American Camp Association

ACA National Camp Research Symposium Abstracts

Sponsored by

YELLOW DAY

WWW.YELLOWDAYMOVIE.COM

2013

Table of Contents

ASSESSING THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF A THERAPEUTIC RECREATION SUMMER CAMP FOR ADOLESCENTS WITH CHRONIC ILLNESS

Authors: Jared Allsop, M.S., CTRS.; Jim Sibthorp, PhD. Contact: Jared Allsop, 1616 S Pecan Lane, Bloomington, IN 47403, jaredallsop@hotmail.com

Chronic illness is a term given to a group of health conditions that persists for longer than 3 months and most often will continue throughout the person's lifetime. Examples of chronic illnesses include cancer, diabetes, and asthma. Over two million adolescents in the United States have some form of chronic illness. Repeated doctor visits and medical treatments all combine to limit the adolescent's exposure to various social situations which in turn can delay or stunt the individual's social growth and limit his or her social development (Bluebond-Langner, Perkel, Gorertzel, Nelson, & McGeary, 1990). Often in comparison to their peers they feel a lack of ability to develop social relationships, create friendships, and excel in social settings. These issues can lead the adolescent with chronic illness to a lower sense of social self-efficacy (Harrison & McGuire, 2008; Melzer & Rourke, 2005), or the belief that they cannot successfully perform a given social task or a behavior change (Bandura, 1977).

Theoretical Framework

Social self-efficacy is vital to the social development of adolescents with chronic illness. Individuals who have an increased sense of social self-efficacy are more adept at various social performances such as a) instigating social conversations; b) developing and maintaining social relationships; and c) functioning in social groups and social situations than individuals who exhibit low levels of self-efficacy (Rapley & Fruin, 1999). Social performance is a behavioral manifestation of social self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Research has indicated that self-efficacy, including social self-efficacy, is strongly connected with numerous health related outcomes, such as an increase in life satisfaction (Hampton, 2000), a decrease in hospital visits and duration of those visits (Horn, Yoels, Wallace, Macrina, & Wrigley, 1998), and an increase in overall functioning (Rejeski, Miller, Foy, Messier, & Rapp, 2001). Research also indicates that both summer camps and therapeutic recreation (TR) are effective sources for increasing social self-efficacy for adolescents with chronic illnesses (Harrison & McGuire, 2008; Melzer & Rourke, 2005).

Summer camps for adolescents with chronic illnesses have shown to increase levels of self-worth and social acceptance (Melzer & Rourke, 2005) while also providing the adolescent an invaluable experience of associating with other individuals in similar situations. Often, these associations are the only opportunity adolescents have to interact with other individuals of their same age with similar medical situations outside of the hospital setting. Summer camps can help increase social self-efficacy and social performance by providing positive social situations, fostering independence, and providing opportunities for leadership experience (Thurber, Scanlin, Scheuler, & Henderson, 2007).

Research by Maughen and Ellis (1991) identified TR as a main modality in helping to decrease depression and increase social self-efficacy in their adolescent population. Additional research has also reported increased self-efficacy levels due to the successful implementation of the TR process: assessment, plan, implementation and evaluation.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of a TR based summer camp on social self-efficacy levels and social performance with peers among adolescents with chronic illness.

This study was primarily interested in testing two research hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that summer camp programs utilizing TR programming to increase social self-efficacy among adolescents with chronic illness would be more effective at increasing social self-efficacy than summer camp programs not utilizing TR. The second was that, in addition to self-reported social self-efficacy measures, participants in the TR based summer camp session would exhibit a greater increase in social performance with peers over the traditional summer camp session

Methods

Seventy nine campers attending a specialty summer camp for adolescents with chronic illness participated in this research. They were divided into two sessions; session 1, a traditional summer camp model (TSCM), and session 2, the Therapeutic Recreation Process Model (TRPM). Research data were collected using the Muris Social Self-Efficacy Scale (SSES) (2001) and the adapted version of the Social Skills Questionnaire (SSQ). The first session of camp served as the control group. The SSQ was completed by the recreational therapists daily. No changes were made to the typical camp program, with the exception of administering the SSES upon arrival and prior to departure. The second session of camp, the TRPM, followed the TR process throughout the session. This included assessments for each participant, measureable goals and objectives, targeted program plans within the same program activities as the first session, and proper evaluation and documentation of all participants and programs.

Results and Conclusions

The data were analyzed using SPSS with both descriptive and inferential statistics. A 2x2 MIXED ANCOVA was used to compare the results from the SSES. The between subjects factor was model with 2 levels (TSCM and TRPM) and the within subjects effect was time (Pre and Post). Alpha was set at .05. Repeated measures ANCOVA was used to compare the results of the social performance scores from the SSQ. The day 1 baseline observation was used as a covariate. SSQ scores were coded so larger numbers for analysis-represented improvements.

The first hypothesis was not supported by these data ($p > .05$). There was, however, a significant main effect for time ($F_{(1,70)} = 17.1$, $p < .001$), indicating that both TSCM and TRPM resulted in increased social self-efficacy.

The second hypothesis was supported by statistical analysis. The time*model interaction was significant ($F_{4,71} = 9.868$, $p < .001$, $\lambda = .643$), indicating that improvement in social performance with peers improved more for the TRPM than for the TSCM over the days at camp. The data show consistent and significant improvements in social performance observed during the TRPM over time compared to the TSCM.

The study did show that over time levels of social performance could be more positively affected through the use of the therapeutic recreation process within summer camp programs. It is interesting that, while the self-perception did not change as a result of the TRPM, the behavioral manifestation, social performance, did show significant and consistent gains over time for the TRPM -gains that were not observed in the TSCM despite similar increases in social self-efficacy. It is possible that the therapeutic process, while not necessary to change self-perceptions, remains essential to changing actual behavior.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bluebond-Langner, M., Perkel, D., Gorertzel, T., Nelson, K., & McGeary, J. (1990). Children's knowledge of cancer and its treatment: Impact of an oncology camp experience. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, *116*, 207-213.

Harrison, M. M., & McGuire, F. (2008). An investigation of the influence of vicarious experience on perceived self-efficacy. *American Journal of Recreation Therapy*, *7*(1), 10-16.

Horn, W., Yoels, W., Wallace, D., Macrina, D., & Wrigley, M. (1998). Determinants of self-efficacy among persons with spinal cord injuries. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *20*, 138-141.

Maughan, M., & Ellis, G. G. (1991). Effect of efficacy information during recreation participation on efficacy judgments of depressed adolescents. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*. *25*(1), 50-59.

Meltzer, L. J., & Rourke, M. T. (2005). Benefits of social comparison. *Children's Health Care*, *34*(4), 305–314.

Muris, P. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youth(s). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *23*, 145-149.

Rapley, P., & Fruin, D. J. (1999). Self-efficacy in chronic illness: The juxtaposition of general and regimen-specific efficacy. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*. *5*, 209-215.

Rejeski, W. J., Miller, M. E., Foy, C., Messier, S., & Rapp, S. (2001). Self-efficacy and the progression of functional limitations and self-reported disability in older adults with knee pain. *The Journals of Gerontology*, *56B*, S261-S265.

Thurber, C.A., Scanlin, M.M., Scheuler, L., & Henderson, K.A. (2007). Youth development outcomes of the camp experience: Evidence for multidimensional growth. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, *36*, 241-254.

READING AT CAMP: OUTCOMES OF A SUMMER READING PROGRAM AT SHERWOOD FOREST CAMP

Authors: Lauren Arend, Saint Louis University and Mary Rogers, Sherwood Forest Camp. Contact: Lauren Arend, St. Louis University, 4236 Cleveland Ave, Saint Louis, MO 63110. lauren.arend@gmail.com

In 2011, a pilot reading program was implemented at Sherwood Forest Camp with two cabins of fourth grade campers (one cabin of boys and one cabin of girls) for a 26-day session. In 2012, the reading program was expanded to include all of the fourth grade campers. A total of 24 boys and 24 girls participated in the program. A reading teacher was hired to implement the reading program curriculum. The curriculum included reading aloud in a group, silent reading, guided journal writing, as well as small group activities centered on skill-building. Campers met for 1 ¼ hour sessions on most days. The boy campers focused their reading on the book *Hatchet* by Gary Paulsen. Girl campers read the book *Belle Prater's Boy* by Ruth White.

Related Literature

An extensive literature review conducted by Terizan, Anderson, and Hamilton (2009) found that children who live in under-resourced, urban neighborhoods experience greater summer reading loss than their middle and upper income peers. A meta-analysis conducted by Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, and Greathouse (1996) found that reading loss was found to be directly related to family socio-economic status. On some measures, middle-class children made actual gains in reading over the summer, while disadvantaged children showed losses.

Over 80% of Sherwood Forest Camp participants qualify for the school lunch program and most reside in urban settings. Two-thirds of the achievement gap is explained by unequal access to summer learning (Terizan, Anderson, & Hamilton, 2009). The Sherwood Forest Camp leadership decided to integrate a reading program in order to address the growing achievement gap between their campers and their higher income counterparts.

In an age where children are categorized based on their performance on reading and writing measures, there are high-stakes for literacy development. Imagine the difference in self-concept for a child labeled "struggling" and one labeled as "above grade-level." "Both what and how one reads and writes can have an impact on the type of person one is recognized as being and on how one sees oneself" (Moje & Luke, 2009, p. 44). Opportunities to read and write in a purposeful way allow campers to not only maintain their learning skills over the summer months, but also explore their developing identities (Arend & Buckner, 2012).

Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation was guided by Michael Patton's model of utilization-focused evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation process was focused not only on how the reading program impacted campers, but also focused on how the evaluation findings could be utilized by the reading program leadership to sustain and improve upon the components of the program. In order to conduct an evaluation within this model, the evaluator formed

working relationships with key personnel to collaborate on evaluation design and implementation.

Within Patton's framework of evaluation, evaluation design and measure selection (what and how components are measured) should be a dialogue between the evaluator and the program stakeholders (1997). Patton argues that the validity and reliability of an evaluation depend on the intended use of the evaluation.

For this evaluation, meetings with program leadership helped determine what should be measured in order to evaluate how the reading program was meeting its goals. All data sources were chosen because they contributed to answering the important questions about program effectiveness developed collaboratively with camp leadership.

Quantitative data sources including pre and post vocabulary tests, pre and post reading attitude surveys, scored writing samples, and camp library usage data were analyzed using descriptive, parametric, and nonparametric inferential statistics. In addition to calculating statistical significance, effect sizes were also reported on most quantitative measures. Qualitative data sources including camper letters, parent interviews, staff interviews, and observations were analyzed thematically to identify patterns and trends.

Results

The majority of campers (75%) showed increases on vocabulary tests developed based on the novels they read. Both the girl and boy reading groups demonstrated significant gains in vocabulary scores from pre to post tests. The implication from these findings is that when campers learn challenging new vocabulary words in the context of a piece of literature they are able to demonstrate gains over a short four week program.

