to OSC as part of the application process, and camp staff members converted the income into one of six tuition categories based on tuition ranges. Participants were divided into two groups based on tuition categories: Low Income (categories 1 and 2) and Higher Income (categories 3, 4, 5, and 6). This variable was used as a proxy for socioeconomic status (SES).

Data for involvement in activities during leisure time was collected using an instrument created for this study (See Appendix A). Items were created based on common activities for school-aged children. The pre-test asked participants two primary questions: "In the past six months, have you participated in any of the following SCHOOL groups?" and "In the past 6 months, have you participated in any of the following COMMUNITY activities?" For school groups, participants circled yes/no for the following: 1) School governance groups; 2) Community service groups; 3) Creative and performing arts groups; 4) Hobby clubs; 5) Sports; and 6) Other. For community activities, participants circled yes/no for the following: 1) Groups for young people outside of school; 2) Faith-based clubs; 3) Community service groups; 4) Creative and performing arts groups; 5) Hobby clubs; 6) Sports; and 7) Other.

Data for the post-test were collected using a similar instrument (See Appendix B); the categories for school groups and community activities were identical, but the questions were changed to “In the next 6 months, do you plan on participating in any of the following SCHOOL groups?” and “In the next 6 months, do you plan on participating in any of the following COMMUNITY activities?”

Responses for both the pre- and post-test were indicated by circling either “Yes” or “No” for each group or activity. Participants were instructed to circle “Yes” to indicate that they had participated (pre-test) or planned to participate (post-test) in that group or activity, or “No” to indicate that they had not participated (pre-test) or did not plan to participate (post-test) in that group or activity. For any items that a participant circled “Yes,” they were asked to answer the question of “How many?” by writing the appropriate number in another column.

The pre-test data includes leisure time activities with which the participants were already familiar before entering the summer of 2007, since the pre-test measures the number of activities or groups in which the participants were already participating during their leisure time. The post-test data includes leisure time activities with which the participants were already familiar before entering the summer of 2007 as well as new activities for which the participants developed a desire to participate during the summer of 2007. Therefore, when considering that the campers were completely immersed in the summer camp experience for three weeks, the change between reported behaviors (pre-test) and aspirations (post-test) should represent the influence of exposure to new activities at the camp.

Two separate Confirmatory Factor Analyses of questionnaire items were conducted, one for pre-test and one for post-test data. The pre-test and post-test factor structure and variable loading scores were highly correlated. Three subscales of leisure time groups/activities emerged at both the pre- and post-test. Table 1 lists the three subscales that emerged and the item factor loadings. The three subscales were: 1) Emphasized Activities; 2) Elective Activities; and 3) Informal Groups.

Table 1
Solution for Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Activities and Groups

	Subscales		
	Emphasized Activities	Elective Activities	Informal Groups
Community Groups			
Hobby clubs	0.72		
Other	0.63		
Sports	0.52		
Creative and Performing Arts		0.47	
Groups for young people		0.40	
Community service groups			0.83
Faith-based clubs			0.52
School Activities			
Hobby clubs	0.69		
Sports	0.68		
Other	0.62		
Creative and Performing Arts		0.88	
School governance clubs		0.70	
Community service groups			0.85

“Emphasized Activities” (EmAs) includes groups and leisure time activities that campers participate in as part of the camp program through regularly scheduled bunk participation, such as basketball, arts and crafts, and woodshop. “Elective Activities” (ElAs) includes groups and leisure time activities that correspond to activities the camp formally offers as part of the camp program, but in which campers can participate only by *electing* at the beginning of the week to be scheduled to that activity, such as drama,

photography, and dance. “Informal Groups”(IGs) includes groups and leisure time activities that correspond to special activities offered by camp staff on a per-case basis, such as a counselor who asks for volunteers to help pick up trash after lunch, or an optional religious service.

Statistical Analyses

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 15.0, Chicago, IL). Descriptive statistics were run for all variables of interest (see Table 2). For responses to items on the Group Involvement instrument that seemed implausible, outliers (as defined by 3 standard deviations above the mean) were recoded to the highest valid response in the data set for that item. For example, Participant x entered a value of 100 in response to the question “How many [times in the next 6 months do you plan to participate in this activity]” for items 1e (School Sports; $M=2.18$, $SD=7.34$) and 2f (Community Sports; $M=1.67$, $SD=7.41$). For both items, Participant x’s data was recoded with a value of 12, the highest valid response in the data set for each item, respectively. This was done to maximize the number of valid data. A total of 25 cases out of 5,318 (<1%) were recoded in this manner.

The first specific aim of this study was to assess the differences in year-round leisure time activity participation before and after the camp experience. A paired sample t-test was used to compare pre-test means with post-test means. A p-value of $p < .05$ was used to indicate statistical significance.

