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ABSTRACT

Personal Growth through Guided Discoveries: An Assessment of Returning Sea Campers’ Self-Efficacy and Environmental Ethics

Kimberly Maravilla

Research has demonstrated children and young adults benefit from attending summer camps, especially when exposed to challenging activities in an outdoor environment. Researchers have identified several benefits derived from attending outdoor camps, such as increased levels of self esteem and environmental awareness. This research attempts to determine whether returning campers continue to accrue and utilize their experiences outside of camp. The research explores how returning to the Catalina Island Marine Institute (CIMI)’s Sea Camp program each summer affects perceived levels of self-efficacy and environmental ethics on young adults (ages 13-17). The purpose of this research is two-fold. First, the research explores campers’ perceived efficacy and ability to set and achieve goals both inside and outside of camp. Second, it investigates whether their outlook on the environment has changed since attending Sea Camp and, if it has, in what ways it has changed. Returning campers, identified as those who have attended Sea Camp for at least two summers, were administered a survey pertaining to their experiences at Sea Camp. The survey was conducted in the early spring, prior to returning to CIMI for the 2011 Sea Camp program. Twenty randomly selected returning campers participated in semi-structured interviews conducted during Sea Camp 2011. The results indicate the paramount importance of providing a safe,
encouraging camp environment as it allows returning campers to develop and/or expand upon their self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, Goals, Environmental Ethics, Adolescents, Environmental Education, Summer Camp, Catalina Island Marine Institute, Catalina Sea Camp
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Stepping off the Catalina Classic Cruises ferry onto the familiar float, luggage dragging behind her, Violet, in her fourth summer at Sea Camp, smiles. Yes, it is hot and the bag that trails behind her is a little cumbersome, but that is all forgotten as she walks up the ramp to the pier where she is greeted by the instructors who are lined up, clapping, singing, dressed in bright, vibrant costumes. Many of the instructors remember her and greet her by name. There is a flutter of activity as she walks down the familiar pier: old friends hugging, new campers looking wide eyed. In a word: excitement. As she begins Sea Camp 2011, she feels “a weight lift off my shoulders.” She is home.

Young adults face many stressors as they transition from adolescence to adulthood; they must become responsible for themselves and make decisions that strongly affect their lives (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). In order to make a successful transition into adulthood, many researchers believe that adolescents’ perceived level of self-efficacy plays a vital role in motivation, goal setting, and adherence to tasks in the face of defeat (Bandura, 1997; Bong, 2006; Sibthorp, 2003; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Self-efficacy, defined by Albert Bandura (1997), refers to “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). In other words, self-efficacy is the belief about what an individual feels he/she can do (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). These beliefs can have lasting repercussions.
Coupled with the notion of young adults making decisions based on what they can do, is the idea that they will be the future caretakers of the planet. Thus, it is imperative, as Dan Perlman and Jeffrey Milder (2004) indicate, to expose children and young adults to nature at an early age. These authors argue that early exposure to nature, especially nature that is accessible (for example, a local park), can influence children and young adults’ perceptions of the environment as well as their attachment to it. Additionally, early exposure (before the age of 18) to the outdoors can also formulate environmental beliefs (Ewert, Place, Sibthorp, 2005). This, in turn, may increase their levels of environmental ethics.

Numerous benefits of attending an outdoor educational facility have been documented. Taken together, these benefits include an increase in self-efficacy, self esteem, conflict resolution, critical thinking, and/or problem-solving skills (American Institutes for Research, 2003; Ernst & Monroe, 2004; Lieberman & Hoody, 1998; Sibthorp, 2003). Additionally, increases in pro-environmental attitudes and environmental information retention have been documented after exposure to an environmental educational program (Farmer, Knapp, & Benton, 2007). These studies suggest that the benefits from outdoor, educational facilities and programs do have lasting influences on participating children and young adults.

Summer outdoor camps, then, have the unique ability to instill wonder in its participants while providing activities designed to challenge. Additionally, the social side of camp (i.e., being away from home for an extended period of time; exposure to new activities, people, and experiences) also plays an important role in the camp
experience. Outdoor camp programs can foster self-efficacy and environmental ethics within their young adult campers.

While many studies focus on a singular experience of attending an outdoor camp, this research focuses on the effects on returning young adults to the Catalina Island Marine Institute (CIMI)’s Sea Camp program. Specifically, my research seeks to understand campers’ perceived self-efficacy and environmental ethics. This research employs both quantitative and qualitative methods to acquire data by asking returning campers (those who have attended Sea Camp for at least two summers) about their experiences at Sea Camp. Their accrued experiences at Sea Camp can provide useful insight to learn whether returning to the same residential camp for multiple summers impacts their self-efficacy and environmental ethics. The results of this study can provide useful information to camp directors, environmental/outdoor educators, and parents as it concerns personal development as well as environmental stewardship.

Although Guided Discoveries, Inc. has run its summer program for over 30 years, there have been no studies conducted within the facility to study the types of effects and influences the program has had on young adults. The premise of my research stems from my observations while working for Guided Discoveries, Inc. over the last five summers at the CIMI facility on Toyon Bay. At this facility I have worked as a Marine Science Instructor and as a National Association of Underwater Instructors (NAUI) Dive Master and Dive Instructor. These positions enabled me to educate and interact with young adults (ages 12-17) from a variety of social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds from all over the world. Based on the current literature as well as my observations and
experiences as a member of the Sea Camp community, my intent is to learn about the ways in which camp affects returning Sea Campers’ lives.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Environmentally oriented outdoor camps provide a venue for children and young adults to not only [re-] discover the outdoors, but to also learn about themselves. Attending a summer camp program gives children and young adults many opportunities to “grow and develop” (Michalski, Mishna, Worthington, & Cummings, 2003). The camp experience enables these young adults to begin the journey of becoming self-efficacious and environmentally aware of their surroundings.

Faced with new challenges, a structured summer camp program provides participants with new obstacles that are not usually encountered in their daily life (Michalski et al., 2003). In these types of camps, participants are encouraged to try new activities and venture out of their comfort zones under the watchful eye of trained camp staff. In doing so, the campers gain experience and knowledge about their capabilities. They also garner experience about the natural environment that will remain with them for years to come. In essence, camps provide a context to bring together two ideas from the literature: self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Self-Efficacy: Background, Sources, and Mediating Factors

Self-Efficacy: Theory and Personal Beliefs

Albert Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy, as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3)
allowing the individual to “take control” of his/her life (Bandura, 1998, p. 421). Self-efficacy is the belief about what an individual feels he/she can do instead of issuing opinions about him/her (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006) and is appraised prior to a task (Bandura, 2006a). These judgments of capability can fluctuate by level, generality, and strength (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006).

Self-efficacy affects several aspects of an individual’s life; it plays a role in determining task choices, goal challenges, application of effort, motivation, and determination even when faced with defeat, optimistic and pessimistic attitudes, and how challenges and opportunities are viewed (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Bandura, 2006a; Bandura & Locke, 2003; Feltz & Magyar, 2006; Pajares, 2002; Schunk & Meece, 2006).2

As noted throughout the literature, there are differences among those with high and low levels of self-efficacy. For example, individuals who exhibit strong self-efficacy do not shy away from difficult tasks; instead, they choose difficult undertakings as they are viewed as challenges to surmount (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Pajares, 2002). Further, self-efficacious individuals create and adhere to challenging goals, are able to bounce back from failures, apply more effort to ensure success, and will not cease even

---

1 Self-efficacy is a component of social cognitive theory which theorizes that human functioning is a result from three interacting forces: behavior, thought, and environment (Bandura, 1986). This theory states that humans are “proactively engaged” in their development and are, therefore, responsible for the actions they take (Pajares, 2002, p. 1). In other words, people are not merely “reactive organisms” but are actively involved in their development (Pajares, 2002, p. 1).

2 Edwin Locke and Gary Latham (2002) define a goal as “object or aim of action…usually within a specified time limit” (p. 705) which is “self reactive in nature” (Bandura, 1997, p. 128).
when challenges are presented (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Pajares, 2002; Schunk & Meece, 2006). Conversely, individuals with low self-efficacy avoid difficult tasks, set unchallenging goals, give up easily, and do not recover quickly from defeat (Bandura, 1996; Bandura, 1998; Pajares, 2002). Frank Pajares (2002) notes that efficacy beliefs can create “self fulfilling prophecies” (How Self-Efficacy Beliefs Influence Human Function section, para. 4) because the individual achieves what he/she believes that they can accomplish. Thus, as Bandura (2006) states, “Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act or persevere in the face of difficulties” (p. 3).

Developing self-efficacy is especially crucial during adolescence. Adolescence, as defined by Dale Schunk and Judith Meece (2006), occurs during the ages of puberty to the early 20s (p.72) and is the age group of the Sea Camper participants in this thesis. This particular developmental time is often characterized as tumultuous because adolescents must learn to deal with biological, educational, and social change (Bandura, 2006a). As Bandura (2006a) notes, social cognitive theory conceptualizes adolescence as a period of substantial growth by utilizing “mastery and…enabling experiences” necessary for development (p. 7).

**Differences between Self-Efficacy and Other Self Constructs**

A key tenet in self-efficacy theory is the idea of facilitating individuals to effectively exert some control on their lives (Bandura, 1997, p. 10). Though there are many theories that look at how the individual views him/herself, it is important, as Barry Zimmerman and Timothy Cleary (2006) and Bandura (1997) state, to distinguish self-
efficacy from self esteem, self concept, outcome expectations, and perceived control.