Recreational reading attitudes as measured by the Elementary Reading Attitudes Survey (McKenna & Kear, 1990) improved significantly for the whole group and the groups broken down by gender. The improvement in reading attitudes was particularly significant for boys. Effect sizes were medium to large for all significant results. Academic reading attitudes improved, but not nearly as much as the recreational reading attitudes. The academic and recreational reading attitudes for all subgroups at Sherwood Camp before the reading program intervention were at or below national norms, the post-program attitudes were all above national norms (McKenna & Kear, 1990).

The 6 Point Writer's Rubric (Education Northwest, 2010) was used to score writing samples from each camper's journal on Day 1, Day 10, and Day 18 of the reading program.
Overall, girls' writing scores were significantly higher than boys' scores. A significant improvement was found in writing scores over time for all campers. Additionally, boys increased their writing scores more than girls over the 18 day period. This is consistent with the findings from the vocabulary tests and the reading attitudes assessment. While the reading program benefits all campers, the benefits are magnified for the boys.

Library usage data in the summer of 2012 revealed that campers enrolled in the 2011 reading program are utilizing the library more and checking out significantly more books than those campers who never participated in the reading program.

Based on camper letters, the Sherwood Forest Camp reading program is demonstrating best practices as identified in the literature review. The reading program is perceived as fun by most campers and the creative environment and diversity of activities

has succeeded in engaging a diverse group of kids. The books were positive and a key component of hooking campers into the reading program. Finally, the reading teacher's ability to create a positive learning environment that supported both camper reading growth and social/emotional development was integral. However, some campers still view the reading program as separate and unequal from the rest of the camp experience.

Parent perceptions of the reading program are positive and most parents recognize the need for sustaining reading skills over the summer. However, some parents share their children's viewpoint that attending the reading program takes them away from other camp activities.

Implications for Camp

Summer reading programs can have a positive impact on children's reading abilities. Related research suggests that summer reading loss affects students of lower socio-economic backgrounds at a disproportionate rate. Based on the literature, effective summer reading programs offer access to a wide variety of books, that the books match the reader's ability and interests, and that comprehension is monitored by an adult who asks appropriate questions and helps kids connect meanings. Camp is a powerful environment for children to make emotional connections- in friendships with peers and adults, through support for trying new things, by being in a place of beauty and wonder. This openness to emotional connections might extend to reading: being read to at bedtime, getting lost in a book out in the woods, and having books to take home and treasure. Camp can be a place where reading is one of the coolest things to do.

References

Arend, L. & Buckner, E.B. (2012). Perspectives worth sharing: Reading and writing at camp. *CompassPoint*, 22 (4), pp. 20-22.

Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Review of Education Research*, *66*(3), 227-268.

Education Northwest. (2010). *6-Point Writer's Rubric*. Retrieved from http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/773

McKenna, M., & Kear, D. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers." *The Reading Teacher, May, 626-639.*

Mikulecky, L.J. (1990). Stopping summer learning loss among at-risk youth. *Journal of Reading, 33 (7),* 516-521.

Moje, E., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415-437.

Patton, M. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation, 4th edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Terizan, M., Anderson, K., & Hamilton, K. (2009) Effective and promising summer learning programs and approaches for economically-disadvantaged children and youth: A white paper for the Wallace Foundation. *Child Trends* July 10, 2009.

POSITIONING CAMP AS A CONTEXT FOR EXPANDED LEARNING THROUGH META-ANALYTIC REVIEW OF CAMP RESEARCH

Authors: Laurie Browne, California State University, Chico, and Ann Gillard, Springfield College. Contact: Laurie Browne, Department of Recreation, Hospitality, and Parks Management, California State University, Chico, Chico, CA 95926. lpbrowne@csuchico.edu

Documenting camp as a context for expanded learning has important implications for camp professionals. Many camps rely on evidence of the benefits of camp to secure funding and the economic climate today makes competition for funding fierce. Camp research provides ample evidence for the beneficial outcomes of the camp experience (Bialeschki, Henderson, & James, 2007), thus camp, in general, is a context for positive youth development (Garst et al., 2011; Henderson, Whitaker, Bialeschki, Scanlin, & Thurber, 2007). Despite this foundation, camp is not among the contexts widely assumed to address critical issues such as summer learning loss (Sloan McCombs et al., 2011). Settings such as after school and summer academic programs are known as expanded learning opportunities because they promote commonly targeted outcomes (e.g., 21st century skills) outside of school. To be recognized alongside these settings, camp research must present camp as an opportunity for expanded learning.

Recent developments in camp research suggest that now is the ideal time to position camp as a context for expanded learning. Camper outcomes including competence (Michalski, Mishna, Worthington, & Cummings, 2003; Roark, Ellis, Wells, & Gillard, 2010), problem solving (Pulgaron, Salamon, Patterson, & Barakat, 2010), and creativity (Saxon, Treffinger, Young, & Wittig, 2003) are targeted 21st century skills, suggesting the camp experience might indeed promote expanded learning. Secondly, studies linking camp with physical activity (Beets & Pitetti, 2011; Hickerson & Henderson, 2010) and healthy eating (Heim, Stang, & Ireland, 2009) show that the camp experience fosters health literacy, another identified 21st century skill. Concerns about nature-deficit disorder (Louv, 2005) represent a third area in which camps show particular promise. Most camps centralize nature in their programming, and the outcomes of these experiences suggest that kids who attend camp become more connected to nature (Browne, Garst, & Bialeschki, 2011; Larson, Castleberry, & Green, 2010). Given these promising trends and the need to position camp as an expanded learning opportunity, the purpose of this study was to analyze journal article titles, keywords, and camper developmental outcomes to understand the impact of camp on youth.

Theoretical Framework for Analysis.

Meta-analysis is a useful method for examining a given body of literature in order to move it strategically forward (Durlak et al., 2007). Beyond direction for researchers, meta-analysis presents research in a way that is accessible and useful to camp professionals. Meta-study assumes that psychosocial phenomena are patterned in words or other qualitative representations (Denzin, 1989) which, in meta-study, are the findings from existing studies (Peterson et al., 2001). A grounded theory approach then allows meta-researchers to interpret key themes and suggest implications in relation to existing

theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The positive youth development perspective (e.g., The 6 C's, 40 Developmental Assets), which assumes that youth will develop into healthy, productive adults given sufficient environmental support, is a theoretical framework that may provide particular insight into the themes generated in this study.

Methods

Phase 1 of this study is a comprehensive overview of article titles, key words, and outcomes. Phase 2 considers qualitative and quantitative studies in their entirety (cf., Connelly & Joly, 2012), employing meta-synthesis to identify key themes among qualitative data (Paterson et al., 2001) and Cooper's (2010) approach to meta-analysis, which examines the statistical relation between camp and camper outcomes across multiple studies. The methods, preliminary results, and implications of Phase 1 are presented here. Selection criteria followed Marsh's (1999) meta-analysis of camper outcomes. Scholarly, peer-reviewed articles (1999-2012) that examine the relation between camp and camper outcomes were selected for initial review. Using the key words of camp, camper, outcome, impact, and youth, 347 results were produced via social science databases such as Academic Search Premier, CINAHL, ERIC, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and PsycINFO. Studies representing personal or ethnographic narratives, descriptions of singular camp programs, reviews of camp research, or recommendations for camp were excluded. Additionally, studies specific to medical (e.g., weight loss), academic (e.g., math skills), staff, or parent outcomes were also dismissed. After attributing the above criteria, 101 articles remained. Articles were entered into a spreadsheet that included publication year, journal name, title, keywords, outcomes, and methodology. Nvivo 9 was used to conduct preliminary content analysis of article titles, keywords, and outcomes. Next steps include the formation of a research team to generate codes, establish inter-rater reliability, and generate key themes from the data.

Results

Of the final sample, 17.5% were published in 2010, 9.7% were published each in 2009 and 2011, and 8.7% were published in 2005 and 2006. Seven articles were published in the *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*. Five articles each were published in the *Child and Youth Care Forum* and *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, and four were published in the *Journal of Experiential Education*. Fifty-nine journals published at least one article about camper outcomes. Representative journals included 16 articles in education-related journals, 15 in recreation-related journals, 13 in child journals, 10 in "care" journals, 10 in psychology journals, and 10 in youth journals. The top four outcomes were self ($n = 33$), social ($n = 25$), skills ($n = 18$), and competence ($n = 10$). Forty-five studies investigated therapeutic camps or populations with illness or medical disability. Seventy-two articles used quantitative methods, 18 used qualitative methods, and 11 used mixed methods.

Discussion

Preliminary analysis of journal titles, keywords, and outcomes suggests two ways future camp research might work to position camp as an expanded learning opportunity. First, broadly defined outcomes related to self- and social competence appear across a spectrum of journals, which supports the notion that camp in general promotes positive experiences for kids. Outcomes specific to 21st century learning skills, such as problem solving and creativity, have limited representation in the literature; furthermore, these

outcomes are minimally represented in youth development journals. The second trend worth noting at this preliminary stage is the disproportionate representation of research focused on the therapeutic outcomes of camps that serve specific populations. In addition to the sheer number of studies in this category, it is also worth noting their presence in journals related to therapy and treatment. Given this preliminary trend, it is possible that camp is viewed by many as an intervention or treatment modality rather than an overall context for expanded learning. Complete meta-analysis of camp research will provide further insight into these and other trends, resulting in an important resource for camp professionals and researchers.

References

Beets, M. W., & Pitetti, K. H. (2011). Using pedometers to measure moderate-to-vigorous physical activity for youth with an intellectual disability. *Disability And Health Journal, 4*(1), 46-51.

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.

Browne, L. P., Garst, B. A., & Bialeschki, M. D. (2011). Engaging youth in environmental sustainability: Impact of the camp 2 grow program. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 29*(3), 70-85.

Cooper, H. (2010). *Research synthesis and meta-analysis: A step-by-step approach (4th ed.)* (Vol. 2). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Durlak, J. A., Taylor, R. D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M. K., DuPre, E. P., Celio, C. I., ... Weissberg, R. P. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(3/4), 269.

Garst, B., Nichols, A., Martz, J., NcNeely, N. N., Bovitz, L., Frebertshauser, D., . . . Walahoski, J. (2011). Examining youth camping outcomes across multiple states: The national 4-h camping research consortium (ncrc). *Journal of Youth Development, 6*(1). doi: 110601FA001

Heim, S., Stang, J., & Ireland, M. (2009). A garden pilot project enhances fruit and vegetable consumption among children. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 109*(7), 1220-1226. doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2009.04.009

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.

Hickerson, B., & Henderson, K. (2010). Children's summer camp-based physical activity. *Camping Magazine, 83*(3), 20-23.

Larson, L. R., Castleberry, S. B., & Green, G. T. (2010). Effects of an environmental education program on the environmental orientations of children from different gender, age, and ethnic groups. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 28*(3), 95-113.

Louv, R. (2005). *Last child in the woods*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books.

Marsh, P. E. (1999). Does camp enhance self-esteem? *Camping Magazine, 72*(6-), 36,38-40.