The second aim of the study was to explore how the camp experience affects year-round leisure time activity participation for groups according to sex, SES, and sex/SES groups. To explore this, participants were first categorized into groups according to sex (boy or girl), SES (low or higher), and then one of four groups based on sex and income. The four groups were Low Income Boys (LIBs, $n = 85$, 34%), Low Income Girls (LIGs, $n = 98$, 40%), Higher Income Boys (HIBs, $n = 26$, 11%), and Higher Income Girls (HIGs, $n = 40$, 16%). Paired sample t-tests were then run within each of the four groups to compare pre-test means with post-test means. A $p\text{-value} < .05$ was used to indicate statistical significance.

Results

Background Information

Characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 2. Males and females were almost equally represented in this sample, with slightly more females participating (56%). This distribution is consistent with the camp's enrollment statistics for the past several summers (OSC Camp Administrator, personal communication, April 6, 2007). The majority of campers were White (64%), with Black being the next most prevalent race/ethnicity (25%). The mean age of participants was 13.4 ± 1.3 years, and the mean summers attending OSC was 3.2 ± 2.0 summers, including the summer of 2007. The majority of participants (74%) came from families that earned \$45,000 or less, as determined by their tuition category. This distribution among tuition categories is

representative of the entire camper population during the summer of 2007 (OSC Enrollment Coordinator, personal communication).

Table 2 <i>Demographic Characteristics of Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N = 249)</i>					
	n	Mean or %	SD	Min.	Max
Sex					
Male	111	44.6			
Female	138	55.4			
Race/Ethnicity					
African-American/Black	61	24.5			
Native American/Alaskan Native	1	0.4			
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	0.8			
Hispanic/Latino	7	2.8			
White/Caucasian	158	63.5			
Other	20	8.0			
Age (in years)		13.4	1.28	10.9	16.1
Summers at camp		3.2	1.96	1.0	9.0
Tuition Category ¹					
1 (\$25,000 and under)	102	41.0			
2 (\$25,001 – 45,000)	81	32.5			
3 (\$45,001 – 60,000)	20	8.0			
4 (\$60,001 – 75,000)	15	6.0			
5 (\$75,001 – 90,000)	7	2.8			
6 (\$90,001 and above)	24	9.6			
¹ Tuition categories are determined by the camp as part of the application process and are based on each camper's family income.					

Table 3 contains information on age and summers at camp for each sex/SES groups. The mean age for LIBs was 13.7 years \pm 1.14, with an average of 3.0 summers \pm 1.77 spent at OSC. The mean age for LIGs was 13.0 years \pm 1.33, with an average of 3.2 summers \pm 1.93 spent at OSC. The mean age for HIBs was 13.8 years \pm 1.09, with an average of 3.7 summers \pm 2.46 spent at OSC. The mean age for HIGs was 13.5 years \pm 1.28, with an average of 3.4 summers \pm 2.08 spent at OSC.

Table 3 <i>Age and Summers at Camp by Sex/SES Groups for Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N = 249)</i>					
	n	Mean	SD	Min.	Max
Low Income Boys					
Age (in years)	81	13.7	1.14	11.9	16.0
Summers at OSC	85	3.0	1.77	1.0	8.0
Low Income Girls					
Age (in years)	98	13.0	1.33	10.9	15.8
Summers at OSC	97	3.2	1.93	1.0	9.0
High Income Boys					
Age (in years)	25	13.8	1.09	11.9	15.8
Summers at OSC	26	3.7	2.46	1.0	8.0
High Income Girls					
Age (in years)	39	13.5	1.28	11.1	15.8
Summers at OSC	39	3.4	2.08	1.0	8.0
¹ Tuition categories are determined by the camp as part of the application process and are based on each camper's family income.					

Specific Aim #1: The Difference Between Camper Aspirations and Reported Behavior

Results for the paired sample t-tests are presented in Table 4. The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience. Participants showed a significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities during their leisure time prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.74 \pm 4.17$). The difference between participants' aspirations to participate in

Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.03 \pm 2.88$). The difference between participants' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.04 \pm 2.87$).

Table 4 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Total Sample attending OSC in 2007 (N=249)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.) n=183	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.) n=183	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	3.52 (4.07) n=183	4.26 (4.60) n=183	-2.394	182	0.018
Elective Activities (ElAs)	2.22 (2.97) n=183	2.25 (2.77) n=183	-0.127	182	0.899
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.34 (2.31) n=183	1.31 (2.32) n=183	0.169	182	0.866
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.					

Specific Aim #2: The Difference Between Camper Reported Behavior and Aspirations By Sex, SES, and Sex/SES Groups

Results for the paired sample t-tests for all Boys are presented in Table 5. It is important to note that a subgroup (n=43) in the first camping session did not complete the post-test, due to time constraints. Boys who did complete both a pre- and post-test

showed no significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.14 \pm 3.94$). The difference between all Boys' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.17 \pm 2.04$). The difference between all Boys' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.32 \pm 2.92$).