Self esteem is concerned with how an individual views him/herself; it is a judgment of “self worth” while self-efficacy is based on beliefs of personal competence (Bandura, 1997, p. 11; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006, p. 49). Bandura (1997) notes there is no concrete relationship concerning a person’s beliefs in their ability and whether or not a person “likes” him/herself (p. 11). Self-efficacy beliefs are context specific, which differs from self concept. Self concept is an individual’s general belief about him/herself (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006); it is their personal “composite view” of themselves (Bandura, 1997, p. 11). In comparing self-efficacy and self concept, Bandura (1997) states self-efficacy is a better indicator of behavior. Outcome expectancy is the belief that behaving a certain way will determine the outcome. Self-efficacy states that one can take the actions necessary to achieve an outcome (Bandura, 1997); behaving a certain way does not necessarily guarantee success or failure. Finally, perceived control is based on the idea that the end results will be based on a person’s behavior or other outside forces (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). These authors note that perceived control fails to account for personal belief in one’s capability to accomplish tasks.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

Where do beliefs in self-efficacy originate from? The literature points to four sources of self-efficacy: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective conditions (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Pajares, 2002; Schunk & Meece, 2006; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). As Bandura (1997) indicates, the individual must evaluate and reflect upon these sources in order to
gauge their perceived self-efficacy. He further notes that some of these sources will be ‘more important’ than others and, thus, more credence will be given to those sources. However, as Schunk and Meece (2006) note, without a foundational skill and knowledge base, no level of self-efficacy will produce the outcome an individual desires.

Many authors state the most effective source of self-efficacy is mastery experiences (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Schunk & Meece, 2006; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Mastery experience substantiates background knowledge, allowing the individual to use his/her experiences to adequately decide if they have what it takes to achieve and accomplish something (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). In other words, based on a person’s previous successes or failures, the individual is better able to judge for him/herself if success is actually achievable. Thus, successful endeavors serve to increase self-efficacy, while failures have the tendency to lower it (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Pajares, 2002; Schunk & Meece, 2006). Another important aspect of mastery experiences regards how success was achieved. Once created, occasional failures do not undermine self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). However, as Bandura (1997) notes, if a person achieved something only after they applied exceedingly high amounts of labor and/or hard work, their efficacy may actually lower because the individual may doubt their capability to conjure the same level of effort in the future.

Another source of self-efficacy, though not as strong as mastery experiences (Pajares, 2002), is through vicarious experiences. Pajares (2002) notes that vicarious experiences are especially important in circumstances where the individual doubts their own ability or does not have enough (mastery) experience to fall back on. Thus, as
Pajares (2002) notes the “If they can do it, so can I” mentality (How Self-Efficacy Beliefs are Created section, para. 2) is bolstered especially when other people are viewed as “similar others” (i.e. models) (Schunk & Meece, 2006, p. 73). For example, if an individual views another person as having similar characteristics such as sex, age, education, socio-economic status, race, and ethnicity (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997), he/she may see the model as a good indicator of whether success is actually possible (Bandura, 1997). Vicarious experiences are especially salient when adolescents look to others, especially their peers, who share the same types of interests (Bandura, 1998; Schunk & Meece, 2006). Therefore, the successes or failures of these “similar others” (Schunk & Meece, 2006, p. 73) carry more weight when compared to those who are not viewed as similar to the individual (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998). Zimmerman and Cleary (2006) note that modeling is used often by adolescents as a means to judge their own self-efficacy. However, the importance of models does not end here. Models, according to Bandura (1998) are also important because they have the potential to teach individuals tools to combat and overcome difficulties that may arise via “word[s] and action[s]” (Bandura, 1997, p. 88).

Self-efficacy also involves verbal persuasion, or as Bandura (1986) explains, “talk[ing] people into believing they possess capabilities…to achieve what they seek” (p. 400). Verbal persuasion is especially potent when the persuader is regarded as important (such as a model) because this person has the knowledge of what is actually needed to succeed in that area. Their persuasions mean more and, thus, have more clout (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). While encouraging individuals can increase self-efficacy, the
literature suggests that encouragement must be kept within “realistic limits” (Bandura, 1986, p. 400) where success is actually possible (Pajares, 2002). In other words, encouraging a person to try to achieve unrealistic goals invites failure, resulting in a decrease in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). As Pajares (2002) states, because it is often “easier” to decrease efficacy than increase it (How Self-Efficacy Beliefs are Created section, para. 3), this notion is especially important because it can deter an individual from trying things that can bolster their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997); this is where feedback comes into play. According to Bandura (1997), how feedback is framed is important. If, for example, the feedback is framed in a positive light, self-efficacy increases. Conversely, if feedback is negative and focuses on the individual’s shortcomings, self-efficacy will diminish.

Finally, the literature suggests that an individual’s physiological and affective states, exemplified in their physical condition and mood, can influence self-efficacy. Bandura (1986) suggests that people take into consideration how they are physically feeling as a gauge of their capabilities. For instance, if a person feels stressed, sweating profusely, and has a high heart rate, he/she may equate this to doubting their ability to accomplish a task (Bandura, 1997). Likewise, moods can also have an effect on one’s perceived efficacy. Not only can an individual’s mood affect their ability to learn, but it can also serve to conjure up past experiences of successes and failures (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). As Bandura (1998) indicates, it is not necessarily the strength of these feelings and physical insecurities; it is how the individual deals with them that is important because the stronger the hold of doubt and fear on a person, the less likely
he/she will feel able to overcome these obstacles and achieve their goals.

**Mediating Processes**

The creation of self-efficacy beliefs from the four sources previously mentioned affects how people “function” (Bandura, 1997, p. 115). Once a person has established a sense of self-efficacy, the literature identifies four mediating processes where efficacy’s “effects” are seen: cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection (Bandura, 1997, p. 115). Mediating processes help an individual ‘see’ their exploits through and often act in unison (Bandura, 1997). Emphasis is placed on cognitive and motivational processes.

Cognitive processes involve thought and learning. Human behavior is “purposive” and uses foresight to create goals (Bandura, 1997, p. 116; Bandura, 1998, p. 423). Since goals are a manifestation of perceived personal capability, the argument contends that efficacious people set higher goals and adhere to them with greater tenacity. If a person lacks belief in their capability, he/she will likely accomplish nothing (Bandura, 1998). Further, individuals with higher efficacy are able to envisage successes, which provide a vehicle for meeting their goal (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998). Thus, it is important that the individual is able to learn, process, and move forward if they are to

---

3 Affective processes have an effect on an individual’s stress, anxiety, and depression levels (Bandura, 1998). For instance, Bandura (1998) notes that those with weaker efficacy tend to focus on the things that could go wrong which induces higher levels of stress and anxiety. Selective processes emphasize the individual’s choice in pursuing specific interests, environments, and avenues of life (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998). Bandura (1997) contends that these selective processes, especially during adolescence, are especially important because of their potential to shape and even omit future life paths.

4 While Bandura (1997) notes that the four mediating processes often act together, for the purposes of my research I have chosen to explore cognitive and motivational processes because my research focuses on whether returning to the same summer camp has affected an individual’s ability to set and achieve goals and how an individual meets those goals.
accomplish their goals. This involves learning how to foresee events that affect their choices and lives (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998).

Motivation is generated through thought (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998) and necessitates the setting of personal standards to gauge performance levels (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Without these standards, it is difficult, if not impossible, to gauge how an individual is ‘doing’ (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Of equal importance, according to Bandura (1998; 1997), is forethought because this enables a person to begin to plan and make necessary arrangements (or steps) to reach a desired goal. The literature identifies three theories that can affect motivation: attribution theory, expectancy value theory, and goal theory (Bandura, 1997); however, emphasis will be placed on the latter.5

Goal theory states that high, difficult goals lead to higher performance levels than non-descript, “do one’s best” goals (Locke & Latham, 1990, p. 29; Locke & Latham, 2006, p. 265). This theory indicates that complex goals stimulate high performance (Locke & Latham, 2002; Locke & Latham, 1990). These ideas are perhaps easier to digest by using goal properties (goal specificity, challenge, and proximity) that Bandura (1997) provides.

Unlike general goals, specific goals give the individual a clear picture what is required to meet the goal, can increase efficacy, and can increase the individual’s performance (Bandura, 1997; Locke & Latham, 1990; Locke & Latham, 2002). Next,

5 Attribution theory is concerned with performance assessments while expectancy value theory looks at how acting a specific way will determine the outcome (Bandura, 1998). My research, however, examines goal theory because the setting and evaluation of goals is a major motivating “mechanism” (Bandura, 1998). Additionally, many of the classes offered at camp may require the campers to set goals for themselves.
goal challenge entails more effort by the individual (Locke and Latham, 2002). This is especially salient when a person shows an active interest in an activity (Bandura, 1997). Easy goals do not motivate because they lack challenges (Bandura, 1997); therefore, difficult goals serve as motivators for greater achievement (Lock & Latham, 2006). Since failing to meet challenging goals can decrease self-efficacy and motivation, research has shown that setting (and meeting) ‘mini,’ ranked goals is important because it provides a sense of mastery, a builder of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Finally, goal proximity dictates the farther off into the future the goal, the less motivated one can become to take the steps to actually achieve it (Bandura, 1997; Bandura & Schunk, 1981). In other words, the goal becomes easier to ‘put off’ when it is in the future. Proximal ‘mini’ goals, too, are a useful medium because they can increase mastery and by extension, self-efficacy (Bandura & Schunk, 1981).

As many researchers illustrate, there is a link between self-efficacy and goal theory, especially when self interests serve as the motivation for goal setting (Bandura, 1997). Efficacy beliefs allow an individual to choose the level of goal challenges, sustain or increase effort, serve self interests, determine how long they will attempt to meet the goal, adherence level, and effort (Bandura, 1997; Bandura & Locke, 2003). Therefore, efficacious individuals set high and difficult goals, have stronger levels of commitment to them, find solutions to problems that halt success, and are not dissuaded from negative feedback (Locke & Latham, 1990; Locke & Latham, 2002).

Self-efficacy may increase when a person is aligned with “similar others” to model (Schunk & Meece, 2006, p. 7), provided opportunities to master, given credible
feedback, (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 708), and are mentally and physically able (Bandura, 1997). These sources enable an individual to readily build their efficacy beliefs and are brought into realization through its mediating effects (such as goal setting).