Michalski, J. M., Mishna, F., Worthington, C., & Cummings, R. (2003). A multi-method impact evaluation of a therapeutic summer camp program. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 20*(1), 53-76.

Paterson, B. L., Thorne, S. E., Canam, C., & Jillings, C. (2001). Meta0study of qualitative health research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pulgaron, E. R., Salamon, K. S., Patterson, C. A., & Barakat, L. P. (2010). A problem-solving intervention for children with persistent asthma: A pilot of a randomized trial at a pediatric summer camp. *Journal of Asthma, 47*(9), 1031-1039. doi: 10.1080/02770903.2010.514633

Roark, M. F., Ellis, G. D., Wells, M. S., & Gillard, A. (2010). Measuring relationships between camp staff and camper developmental outcomes: An application of self-determination theory. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 28*(3), 79-94.

Saxon, J. A., Treffinger, D. J., Young, G. C., & Wittig, C. V. (2003). Camp invention: A creative, inquiry-based summer enrichment program for elementary students. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 37*(1), 64-74.

Sloan McCombs, J., Augustine, C. H., Schwartz, H. L., Bodilly, S. J., McInnis, B., Lichter, D. S., . . . Education, R. (2011). Making summer count: How summer programs can boost children's learning. Monograph: RAND Corporation.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR OF CAMP STAFF: THE EFFECT OF JOB DIAGNOSTIC DIMENSIONS

Author: Margaret Braun. Contact: Maggie Braun, Camp WeHaKee, 715 28th Street South, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601. maggie@wehakeecampforgirls.com

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) encompasses behaviors that go above and beyond what is expected in a particular job description (Krishnan & Arora, 2008). OCB is defined as helping behavior or altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue, and conscientiousness (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Employers wanting employees to exhibit OCB need to consider the effect of core job characteristics on OCB. Oldham, Hackman, and Pearce (1976) defined core job characteristics to include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from job, feedback from others, and dealing with others. Oldham et al. (1976) determined when job characteristics are present, employees perform well. He specifically noted high internal work motivation, quality work performance, and satisfaction with work as well as low absenteeism and turnover. Chen and Chiu (2009) found employees display OCB if their jobs included motivating characteristics, including the ability to complete a task and to feel the importance of their job related to organizational success.

Limited studies explore behaviors of camp staff. Studies of mindfulness of camp staff determined when staff members are alert and aware to their own feelings and emotional states, they are better equipped to self-regulate, potentially enhancing the participants' experience (Gillard, Roark, Nyaga, & Bialeschki, 2011). Research also indicates camp staff demonstrate high levels of autonomy support, defined as providing choice and clear explanations, while displaying less controlling behaviors (Roark, Ellis, Wells, & Gillard, 2010).

Specifically, OCB and job diagnostic dimensions have not been explored in camp staff. Camp work often requires staff to go beyond their job duties to ensure a positive experience for participants. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of job diagnostic dimensions on OCB in camp settings. It was hypothesized that job dimensions have a significant influence on OCB of camp staff. Resident camp staff and camp directors across the United States were of particular interest in this study, specifically employees of camps that have a minimum length of stay of five days and four nights, with campers and staff residing overnight.

Methods

Camp directors from a random sample of 350 residential camps provided by the American Camp Association were contacted by email and invited to participate in the study. A total of 23 camp directors responded, agreeing to invite their camp staff to participate in the study. Camp directors were provided a letter of invitation to use when contacting their staff members by email, including a link to an on-line questionnaire. Staff members were assured their responses would be confidential and not known by the camp director. Reminders were sent out twice to camp directors. All participants completed the questionnaire between July 31 and September 30, 2011.

The online instrument included 23 items of the OCB scale comprising the five dimensions of altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue

(Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Another section included 22 items of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) covering skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from job, feedback from others, and dealing with others (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). Respondents were also asked to identify which camp they were employed at using a drop down menu.

Data Analysis

Camps with at least five staff respondents were included in the analysis. There were 102 staff member participants from 13 camps. Reliability analysis was performed on the OCB factors. Given low reliability estimates in the original instrument, exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted with three factors emerging: courtesy, altruism, and sportsmanship. Reliability analysis of these factors indicated acceptable reliability for courtesy ($r = 0.86$), altruism ($r = 0.88$) and sportsmanship ($r = 0.67$). One way ANOVA tests were performed to determine if there was a group level effect on organizational citizenship behaviors and job diagnostic factors. ANOVA results revealed significant differences emerged across camps in the following factors: sportsmanship ($F = 3.30$; $p < .001$), feedback from job ($F = 5.42$; $p < .05$), and feedback from others ($F = 4.57$; $p < .001$) had a significant group level effect.

Reliability analyses for the job diagnostic survey (JDS) showed acceptable reliability in feedback from the job ($r = 0.65$), feedback from others ($r = 0.78$), and dealing with others ($r = 0.62$). Results revealed low reliability for four JDS dimensions: skill variety, task identity, task significance and autonomy and were not included in subsequent analysis. The effect of JDS dimensions on sportsmanship of camp staff was tested with hierarchal linear modeling (HLM) due to the significant group level effect. Linear regression was used to test the effect of JDS dimensions of feedback from job, feedback from others, and dealing with others on courtesy and altruism.

Results

The study demonstrated the effect of job diagnostic dimensions on OCB of camp staff. The job diagnostic dimension of feedback from others was a significant predictor of courtesy ($t = 2.73$, $p < .01$). Feedback from others and dealing with others were significant predictors of altruism in camp staff ($t = 2.91$, $p < .01$ and $t = 3.06$, $p < .01$, respectively). Twelve percent of the variance in courtesy ($R^2 = 0.12$) and 17% of the variance in altruism ($R^2 = 0.17$) is explained by the JDS dimensions. Feedback from others was a significant predictor of sportsmanship in camp staff ($b = 2.32$, t-ratio 2.32, $p < .05$). Dealing with others was also a significant predictor of sportsmanship in camp staff ($b = 2.84$, t-ratio 2.84, $p < .01$). Camp staff sportsmanship is affected by the group level influence of being a part of the camp staff and camp experience. Hierarchical linear regression revealed a total of 21% of the variance in sportsmanship was explained by camp membership and 5% by the job diagnostic dimensions.

Benefits and Camp Implications

My study shows the effect of job diagnostic dimensions of feedback from others, dealing with others, and feedback from the job on the organizational citizenship behaviors of courtesy, altruism, and sportsmanship. Sportsmanship was found to have a significant group level effect, indicating staff members are affected by their camp setting and co-workers. In general, low sportsmanship among employees can cause difficulties within a work group's camaraderie and connectedness (Podsakoff et al., 1997). Results

convey the importance of feedback from others and dealing with others, which promote behaviors beyond the basic work expectations for camp staff. Supervisors who create and use regular feedback with employees increase their organizational citizenship behavior (Peng & Chiu, 2010). Feedback from others was determined to be a significant predictor of courtesy in camp staff. These results mirror conclusions from Gillard, Roark, Nyaga, and Bialeschki (2011) claiming staff members are better able to manage their personal reactions and emotions when they are aware of their own feelings. Feedback from others could facilitate staff having the opportunity to express their feelings and receive helpful information on job duties and camp responsibilities. This provides an approach for camp directors to consider in improving the staff culture at their camp. Providing opportunities for feedback from others and support for dealing with others may be the most helpful leadership strategy for camp directors and staff.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. One potential limitation could be bias related to directors who participated who may have believed their staff have strong work behaviors. This limitation could not be controlled as it was necessary to obtain access to camp staff through the agreement of the directors. Another limitation was that 23 camps agreed to participate, but only 13 camps were included in this analysis because a minimum of five responses were required from a camp to be included.

THE EFFECTS OF COGNITIVE STYLE ON CAMP COUNSELOR TEAM FUNCTIONALITY

Author: Sarah Bush. Contact: Sarah Bush, University of Florida, P.O. Box 110540, Gainesville, FL 32611, sarah.bush17@gmail.com

Camp counselors must collaborate with their co-counselors to control conflict and adversity, which may occur on a day-to-day basis, within their cabin group. Therefore, co-counselors must be able to work effectively together to provide guidance and leadership to their cabin group (Aycock, 2010). If counselors are not on the same page, campers quickly figure out where the "weak link" occurs and may use this to their advantage (Aycock, 2010). Co-counselors must keep open communication and work in a collaborative effort to solve issues. However, the intimacy of camp life, which involves working/living together day in and out, may lead to staff conflicts (Koch & Jordan, 1993). These conflicts may affect all members of the camping community, especially the campers (Koch & Jordan, 1993). Koch and Jordan (1993) expressed the need to research common causes of inter-staff conflicts and skills for solving these problems. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of cognitive style on a group of co-counselor's team functionality.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks for the study were Kirton's Adaption-Innovation (KAI) Theory and Lencioni's (2002) Five Dysfunctions of a Team Model (FDTM). KAI Theory describes cognitive style (Kirton, 2003). According to Kirton (2003), individuals have different preferred styles to manage change. The KAI Inventory places individuals on a continuum from highly adaptive to highly innovative based on their preferred style (Kirton, 1999).

Adaptors prefer more structure and tend to formulate ideas, which fall within the current paradigm (Kirton, 2003). Innovators prefer less structure and provide a wide range of ideas, which typically threaten or replace the current paradigm and may present a great deal of risk (Kirton, 2003). An individual's preference for structure does not imply lesser or greater capacity (Kirton, 2003). An individual who falls between an adaptor and an innovator on the KAI continuum and acts to link the gap between cognitive styles is termed a bridger (Kirton, 2003). Bridgers' willingness and ability to reduce the gap between cognitive styles of other members has an impact on their personal stress and the overall functionality of the team (Kirton, 2003). Differences in preferred cognitive style may cause problems within teams (Kirton, 2003). Kirton (2003) argued that understanding how different individuals operate and being aware of each other's differences aids teams by getting the best out of every member according to the nature of the problem.

Lencioni's (2002) FDTM identifies dysfunctions that may cause team dissonance, including absence of trust, fear of conflict, lack of commitment, avoidance of accountability, and inattention to results. The first dysfunction, absence of trust, is described as a lack of confidence in one's peers' intentions (Lencioni, 2002). When a team trusts all group members they can overcome the fear of conflict (Lencioni, 2002). Lencioni (2002) described ideological conflict as healthy debate over concepts and ideas.

Kahn (1990) found camp counselors who trust others in the work environment are more like to partake in open interactions. In order to overcome lack of commitment, the third dysfunction, team members must be able to fully support decisions and understand their role in a productive team (Lencioni, 2002). The fourth dysfunction, avoidance of accountability, occurs when team members are not willing to approach peers about performance or behaviors that could be harmful to the team (Lencioni, 2002). Inattention to results, the fifth dysfunction, occurs when team members focus their attention on "something other than the collective goals of the group" (Lencioni, 2002, p. 216). Wilderness trip leaders identified preferences for a co-leader's ability and willingness to form trusting relationships, the co-leader's ability to handle personal conflict, the co-leader's desire to take care of people, and the co-leader placing importance on the overall well-being of the community (Rilling & Jordan, 2007). These preferences are related to Lencioni's (2002) dysfunctions. According to Lencioni (2002), the ability for a group to overcome these five dysfunctions will lead to increased efficiency and less tension.