Table 5 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=111)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	4.03 (4.83) n=58 ³	4.17 (5.01) n=58	-0.267	57	0.791
Elective Activities (ElAs)	1.49 (2.09) n=59	1.66 (2.96) n=59	-0.640	58	0.525
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.04 (1.51) n=56	1.36 (3.15) n=56	-0.824	55	0.413
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience. ³ A large number (n=43) of boys were in a camp unit that was unable to complete the post test.					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for all Girls are presented in Table 6. All Girls showed a significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized

Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 1.02 \pm 4.26$). The difference between all Girls' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -.04 \pm 3.20$). The difference between all Girls' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.20 \pm 2.84$).

Table 6 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=138)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	3.29 (3.67) n=125	4.30 (4.42) n=125	-2.267	124	0.009
Elective Activities (ElAs)	2.56 (3.24) n=129	2.52 (2.64) n=129	0.138	128	0.891
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.48 (2.58) n=124	1.28 (1.85) n=124	0.775	123	0.440
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for youth of low SES are presented in Table 7. Youth of low SES showed no significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.63 \pm 4.37$). The

difference between youth of low SES' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.15 \pm 3.13$). The difference between youth of low SES' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.08 \pm 2.94$).

Table 7 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Youth of Low Socioeconomic Status attending OSC in 2007 (N=183)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	3.73 (4.45) n=132 ³	4.36 (4.96) n=132	-1.653	131	0.101
Elective Activities (ElAs)	2.32 (3.23) n=134	2.31 (2.90) n=134	0.055	133	0.956
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.46 (2.46) n=130	1.38 (2.35) n=130	0.314	129	0.754
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience. ³ A large number (n=43) of boys were in a camp unit that was unable to complete the post test.					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for youth of higher SES are presented in Table 8. Youth of higher SES showed a significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 1.02 \pm$

3.62). The difference between youth of higher SES' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.13 \pm 2.16$). The difference between youth of higher SES' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.08 \pm 2.70$).

Table 8 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Youth of Higher Socioeconomic Status attending OSC in 2007 (N=66)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	2.98 (2.83) n=51 ³	4.00 (3.56) n=51	-2.009	50	0.050
Elective Activities (ElAs)	1.98 (2.17) n=54	2.11 (2.41) n=54	-0.440	53	0.662
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.04 (1.84) n=51	1.12 (2.28) n=51	-0.208	50	0.836
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience. ³ A large number (n=43) of boys were in a camp unit that was unable to complete the post test.					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for LIBs are presented in Table 9. LIBs showed no significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.22 \pm 4.15$). The difference between

LIBs' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.07 \pm 2.13$). The difference between LIBs' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.26 \pm 2.68$).

Table 9 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Low Income Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=85)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	4.36 (5.37) n=44 ³	4.14 (5.50) n=44	0.363	43	0.718
Elective Activities (ElAs)	1.56 (2.15) n=45	1.62 (3.02) n=45	-0.210	44	0.834
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.02 (1.65) n=42	1.29 (3.03) n=42	-0.634	41	0.530
<p><i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis.</p> <p>¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience.</p> <p>² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.</p> <p>³ A large number (n=43) of boys were in a camp unit that was unable to complete the post test.</p>					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for LIGs are presented in Table 10. LIGs showed a significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 1.06 \pm 4.44$). The difference between LIGs' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and

reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.06 \pm 3.54$). The difference between LIGs' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.25 \pm 3.06$).

Table 10 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Low Income Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=98)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	3.42 (3.91) n=88	4.48 (4.69) n=88	-2.234	87	0.028
Elective Activities (ElAs)	2.71 (3.61) n=89	2.65 (2.80) n=89	0.150	88	0.881
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.67 (2.76) n=87	1.43 (1.96) n=87	0.753	86	0.453
<i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis. ¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience. ² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for HIBs are presented in Table 11. HIBs showed no significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 1.29 \pm 3.02$). The difference between HIBs' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.50 \pm 1.74$). The difference between HIBs' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups

after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.50 \pm 3.65$).

Table 11 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Higher Income Boys attending OSC in 2007 (N=26)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.)	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.)	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	3.00 (2.32) n=14 ³	4.29 (3.22) n=14	-1.590	13	0.136
Elective Activities (ElAs)	1.29 (1.94) n=14	1.79 (2.89) n=14	-1.073	13	0.303
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.07 (1.07) n=14	1.57 (3.61) n=14	-0.512	13	0.617
<p><i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis.</p> <p>¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience.</p> <p>² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.</p> <p>³ A large number (n=43) of boys were in a camp unit that was unable to complete the post test.</p>					

Results for the paired sample t-tests for HIGs are presented in Table 12. HIGs showed no significant increase in their aspirations to participate in Emphasized Activities after the camp experience when compared to their reported participation in those activities prior to the camp experience ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.92 \pm 3.86$). The difference between HIGs' aspirations to participate in Elective Activities after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = 0.00 \pm 2.30$). The difference between HIGs' aspirations to participate in Informal Groups

after the camp experience and reported behaviors before the camp experience was not statistically significant ($\bar{x}_{t2-t1} = -0.08 \pm 2.28$).