Environmental Ethics

Humanity’s interaction and connection to the environment have long been investigated by scholars. Given the decreasing amounts of and access to open space (Louv, 2008), it is important to examine how the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that humans hold about the natural world are influenced by personal experiences and knowledge to create a person’s environmental ethic.

Louis Pojman (1994) defines environmental ethics as “humanity’s [ongoing] relationship to the environment, its understanding of and responsibility to nature, and its obligations to leave some of nature’s resources to posterity” (p.1-2). While this is a useful definition, it does not account for cultural and natural perspectives (Ulman, 1998) or an individual’s attitudes, beliefs (Tuan, 1974), and behavior.  As Lewis Ulman (1998) posits, our relationship with the environment, and by extension, our environmental ethics, is a “story we must continually compose” (p. 232) vis-à-vis our actions, thoughts, and beliefs. Therefore, it is important to include an individual’s behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs as constituents to environmental ethics.

6 Due to the related nature of environmental ethics to values (Armstrong and Botzler, 2004, p. 2); ethics and values will be used interchangeably.
People, places, and actions are all sources that shape behavior. Influential \textit{people} serve as an important source of behavior modeling. In studies of adult and youth environmental leaders, influential figures such as parents, role models, and peers have all been considered to have significantly impacted these people (Arnold, Cohen, & Warner, 2009; Chawla, 1998). For example, Heather Arnold \textit{et al.} (2009) found that “passionate” role models, teachers, and friends triggered “transformational” (p. 34) changes in young environmental leaders by demonstrating pro-environmental behaviors (for example, involvement with environmental club/projects and avoidance of using unsustainable products such as Styrofoam) (Arnold \textit{et al.}, 2009, p. 31).

Another important source of behavior is the emotional bonds between a human and a \textit{place} (Tuan, 1974). The familiarity of a place has the ability to “breed affection” (Tuan, 1974, p. 99) especially when one devotes much time and emotion. Attachment to a particular place, as suggested by Jerry Vaske and Katherine Kobrin (2001) is mediated through place dependency (physical characteristics) and place identity (emotional attachment) as both suggest a continual relationship with a particular place. This attachment to a place can influence behavior (Vaske & Kobrin, 2001). For example, these authors found that fostering adolescents’ (ages 14-17) familiarity and connection with a natural site assisted in developing their environmentally responsible behaviors (ERBs).\footnote{Environmentally responsible behaviors (ERBs) have been defined as individual or group actions that promote “sustainable or diminished use of natural resources” (Sivek & Hungerford, 1989/1990 as cited in...}
In addition to places and people, actions also shape behavior by increasing ERBs and informing environmental identity. actions are physical; they require involvement with the environment. Participation in outdoor activities has been demonstrated to effectively encourage ERBs. For example, Vaske and Kobrin (2001) found that when natural resource youth work programs are designed in conjunction with specific ERBs in natural settings (such as trail maintenance), it tended to promote environmentally responsible behaviors in “everyday” life such as talking to friends about environmental concerns (p. 20). The importance of “everyday” ERBs, then, is especially salient when individuals are provided with the tools, strategies, know-how, and chances to practice them (Dresner & Gill, 1994; Palmberg & Kuru, 2000). This is due, according to Irmeli Palmberg and Jari Kuru (2000), to the fact that ERBs are a “learned response or action” (p. 5) (i.e., behaviors). These learned behaviors, then, coupled with experiences, can craft or even change a person’s identity formation (Hinds & Sparks, 2009; Lewis, 2005) because people identify (as well as behave and act accordingly) with things that are important to them (Frankfurt, 1988 as cited in Hinds & Sparks, 2009, p. 182). Identity, then, can figure into a person’s environmental behaviors and attitudes (Hinds & Sparks, 2009).

An individual’s attitudes and beliefs stem from a lifetime of experience (Tuan, 1974). Our experiences play a major role in the attitudes and beliefs we assign to

Vaske & Kobrin, 2001, p. 16). I also include in this definition the idea that these behaviors are a “learned response or action” (Palmberg & Kuru, 2000, p. 4) because behaviors are often learned from others.

Environmental identity is defined as “the meanings one attributes to the self as they relate to the environment (Stets & Biga, 2003 as cited in Hinds & Sparks, 2009, p. 182).
thoughts and actions, which eventually evolve into behavior. Individuals exposed to the environment early in life are introduced to the idea that they are “not alone in the world” (Louv, 2008, p. 296) and share the environment with other life and non-life forms. This early acknowledgement can engender pro-environmental beliefs (Ewert et al., 2005; Hinds & Sparks, 2009). Beliefs, coupled with an individual's behavior, can be regarded as a reflection and predictor of an individual’s attitude. For example, Jana Meinhold and Amy Malkus (2005) found that adolescents’ pro-environmental attitudes predicted their pro-environmental behaviors.

Pojman’s (1994) definition of environmental ethics encompasses the notion of responsibility for providing future generations with an environment they may enjoy and utilize. However, he does not take into account the behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs of the individual. Ethics encompass more than a definition of responsibility; they engender a lifetime of knowledge and experience that leads to how an individual views the environment and responds to it.

**Experience and Knowledge: Effects on Behaviors, Attitudes, and Beliefs**

What affects an individual’s behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs? The literature indicates that personal (direct or indirect) experience with nature as well as knowledge play an informative role in a person’s behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs (i.e. environmental ethics). For instance, Joe Hinds and Paul Sparks (2009) define experience as “direct, visceral contact” (p.181) with nature. Experience may be direct or indirect; therefore, it is important to distinguish between the two. Direct experience differs from indirect
experiences because of its lack of ‘hands-on’ involvement with nature. 9 While the two differ in terms of activities with nature, both are capable of procuring and influencing environmental ethics.

Direct experiences with nature can increase interest and curiosity in the natural world (Gill & Dresner, 1994) while creating “empathetic relationship[s]” with nature (Palmberg & Kuru, 2000, p. 4). A great deal of evidence suggests direct experiences with nature, especially at an early age, has the ability to “precondition” (Ewert et al., 2005, p. 234) an individual to foster environmental behaviors and attitudes in adulthood. In a study of urban adults’ childhood nature experiences and subsequent adult views on the environment, Nancy Wells and Kristi Lekies (2006) found adults who participated in “wild” nature before age 11, had a tendency to exhibit more pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors (p. 13). 10 Similarly Alan Ewert et al. (2005) found that early involvement with “appreciative and consumptive” (p. 234) outdoor activities correspond with an adult’s environmental beliefs. 11 Other studies (Corcoran, 1999; Palmer, 1993; Tanner, 9 The literature differentiates between structured and unstructured forms of direct experience. Structured experiences usually take the form of programs, such as camps that include environmental and/or outdoor education (Wells & Lekies, 2006). Unstructured experiences usually take the form of free/play time. Newhouse (1990 as cited in Ewert et al., 2005, p. 227-228) contends that “most environmental attitudes are formed as a result of life experiences rather than any specific program that was designed to change attitudes.” For the purposes of my research, I contend that both are equally important in the shaping environmental beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Both unstructured and structured involvement in nature are forms of direct exposure to the environment embrace “direct, visceral contact” (Hinds & Sparks, 2009, p. 181) with nature and are present in CIMI’s Sea Camp.
10 Wells and Lekies (2006) differentiate direct experiences with nature as “wild” and “domestic.” “Wild” experiences include hiking, fishing, playing in the woods while “domestic” experiences include picking flowers, planting seeds, etc. (p.1). Because both of these definitions encompass “direct, visceral contact” with nature (Hinds & Sparks 2009, p. 181), I consider them to both be direct experiences.
11 Similarly, Ewert et al. (2005, 229) describe three categories of outdoor activities: appreciative (little environmental impact), mechanized (using mechanical items such as ATVs and boats to enjoy nature), and
1980 as cited in Ewert *et al.*, 2005, p. 228) and authors (Orr, 1992; Perlman & Milder, 2004) have similarly found that early childhood experiences in nature were contributing factors in the development of both adult and youth (ages 16-19) environmentalist and conservationists (Arnold *et al.*, 2009).

Direct experiences in nature are also found in camps and environmental and/or outdoor educational programs. Numerous benefits of attending environmental and outdoor educational programs have been well documented throughout the literature. While some benefits include personal development such as increases in self-esteem, conflict resolution, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills (American Institutes for Research, 2003; Ernst & Monroe, 2004; Lieberman & Hoody, 1998), others facilitated the development of environmental ethics. For example, James Farmer, Doug Knapp, and Gregory Benton (2007) found that attending an environmental education program helped 4th graders develop pro-environmental attitudes. Additionally, Arnold *et al.* (2009) found that some young environmental leaders stated that attending camps at a young age provided influential experiences that shaped their pro-environmental views.

consumptive (taking away from the environment). Again, because these activities involve “direct, visceral contact” with nature, they are deemed, for the purposes of this thesis as direct experiences with nature.

12 Environmental education has been defined as a process that informs individuals about the environment and environmental problems and increases environmental awareness so that individuals can make informed, responsible decisions to solve current issues and prevent future issues (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2011; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 1977). Outdoor education has been broadly defined as organized activities that take place in outdoor environments for different purposes (Neil, 2008). Adventure education as indicated by Sibthorp (2003) refers to experiences that use adventure to “achieve educational or developmental goals” (p. 82). Based on the definitions above my thesis, I will use these terms interchangeably because both incorporate the use of nature to provide a learning opportunities and outdoor experience. Additionally, CIMI’s Sea Camp can be regarding of incorporating these educational concepts (R. Turner, personal communication, September 12, 2011).
While camps do indeed seem to be an important arena for pro-environmental attitudes and behavior, they are not the sole determinant to establish environmental ethics. For example, Ewert et al. (2005) caution that while youngsters can form values while participating in activities, programs may serve to “modify” pre-existing environmental beliefs and attitudes of the individual “regardless of the type or intensity of program being offered” (p. 234). Similarly, Wells and Lekies (2006) found that involvement in environmental educational programs did not necessarily equate to development of pro-environmental attitudes or beliefs, noting that some programming may be too structured to provide a hands-on experience.