Methods and Analysis

This study utilized a non-experimental causal comparison survey design. The participants were selected using a stratified purposive sample from all female counselors hired to work at a single coed residential summer camp in the summer of 2012. Six female cabins with three counselors each participated in the study. Only female data was utilized due to a lack of complete data from males and consistency of cabin groups. The instruments used were a demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher using Dillman's Tailored Design Methods and two previously established instruments, KAI Inventory and a Team Assessment Tool (Lencioni, 2002). The KAI Inventory is a 32 question measurement tool, which asks respondents a variety of questions regarding their personal preferences for problem solving. The instrument is designed as a Likert-type scale with Very Hard, Hard, Easy, and Very Easy being listed as markers on a continuum. The Team Assessment Tool is a 15 statement instrument. Participants were asked to indicate how the statement applied to her team on a Likert-type scale ranging from three to one (3=Usually, 2=Sometimes, 1=Rarely). A direct-administered process was utilized for data collection. The data was analyzed using a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Results and Conclusions

The results indicated the individual whose score fell in the middle on the KAI continuum tended to have the highest amount of discomfort and reported lower perceptions of team functionality compared to other team members. Individuals with the highest KAI score on their team had a mean overall team functionality score of 6.85 out of 9 with a standard deviation of .417. The mean score of individuals with the lowest KAI score on their team was 6.44 with a standard deviation of .574. The mean score of individuals with the middle KAI score on their team was 6.32 with a standard deviation of .372. The middle scorers had the lowest perceptions of team functionality for each individual dysfunction with the exception of fear of conflict. In addition, one way analysis of variance tests found significant differences dysfunction 1 ($F=3.771$, $p<.05$), dysfunction 3 ($F=21.425$, $p<.05$), dysfunction 4 ($F=3.645$, $p<.05$), dysfunction 5 ($F=3.157$, $p<.05$), and overall dysfunction ($F=9.752$, $p<.05$) and the cognitive gap of each team.

Overall, the results supported the impact cognitive style may have on an individual's perceptions of team functionality. Kirton (2003) indicated that team functionality can be increased by using bridging techniques. A bridger who is willing and understands her/his role as a bridger may also be helpful to the team. The results indicated that bridgers in this study did not manage stress properly or understand their role as a bridger. An ideal team would be aware of and utilize the cognitive style differences between team members. In these teams, members take turns leading the group to produce the most efficient results according to the problem.

Camp Applications

Specific training should be developed to aid camp counselors in learning how to collaborate more effectively and manage team diversity. This training material should incorporate both an understanding of one's cognitive style and the various diversities among the group. An incorporation of Lencioni's (2002) Dysfunctions Team Model would further camp counselors' understanding of the types of issues contributing to a lack of harmony and team functionality among his or her cabin group.

It is also recommended that co-counselors partake in evaluations. These evaluations should include self-evaluations, an evaluation from the team's leadership personnel, and a collaborative team evaluation. These evaluations would allow teams to identify personal strengths of individual members, team strengths, and areas for improvement. By finding the most pertinent source of dysfunction, teams will be able to increase their overall functionality. For example, if a team is lacking trust, which could be based on feelings of incompetency of other members due to differences in cognitive style preference, the other dysfunctions are more than likely present, as well. Teams, who do not trust each other, do not feel comfortable partaking in positive conflict (Lencioni, 2002). By establishing the first and foremost dysfunction present and working to overcome that dysfunction, a team would be able to work towards higher levels of team functionality.

Training and evaluation would aid in developing teamwork skills, which are transferable to counselors' future professions (Brandt & Arnold, 2006). Further research should be conducted to validate and replicate the findings on a larger scale, as well as examine the counselors' explanations for their team functionality more in depth.

References

Aycock, K. (2010). Big deal or no big deal: A framework for co-counselors. *Camping Magazine, 83*(3), 72-77.

Brandt, J. & Arnold, M. E. (2006). Looking back, the impact of the 4-H camp counselor experience on youth development: A survey of counselor alumni. *Journal of Extension, 44*(6). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2006december/rb1.php

Jablokow, K. W., & Booth, D. E. (2006). The impact and management of cognitive gap in high performance product development organizations. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 23,* 313-336.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *The Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724.

Kirton, M. J. (1999). *Kirton adaption-innovation inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Suffolk, UK: Occupational Research Centre.

Kirton, M. J. (2003). *Adaption-innovation: In the context of diversity and change*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Koch, S. J., & Jordan, D. J. (1993). We can work it out: Resolving staff conflicts. *Camping Magazine, 65*(6), 21-25.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rilling, C., & Jordan, D. (2007). Important co-leader skills and traits on extended outdoor trips as perceived by leaders. *Leisure Studies, 26*(2), 193-212. doi:10.1080/02614360500337524

EXPLORING 4-H CAMP COUNSELING AS A CONTEXT FOR DEVELOPING RESPONSIBILITY

Authors: Theresa M. Ferrari & Leslie Risch, The Ohio State University. Contact: Theresa Ferrari, Ohio State University, 2201 Fred Taylor Dr., Columbus, OH 43210. ferrari.8@osu.edu

Camp programs have offered developmental opportunities for youth for over 150 years and camping is one of the tried-and-true delivery methods for achieving youth development outcomes in the 4-H program. Adult leaders entrust teen camp counselors with many responsibilities; it is likely the most responsible role these teens have the opportunity to undertake as a 4-H member. Previous research has documented that camp counseling provides a positive developmental context (e.g., Garst, Browne, & Bialeschki, 2011; Johnson, Goldman, Garvey, Britner, & Weaver, 2010), and studies about teen 4-H camp counselors have recognized that they developed leadership, responsibility, and other life skills (Digby & Ferrari, 2007; Ferrari & McNeely, 2007; Garst & Johnson, 2005). Data collected through the 4-H Camp Counselor Work-Based Learning project in our state recently identified that teens were clearly becoming more responsible through their role as a camp counselor. However, the process by which they developed responsibility remained unclear. Camps involve a considerable degree of risk, and therefore a high quality camping program depends on having responsible young people who are caring for campers. Thus, the process by which teens become responsible is important to those who work with teens at camps as well as more broadly within the context of youth organizations.

Theoretical Foundations

Based on their program of qualitative research, Larson and his colleagues (Larson et al., 2004) have proposed a theory regarding the developmental processes experienced through participation in youth programs. Building on the recognition that responsibility is a common developmental outcome in such programs, Wood, Larson, and Brown (2009) identified a three-step process by which adolescents are active producers of their own development. They proposed that youth come to see themselves as responsible by experiencing ownership for their actions, while making choices about the various demands within the structure of a youth program that clearly defines expectations (Wood et al., 2009). Programs that supported responsibility development had *youth ownership,* where leaders structure the program so that youth were able to experience some form of control and consequently feel some sort of ownership; *a priori structure* where the program structure, rules, and deadlines are known ahead time, are often planned with or by adults, and need to be followed; and *high expectations and accountability* where expectations are clear and possibly linked to consequences (Wood et al., 2009). It was the adult leaders in these programs who played an important active role in creating these conditions that facilitated the development of responsibility. This study made use of Wood et al.'s (2009) grounded theory by considering the unique setting of camp as a context for understanding the process of developing responsibility and the role of adults in this process.

Methods

The purpose of this study was to gain a greater understanding about the process of responsibility development through participation in the 4-H camp counseling program. The objectives were to (a) determine what contributes to teens becoming more responsible through their role as 4-H camp counselors, and (b) understand the role of adults in the development of responsibility in 4-H camp counselors. A non-experimental design incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods was used. Five data sets were collected, which reflected three different perspectives (teens, observer, and adult leaders). A questionnaire provided both qualitative and quantitative data from 247 teens. Observations were conducted at training meetings and during two days of the camp session of one county 4-H camp. Twenty-two teens from this county were interviewed after the camp session to gain further insight. Finally, 14 4-H professionals completed an e-mailed questionnaire. The results reported here are from the qualitative data.

Transcripts from interviews and open-ended survey responses were analyzed using open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Initially, each data set was analyzed individually. We reviewed transcripts line by line, reaching consensus on coding the data. These data were supplemented with descriptions obtained from observation field notes. Next, we coded data into categories and synthesized across data sets for themes that illustrated types of tasks and responsibilities, types of support provided, and conditions that fostered responsibility development. We used tables to organize the display of data and direct quotes to illustrate concepts and themes. Throughout the process, we took steps to ensure trustworthiness as recommended by qualitative researchers (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008).

Results

The findings documented that teens clearly knew what it meant to be responsible and they recognized both positive and negative consequences that may result from how they perform their role. A number of conditions were identified that contributed to the process of developing responsibility, including the setting where it occurred, the interactions of the people involved, and the nature of the roles to be performed. Teens described a very complex and multifaceted role involving many challenging tasks. The residential nature of the camp setting heightened the responsibility. Not only were teens responsible *for themselves*, they were responsible *to others* (both adult leaders and their peers), *with* others (as team members with other counselors), and *for others* (the campers under their care). Despite knowledge of what constitutes responsible behavior, there were instances where teens did not act as responsibly as they could have. In general these behaviors involved a lack of preparation, lack of focus, or poor judgment. Examples were not having enough supplies available at the time of an activity, counselors interacting with other counselors rather than engaging with campers, counselors demonstrating a lack of initiative in leading games with campers, and counselors disregarding a camp rule. These behaviors were the exception rather than the rule.

Additionally, adult leaders played an integral role in facilitating the process of developing responsibility in teens as they intentionally structured the camp training and planning that preceded the camp session. They provided emotional and instrumental support while balancing the conflicting needs of control and youth ownership. Consistent with Wood et al.'s (2009) program characteristics, there was evidence of youth ownership, a priori structure, and high expectations and accountability in the 4-H camp

counseling program. Both by their self-report and through what we observed, the adult leaders provided opportunities to learn and practice skills and provided feedback on counselors' performance throughout the process.

Conceptual models were developed to represent the process from the viewpoint of teens and from the adult leaders. Teens were building on a base of responsibility gained from experiences at home, at school, and within youth organizations. As camp counselors, they learned through observing others, making mistakes and learning from them, and having a responsibility and carrying it out. To prepare for teens for the camp counseling role, the adult leaders shared expectations and structured a series of opportunities for teens to learn content and to practice skills and receive feedback on their performance, being given greater responsibility as their performance and the situation warranted. In the camp setting, the adult leaders provided real-time feedback and later engaged the teens in reflection in order for them to learn from their experiences.