Table 12 <i>Paired Sample T-test Results for Higher Income Girls attending OSC in 2007 (N=40)</i>					
	Pre-test Mean ¹ (s.d.) n=37	Post-test Mean ² (s.d.) n=37	t-value	df	p-value
Emphasized Activities (EmAs)	2.97 (3.04) n=37	3.89 (3.71) n=37	-1.448	36	0.156
Elective Activities (ElAs)	2.23 (2.21) n=40	2.23 (2.25) n=40	0.000	39	1.000
Informal Groups (IGs)	1.03 (2.07) n=38	0.95 (1.54) n=38	0.217	37	0.830
<p><i>Notes.</i> Only individuals with complete data were used in this analysis.</p> <p>¹ The pre-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper participated in the six months prior to the start of their camp experience.</p> <p>² The post-test mean represents the average number of activities or groups in each subscale in which each camper aspired to participate during the six months following their camp experience.</p>					

Chapter 3

DISCUSSION

The findings provide evidence that aspirations for participating in sports, hobby groups, and other activities during leisure time increases after experiencing the OSC program in comparison to reported participation in those activities before experiencing the OSC program. While the increase in aspirations for participation in EmAs during leisure time was statistically significant for the entire sample as a whole, but subgroup analyses revealed that Girls, youth of higher SES, and LIGs were the only groups to show a statistically significant increase in this area. Two possible explanations for why all Boys, LIBs, and HIBs did not show a statistically significant change is that: 1) Sample size was not large enough, and 2) Boys at the pre-test reported more participation than girls, which provides less room for improvement.

The increase in aspiration over behavior for participation in EmAs is not surprising, given that this group of outcomes includes groups and activities that strongly correspond to activities emphasized as part of the camp program. In other words, the OSC schedule ensures the typical camper spends at least 22 activity periods out of a possible 30 per five day schedule (73.3%) participating in basketball, softball, soccer, swimming, arts and crafts, woodshop, etc. (OSC Daytime Activities Coordinator, personal communication, May 1, 2008), which are leisure time activities described as Sports and Hobbies on the Group Involvement instrument and part of the EmAs outcome.

While the increase itself could have been anticipated, the size of the increase (on average, less than one additional activity per participant during the next six months) was less than expected. Given that the participants were exposed to at least 22 sports or hobby activities every five days, the increase of less than one amounts to aspiring to participate in only an additional 3% of those activities after the summer.

Several possible explanations exist to explain why participants exposed to so many EmAs only aspired to participate in less than one new activity afterwards. First, and easiest to explain, is that the campers were simply not interested in any of the activities to which they were exposed. One possible reason for a lack of interest includes the idea that campers are already participating in the school activities or community groups (SA/CGs) that interest them; therefore, the other camp activities in which they are not already participating fell outside of the realm of their interests. This is possible because study only measured *participation* and *aspirations to participate* in activities. This oversight excludes the possibility that the intensity of participation and interest in a particular activity/group may have increased, even though participation or aspirations to participate in those activities/groups may not have increased. Another reason could lie in the camp program itself; that is, the activities offered by the camp were not presented or executed in a manner that made them appealing to campers unfamiliar with them. It is recommended that OSC supervisors examine both the variety of activities the camp offers as well as the quality of each activity's program to ensure activities are meeting the desired standards of the supervisors.

Another possible explanation lays in the type of families that OSC targets for camper enrollment. Since OSC targets families with financial challenges, 74% of the

study's participants belong to families earning less than \$45,000, including 41% from families earning less than \$25,000. The result is that some of the campers may have discovered new activities in which they are interested but may not have year-round access to the resources and equipment necessary to participate in those activities. Similarly, those activities of interest may not be available in campers' schools and communities or outside of the camp program. This potential reason – as well as the possible lack of interest cited in the previous paragraph – could have been confirmed or rejected if the instruments used measured interest in specific activities at the camp during the pre- and post-test in addition to measuring intentions and aspirations to participate in new activities.

While a statistically significant increase was experienced in aspirations to participate in EmAs, no such increase was evident in ElAs and IGs. In fact, even though the findings were not statistically significant, campers actually aspired to participate in slightly *fewer* activities after the summer than they participated in before the summer. Several possible explanations could explain this lack of increase in ElAs and IGs aspirations for the sample, as well the decrease for IGs.