While direct experiences with the environment can inform an individual’s environmental ethic, the literature also suggests the importance of indirect experiences. Arnold et al. (2009) identify “influential people” (p. 29), such as parents, role models, teachers, and friends, as having a significant impression on environmental leader’s development. Marion Dresner and Mary Gill (1994) also indicate that role models are important because observations of these people can increase environmentally responsible actions in others.

Aside from influential people, Dresner and Gill (1994) indicated that case studies can potentially augment learning and increase skills to be used in environmentally responsible actions. Though Dresner and Gill (1994) did not specify what types of case studies would be the most beneficial in developing environmentally responsible actions, one may argue that case studies that examine the local environment would have the most impact since they would allow for the most hands on application. Other indirect
experiences that influenced both youth and adult environmentalists include media, books, and witnessing the destruction and/or alteration of the environment (including pollution) (Arnold et al., 2009; Chawla, 1998). Louise Chawla (1998), in a review of the literature concerning significant life experiences, makes an important statement regarding ERBs: many types of experiences (both direct and indirect) taken together contribute to an individual’s knowledge. One may extend this to mean that all experiences with nature are important, as they all hold the capability to inform an individual.

As in many areas of life, knowledge has the potential to not only inform, but to also inspire change within the individual. This is especially true regarding environmental ethics. For example, Dresner and Gill (1994) found that increases in both ecological knowledge and awareness of environmentally responsible actions resulted in an increase of the participants’ (ages 10-13) environmentally responsible behaviors. For example, they indicated that after attending an environmental camp, participants indicated that they recycle more at home, made conscious efforts to be less wasteful, and increased bike riding. Similarly, Meinhold and Malkus (2005) found that adolescents (ages 14-18) who showed more knowledge and pro-environmental attitudes illustrated more pro-environmental behaviors. Farmer et al. (2007) also found that environmental knowledge equated in increased pro-environmental attitudes. A combination of knowledge and values, according to Palmberg and Kuru (2000), “form a willingness to act” (p. 5) and play a vital role in decision making.

Humans are lifelong learners. As new information and experiences are accrued and processed, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs begin to take shape. Research has
illustrated that experiences with nature (especially during childhood) and environmental knowledge can bolster (or perhaps create) a sense of environmental ethics that stick with the individual for the rest of their life.

Camps

How can camps play a role in the development of an adolescent’s self-efficacy and environmental ethic? For over 150 years, camps have provided millions of children and young adults with opportunities to grow, play, and explore (Garst, Browne, & Bialeschki, 2011; Bialeschki, Henderson, & James, 2007; Henderson, Thurber, Scanlin, & Bialeschki, assisted by Schuler & Gambone, 2007). Camps, however, are more than a place to reside and ‘have fun.’ Camps provide an arena where their participants gain “affective, cognitive, behavioral, physical, social, and spiritual benefits” (Garst et al., 2011, p. 73) both during and after camp. Aside from schools and churches, camps constitute the largest organized programs in the United States and influence many children and young adults each year (Bialeschki et al., 2007).

Camps have traditionally been viewed as “good” (Henderson, Bialeschki, Scanlin, Thurber, Whitaker, and Marsh, 2006-2007, p. 19). The benefits of attending camp were examined in a large-scale study conducted by the American Camp Association (ACA). Campers (ages 8-14), parents, and staff received surveys before, during, and six months after camp (ACA, 2005, p. 2). Their findings suggest that camp promotes and increases campers’ levels of self esteem, independence, leadership skills, adventurous attitudes, and willingness to try new things (ACA, 2005, p. 2). While the study found that campers did
not perceive any changes in environmental awareness, it suggested that camps that do focus on environmental education can structure their program to promote a sense of connection with nature by providing access to participate in nature, thus, providing its campers with knowledge and tools to take action (Dresner & Gill, 1994). If environmental awareness, as Megan Urban and Kirsten Martin (2008) suggest, is not a specifically addressed in programs, campers may not gain it on their own. Similarly, a meta analysis of 61 camps suggests that if camps wish to bolster self constructs, such as self esteem, then aims and program structure need to reflect this goal (Marsh, 1999).

Based on the previous discussion concerning environmental ethics, a connection with nature, especially when individuals are directly and/or indirectly exposed to it at an early age, has been shown to develop and increase pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors, contributors to environmental ethics. While direct experience with nature may be “the most important aspect of the camp experience” (Louv, 2008, p. 228), Dresner and Gill (1994) contend that participating in all aspects of camp (both emotionally and physically) can serve as a “catalyst for action taking” (p. 2) and can carry over into home life.

Camp Characteristics

Camp can be seen as a vehicle for positive youth development; understanding how camp figures into this is increasingly important given the limitations to nature access that young adults face today (Garst et al., 2011; Louv, 2008). Garst et al. (2011) provide

---

13 Parents did note a change in their child’s environmental awareness between pre and post camp surveys. However, this was not maintained six months later (ACA, 2005).
a useful set of camp characteristics that can foster development for its campers: setting, structure, and program. Additionally, the importance of camp staff is also examined because the staff interacts often with the campers and provides an excellent example of role modeling for young campers.

The physical setting of camps provides campers with the experience of living away from home in a community situated in an “outdoor recreational setting” (Henderson et al., 2007, p. 1). The experience of being away from home is significant because camps provide extended immersion experiences for campers in a “low tech, nature-based, and comparatively simple environment” (Garst, Franz, Baughman, Smith, and Peters, 2009, p. 30). The camp experience differs from other experiences children may have because camp, especially, residential camps, are an intense, engrossing experience that can last for weeks (Garst et al., 2011; Henderson et al., 2007). Research has shown that when compared with day camps, residential camps, with longer sessions (4+ weeks), have higher levels of supportive relationships, skill building, and safety (ACA, 2006). The changes in environment and activity, coupled with the length of time spent at camp, provide campers with new challenges, and possibly goals, which can differ from their lives at home (Garst et al., 2011). Camp, then, can provide “escape[s]” (Garst et al., 2011, p. 76); escapes from the pressures of home and peers as well as the ability to make their own decisions and exert independence (ACA, 2005; Dresner & Gill, 1994).

The structure of camp provides necessary foundational support for its campers by providing rules, equalizing conditions, and a creation of a safe space which, taken together, can coalesce an association of camp with positive experiences and memories
(Garst et al., 2011). First, Garst et al. (2011) indicate that camp norms provide a guiding force of what rules and behaviors are expected at camp and are often demonstrated by adult staff and embodied in positive peer pressure. Next, while at camp, campers are treated as equals, minimizing the disparities between the “have and have nots” because they are provided with the same living conditions, eat the same food, and participate in the similar activities (Garst et al., 2011, p. 78). The equalizing force of camp, coupled with camp norms, has the ability to create a special, safe place for its campers. The safe space afforded by camps allows campers to leave their personal “baggage” at home (Garst et al. 2011, p. 78), create new personas (or ‘be themselves’), become less shy, and try new things because the possibilities are seemingly endless at camp (ACA, 2006; Dresner & Gill, 1994).

Camps are comprised of unstructured and structured components (Garst et al., 2011). Though unstructured components of camp have the ability to foster confidence in social settings (Roth & Brooks-Gunn as cited in Garst et al., 2011, p. 79-80), the most ‘successful’ camps limit the amount of unstructured time. Structured camp activities and programs allow for personal development because they give campers the opportunity to choose and/or progress through classes, which can foster their interests, promote independence, and encourage them to try new things (ACA, 2005; Garst et al., 2011).

While the characteristics of camp are important, the potential influence of camp staff and peers must also be addressed. Henderson et al., 2006-2007, state “relationships, especially with staff, are central components to almost everything that happens in youth organizations” (p. 20). Camp staff members, usually between 18-25 years old, are in
charge of teaching as well as camper supervision (Garst et al., 2011). As a result of this constant interaction (Henderson et al., 2007), especially at residential camps, campers pick up on behaviors exhibited by the staff (such as recycling, water conservation, etc.) and can be places where behaviors and ideas originate and/or develop (Urban & Martin, 2008). Thus, while camps provide many opportunities for personal development in outdoor settings, the characteristics of camps, camp staff, and peers can all play important roles in fostering self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Camps, Self-Efficacy, and Environmental Ethics

The importance of camps is clear. Camps (Dresner & Gill, 1994) serve as important settings for personal growth and development (ACA, 2005; Garst et al., 2011). Camps also have the potential to teach and demonstrate pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors (Dresner & Gill, 1994). As the literature indicates, camps provide a setting where these elements can be created or expanded upon. Camps, then, may prove to be a fertile ground for establishing and/or developing an adolescent’s sense of self-efficacy and environmental ethic.

Camp’s characteristics provide a context to furnish the four sources of self-efficacy. For example, it is common for staff members to be close in age to the campers (Garst et al., 2011). Similarly, other characteristics such as sex, socio-economic status, race, and ethnicity (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1986), coupled with the equalizing forces of camp, can provide vicarious experiences for campers and are further amplified by the fact that campers are constantly surrounded by staff members. Fellow campers also provide
vicarious experiences because, they too, spend vast amounts of time with each other and may share similar characteristics. However, peers and staff members do more than just provide vicarious experiences to campers; they also provide a constant support system by offering campers continual encouragement and help. As noted in an ACA (2006) study, returning, older campers (ages 14-18) indicated that they felt safe and supported in camp environments. The safety of a camp setting, coupled with positive feedback and meaningful persuasion, may instill a sense of stability and calm while creating a safe space for campers to branch out and try new things, thus affecting a camper’s physiological and affective states. In his research studying adventure education programs, Sibthorp (2003) notes that adolescents rely on their peers and adults [staff members] for both models and feedback, two sources of self-efficacy. The benefits of a safe, supportive environment may also extend into camp programs. The camp program and structure also allows campers to decide which activities to participate in and may serve to exemplify their mastery in a specific area. Taken as a whole, the sources of efficacy can be embodied within a camp climate.