Conclusions

Teen camp counselors understand both the positive and negative consequences of acting responsibly. However, this understanding does not always translate into action. It was reiterated by many that the way to develop responsibility was to be given responsibility, that is, to learn by doing. Although overall teens acted responsibly, there were instances of less-responsible behavior. Adults can better facilitate the development of responsibility if they understand the process as it develops in teens and their role in it. Initially, counselors in our state have been selected through a screening process, which ensures some level of responsible behavior. As well, the training and planning period prior to camp may serve as a key precursor to the development of responsibility, allowing for practice and feedback. Adult leaders must balance program control and youth ownership. Ultimately, the real test of responsible behavior is when the teens must perform their role in the camp setting. This research documented camp counseling as one context in which youth can become responsible leaders, one that can serve as a model for other youth organizations.

References

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing your qualitative dissertation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Digby, J. K., & Ferrari, T. M. (2007). Camp counseling and the development and transfer of workforce skills: The perspective of Ohio 4-H camp counselor alumni. *Journal of Youth Development, 2*(2), Article 0702FA007. Retrieved from the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents Web site: http://data.memberclicks.com/site/nae4a/JYD_070202final.pdf

Ferrari, T. M., & McNeely, N. N. (2007). Positive youth development: What's camp counseling got to do with it? Findings from a study of Ohio 4-H camp counselors. *Journal of Extension*, *45*(2), Article 2RIB7. Retrieved from: http://www.joe.org/joe/2007april/rb7.php

Garst, B. A., Browne, L. P., & Bialeschki, M. D. (2011). Youth development and the camp experience. *New Directions for Youth Development, 130,* 73-87.

Garst, B., & Johnson, J. (2005). Adolescent leadership skill development through residential 4-H camp counseling. *Journal of Extension*, *43*(5), Article 5RIB5. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2005october/rb5.shtml

Johnson, S. K., Goldman, J. A., Garvey, A. I., Britner, P. A., & Weaver, S. E. (2010). Emerging adults' identity exploration: Illustrations from inside the "camp bubble." *Journal of Adolescent Research, 26*(2), 258-295.

Larson, R., Jarrett, R., Hansen, D., Pearce, N., Sullivan, P., Walker, K., Watkins, N., & Wood, D. (2004). Organized youth activities as contexts for positive development. In P. A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice* (pp. 540-560). New York: Wiley.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wood, D., Larson, R. W., & Brown, J. R. (2009). How adolescents come to see themselves as more responsible through participation in youth programs. *Child Development, 80*(1), 295-309.

EXPLORING OUTCOMES AT A CAMP DESIGNED FOR MILITARY-DEPENDENT YOUTH WITH AND WITHOUT DISABILITIES

Authors: Chris Harrist and Boyd Hegarty, University of New Hampshire. Contact: Chris Harrist, University of New Hampshire, 4 Library Way, 191 Hewitt Hall, Durham, NH 03824. chris.harrist@unh.edu

Military parents living in civilian communities often become mobilized, forcing their children to suddenly become "military kids." Although these children appear the same to friends and teachers, their life has dramatically shifted (Chandra, et al., 2010). News coverage can cause daily anxiety and their usual support systems are no longer available. These military children need a resource that connects them with others in their same situation. Research has shown that camps are not only healthy for children's physical wellbeing but enable individuals to build a better sense of self, catering to their emotional and social wellbeing (Henderson, Whitaker, et al., 2007; Thurber, et al., 2007). Through interactions with others, youth can better understand themselves, become more self-reliant, learn respect, and build confidence in their own abilities (McRoberts, 1998). Increasing these skills is beneficial in developing resiliency among military youth and benefits them far beyond the few days spent at camp, in many cases lasting lifetimes.

Camps provide caring environments where instructors are there as role models and listeners. These settings may be particularly important for youth in military families. The extra attention that these military youth receive makes them feel included, supported, and welcome. Between the programs, instructors, and other campers, youth gain leadership and communication skills, a feeling of resourcefulness and responsibility, and learn trustworthiness and citizenship (ACA, 2007).

The purpose of this study is to explore the outcomes experienced by youth at a camp specifically designed for military-dependent children. While maintaining an intentionally atheoretical approach, this study did include elements of Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, et al., 2000). More specifically, we were interested in what the campers learned about themselves through participating in a winter adventure camp. These learning outcomes could be internal (e.g., self-efficacy) or external (e.g., activity-based).

Methods

Seventy-two military teens, ages fourteen to eighteen, attended the Military Teen Winter Adventure Camps and took part in this study. Some youth participants possessed cognitive and/or physical disabilities that required special accommodations for participation in this study. To provide full participation in focus groups, youth caretakers and/or parents were present during data collection to aid in understanding the meanings of research questions and provide any interpretation necessary. There were two camp sessions held for campers with disabilities and three sessions held for those without. This study employed a phenomenological approach to discover the self-reported outcomes of camp participation (van Manen, 1990). Give that this camp experience was a social activity, focus groups were used to collect data as they provided a socially-oriented and non-threatening environment where group dynamics could be used to elicit responses (Kreuger 1988; Taylor & Bodgan, 1998). Data analysis consisted of microscopic, open,

and axial coding (Henderson, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process generated conceptual domains of camper responses and allowed the researchers to discover relationships among domains to identify common themes.

Results

One of the first and most powerful themes to emerge was that of **authenticity**. As numerous campers remarked, "I can be myself here." For those campers without disabilities, this meant they were around peers who knew what it was like to live in a military household. As *John* stated, "when I first moved to this new school, kids would always ask me, 'How many people has your dad killed?' But when I came here everyone kinda knew what each other goes through and it's easier to make friends cuz you can be yourself." *Carrie*, a camper with a mild cognitive disability, had a little different take, as did many of her peers. She stated that "here [at camp] the counselors have worked with kids like us [with disabilities] before which is cool because it allows us to be ourselves. We can't get away with saying, 'I can't do this or I can't do that.' And I think that's cool because they're not overprotective like our parents are sometimes and we can really be who we are."

A second major theme that was evident in all camp sessions was that of **discovery**. For many campers, this was their first trip to the northeast and, for a few, their first time seeing snow. Campers from all sessions had the opportunity to engage in many activities for the first time (e.g., dog sledding, ice skating). *Cindy* noted that, "I never thought I could learn how to ski cuz where I'm from doesn't have snow. I learned a lot about myself today. This gives me the confidence to, you know, try new things when I get back home." *Spencer*, a camper with a physical disability, said he "never thought someone in a wheelchair could go hiking or [ice] skating but they found a way for us to do it. Who knows what I can do now. It's opened a whole new door for me."

The last major finding to emerge from the data was the ability of those at the camp to **network**. *Charles* really felt that he made good friends during the camp, "I already have all these guys' and gals' Facebook." Building on *Charles'* comment, *Christie* added, "Now when we have a rough day or we think nobody at our school understands, we can Facebook each other and know someone understands, someone knows." Other campers, who were from the northeast, felt they were able to find people who could help them engage in new recreation activities. As *Amanda* commented, "I never knew there were people who specialize in helping people like me [with disabilities] ski, or skate, or dog sled. Now I know I can call them and they can help me get out there."

Discussion

These findings add to the growing body of knowledge related to military-dependent children and examine one of the first camps for military-dependent children with disabilities. Given the important social outcomes expressed by camp participants, camp personnel can intentionally program for these elements in future camps. In addition, many of the findings exhibit characteristics specific to military-dependent children. With a large majority of our military personnel returning from their service overseas, these camps provide a vitally important context to aid in the positive development of youth.

References

Chandra, A., Lara-Cinisomo, S., Jaycox, L.H., Tanielian, T., Burns, R.M., Ruder, T., & Han, B. (2010) Children on the homefront: The experience of children from military families. *Pediatrics, 125*(1), 16-25. doi:10.1542/peds2009-1180

Henderson, K.A. (2006). *Dimensions of choice: Qualitative approaches to parks, recreation, tourism, sport, and leisure research* (2nd edition.). State College, PA: Venture.

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.

Kolb, D.A., Boyatzis, R.E., & Mainemelis, C. (2000). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. In R.J. Sternberg & L. Zhang (Eds.), *Perspectives of Thinking, Learning, and Cognitive Styles* (pp. 193-210). New York: Routledge.

Kreuger, R. (1988). *Focus groups*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McRoberts, K. (1998). *The self-esteem benefits of summer camp on kids are well documented*. Retrieved from Los Altos Town Crier online Journal: http://www.latc.com/1998/04/06/schools/schools6.html

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1988). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: Wiley.

The American Camp Association (2007). *Benefits of Camp: The camp experience enriches lives and changes the world*. Retrieved October 17, 2007, from the American Camp Association Web site: http://www.acacamps.org/parents/expert/benefitscamp.php

Thurber, C.A., Scanlin, M.M., Scheuler, L., & Henderson, K.A. (2007). Youth development outcomes of the camp experience: Evidence for multidimensional growth. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 36*(3), 241-254.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

THINK OUTSIDE THE 'BLACK BOX': APPLYING IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION TO A STRUCTURED CAMP CURRICULUM

Author: Tracy Mainieri, Clemson University. Contact: Tracy Mainieri, 128 McGinty Court, 276 Lehotsky Hall Clemson, SC 29634. obrien@clemson.edu

As Bialeschki, Henderson, and James (2007) explained, "Camp is not inherently good without purposeful and directed efforts by camp professionals" (p. 770). To this end, several camp scholars have designed structured curricula to engender specific outcomes in organized camps (e.g. Garst & White, 2012; Roark & Evans, 2010). These programs aim to break down the 'black box' of programming by explicitly outlining the mechanisms that connect programs with their outcomes.

Evaluators can further break down the 'black box' of programming by detecting the specific parts of a program that engender specific outcomes in order to detail the 'how' of a program. Pawson and Tilley (1997) offered a useful conceptualization to better understand and document the 'how' of programs called 'realistic evaluation'. Under the premise of realistic evaluation, certain ideas work for certain participants in certain situations. Pawson and Tilley (1997) simplified the program process to the following equation: mechanism + context = outcomes. Given that the first rule of realistic evaluation states that evaluations need to address why and how a program has potential to cause change, this model's applicability to breaking down the 'black box' of programming seems clear.

Implementation evaluation aims to understand how well a program operates when delivered to participants (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). The implementation literature has identified four main dimensions of implementation: fidelity (adherence to curriculum), quality of delivery (facilitators' skills), program adaptation (changes made to the program), and participant responsiveness (enthusiasm and participation) (Berkel, Mauricio, Schoenfelder, & Sandler, 2011). A low percentage of studies address implementation evaluation in any way, let alone all four of these dimensions in one evaluation (Berkel et al., 2011; Durlak & DuPre, 2008).

Study Purpose

The purposes of the current study were 1) to implement an intentional camp program aimed to increase participants' civic engagement and social capital in their home communities and 2) to explore how and at what quality the program was implemented.

Sample

The unit of analysis was a week-long pilot camp program, Teens Leading & Connecting (TLC), that was structured to increase participants' civic engagement in their home communities. The program was implemented twice during the summer 2012 at a day camp in Northeast Georgia, serving a total of 17 teen campers ages 13-16.