The first possible explanation for the findings is that these groups of outcomes include activities and groups that strongly correspond to activities into which the camp schedules campers based on individual choice (ElAs), or through informal, unscheduled opportunities that campers can volunteer for participation (IGs). These activities are disproportionately represented within the camp's program, since only 9 of the 40 programs officially offered by the camp (22.5%) fall into the activities represented by the ElAs outcome (OSC Daytime Activities Coordinator, personal communication, May 1,

2008). Additionally, fewer opportunities to participate in these activities exist since an individual camper can only participate in these types of activities no more than 8 times out of a possible 30 per five-day schedule (26.7%), so the activities are also disproportionately represented as a part of any individual camper's experience at OSC. The lack of opportunities for IGs is even more important, as these activities are offered informally, irregularly, and without any advanced notice or preparation.

Another possible explanation for the lack of an increase in EIAs and IGs is that campers at OSC elect to participate in these types of activities on an individual basis instead of with the bunk group with whom they spend approximately 90-95% of their time at camp. As a result, campers are exposed to others who possibly share an interest in that particular activity, but only for a short time and/or on an irregular basis. Not being surrounded by those individuals on a prolonged basis denies campers the opportunity to further explore an activity of interest with others who share that interest. Consequently, this inhibits their ability to create values and develop a common identity around the activity and group, which leads to normative behavior – in this case, interest or a desire to participate – related to that activity (Christensen, Rothgerber, Wood, & Matz, 2004).

Another possible explanation for the lack of increase in EIAs and IGs is similar to a potential explanation when discussing EmAs: the problem lays once again in the activities themselves. That is, the activities offered by the camp were not presented or executed in a manner that made them appealing to campers unfamiliar with them. It is again recommended that OSC supervisors examine the quality of each EIAs' program to ensure activities are meeting the desired standards of the supervisors.

One more possible explanation, related to the activities themselves, is that the activities in these categories, such as drama/theater, dance, photography, video, radio/podcasting, and community service, may carry expenses or a stigma that makes participation unappealing outside of the camp environment. Given that a majority of OSC's campers come from families of lower SES, it is likely that the expensive cost of equipment for video, photography, and radio/podcasting is too high for families to afford. Heath and McLaughlin found that youth who wish to take risks and try something new need a welcoming and safe environment that provides a family-like community (1991) – something that OSC strives to create as part of its mission. Therefore, it is also likely that campers may feel welcome and safe participating in an activity like drama/theater or dance at OSC, but that participating in these activities is either unavailable or unacceptable in their communities or schools. As previously mentioned, this possible reason could have been confirmed or rejected if the instruments used measured interest in specific activities at the camp during the pre- and post-test in addition to measuring intentions and aspirations to participate in new activities.

With regards to the second specific aim, to determine the difference between camper aspirations and reported behavior by sex, SES, and sex and SES groups, only three groups – all Girls, youth of higher SES, and LIGs – showed a statistically significant change between aspirations and reported behavior on any of the three outcomes (EmAs). The increase for all Girls and LIGs is not surprising, since Arnold, Bourdeau, and Nagele (2005) previously reported that girls in general found camp to be a good setting in which to learn new things they like to do and try new things. The Girls and LIGs' increase in aspirations to participate in EmAs is consistent with this research.

This finding raises the possibility that the OSC program contributed to this increase, as its program targets and benefits a population that most needs this exposure, support, and influence to participate.

It is difficult to examine the difference between HIGs' aspirations and reported behaviors on EmAs, which appears to be an increase of almost one full activity per six months, because the sample size was too small to be significant ($n = 37$). Likewise, both LIBs and HIBs showed no statistically significant increase and this was likely due to the size of the sample ($n = 44$ and 14 , respectively).

The presence of a statistically significant increase in youth of higher SES' aspirations to participate in EmAs was unexpected, particularly when considering that youth of low SES showed no statistically significant increase. One possible explanation for this increase among youth of higher SES is that they were exposed to more new activities at OSC in which they did not already participate. A second possible explanation is that these youth are entering a new situation, such as a new school because of their age or the family's relocation, where more activities are available to them. Another possible explanation for the increase is that these youth, who came from families with more financial resources and opportunities, have greater influence and input regarding their activities and involvement during leisure time and are more confident that they will be able to participate in more activities after the summer.

There were several limitations to the present study. First, while the campers at OSC did not experience a significant increase between their reported behaviors and aspirations, perhaps the benefit of participating in the OSC program during the summer positively is the prevention of a decrease in aspirations to participate in leisure time

activities after the summer. The idea of a change in aspirations could not be tested by this study, however, because the instrument used measured *behavior* during the pre-test and *aspirations* during the post-test. According to behavior change theories, these are two different constructs (Garber et al., 2008; Marcus, Rakowski, & Rossi, 1992). Changes in participants' aspirations may have been more accurately measured if the instrument had asked "What do you plan to participate in the 6 months after the summer" at pre-test *and* at post-test, and then compared aspirations from before summer to aspirations after summer.