A bolstered sense of self-efficacy may also contribute to their knowledge,

---

14 This study measured safety to include both emotional and physical safety while at camp (ACA, 2006, p. 11). The identification of a safe space afforded by camps can provide a stable environment that may play into an individual’s physiological and affective states, another source of self-efficacy. This study also found that supportive relationships included guidance, emotional support, practical support, adult and peer knowledge (ACA, 2006, p. 11). These relationships exemplify and provide both vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion sources of self-efficacy. Jim Sibthorp (2003), in his examination of a three week adventure education program for teenagers, found that when adolescents felt empowered, supported, and were engaged with the program, their self-regulatory, social, and leadership self-efficacy also increased.

15 Sibthorp (2003) argues that self-efficacy can be bolstered through adventure programs because the programs offer “ideal” (p. 89) settings and experiences. Based on this assertion, I contend that the same may be said of camps, especially camps that offer adventurous activities, such as Sea Camp.
attitudes, and behaviors about nature. The camp experience is just that: *an experience*. The emotional ties campers associate with camp and its surrounding environment are reinforced through positive experiences and memories (i.e. traditions, awards, certifications, mastery experiences) (Garst *et al.*, 2011). Additionally, camp activities are important in developing a relationship with a place because they can help create a special bond and identity with the natural world which can foster environmentally responsible behaviors (Dresner & Gill, 1994). Thus, multiple summers spent in the same place, such as a summer camp, may serve to build familiarity and affection for it (Tuan, 1974). In turn, repeated summer camp experiences may shape a person’s environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors since a major component of camp lies in its ability to provide access (in the form of materials, instruction, and experience) to nature, allowing campers to apply their accrued knowledge. Instead of letting their knowledge dissipate, application of knowledge facilitates their feelings of capability to do “something important” especially in regards to protecting nature (Palmberg & Kuru, 2000, p. 5). For example, Palmberg and Kuru (2000) found that among 11 and 12 year olds, repeated (though the years were unspecified) exposure to outdoor activities and education tended to yield more sympathetic views about nature and self confidence than those with limited exposure. If adolescents demonstrate more environmental knowledge and attitudes, their participation in pro-environmental behaviors is increased (Meinhold & Malkus, 2005).

While researchers have examined the effects of camp on campers’ self confidence as well as environmental attitudes, there remains a lack of understanding of the potential linkages between self-efficacy and environmental ethics within the context of camp as
well as in a non-camp context. The characteristics of camp, coupled with previous studies, indicate that camp may, indeed, be a very powerful medium to inform adolescents’ self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Meinhold and Malkus (2005) contend that while the literature has engaged with concepts related to self-efficacy (locus of control, self concept, and self esteem), there has been a deficiency linking it to environmental behaviors and attitudes [and knowledge], noting “little, if any, research [has been] published discussing self-efficacy and its connection to environmental issues” (Meinhold & Malkus, 2005, p. 514). Additionally, they note that self-efficacy can contribute to better understanding and measuring adolescents’ environmental knowledge, behavior, and attitudes. Self-efficacy, then, provides a baseline of understanding and, according to Meinhold and Malkus (2005), aid in forecasting and explaining behavior. Their study found adolescent high school students’ pro-environmental behaviors was predicted by their attitudes. Additionally, their study found that when adolescents had increased levels of environmental knowledge and attitudes, their pro-environmental behaviors also increased (Meinhold & Malkus, 2005, p. 528). As these authors note, knowledge is an important mediating factor of environmental attitudes and behaviors.16 While the study did not find self-efficacy to have a strong link between the relationship of environmental attitudes and behaviors, it did, as the authors state, indicate a positive relationship between self-efficacy and

16 Conversely, Urban and Martin (2008), in their study of week long day campers (ages 6-13), did not find a strong relationship between attitudes and knowledge. Instead, the research indicates that affect and knowledge are related. This interesting insight suggests that factors such as emotions and feelings may have impact a person’s behavior and knowledge.
environmental behaviors. This finding suggests that there is a potential for self-efficacy to inform environmental behaviors and even attitudes.\textsuperscript{17} While it seems as though self-efficacy may influence ERBs, and by extension environmental ethics, further research is needed to explore these interrelationships, especially within the context of returning campers’ summer camp experiences.

Summer camp has the potential to provide a space where both efficacy and environmental ethics can be fostered because it provides campers with the opportunity to try new things, master skills, explore and learn about the environment, and build lasting friendships with both peers and staff, all within a safe, encouraging environment. Given these opportunities afforded by camps, what are the lasting effects on its returning campers? What do the campers walk away with year after year?

What is missing from the literature is the understanding of whether returning to the same camp for multiple summers impacts its campers, especially in terms of their self-efficacy and environmental ethics, during camp and at home. While the ACA (2005) and Farmer \textit{et al.} (2007) looked at ‘long’ term effects of attending camps and environmental programs (six months; one year, respectively), this research asks:

- Does Sea Camp offer its returning campers the opportunity to master activities and affect their self-efficacy?

\textsuperscript{17} In a recent study, Tabernero and Hernandez (2011) studied recycling behaviors (an ERB) of city adults and the link to self-efficacy. They found that self-efficacy and intrinsic (interest) motivation played a mediating role in self-efficacy and pro-environmental behavior (Tabernero & Hernandez, 2011). While the context and participant groups of these two studies differed, both propose that self-efficacy may have an impact on ERBs.
• Does emulating peers and staff members affect returning campers’ self-efficacy?
• What roles do peers and staff members play in verbally persuading returning campers?
• How does the ‘camp experience’ factor into returning Sea Campers’ ability to try new things and set new goals?
• How does participating in direct and indirect environmental experiential programs each summer at camp influence environmental behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs?
• Does environmental knowledge influence returning campers’ behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs?
• Do multiple experiences at camp generate or modify campers’ placed based identity?
CHAPTER THREE: WELCOME TO SEA CAMP

Located in southern California, Guided Discoveries, Inc. was founded in 1978 by Ross and Kristi Turner. 18 This non-profit 501 (c) (3) organization’s stated purpose is to “Make a difference in the lives of children through unique opportunities of discovery” (Turner, 2011). Since its inception, over 941,000 students, campers, and adult chaperones have participated in the programs at one of Guided Discoveries’ five American Camping Association’s (ACA) accredited facilities (R. Turner, personal communication, September 12, 2011): the Catalina Island Marine Institute (CIMI) at Cherry Cove, Fox Landing, and Toyon Bay; Astrocamp, and the SSV Tole Mour, the largest educational tall ship on the West coast.

Guided Discoveries offers school year and summer camp programs. 19 While all of these facilities focus on hands-on, experiential learning, this thesis explores Sea Camp; the two, three week residential summer camp programs at Toyon Bay during July and August each summer for adolescents 12-17 years old. 20 Since 1980, Sea Camp staff have provided youth from a variety of backgrounds the opportunity to try new things, set personal goals, learn about the environment, and make friends in a supportive atmosphere. Sea Camp takes place in an outdoor, ‘unplugged’ setting (campers are not

18 For more information, please visit Guided Discoveries, Inc.’s website: http://www.guideddiscoveries.org
19 During June CIMI offers Junior Sea Camp. This program is comprised of three, one week programs tailored to children ages 8-13. Other Guided Discoveries’ summer programs include Astrocamp in Idywilde, CA and on the SSV Tole Mour.
20 Sea Camp was specifically chosen for this research for two reasons. First, Sea Camp has numerous returning campers who fit the criteria for this research, creating a large pool of potential participants. Second, I have spent the last five summers at Sea Camp and am well versed in Sea Camp’s traditions and practices.
allowed to bring items such as iPods, cell phones, etc. into camp). In essence, Sea Camp’s vision is to “prepare kids for life” (Turner, 2011).

This vision is manifested through the stated goals of Sea Camp: ensuring that campers have an enjoyable experience, allowing campers to expand their life skills by taking different classes, developing self esteem, providing positive support in a safe environment, encouraging environmental stewardship, and instilling the importance of the camp community (Turner, 2011). The purpose, vision, and goals of Sea Camp are dependent, then, on not only the unique environment that comprises camp, but the campers and staff members themselves.

Camp Participants: Campers and Staff

Camp is comprised of an array of diverse campers and staff members from around the United States and the world. Both campers and staff come from different socio-economic backgrounds, races, and religions.21 The diverse groups of campers are arranged into three groups based on age and gender: A Crew (ages 12-13), B Crew (ages 14-15), and C Crew (ages 16-17), with most campers in the B and C crews. Each of the crews can range in size from 4 to 10 campers per group per counselor, with returning

---

21 While there is a diverse community at Sea Camp, this research did not focus on a particulate race, class, gender, or socio-economic background. Rather, it sought to explore the experiences from any returning camper, regardless of his/her background. Tuition to attend Sea Camp in 2011, when this research was conducted, was $3,700 per session (Guided Discoveries, Inc., 2011). Because Sea Camp wants to reach as many young adults as possible, Guided Discoveries provides financial assistance to some of the campers through scholarships.
campers given the opportunity to request bunkmates.\textsuperscript{22} During their three week stay at camp, the campers share the same dorms with their groups but are encouraged to eat meals with other age groups. Additionally, many classes and activities at camp include campers of all ages, giving them the opportunity to meet and become friends with other campers in other age groups.

The diverse array of youth is also reflected in the staff.\textsuperscript{23} Staff members are from around the country and the world; some staff members were once campers themselves. There are instructional staff members (Dive Staff, Sail Staff, Science and Adventure Staff) and counseling staff members. Sail Staff members must have a college degree or be currently enrolled in college; Science and Adventure staff members must have a Bachelors of Science degree. All of the instructional staff must be at least 21 years old. The counseling staff must be at least 19 years old and currently enrolled in college.

Camp is overseen by the Catalina Sea Camp director, Paul “Butterkup” Kupferman and Sasha Moore. They are responsible for all of the campers as well as any issues that may arise during camp.