Methods

Direct observation and facilitator interviews were employed to assess the four dimensions of implementation. First, the researcher utilized three domains (Supportive

Environment, Interaction, and Engagement) of the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) to observe and assess program activities. The researcher followed the YPQA manual's instructions to calculate weekly scale scores for each of the three domains for each TLC session and for TLC overall. The researcher also used the results of the first week's YPQA scores to inform intentional curriculum adjustments for the second week of TLC. Second, the researcher developed a fidelity checklist to assess how closely the curriculum was followed. The researcher calculated the fidelity percentage for the core program components with an 80% compliance threshold as an indicator of success to align with literature recommendations. Third, the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview with the facilitator after each iteration of the program. The interviews focused on the amount and quality of the program delivery, any adaptations that occurred, and the successes and challenges experienced while facilitating the program.

Findings

Table 1 displays the domain scores for TLC from the YPQA for both weeks as well as the fidelity percentages. The highest possible score for the YPQA is 5. Based on each activity's performance on the YPQA in the first week, intentional changes were made to the TLC curriculum after the first week. These changes to the curriculum resulted in increased scale scores on the YPQA in Week 2. TLC was implemented with a high level of fidelity both weeks. The wording of some of the activities was intentionally modified after the first week to give the facilitator more implementation freedom based on the results of the fidelity checklist, resulting in a slightly lower, yet still acceptable, fidelity percentage in the second week. Interviews with the facilitator offered several themes that help to understand the mechanisms and contexts that helped TLC be successful: the methodical curriculum, modifications to the curriculum, TLC as a process of exposure, camper engagement in TLC, supportive environment, and supportive group dynamics. The TLC curriculum was intentionally structured to guide campers through the process of learning in a way that built on previous learning and exposed them to new ideas and skills. Further, the success of TLC was supported by a non-judgmental, trusting environment within the freedom of the larger camp environment. Finally, despite marked differences in the group dynamics between the two weeks of TLC, both groups were able to complete the curriculum with success because TLC facilitated a team atmosphere.

Table 1.
Results of YPQA and fidelity checklist for the TLC program

| | YPQA | | | Overall TLC Fidelity |
	Supportive Environment	Interaction	Engagement	
TLC Week 1	4.4089	3.297	3.2431	87.153%
TLC Week 2	4.5506	3.9913	3.65	84.404%

Discussion

In order to unpack the 'black box' of camp programming, camp professionals must continue to consider intentional programming and structured curricula as viable options within the camp context; further, camp researchers must devote energy to

evaluating how and at what quality such curricula are implemented. The purposes of the current study aligned with both of these needs. The findings suggest that TLC was implemented at above-average quality and with a high level of fidelity. More importantly, the findings suggest that a variety of mechanisms and contexts supported TLC's success. Understanding these mechanisms and contexts helps to inform the implementation of TLC, and similar programs, in new camp environments. Further, the results of this study, particularly the changes between weeks in the YPQA and fidelity scores, demonstrate that implementation evaluation techniques are not just valuable for evaluation results. Indeed, as they were used in this study, such techniques can directly inform and enhance program delivery in a highly intentional manner.

(References upon request)

SAFE CAMP ENVIRONMENTS BUILD SELF-EFFICACY, GOAL SETTING, AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

Author: Kimberly Maravilla. Contact: Kimberly Maravilla, Guided Discoveries, Inc., P.O. Box 1360, Claremont, CA 91711. kmaravil@gmail.com

Research has demonstrated camp programs can provide a setting for personal growth and development (ACA, 2005; Garst *et al*., 2011). In addition to increasing campers' self-esteem, independence, leadership, adventurous attitudes, and willingness to try new things (ACA, 2005, p. 2), camps can develop environmental ethics and self-efficacy.

My research explored if returning to the same summer camp each year affected returning campers' (identified as those who attended camp for at least two summers) self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics. The results of this study provide information applicable to camp directors, environmental/outdoor educators, and parents as it concerns personal development and environmental stewardship.

Theoretical Framework

The impetus of this research, subsequently shaping my theoretical framework and methods of inquiry, stemmed from personal experience and observation as an employee of Guided Discoveries. The research used tenets of post-positivist and constructivist epistemologies that both validated my background and experiences gained through employment at this camp. Additionally, because each returning camper brought his/her own multi-faceted views of their experiences to this research, it was appropriate to utilize components of these two epistemologies as they did not strive to make generalizations regarding their summers at camp.

While post-positivism often employs a scientific method of inquiry (quantitative surveys), it acknowledges that no data collection is ever flawless as no singular truth exists. A constructivist approach placed the research within the participants' subjective views and experiences, allowing them to guide and shape the research process (Creswell, 2003) while granting me the ability to search for nuances in their statements. Combining these epistemologies allowed my research to explore how and if returning to Sea Camp affected returning campers' self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Methods

A mixed method approach used quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry via closed and open ended questions (survey and interviews, respectively) (Creswell, 2003). Purposive sampling targeted returning campers; first year campers were excluded. One hundred eighty campers fitting the research criteria were identified using Guided Discoveries' database and File Maker Pro® software. In March 2011, the following literature was sent from the camp's main office to potential participants: a signed approval letter from the camp's executive directors, a signed explanation of my research, consent/assent forms, survey, and a self-addressed return envelope. Out of 180 potential participants, 112 had attended camp for at least two summers.[1] With N=112, 27 campers

---

[1] Initially, my research identified 113 potential candidates and analyzed 28 surveys. After the surveys were analyzed, it was found one camper was ineligible for participation. Since the survey was anonymous, I was

(24.1% response rate) returned the consent and assent forms, making them eligible for participation.

The written survey invited participants to rate the degree they believed they were capable of doing different tasks (0 = Cannot do at all; 10 = Highly certain can do) relating to the interests of this study. The survey was based on self-efficacy scales developed by Bandura (1997; 2006) and Schwarzer and Jerusalem (2009). Participants were also provided space to write about their experiences at camp. The data gleaned from the survey helped craft semi-structured interview questions.

Twenty of the 27 eligible participants were randomly selected for individual interviews conducted during each of the 2011 camp sessions. Each camper was interviewed once with interviews lasting 25 minutes to approximately two hours. Interviewed campers were asked questions regarding their camp experiences, goal setting abilities, and their views on the environment. To protect confidentiality, those interviewed chose (or were given) pseudonyms.

Analysis Procedures

ANOVA and t-tests were used to analyze the quantitative data garnered from the surveys using the Statistical Package for the Social Science program (SPSS). ANOVA compared mean responses to each of the 26 survey variables and years of camp attendance. T-tests compared two categories (e.g., third year summer campers with fourth year summer campers; males and females) to each of the 26 variables. The survey analysis objective was to understand whether any relationships existed between the categories and variables, not as conclusive evidence of how or if camp has affected returning campers or whether returning to camp for X number of years was *the* most beneficial.

Grounded theory was used throughout the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis processes, reflecting "focused" data collection and analysis (Charmaz, 2002, p. 676). Qualitative data generated from the open response portion of the survey and the twenty transcribed interviews was analyzed using open and focused coding procedures and subsequent memo writing (Charmaz, 2002). The analysis procedures generated theories of how or if returning to Sea Camp each summer affected returning campers with regard to self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics.

Results and Conclusions

This research explored how and if returning to Sea Camp for multiple summers affected returning campers' self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics. While the ANOVA did not yield significant relationships between variables and years of camp attendance, the t-test results indicated a relationship between second and third year campers and between the sexes ($p \leq .05$) (Table 1).

Table 1. Survey questions yielding t-test *p* values ≤ .05. All four survey questions listed below produced $p \leq .05$ between second and third year campers. The last survey question listed in the table also procured $p \leq .05$ between male and female campers*.

Survey Question	*p* value
Since I started coming to Sea Camp, I can explain to my family and friends	0.001

---

unable to exclude this camper's survey. The interview participants reflect the change to 112 potential candidates.

why we need to use our natural resources wisely.	
Since I started coming to Sea Camp, I can understand the importance to take action in local environmental issues.	0.033
In general, I can complete tasks by myself.	0.021
In the future I can learn from experiences at camp to help make new goals.	0.016; 0.017*

A major qualitative finding in this study indicated nearly every interviewed camper felt safe at Sea Camp. While safety held a variety of meanings to campers, it encompassed the idea of mental and physical security. Eighteen of the twenty (90%) interviewed campers gave statements about having positive moods and feelings while at camp. Their statements identified a safe place as one where you are free to be yourself, find yourself, come out of your shell, and become outgoing. Many of these campers attributed these feelings of safety into their willingness to try and master new activities, test their limits, progress into higher level classes, and meet their goals. For example, twelve campers indicated they met more goals at camp. The results suggested the other sources of self-efficacy (e.g., mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion) may be built around the premise of creating a safe space countering the belief commonly found in the literature that mastery experiences are *the* builder of self-efficacy.

Though the data cannot conclusively assert that feeling safe at camp equates to the development of an environmental ethic, it suggests that feeling safe may encourage campers to engage in outdoor activities. All twenty interviewed participants stated they had positive experiences with nature. Out of the sixteen interviewed campers who made statements about having positive environmental attitudes and beliefs, fourteen provided statements of engaging in pro-environmental behaviors (e.g., increased recycling, water conservation). As other research suggests, positive experiences in nature, especially at a young age, plays a role in the development of environmental ethics.

While research indicates returning campers usually feel safe and supported (ACA, 2006), it is important to understand *how* these feelings of safety and support are manifested in returning campers' self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics. Telling campers, for example, they can accomplish something is important. However, continuing to provide them with a safe, positive environment is paramount and its effects are far reaching. These results suggest camp can provide a safe space where campers may feel comfortable enough to develop and/or expand upon their self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics.

Camp Applications

The applications of this research are relevant for camps and organizations that offer youth and adolescent programs, especially those with high return rates. These organizations can promote self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics in a variety of ways.

While safety is an obvious priority for any institution that works with youth, it is clear that providing a safe environment from day one is crucial and must be the first thing campers see. For example, introduce the staff as a fun, outgoing group by having them dress in costumes and cheer to welcome each camper. This act encourages and promotes self-expression while creating a fun environment, which reminds returning campers why camp is special. Additionally, campers and staff members are crucial components for

making the camp experience fun, exciting, and safe. As this research and previous research indicated, campers follow the examples and actions of their (older) peers more than staff. Camps and organizations should give these individuals leadership roles and encourage them to interact with younger campers.

Creating a safe environment does not mean camps should stop challenging its campers. On the contrary, camps should offer challenging outdoor, experiential activities with a focused goal as it can accomplish two things. First, activities with progressive amounts of difficulty means campers must pass prerequisite classes thereby providing them with mastery experiences and the idea they *can* do a particular activity. In turn, these successes may encourage them to set higher, more difficult goals. Next, mastering skills and activities while immersed in nature allows the individual to accrue environmental knowledge and outdoor experience, which, as previous literature suggests, can lead to an appreciation for nature and the development of environmental ethics.

Camps and youth organizations must provide a mentally and physically safe, stable environment for clients. However, this element of safety extends past smiles and words of encouragement. It allows an individual to try new things, set new goals, and challenge themselves. In doing so, camps can offer their participants more than just fond memories; they can offer their campers a chance to develop into efficacious environmentally aware individuals.