Another modification to the instrument might have been to record data relating to new activities. In other words, the instrument should have included items collecting some form of the following data: 1) How many of the activities to which the participant had been exposed were new to him or her; and 2) How many of the activities in which the participant aspires to participate were new to him or her?

A final limitation of this study is that it is quasi-experimental; there was no control group of either children at another camp or children who did not attend a camp at all. Using a control group would reduce threats to validity associated with correlational research. For example, a participant's environment after the summer may be different from their environment before the summer, and this could account for the difference (or lack thereof) between their aspirations and reported behaviors. Some participants may have been transitioning from middle to high school, thus having a different set of opportunities for leisure time activities in which they could participate. Similarly, some participants' families may have moved over the summer, meaning the camper will be living in a new community and therefore exposed to new opportunities or even unsure of

what opportunities they will have. Finally, some participants may have been aware of some change in their family's financial status over the summer, either negative (pay cut, job loss, etc.) or positive (promotion, raise, etc.), which may have influenced their aspirations for participation.

While this study had the aforementioned limitations, it did have several strengths and implications for the future. First, a strength of this study is that it collected data directly from the campers themselves, as opposed to asking counselors, parents, and other adults to share their observations of the campers' aspirations or behavior. The result is that the data accurately represents the experience of the campers and their reported behaviors and aspirations, and not a view based on speculation, observations, or what the camp program intended to deliver.

The implications of this study fall into two areas: recommendations and suggestions for OSC, and ideas for future research. With regards to recommendations for OSC, the camp supervisors need to evaluate the quality of all activities it offers to ensure that each EmAs meets their standards and expectations.

Additionally, OSC should incorporate a stronger emphasis on promoting leisure time participation in its mission statement so that it can continue to help its campers develop into well-rounded individuals who contribute positively to society. Increasing a camper's interest in a positive activity, and therefore promoting involvement in that activity during leisure time outside of camp, can help a camper avoid problem or risk behavior, as research has shown that general activity involvement results in psychological benefits and deters delinquent behavior (Palen & Coatesworth, 2007). There are at least two ways to accomplish an increase in interest and involvement. First, OSC can provide

a better structure for offering opportunities to participate in Informal Groups, perhaps by changing some of them into *formal* groups and offering them as an emphasized part of the camp program. For example, each bunk could be scheduled to a community service program during the activity schedule, during which the campers would find or create a need and then perform some type of service or project that would benefit the camp community as a whole.

Another suggested approach for improving involvement aspirations is for OSC staff to help transfer the campers' interest in activities from the camp environment to their community or school environment. This could be accomplished in two different ways. The first approach is that each activity instructor would identify opportunities to participate in his or her respective activity in the Philadelphia area. For example, the basketball instructor would identify youth basketball leagues, and the arts and crafts instructor would identify craft groups for children. The second approach is that OSC would offer these opportunities throughout the year in the form of programming for its campers. This approach would make participation in that activity more consistent, particularly since OSC would be able to control the program, unlike other community offerings, and therefore ensure that the activity is offered in a welcoming and safe environment similar to the one experienced during the summer.

The limitations of this study as well as its findings have created ideas for future research. First, a future study should be conducted that measures aspirations during both the pre- and post-test. Second, a study should be conducted that focuses on the different sex/SES groups, particularly with larger samples, to further explore the way the camp program affects children from different backgrounds. Finally, a follow-up study should

be conducted six months after the conclusion of each camping session. The follow-up study would have asked participants to report their participation in activities using the same instrument that was used on the pre-test. Thus, there would be data from August 2007 where participants shared information about their aspirations to participate in activities or groups, and data from February 2008 where participants shared information about their reported behaviors of participation during the previous six months. Then, analyses could have assessed the level to which campers' aspirations match their behaviors, to further explore how the camp experience impacted their ability to try new things and use their leisure time.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allen, L.R., Cox, J., & Cooper, N.L. (2006). The impact of a summer day camp on the resiliency of disadvantaged youths. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 77(1), 17-23.
- American Camp Association. (2005). *Directions: youth development outcomes of the camp experience*. Martinsville, IN: Burkhardt, M., Henderson, K., Marsh, P., Thurber, C.A., Scanlin, M.M., & Whitaker, L.S. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from <http://acacamps.org/research/enhance/directions.pdf>
- American Camp Association. (2006). *Inspirations: Developmental supports and opportunities of youths' experiences at camp*. Martinsville, IN: Thurber, C., Gambone, M., Scanlin, M.M., Sipe, C.L., Daraio, S., Garst, B., et al. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from <http://www.acacamps.org/research/Inspirations.pdf>
- American Camp Association. (2007). *Standards-at-a-Glance*. Retrieved February 1, 2008, from <http://www.acacamps.org/accreditation/stdsglance.php>
- American Camp Association. (2008). *ACA fact sheet – American Camp Association*. Retrieved January 25, 2008, from http://www.acacamps.org/media_center/about_aca/facts.php
- Arnold, M.E., Bourdeau, V.D., & Nagele, J. (2005). Fun and friendship in the natural world: The impact of Oregon 4-H residential camping programs on girl and boy campers. *Journal of Extension*, 43(6). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2005december/rb1.shtml>