During training week prior to camp, each staff member undergoes rigorous training in their respective field. Additionally, the basic tenets and principles of Sea Camp are presented to the entire staff, so that everyone understands what Sea Camp

\textsuperscript{22} Some Sea Campers have attended CIMI’s summer camp program for as long as 10 summers. These returning campers began coming to camp as Junior Sea Campers since the age of 8. For the purposes of my research, the term “returning campers” includes campers who have attended Sea Camp for at least two summers.

\textsuperscript{23} Camp staff is comprised of not only instructional staff and counselors but also maintenance, kitchen, and office staff. For the purposes of this discussion, I am focusing on the instructional and counseling staff as they spend the most time with the campers.
entails. This training session also helps the staff bond as a whole. In this way, the staff begins to build a community at camp. This community is the basis for Sea Camp.

Camp Structure and Programs/Activities

Sea Camp’s three week sessions enable young adults from a variety of backgrounds to explore and engage in several activities while making new friends. Campers are afforded these opportunities in a safe, positive environment. As part of the application process, all campers are required to sign and adhere to the same basic camp rules and policies. The campers, then, come into camp knowing what type of behavior is and is not acceptable. For example, Sea Camp has a strict no bullying policy. One of the aims of camp is to create a safe environment where the campers can feel as though camp is their home. In addition, all campers are also expected to keep both their dorms and cabins clean, help with meal clean ups, and to make sure their trash enters the waste baskets or recycling bins.

Before coming to camp, the campers choose and register for their classes.24 A course catalog with brief descriptions is sent to the campers. Additionally, campers can access course descriptions as well as register on the Guided Discoveries website. On the first full day of camp, the campers spend the morning going to each of their classes for 15-30 minutes. After lunch, the campers are then allowed to add and/or drop their

24 Some classes require prerequisites, such as some scuba diving and sailing classes. Other classes, such as surfing, are reserved for the older campers (i.e. the Cs).
classes, depending on availability and prerequisites. This places the campers in the driver’s seat for how they want to spend their time at camp.

Campers meet with their classes three times a week. Morning and afternoon activity periods are either an hour and a half or three hours, depending on the activity. In each of the activities, campers are often with other campers from different groups. Depending on the activity, the class size ranges from 8 to 16 campers per instructor(s). Regardless of the type of class, all campers are responsible for caring for any equipment used and cleaning up after each of their classes.

When classes are not in session, for example, after meals, the campers have free or ‘rec’ time. Some of their free time is spent bonding with their cabin groups. Other times, the campers are free to spend their time as they choose (playing basketball, volleyball, walking along the beach, etc.) under adult supervision.

Each night, campers attend evening program. For the first few days of camp, these evenings are devoted to “Crew Nights” or nights where the A, B, and C campers bond with the other campers in their crew. For example, the Cs may have a jungle themed crew night while the As sing karaoke. As camp progresses, the campers have free or elective nights. On these nights, the campers are given a list of choices they may sign up for. Night activities range from tie dying at the Art Shack (the arts and crafts center) to watching the Sail Staff perform an interactive version of Captain Ron on the

25 For example, Seafood Cookery (a class where campers learn to cook) is an hour and a half period. All scuba diving classes, on the other hand, are all three hour periods.
26 For some classes, such as scuba diving, two diving instructors are assigned to each class.
Sail Deck to participating in night dives. The campers are also treated to a carnival and a
dance on the two Saturday evenings of camp. These evenings are theme oriented with
games, dancing, and refreshments provided. Because Sea Camp encourages participation
in these activities, the themes (decided by the counselors before camp) of these evening
activities are e-mailed to the campers prior to camp so they can bring costumes. All staff
members also attend these events, dressed in costume.

The Camp Atmosphere

On the campers’ first night at Sea Camp, they are welcomed to camp and are
treated to a campfire. During the campfire instructors and counselors put on skits. The
campfire is “hosted” by Butterkup and other counselors. The hosts dress up and act in
character. On their very first day of camp, campers are encouraged to participate in camp
norms such as ‘call and responses’ which are used throughout camp.27

The campfire and skits serve many purposes. First, the skits are intended to be a
humorous and many times incorporate pop culture and “CIMI-isms” (for example, the
saying, “There’s no wind underwater” is a reference to the good natured rivalry between
the Dive Staff and Sail Staff). In the skits, the instructors and counselors dress in
costumes, sing, dance, and, in general, act silly. The skits, then, ‘set the stage’ for the fun
attitudes and atmosphere to be generated during Sea Camp. Next, the skits serve as a
way for the staff members to engage with the campers by encouraging participation.

27 ‘Call and responses’ are attention-getting tools employed at camp. For example, when an adult needs to
get several campers’ attention he/she may shout, “How do you feel?” The group of campers responds, “We
feel good, oh we feel so good!” After they finish responding, they are aware that their attention is required.
Finally, the skits introduce the staff members to the campers. For example, at the end of each skit, the skit members introduce themselves and tell the campers which staff they are on.

Throughout the duration of camp, the CIMI staff participates in all of the activities and encourages the campers to do the same. It is not uncommon, for instance, to see instructors and counselors dressed in costumes for class, attending evening programs, and interacting with the campers. For example, during the carnival, the staff members make smoothies and play games with the campers. In this way, the staff and campers interact with each other out of class. Over the course of three weeks, both staff and campers are able to forge positive relationships.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

Epistemological Tradition

In this research, I employed two epistemologies, or ways of knowing (Trochim, 2001): post-positivism and constructivism. A central principle of post-positivism is the understanding there is not an ‘absolute truth’ since it is impossible to be completely certain about what we state as knowledge and the theories that we create (Creswell, 2003; Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Post-positivism enables the research to uncover and expand upon “true statements” and/or clarify whether there are relationships concerning a specific research question (Creswell, 2003, p.8; Phillips & Burbules, 2000, p. 38). Post-positivism acknowledges and validates the multiple realities of the participants (Creswell, 2007) and is “non-foundational,” acknowledging what we ‘know’ can and does change (Phillips & Burbules, 2000, p. 29). It is the understanding that theory and knowledge are not set in stone.

While this epistemology often employs a scientific method of inquiry (for example, quantitative surveys), it notes that the acquired information is not flawless because a perfect truth does not exist (Creswell, 2003; Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Due to this insight, Trochim (2001) notes, it is important to triangulate several different measures, including direct observation, in order to better understand the situation studied (p.19). For example, while my survey attempted to quantify returning campers’ views, it was not the end of my data collection or the sole way of trying to understand the impact...
of camp. Rather, it provided insights and generated questions that were later explored in the interviews.

As noted, post-positivists do not believe in an absolute truth. Our observations and modes of inquiry can originate from personal or “cultural experiences and world views” (Trochim, 2001, p. 19). For example, as a five year employee of Guided Discoveries, I, too, share the cultural experience of camp. My experiences and observations at camp facilitated the development of my inquiries. These ideas also align with some basic tenets of constructivism; personal views and interpretations of the world can be based on our own personal understanding of it (Trochim, 2001).

Constructivism acknowledges that the researcher’s prior experiences (personal, cultural, etc.) may influence his/her interpretation (Creswell, 2003; Charmaz, 2005). Thus, my interactions with the participants may affect my analysis and interpretation of their experiences (Creswell, 2003). Kathy Charmaz (2005) indicates that the researcher enters into the field with a frame of reference because what the researcher “see[s] and hear[s]” can depend upon prior experiences in the field as well as the relationships with the participants (p. 509). As an instructor, I share in the camp experience and interact with the “multiple realities” (Corbin & Holt, 2005, p. 49) of the participants.

A constructivist framework relies on the subjective views from people in a specific situation. This framework allows the participants to guide and shape the research process by sharing their experiences (Creswell, 2003). Further, constructivism does not limit or narrow participants’ explanations of their experiences into a few generic categories. Rather, the researcher searches for nuances in their responses by obtaining
several views about the studied situation (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2003). Therefore, I relied on participants' point of view to interpret their impressions of Sea Camp in order to develop a “pattern of meaning” of their experiences (Creswell, 2003, p. 9). Examining their subjective views through a constructivist lens enables my research to understand how (or if) the camp experience has influenced these young adults.

It is important to note that the camp experience may vary from person to person; subjective meanings and perceived truths may also vary. Therefore, it is inappropriate and incorrect to attempt to craft “universal truth[s]” about Sea Camp (Hesse-Biber, Leavy, & Yaiser, 2004; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). My research can not successfully explore Sea Camp’s impact on its campers by constricting their experiences to form a singular, generalized truth. This would ignore and marginalize other perceptions. Thus, the purpose of this research is not to identify one, absolute truth about Sea Camp. Rather, it seeks to understand campers’ perceived “partial and context-bound truths” (Hesse-Biber et al., 2004, p. 14).

Since I am relying on the campers’ participation to share their experiences and reflections of Sea Camp, it is important to acknowledge the relationship between the participants and myself. Since the youth population has traditionally lacked power in relation to adults, it is important to acknowledge this power dynamic (Eder & Fingerson, 2002). In other words, it is important that participants not only share the role of creating knowledge (Hesse-Biber et al., 2004) but are actively involved in the process. To insure inclusion in this process, participants were each given and asked to sign assent forms that explained that the research was entirely voluntary and they could decide at any time to
end their participation without any negative repercussions (Appendix D). Additionally, in order to protect confidentiality during the interview, each participant was given the opportunity to create their own pseudonym. These two measures gave the participants the power to decide if they were willing to participate, thus, giving them control of their involvement in the research process.