TEENS LEARNING TEAMWORK: ACTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AT CAMP

Author: S. Cole Perry, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Contact: Perry Cole, 2023 Christopher Hall, 904 W. Nevada St., Urbana, IL 61801 perry7@illinois.edu

Studies of camp staff outcomes, which have recently received more scholarly attention, complement similar work done with campers (Ferrari & McNeely, 2007). My study describes processes of teenaged staff learning teamwork and reveals insights into how development happens within the "black box" of camp programming.

Qualitative interviews were used to construct grounded theory around ways teenagers improve at collaborating, similar to the work of Larson and colleagues with teens in after-school programs (Larson & Angus, 2011). Building upon this and other developmental work on teamwork, conscious processes of development were analyzed in youths' reports of their own learning (Larson, Hansen, & Walker, 2005; Larson, 2007; Selman, 1980; 2003).

Methods

This research project involved semi-structured interviews with 26 teenaged staff members at an overnight summer camp near a mid-sized Midwestern city. Youth were 10th graders and most stayed six days each week of a three-week session. Supervised by college-aged leaders, the participants washed dishes, served meals, cleaned bathrooms, and did construction projects for the camp, which many had previously attended as campers.

Modified grounded theory methods--including coding, memos, diagrams, and comparison--were used at every step of the research process from informing the creation of the interview protocol to analyzing and describing patterns in the data (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Results

The data yielded a rich array of dynamic developmental processes (see Table 1). The three categories testified to the active learning taking place among adolescents and their peers.

The first process consists of youth observing their peers' actions of working together and then expending effort to interpret and make sense of the social situation. Laura saw herself emulating aspects of successful team interactions; Daniel broke down specific pro-collaborative actions in order to replicate them; and Marta figured out her peers' work styles so she could collaborate better.

The second process includes youth carefully considering advice from other youth and adapting the input. With his friends' chiding, Brad reduced his counterproductive "defiance" and set a reformative goal to listen and "work better" with others. Phillip, similarly, accepted suggestions in how to avoid anger and built off the counsel he received to fashion his own strategies for successful collaboration.

The third process comprises youth negotiating and compromising in order to accommodate each other on the team. Natalie, Blair, and Molly all reported some "give and take" to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution with their co-workers. Through

coming to this agreement, their thinking became oriented more to addressing the group's needs than to their own interests.

Discussion and Camp Applications

Each of the examples presented here reinforces the idea of youth as active "producers of their own development" (Lerner, 2002). The adolescents portrayed here are not mindlessly copying behavior, blindly following advice, or just going along with what their peers are doing or saying. This depiction of teenaged staff is consistent with very recent work on camp counselors developing responsibility (Risch, 2012) and leadership (Duda, 2009). For camp researchers, the examination of processes in context can be seen as a step toward integrating the major areas of study: outcomes and camp operations (Henderson, Bialeschki, & James, 2007).

Camp professionals should take note of the various ways in which teenagers are engaging with their peers and learning from these interactions. Conceptualizing the way young staff can serve as resources for each other and catalysts for learning can help practitioners be intentional about programming, initiate productive dialogue, and generally maximize opportunities that facilitate specific ways teens learn teamwork. *References available upon request.*

Table 1: Processes of Learning Teamwork

Interpreting Peers' Actions	*Adapting Others' Advice*	*Negotiating and Compromising*
"if you watch them you're like, … 'that looks cool. I'll try that.' **It's easier to picture. 'OK, I can do that'** or 'I can work like that.' ... You have to go through it and see for yourself. Like see how to improve it next time." [Laura, age 15]*	"I was being defiant ... and it didn't work out. They pointed out to me later that I was just making a big mess. **[Those] people helped me realize** that I need to work better with other people--because [they] slowly pointed it out and helped me get there ... listening's helped me a lot" [Brad, 14]	"We eventually merged into each other's [way of working], like every other time, **we just kept switching on and off, ended up coming together**, I guess. And agreeing. We didn't seriously argue or anything." [Natalie, 15]
"he's very hardworking and things. So **I try to like be more like him** 'cause he worked hard for everyone but also worked toward the goal and not get distracted by the means of getting towards the goal" [Daniel, 15]	"I get angry easily but **they'll like talk to me, like, 'Just do it this way**.' I'm actually cooling down quicker, just by doing it their way and it'll be easier ... I've figured out that if you talk to [peers], you learn how to actually work with them the way that they're used to working instead of making them work your [way]" [Philip, 16]	"You might not be good at it at first, [but] once you start compromising with people you realize, "Hey this actually works!' ... **You have to learn to compromise through actions** like, 'I'll help you carry this if you help me carry that.' It's like you have to like experience in order to understand it fully." [Blair, 14]
"When I work with people it seems like **I get a feel for, like, their work personality**. And you can use that to your advantage and then it's a little easier to think of how they'd work and what might affect them or if they're shy, outgoing..." [Marta, 14]		"we would all learn like how to do it together and then we would just take turns trying the different things ... **we kind of, like, just developed a system** of who would do what and taking turns" [Molly, 15]

all emphases added

THE EFFECT OF INTENTIONALLY DESIGNED EXPERIENCES ON YOUTHS' TEAMWORK SKILLS

Authors: Mark F. Roark, Ann Gillard, and Marissa Mikami Blauer. Contact: Mark F. Roark, 7000 Old Main Hill, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-7000, mark.roark@usu.edu

The American Camp Association (ACA) *20/20 Call to Action* encourages camp professionals to partner with the community (ACA, 2012). This is one reason why resident and day camps have begun exploring partnering with schools (Roark & Mikami, 2011), understanding that the provision of developmentally-intentional camp programming to after-school programs (ASPs) could benefit both. Outcome-based camp programming for participants in the ASP setting could serve as a potential recruitment tool for camps. Similar to camp programming, after-school curricula typically include a focus on the social development needs of youth (Granger & William T. Grant Foundation, 2008). For example, teamwork is one type of social development outcome that is a goal of both camp and after-school programs. Engaging youth in fun opportunities to work together to accomplish tasks can build skills and pro-social behaviors appropriate to working with others later in life.

Theoretical Framework

Through the development of teamwork skills (TS), youth learn social skills such as how to work with a variety of people, compromise, give and receive feedback, and acquire social norms. In adulthood, TS can serve as a foundation for building social capital, dealing with stress, working with others to achieve goals, and engaging as active citizens (Bowler & Brass, 2006). Accordingly, teamwork was defined as "beliefs that one can be an effective and productive group member" (Ellis & Sibthorp, 2006). Further, over 400 employers identified TS as one of the four most important skills for success for new entrants into the workforce (The Conference Board, et al., 2006). However, in an era of increased focus on academic achievement and testing coupled with the economic tightening of out-of-school-time resources (After School Alliance, 2011), opportunities to build TS are shrinking within school curricula. Intentional camp program experiences are one developmental context holding promise as an additional support for youth in ASPs.

In this study, program experiences include Sequential, Active, Focused and Explicit (SAFE) approaches that support opportunities for social development (Durlack & Weisenberg, 2007; Lipsey 1992). Similar to the design of Roark and Evans (2010) *Play It Measure It* experiences, each program experience has a sequence of interactive activities with facilitation language scripted toward the targeted outcome. Experiences also apply Symbolic Interaction Theory (Denzin, 2009; Kuhn, 1964) specifically encompassing Rossman and Schlatter's (2011) Situated Activity System approach. These approaches are intentionally integrated into each experience. While programs using such approaches have been linked to friendship skills (Roark, Gillard, Evans, Wells, & Blauer, 2012), the extent to which programs possess and use such experiences to achieve social development outcomes is limited and has not been tested with TS. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to test the effect of three intentionally designed camp experiences on TS in an after-school setting.

Methods

Three teamwork experiences were implemented with a group of approximately 25 seventh graders in an after-school setting. Each experience lasted 90 minutes with the following

themes: Island, Pirates, and Superheroes. Reliability of experience implementation was collected using observation checklists.

Analysis Procedures

Three outcomes were measured. Teamwork was measured using the reliable (.94) ACA 8-item self-report measure (Ellis & Sibthorp, 2006). The measure began with the stem, "How much, if any, has your participation in this [name of experience] changed you in each of the following ways?" The change in the teamwork measure was retrospective in design, allowing questionnaire administration to occur once at the end of the experience. The response format measured whether the outcome decreased (score of 1), did not change (did not increase or decrease = 2), or increased (a little = 3, some = 4, a lot = 5). By definition of the retrospective scale, the participants' baseline score was 2. In other words, if the participants were not to participate in the experience and complete the questionnaire, their scores would reportedly have no change (i.e., a score of 2). Percent change was computed to measure the effect of the experience on teamwork. A non-retrospective post-score of fun was measured by a single item from 1 (no fun) to 5 (lots of fun). Two ACA Affinity for Nature (2009) items were used to measure against social desirability and provide evidence of treatment validity. In other words, the experiences were indoors and not designed to increase affinity for nature; thus, any negligible increases on the two items indicated participants provided appropriate responses.

Results and Conclusions

As depicted in Table 1, each experience generated high percent changes, negligible scores on the 2-item nature scale were reported, and participants had fun.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Perceived Effects of Intentionally Designed Experiences on TS and Fun by Theme

Theme	N	M	SD	Δ Score	% Δ
Island					
Teamwork	29	3.47	.76	1.47	74%
Nature	29	2.55	.78	.55	28%
Fun	29	4.14	.95		
Pirates					
Teamwork	20	3.88	.62	1.88	94%
Nature	20	2.33	.57	.33	17%
Fun	20	4.40	.68		
Superheroes					
Teamwork	32	3.10	.81	1.10	55%
Nature	32	2.00	.25	0	0%
Fun	32	3.81	.93		

Camp Applications

This study contributes to the developing body of empirical evidence about relevant and useful youth program processes and practices that influence social outcomes for youth. Of particular interest to the camp industry, the ACA outcome measure of teamwork was

investigated for one of the first times with participants outside of camp. The study also has specific applications for practice with camps partnering with ASPs. The demonstration of acquisition of TS implies that camp or after-school programmers could apply the following:

1) Use the theoretical and evidence-based experiences in their programs.
2) Collect data on each experience using the ACA questionnaire.
3) Share evidence of effective programming results with stakeholders.

In the spirit of ACA's 20/20 vision, camp administrators could use this study as a catalyst to open discourse with school administrators about offering camp programming to ASPs to increase the number of youth exposed to experiences similar to what may occur at their camps.

References

American Camp Association. (2009). *Affinity for Nature Scale: A component of ACA's youth outcomes surveys for administration in camps and other youth settings*. Retrieved form http://www.acacamps.org/research/youth-outcomes-battery

American Camp Association. (2012). *Your Call to Action - 20/20 Vision*. Retrieved form http://www.acacamps.org/2020/your-call-to-action

After School Alliance. (2011). *Quality afterschool: Helping programs achieve it and policies support it.* Retrieved from: http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/issue_briefs/issue_quality_47.pdf

Bowler, W., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 70-82.