- Barber, B.L., Eccles, J.S., & Stone, M.R. (2001). Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16*(5), 429-455.
- Bialeschki, M.D., Henderson, K.A., & James, P.A. (2007). Camp experiences and developmental outcomes for youth. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 16*(4), 769-788.
- Caldwell, L.L., Baldwin, C.K., Walls, T., & Smith, E. (2004). Preliminary effects of a leisure education program to promote healthy use of free time among middle school adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research, 36*(3), 310-335.
- Caldwell, L.L., & Smith, E.A. (1995). Health behaviors of leisure alienated youth. *Loisir & Societe/Leisure and Society, 18*, 143-156.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1992). *A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the nonschool hours*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Christensen, P. N., Rothgerber, H., Wood, W., & Matz, D. C. (2004). Social Norms and Identity Relevance: A Motivational Approach to Normative Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(10), 1295-1309.
- Eccles, J., & Gootman, J.A. (Eds.). (2002). Community programs to promote youth development. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Forum for Youth Investment. (2004). School's out: a look at summer learning and engagement. *Out-of-School-Time Policy Commentary, 7*, 1-7.

- Fredricks, J.A., & Eccles, J.S. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(4), 698-713.
- Garber, C.E., Allsworth, J.E., Marcus, B.H., Hesser, J., & Lapane, K.L. (2008). Correlates of the stages of change for physical activity in a population survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(5), 897-904.
- Goodin, R., Rice, J., Bittman, M., & Saunders, P. (2005). The time-pressure illusion: Discretionary time vs. free time. *Social Indicators Research*, 73(1), 43-70.
- Grunbaum, J., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., Lowry, R., et al. (2004). Youth risk behavior surveillance – United State 2003. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly*, 53(SS-2), 1-96.
- Heath, S.B., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1991). Community organizations as family: Endeavors that engage and support adolescents. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(8), 623-627.
- Henderson, K.A., Whitaker, L.S., Bialeschki, M.D., Scanlin, M.M., & Thurber, C. (2007). Summer camp experiences: Parental perceptions of youth development outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(8), 987-1007.
- Irby, M., & Tolman, J. (2002). *Rethinking leisure time: Expanding opportunities for young people and communities*. Washington, D.C.: The Forum for Youth Investment.
- Kimm, S.Y.S., Glynn, N.W., Kriska, A.M., Barton, B.A., Kronsberg, S.S., Daniels, S.R., et al. (2002). Decline in physical activity in black girls and white girls during adolescence. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 347(10), 709-715.

- Kleiber, D.A., Caldwell, L.L., & Shaw, S.A. (1993). Leisure meanings among adolescents. *Loisir & Société/Leisure and Society*, 16, 99-114.
- Klem, M. (2006). An evaluation of the effectiveness of life skill development in Missouri's 4-H youth resident summer camps. *Presented at the 2006 Camp Research Symposium*. Retrieved on May 12, 2008, from <http://www.acacamps.org/research/symposium/klem.pdf>
- Larson, R.W., Richards, M.H., Sims, B., & Dworkin, J. (2001). How urban African American young adolescents spend their time: Time budgets for locations, activities, and companionship. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(4), 565-597.
- Levin, D., Smith, E.A., Caldwell, L.L., & Kimbrough, J. (1995). High school sports participation and violence. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 379-388.
- Mahoney, J.L. (2000). School extracurricular activity participation as a moderator in the development of antisocial patterns. *Child Development*, 71(2), 502.
- Mahoney, J.L., & Cairns, R.B. (1997). Do extracurricular activities protect against early school dropout?. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(2), 241-253.
- Marcus, B.H., Rakowski, W., & Rossi, J.S. (1992) Assessing motivational readiness and decision making for exercise. *Health Psychology*, 11, 257-261.
- Miller, K.E., Sabo, D.F., Farrell, M.P., Barnes, G.M., & Melnick, M.J. (1998). Athletic participation and sexual behavior in adolescents: The different worlds of boys and girls. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 39(2), 108-123.
- National Academy of Sciences. (2001). Community programs to promote youth development. Washington, D.C: National Research Council.