Methodological Approach

This research hinges on the views of Sea Camp’s returning campers. I used aspects of a grounded theory framework because it provides the necessary tools to analyze data so that “processual” relationships can be identified (Charmaz, 2005, p. 508). Further, grounded theory allows flexibility, considers the researcher’s point of view, and does not assume that the researcher lacks a frame of reference or theoretical views (Charmaz, 2005; Charmaz, 2002; Creswell, 2007). Additionally, the grounded theory approach uses data collected from the participants to construct and organize theories from the ground-up (Creswell, 2007). Data analysis is conducted throughout the data collection process, thereby allowing the researcher to “zig-zag” between analyses and data collection (Creswell, 2007, p. 64). The idea of “zig-zagging” between data analysis and data collection reflects Charmaz’s (2005, p. 510) view that this process is interactive in nature. For instance, five summers of observation in the field as a Sea Camp employee, engagement with the literature, and analysis of the survey all aided in the creation (and reformation) of the interview questions. This continual engagement with the data and literature illuminated areas in need of further clarification and/or expansion,
allowing for more “focused” data collection (Charmaz, 2002, p. 676). Grounded theory complements a triangulated approach for data collection (Corbin & Holt, 2005, p. 50) and includes both deductive and inductive reasoning (Charmaz, 2005, p. 104). This analysis and engagement with the data allowed me to formulate and revise my interview questions to address new areas of interest, further exploring my research questions.

Methods

Participants

Many campers have attended Sea Camp for several years; some have attended for as many as ten summers. Because returning campers have already experienced Sea Camp, I believe they make excellent candidates to learn if attending Sea Camp has affected their lives, especially in terms of their self-efficacy and environmental ethics. I chose to utilize these particular campers instead of those who have been to Sea Camp only one summer because I wanted the campers to be able to draw upon multiple summers of Sea Camp experiences. In other words, camp is not a ‘new’ experience for them. Additionally, the literature does not provide an extensive array of returning participants’ experiences at camps or in other environmental/outdoor educational programs; most research focuses on a singular experience. Therefore, my research identifies participants as returning campers who have spent at least two summers attending Sea Camp.

In order to find participants for this study, I employed purposive sampling to specifically look for campers who had spent at least two summers at Sea Camp (Berg,
Guided Discoveries used their database and File Maker Pro® software to identify and select campers who had previously attended Sea Camp; those who had never attended Sea Camp were excluded. This criterion initially produced 180 Sea Campers. Upon further verification, I found that out of the 180 campers, 112 met the requirement for this research. Out of the 112 eligible participants, 27 campers (24.1% response rate) completed and returned the consent and assent forms, and thus were able to participate in this research.

The initial contact was sent by Guided Discoveries in March 2011 and included: a signed letter from the founders of Guided Discoveries, Inc. explaining and supporting my research (Appendix A), a personally signed letter explaining my research (Appendix B), the consent/assent forms (including extra copies for the parents/guardians and campers to keep) (Appendices C and D, respectively), the survey, and an addressed return envelope. After the initial contact, I sent a reminder letter a few weeks later in April 2011 (Appendix E) to increase the number of responses and participants. Returning campers were deemed ‘eligible’ participants once they completed and returned both the consent and assent forms. Completion of these forms allowed the participants to be involved in both the survey and the interview.

**A Mixed Methods Approach**

A mixed method approach allowed me to generate and eventually refine my data through the utilization of both quantitative and qualitative methods (Creswell, 2003).

---

28 Out of the 180 potential participants, 68 participants had only attended Sea Camp once (making 2011 Sea Camp their second summer), and thus, were ineligible for participation.
Additionally, mixed methods allowed me to obtain information through the use of closed and open ended questions (survey and interviews, respectively) (Creswell, 2003). By applying sequential mixed methods procedures, I was able to utilize, for example, the results of the quantitative surveys in order to develop qualitative interview questions (Creswell, 2003) that informed the 20 semi-structured interviews conducted during the two sessions at Sea Camp in 2011.

A mixed methods approach was chosen because focusing exclusively on quantitative or qualitative methods would not give my research the in-depth results that I believe is necessary. Since “no singular investigatory approach can provide a full explanation of behavior” (Bandura & Locke, 2003, p. 96), a mixed methods approach is fruitful because it allows the researcher to “blend” the strengths of these two methods (Trochim, 2001, p. 158). For example, obtaining data strictly through surveys would not allow me to personally interact or engage with the participants. Surveys alone cannot provide important anecdotes or clarify certain responses. Conversely, using strictly qualitative measures limits the number of participants and would be a narrow approach to collect data. While conducting interviews allows me to interact with the participants on a personal level, it was not realistic or feasible to conduct over one hundred interviews during the two, three week sessions of Sea Camp. Therefore, the compilation of quantitative and qualitative methods aided in providing deeper insight to my data collection and analysis of returning Sea Campers’ experiences (Creswell, 2003).
Data Collection

In the first phase of research, returning campers were issued a survey in March 2011, prior to the 2011 summer Sea Camp sessions. The survey was based on Albert Bandura’s self-efficacy scale (Bandura, 1997; 2006b) and components from Ralf Schwarzer and Matthias Jerusalem’s (2009) general self-efficacy scale to determine the levels of campers’ perceived self-efficacy. The anonymous survey also asked the campers about their views concerning the environment (Appendix F). The survey invited the campers to rate on a scale of 0-10 to what degree they believe they can do something (0=Can not do at all; 10=Highly certain can do). Because this survey focuses specifically on returning campers, it did not contain many screening questions (Czaja & Blair, 2005). Care was taken to reduce the amount of jargon or other language that could potentially influence the participants’ answers (Czaja & Blair, 2005; Fargas-Malet et al., 2010).

The survey served two objectives. First, it allowed my research to generate a large amount of data from returning campers since interviewing all returning campers was not plausible. A survey done prior to camp allowed my research to obtain information from returning campers that would otherwise not have had the chance to take part in this research. Second, the results of the survey served as a tool to help identify areas that needed expansion or clarification, allowing me to craft semi-structured interview questions that reflected the results of the survey.

Twenty out of the twenty-seven eligible campers were randomly selected for the semi-structured interviews. Ten campers from each session were notified prior to camp that they had been randomly selected to be interviewed during their respective session
(Appendix G). Once at camp, I introduced (or re-introduced) myself to each camper. On the morning of the interview, I reminded the camper about the time and location of the interview.

This smaller sample size reflects the logistical and time constraint concerns at camp. A smaller number of campers helped ensure thorough, meaningful interviews about their experiences. In this way, the interviews attempted to ascertain a deeper understanding of camp’s impact and the important components of their experiences (Charmaz, 2002).

The semi-structured interview method gave the interview process flexibility because it allowed for reorganization during the interview (Berg, 2009). This flexibility is especially important when interviewing young adults about their experiences at camp because it allows them to digress and expand while allowing the interview to maintain some semblance of structure. As with the survey questions, the interview questions were crafted to reflect common vernacular. It was also imperative that I was reflexive during the interview process so that the questions not only ‘made sense’ to the participants but were designed to elicit individual experiences (Charmaz, 2002, p. 681). Additionally, the flow of the interview came from the campers’ perspective (Berg, 2009) which enabled them to understand and comprehend the questions.

Because Sea Camp is highly structured, I had a limited window of time to interview campers; therefore, each camper was interviewed once. With all of these considerations in mind, it was, therefore, important to limit the amount of throw away questions and, instead, focus on essential and probing questions (Berg, 2009). The
interview itself was comprised of predetermined questions relating to specific topics that were created to utilize the campers’ individual Sea Camp experiences (Berg, 2009; Charmaz, 2002). For example, campers were asked questions about their experiences at camp and whether these experiences influenced their goal setting abilities and their feelings towards the environment (Appendix H). I asked the participants the same core questions, allowing space for those who wished to elaborate by telling stories and/or sharing anecdotes. These interviews were then able to put an “individual face” on the interview data (Charmaz, 2002, p. 690). The interview process allowed the campers to reflect on their experiences in their own words and serve as “experts” in their own lives, capable of explaining and articulating their life experiences (Fargas-Malet et al., 2010, p. 175).

The limited window of time to interview these campers reflects the choice of employing “one shot interviews” (Charmaz, 2002, p. 682). While these interviews may be unable to correct earlier oversights from the early interviews, I was able to review and revise some of interview questions to reflect new areas of interest (Charmaz, 2002). While one shot interviews, as Charmaz (2002) states, can be problematic because the researcher may be unable to fully grasp the situation under study, my experience and familiarity with Sea Camp and the participants assures that I am not merely an outsider studying camp. Rather, I have been an active member of the Sea Camp community for five summers and, therefore, fully immersed in Sea Camp’s community, activities, and culture.
With logistical and time considerations in mind, I purposely scheduled interviews during evening recreational time (‘rec time’), the period after dinner and before evening program, so that it did not interfere with morning, afternoon, and evening programs. Only one interview was scheduled per evening, allowing the campers to have as much time as they wanted to answer the questions. Specific evenings were excluded from conducting interviews because they would have interfered with major camp events (such as the dance and the carnival). These events are important social components to camp; recreation time on these evenings was used by many campers to prepare for these activities.

All interviews took place in an outdoor, public area that received minimal foot traffic (for example, outside the camp director’s office and/or picnic tables). Camp regulations forbid an adult and minor to be in a private room together without the presence of another adult. Therefore, in order to eliminate any perceived intimidation or pressure of having another adult present (and listening to their responses) during the interview, it was important to not only keep the interview in a public, yet quiet area, but also a place where the campers felt safe. Campers were reminded at the beginning of each interview that their participation was voluntary and they could end the interview at any time. Once the interview ended, campers resumed recreation time until evening program began.

In order to protect confidentiality, I took the following measures. After each interview was completed, I wrote detailed field notes on a personal, password protected computer. To insure confidentiality, I provided (or had the camper choose) a pseudonym. When the recorder was not in use, it, along with all other data pertaining to this research,
was kept in a secure location. The audio recordings of the interviews were destroyed as soon as possible after the interviews were conducted. The results of this research will be published, with a copy of this thesis given to Guided Discoveries. While the raw data may be used by Guided Discoveries for future use (Appendix C), the identities of all participants will not be released. All data will be destroyed after three years.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The first portion of the results and analysis conveys the survey results. In the second portion of this section, the interviews are analyzed to provide a deeper understanding of returning Sea Campers’ experiences.