The Conference Board, Corporate Voices for Working Families, Partnership for 21st Century Skills, & Society for Human Resource Management. (2006). *Are they really ready to work? Employers' perspectives on the basic knowledge and applied skills of new entrants to the 21st century U.S. workforce*.

Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ellis, G., & Sibthorp, J. (2006). *Development and validation of a battery of age appropriate measures for camper outcomes*. Martinsville, IN: American Camp Association.

Granger, R. C., & William T. Grant Foundation (2008). After-school programs and academics: Implications for policy and research. *Social Policy Report: Giving Child and Youth Development Knowledge Away, XXII* (2), 3-19.

Kuhn, M. H. (1964). Major trends in Symbolic Interaction Theory in the past twenty-five years. *The Sociological Quarterly, 5*(1), 61-84.

Lipsey, M. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In T. D. Cook, H. Cooper, D. S. Cordray, H. Hartmann, L. V. Hedges, R. J. Light, T. A. Louis, & F. Mosteller (Eds.). *Meta-analysis for explanation: A casebook* (pp. 83-127). NY: Russell Sage Foundation. Reprinted in F.T. Cullen & B.K. Applegate (Eds.). Offender rehabilitation: Effective correctional intervention. Hampshire, UK: Dartmouth Publishing Co, 1998.

Roark, M. F., & Evans, F. (2010). *Play it, measure it: Experiences designed to elicit specific youth outcomes*. Monterey, CA: Healthy Learning.

Roark, M. F., Gillard, A., Evans, F., Wells, M. S., Blauer, M. M. (2012). Effect of intentionally designed experiences on friendship skills of youth: An application of Symbolic Interaction Theory. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 30(3), 24-36.

Roark, M. F., & Mikami, M. (2011). Campers have a world of good: Insights from the ACA Sites, Facilities, and Programs Report: 2011. *Camping Magazine*, 8*4*(5), 64-69.

Rossman, R. J., & Schlatter, B. E. (2008). *Recreation programming: Designing leisure experiences*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore.

TRACKING THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS IN MENTOR/SUPERVISION RELATIONSHIPS AT SUMMER CAMP

Authors: Kate Smidt and Michael Basseches. Contact: Kate Smidt, Suffolk University, 41 Temple St., Boston, MA 02114. kesmidt@suffolk.edu

Summer camp counselors have a unique, round-the-clock job. The challenges of sharing tight living quarters, being responsible for up to twenty campers at a time, and trying to fit in with other staff members leads to the potential for developmental and interpersonal conflicts (Becker, 1962). Limited interaction with the outside world gives staff members the opportunity to grow as individuals, enhancing their independence and perspective on the world. At the same time, emotionally loaded problems and crises involving human relationships are likely to arise (Becker, 1962).

When camp counselors struggle they are encouraged to seek guidance from a supervisor or director of the summer camp (Northway & Lowres, 1963). DuBois and Silverthorn (2005) recognize that older adolescents face a multitude of challenges as they transition into adulthood, including finding their identity and maintaining effective functioning in education, work and interpersonal domains. With the help of a mentor, these hardships may be alleviated. Mentor relationships may help children and adolescents in a variety of domains, such as academic adjustment, social competence and support, and wellbeing (Goldner & Mayseless, 2009). Rhodes, Spencer, Keller, Liang and Noam (2006) developed a conceptual model of a mentoring relationship. They found that when mentors offer genuine care and support, they can help to challenge their mentee's negative views that he or she may hold of themselves or of others. Additionally, mentors can help to shift their mentees' conception of their current and future identity, thus helping their mentees achieve a more positive identity development (Rhodes et al., 2006).

Mentoring has also been shown to be beneficial in employment contexts. Gregory and Levy (2011) understand the importance of feedback between a supervisor and his or her employees through the utilization of developmentally-oriented employee coaching. Through this approach, the employee regularly meets one-on-one with the supervisor so that his or her current job performance and capabilities for future challenging roles can be discussed. Through constant feedback, trust and empathy, a supervisor can significantly increase the development of the employee's work performance (Gregory & Levy, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

This present study uses the methods of Basseches' and Mascolo's (2010). Developmental Analysis of Psychotherapy Process (DAPP) to focus on the microdevelopmental movement over eight supervisory sessions. Two fundamental assumptions of the DAPP model and research method are 1) that development in psychotherapy is largely the result of relational-developmental processes that have the potential to occur in all human relationships, and (2) that "helping" relationships entail the effort to optimize the usefulness of these processes to clients, or the people whom the relationships are designed to help. The rigor of the DAPP method depends on juxtaposing verbatim raw data with interpretations of those data using DAPP's coding categories. Raw data consists of audiotapes or videotapes of sessions and transcripts made from those tapes. In viewing such data, DAPP studies three ways in which all therapists

offer novel resources (i.e., attentional support, interpretation, and enactment opportunities) to clients within the context of psychotherapy. Further, DAPP then tracks and demonstrates whether and how the structure of the clients' thinking, feeling and acting develops over time.

Prior to this study, the DAPP methodology had only been applied to therapeutic relationships. However, DAPP analysis has successfully tracked microdevelopmental movement leading to major developmental and therapeutic change in cases representing a wide range of therapeutic approaches. These include cases of 1) mindfulness therapy (Annunziata, 2009), 2) short-term "anxiety-regulating dynamic therapy" (McCullough, 1999; Basseches & Mascolo 2010), 3) dialectical behavioral therapy (Licht, 2011), 4) developmentally-oriented psychotherapy (Basseches, 1993), 5) emotion-focused therapy, (Dangelo, 2007), and 6) sensory-integration therapy (Basseches, Mascololo & DeSantis, 2009).

The DAPP method had never been applied systematically to relationships outside of therapy, including mentor-like or supervisory relationships. The parallels of mentor-model supervisory relationships to therapy relationships are significant enough to determine the DAPP method may be useful. Therapy helps clients to face challenges that otherwise might be avoided or left unresolved (Basseches & Mascolo, 2010). Similarly, camp counselors are faced with a multitude of challenges throughout the course of the summer and by working with their supervisor, a context for possible resolution is provided. In the current case study, the DAPP method was applied to the relationship at a summer camp between a supervisor; the Girls Camp Director, and a camp counselor.

Methods

This study took place through eight weekly sessions. To select a camp counselor for this research study, the Girls Camp Director sent out a letter to all female second-year staff members two months before staff training began. All staff members recruited were eighteen years old. The letter explained the researcher's interests and provided a description of the study to be conducted. Phone conversations with individuals who were interested in the study were set up and all ramifications of the study were explained. Based on the conversations and the staff members' interest, understanding and level of motivation, the staff member for the study was selected. All eight sessions between the staff member and supervisor were audiotaped. Written transcriptions were then made from those taped sessions, using verbatim utterances.

Communication between the camp counselor and her supervisor occurred each week for thirty to forty-five minutes, throughout the summer. Throughout the scheduled sessions, steering of the conversations by the supervisor was intentional, parallel to the ways in which therapists often steer psychotherapy dialogue to try to optimize its therapeutic/developmental value. The supervisor's goals of steering the conversations were to bring to attentional focus developmental challenges that the camp counselor faced, and to support and acknowledge her developmental achievements, through focusing on the goals she had over the course of the summer. Therefore, this was not conceived as "investigator bias". Rather, it was purposeful, in order to support the camp counselor's optimal developmental achievement. As a therapist aims to influence a client through therapeutic interactions, the supervisor's aims in her relationship with the camp counselor were similar.

Analysis Procedure

Important developmental processes were identified as areas in which major conflicts emerged and moments in which syntheses were constructed by the camp counselor. The DAPP Framework demonstrated its relevance to mentoring in a camp setting and shed light on change

mechanisms common to psychotherapy and other helping relationships. These mechanisms include general processes of developmental movement in which attention paid to emergent conflict facilitates the construction of novel syntheses. They also include the particular ways that the supervisor offers resources to the process that facilitate emergence of conflict, attention to such conflict, and co-construction of novel syntheses.

Results & Discussion

The greatest developmental area identified was the staff member's relationship with her co-counselors. Through the analysis of verbatim utterances, the staff member learns to conceptualize the importance of communication in her relationship with them. With her own experience and with the help of the supervisor's use of attentional support, interpretation and enactment, the staff member learns how to be more effective in discussing various camping and personal issues while working with her co-counselors in close proximity.

In looking through the DAPP lens, the supervisor was able to better understand how the staff member experienced conflict, particularly relevant to her relationship with her co-counselors, what led to her challenges, and how she was successful in recognizing her struggles and ways to improve her summer performance. The supervisor was also able to recognize how issues of communication can significantly interfere or enhance relationships with co-counselors.

Camp Applications

Results of this study may encourage supervisors and directors of summer camps to implement new strategies when training staff members at summer camp. Various workshops might be conducted to highlight the importance of open communication among camp counselors. These workshops could include strategies on how to approach co-counselors if something is starting to go wrong, and how to recognize both the difficulties and value of taking action to address problems before they escalate. Moreover, regular feedback sessions between co-counselors might be considered, perhaps facilitated by senior staff. These sessions could lead to open discussions resulting in mutual understanding among all counselors involved. In turn, such mutual understandings could lead to more positive outcomes for counselors and campers alike.

References

Annunziata, T. (2009). *Assessing the developmental processes of adjunctive mindfulness therapy: a single-case design.* (Unpublished masters thesis). Suffolk University, Boston.

Basseches, M. (1993). Disequilibrium and transformation. In A. Lipson (Ed.), *Critical incidents in psychotherapy* (Unpublished collection).

Basseches, M. Mascolo, M., & DeSantis, A. (2009), Ben I Am Not: *Affective Splitting and the Reintegration of Self in an Autistic Child.* (Unpublished manuscript). Boston, MA.

Basseches, M. & Mascolo, M. (2010). *Psychotherapy as a Developmental Process.* New York: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

Becker, J. (1962). *Training camp counselors in human relations: A case book.* New York: Association Press.

Dangelo, S. (2007). *Developmental processes in emotion-focused therapy.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Suffolk University, Boston.

DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health, 95 (3)*, 518–524.

Goldner, L., Mayseless, O. (2009). The quality of mentoring relationships and mentoring success. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 38 (10),* 1339-1350.

Gregory, J., Levy, P. (2011). It's not me it's you: a multilevel examination of variables that

impact employee coaching relationships. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63 (2)*, 67-88.

Licht, I. B. (2011). *The developmental analysis of psychotherapy process (DAPP) in dialectical behavior therapy (DBT): A case study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Suffolk University, Boston.

McCullough, L. (1999). Short-term psychodynamic therapy as a form of desensitization: Treating affect phobias. *In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice, 4(4),* 35-53.

Northway, M. & Lowes, M. (1963). *The camp counselor's book.* Toronto: Burgess Publishing Co.

Rhodes, J.E., Spencer, R., Keller, T.E., Liang, B., & Noam, G. (2006). A model for the influence of mentoring relationships on youth development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34(6)*, 691-707.