National Center for Youth Statistics. (1996). Youth Indicators, 1996. Washington, D.C.:

Author.

Nicholson, H.J., Collins, C., & Holmer, H. (2004). Youth as people: The protective aspects of youth development in after-school settings. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591, 55-71.

Palen, L., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2007). Activity-based identity experiences and their relations to problem behavior and psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30(5), 721-737.

Pedersen, S., & Seidman, E. (2005). Contexts and correlates of out-of-school activity participation among low-income urban adolescents. In J.L. Mahone, R.W. Larson, & J.S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development: Extracurricular activities, after school, and community programs* (85-110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Quinn, J. (1995). Positive effects of participation in youth organizations. In M. Rutter (Ed.), *Psychosocial Disturbances in Young People: Challenges for Prevention*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Readdick, C.A., & Schaller, R.G. (2005). Summer camp and self-esteem of school-age inner-city children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 101(1), 121.

Roffman, J., Pagano, M., & Hirsch, B. (2001). Youth functioning and experiences in inner-city after-school programs among age, gender, and race groups. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 10(1), 85-100.

Scales, P.C., Benson, P.L., Roehlkepartain, E.C., Hintz, N.R., Sullivan, T.K., & Mannes, M. (2004). The role of parental status and child age in the engagement of children

and youth with adults outside their families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25(6), 735-760.

Schinke, S.P., Orlandi, M.A., & Cole, K.C. (1992). Boys & girls clubs in public housing developments: Prevention services for youth at risk. *Journal of Community Psychology. Special Issue: Programs for change: Office for Substance Abuse Prevention demonstration models*, 118-128.

Yuen, F.C., Pedlar, A., & Mannell, R.C. (2005). Building community and social capital through children's leisure in the context of an international camp. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 37(4), 494.

Zill, N., Nord, C.W., & Loomis, L.S. (1995). *Adolescent time use, risky behavior and outcomes: An analysis of national data*. Department of Health and Human Services.

APPENDIX A

Instructions: This section asks about your involvement in various types of groups, activities, and clubs. For each line, answer whether or not you were involved in a group of that type during the past 6 months. If you circle “Yes” then please indicate how many groups of that type in which you were involved. Circle “No” if you have never been involved or were not involved with that type of group during the last 6 months.

GROUP INVOLVEMENT

1. In the past 6 months, have you participated in any of the following SCHOOL groups?

	Yes, within the past 6 months	If yes, then how many?	No, not within the past 6 months
a. School governance clubs (e.g. student government or leadership)	Yes	# = ____	No
b. Community service groups	Yes	# = ____	No
c. Creative and Performing Arts groups (e.g. band, choir, dance, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
d. Hobby clubs (e.g. model building, magic, chess, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
e. Sports	Yes	# = ____	No
f. Other – please specify	Yes	# = ____	No

2. In the past 6 months, have you participated in any of the following COMMUNITY activities?

	Yes	# = ____	No
a. Groups for young people outside of school (e.g. 4-H club, Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
b. Faith-Based Clubs (e.g. church or synagogue group, prayer group, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
c. Community service groups	Yes	# = ____	No
d. Creative and Performing Arts groups (e.g. band, choir, dance, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
e. Hobby clubs (e.g. model building, magic, chess, etc.)	Yes	# = ____	No
f. Sports	Yes	# = ____	No
g. Other – please specify	Yes	# = ____	No

APPENDIX B

Instructions: This section asks about your planned involvement in various types of groups, activities, and clubs. For each line, answer whether or not you plan to be involved in a group of that type during the next 6 months. If you circle “Yes” then please indicate how many groups of that type in which you plan to be involved. Circle “No” if you do not plan to be involved with that type of group during the next 6 months.

GROUP INVOLVEMENT

1

1. In the next 6 months, do you plan on participating in any of the following SCHOOL groups?

	Yes	If yes, then how many?	No
a. School governance clubs (e.g. student government or leadership)	Yes	# = _____	No
b. Community service groups	Yes	# = _____	No
c. Creative and Performing Arts groups (e.g. band, choir, dance, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
d. Hobby clubs (e.g. model building, magic, chess, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
e. Sports	Yes	# = _____	No
f. Other – please specify	Yes	# = _____	No

2. In the next 6 months, do you plan on participating in any of the following COMMUNITY activities?

	Yes	# = _____	No
a. Groups for young people outside of school (e.g. 4-H club, Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
b. Faith-Based Clubs (e.g. church or synagogue group, prayer group, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
c. Community service groups	Yes	# = _____	No
d. Creative and Performing Arts groups (e.g. band, choir, dance, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
e. Hobby clubs (e.g. model building, magic, chess, etc.)	Yes	# = _____	No
f. Sports	Yes	# = _____	No
g. Other – please specify	Yes	# = _____	No