Survey Results and Analysis

Camper demographics

Out of 180 campers Guided Discoveries, Inc. contacted, I initially found 113 potential candidates for this research and received and analyzed 28 survey responses (response rate 25%) using the Statistical Package for the Social Science program (SPSS).\textsuperscript{29} The average age of the 28 survey responses was 15.39 (Figure 1). Just over half (57.1%) of these campers were between the ages of 15 and 16 (25% and 32.1%, respectively). There was one 13 year old who responded and five 17 year olds (Figure 1). Of these 28 campers, 18 were females (64.3%) and 10 were males (35.7%).

\textsuperscript{29}This number was later adjusted to 112 potential candidates after adjusting for eligibility. While I attempted to create an understandable survey and to ensure each camper was qualified to contribute in this research, it was later found that one camper was ineligible. Due to the fact the survey was anonymous; I was unable to readjust the survey to reflect this change after the data was analyzed.
The average amount of summers spent at Sea Camp is 2.54 summers, with over half (57%) indicating they spent two summers at Sea Camp (Figure 2). Campers who had attended Sea Camp for three summers make up just under a third of the respondents (32%). Three campers have been to Sea camp for four summers (11% of the sample).
Figure 2. Number of summers spent at Sea Camp based on survey data (Not including 2011 summer).

Recoding and reclassifying

The scale for my survey had an original range from 0-10 (0-Cannot Do at All; 10-Highly Certain Can Do). In order to better analyze the data in SPSS, the range of response choices was recoded to a range of six. Though “0” was recoded, it was not combined with “1” since “0” was the lowest possible response in the survey (Cannot Do at All). The range was recoded as follows: 0 responses changed to 1 (Cannot Do at All); 1-2 responses changed to 2 (Cannot Do); 3-4 responses changed to 3 (Moderately Cannot Do); 5-6 responses changed to 4 (Moderately Cannot Do); 7-8 responses changed to 5
For the remainder of this analysis, I will refer to these recoded variables.

Initially I had categorized the responses as an Ordinal variable, since this is a ranking scale. However, in order to utilize ANOVA and t-Tests, I reclassified them as Interval/Ratio variables because the distance between the categories is an important differentiation (Babbie et al., 2007, p. 21).

The findings

The analysis of these surveys served as a starting point that helped inform the development of the interview protocol. The analysis was not meant to be viewed as conclusive evidence of how or if camp has affected returning campers; nor does it seek to procure a singular truth. Additionally, it did not seek to compare one cohort against another for the purpose of describing if attending Sea Camp for X number of years was the most beneficial. Though the analysis of the survey broke the campers up into cohorts, its purpose was to understand if any relationships existed. Using SPSS, I analyzed the campers’ responses using ANOVA and t-Tests.

An ANOVA compared mean responses (the recoded 0-10 scale) to each variable (26 total) and the years of attending camp to examine if a significant relationship existed. Levene’s significance was used to determine if an ANOVA was applicable (Levene’s p must be ≥.05). While some variables had a p value of ≥.05, upon further analysis, these variables were not significantly different. This suggests that variances are significantly

---

30 One camper responded using two decimals (8.5 and 9.5). In terms of recoding, those answers that were 8.5 were kept in the 7-8 categories. Answers with a 9.5 were recoded into the 9-10 categories.
different and that there was not a relationship between years at camp and the measured variables.

While the ANOVA did not yield significant relationships, t-Tests were conducted to further analyze the data to determine if any relationships existed. In this way, the results of the t-Tests could further guide the interview questions. The t-Tests compared two categories at a time (for example, comparing third year summer campers with fourth year summer campers; males and females) to determine if there was any significance in regards to each of the 26 variables in the survey. The results of the t-Tests indicated that only the t-Tests between second and third year campers and t-Tests between the sexes indicated a relationship (p≤.05) (Table 1).

Table 1 illustrates the variables that had significant values (p≤.05). Within this cohort of campers, 16 campers had been to Sea Camp for two summers and 9 campers had been to Sea Camp three summers. The first two variables (p=.001 and p=.033, respectively) provide useful information regarding environmentally responsible behaviors as both suggest taking action. However, further inquiry was necessary to ascertain how (or if) this translated into the daily lives of campers. How, for example, were these variables put into action? These variables were explored further in the interviews (questions 10 and 11) to learn if any pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors were described.

The third variable listed below (p=.021) attempted to learn whether campers felt as though they could accomplish tasks on their own. This is related to interview questions 6 and 7 in regards of whether campers ask for help at camp/home, who they
receive help from, etc. The last variable (p=.016; p=.017) asked campers to what degree they were able to learn from previous camp experiences to help make new goals. This was investigated further in interview question 8, asking campers to provide examples and insight as to how (or if) camp has influenced them to use their experiences at camp to set future goals for themselves. For instance, do they use their past successes at camp to set more goals for themselves?

Table 1. t-Test between campers who have been to Sea Camp two and three summers; t-Test between campers’ sex*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since I started coming to Sea Camp, I can explain to my family and friends why we need to use our natural resources wisely.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I started coming to Sea Camp, I can understand the importance to take action in local environmental issues.</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I can complete tasks by myself.</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future I can learn from experiences at camp to help make new goals.</td>
<td>0.016; .017*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-Tests were also conducted on campers who have been to Sea Camp 3 and 4 summers (9 campers and 3 campers, respectively) and campers who attended camp 2 summers and 4 summers (16 campers and 3 campers, respectively). In both of these t-Tests, I found no p values that were less than .05. While there is no relation for these particular variables in this particular research, one must temper the results of these two t-Tests with the fact that there is a much smaller number of camper responses who have attended Sea Camp for four summers when compared to the numbers of the campers in the other cohorts. It is also important to note the cost of camp may have an impact on the numbers of fourth year returning campers (in the summer of 2011, the cost to attend a session of Sea Camp is $3,700).
The responses obtained from the 28 campers, before and after recoding, indicated very high scores. For instance, 25/26 variables had a mean response of at least 5 (Can Do). These high responses speak to high ceiling effects and/or social desirability response biases, which are commonly found within adventure education research (Sibthorp, 2003). Though these campers felt confident they can do the tasks listed for them, none of these responses reared a mean of 6 (Highly Certain Can Do). One response, regarding taking action in local environmental issues, had the lowest mean score of 4.8 (Moderately Can Do).

It is important to also note that not all of the variables yielded high scale responses. In other words, not all respondents felt strongly that they “can do” all these tasks. Though none of the responses analyzed revealed scores lower than a 2 (Cannot Do), there were three variables with minimum scores of 2. These variables included sharing Sea Camp experiences with others who had not attended camp, explaining to others the importance of using resources wisely, and taking action involving local environmental problems (survey questions 7, 27, 28, respectively). These three variables seem interrelated as they involve communication and action. For example, if one is not comfortable sharing experiences with those who have not attended camp, they may be, perhaps, unlikely to explain to others the importance of conservation and, thus, may not take environmental action.

Seventeen out of twenty-eight participants chose to share tidbits about their experiences at Sea Camp at the end of the survey. Eleven campers indicated camp, is an extremely positive place that is not only “safe” but also “inspirational.” One camper
indicated that “after coming back from Sea Camp (especially my second year) I had a whole new perspective on what I am capable of doing!” Another camper indicated that camp “instill[s] confidence and teaches kids that they can do new/different things.” Two campers felt Sea Camp helped them understand the environment; one wrote classes such as Green Team and Mountain Biking had a significant impact, writing “Biking has taught me a lot, and how much impact one small act can make.”

In their own words, the open responses begin to cast a light on how the campers feel about camp. Their words and feelings, in addition to their survey responses, helped generate and inform my interview questions for the next phase of research.

Interview Results and Analysis

Camper demographics

During the 2011 Sea Camp sessions, I conducted 19 complete interviews and 1 incomplete interview. Each interview ranged from twenty-five minutes to just under two hours. Of these 20 returning campers, 6 were males and 14 were females. Seventy percent were between the ages of 16 and 17 (eight and six campers, respectively), 25% (5 campers) were 15 years of age, and one camper was 14 years old (Figure 3).
As with the survey, many (50%) of the interviewed Sea Campers had been to Sea Camp twice before, making this year their third year at camp (Figure 4). Seven campers (35%) had been to Sea Camp for three summers while 3 campers (15%) attended Sea Camp for four previous summers.

**Figure 3.** Distribution of Sea Campers’ age based on interview data.

**Figure 4.** Number of summers spent at Sea Camp based on interview data (N=20) (not including 2011 summer).
For the purposes of the analysis, I refer to the campers as “third, fourth, and fifth year campers” because at the time of the interview, the campers were in their third, fourth, and fifth summers at camp. Additionally, the participants’ names have all been changed to protect their confidentiality. Camper biographies are located in Appendix I.

**Mastery experiences at camp**

Sea Camp provides many upper level classes that usually require ‘passing’ prerequisite classes. In this respect, campers must demonstrate adequate knowledge and master skills in order to progress into higher level classes. For some campers, mastery entailed acquiring and demonstrating skill proficiency. This served as an indicator that their abilities were deemed satisfactory; they succeeded in a task and were allowed to progress. Others identified their physical ability to perform a certain set of skills (such as tying knots, completing dive skills, and skippering boats) as indicator of success. A commonality among these responses involves the idea of obtaining tangible proof as a means of gauging their success (i.e. progressing to an upper level class or obtaining a certification).

Nineteen out of twenty campers indicated they were taking higher, more advanced classes. As mentioned above, in order to participate in these more advanced classes, they needed to have demonstrated the necessary prerequisite skills and knowledge.  

---

31 For example, in order to take the advanced scuba diver class, one must have already demonstrated mastery and proficiency in their skills and succeeded in passing the scuba diver written test.
“logical” step, even becoming “addicted” to moving up through classes and/or obtaining higher levels of certification. As Megan, a fifth year Sea Camper noted, “you feel more accomplished when you get to another level.” This attitude also reflected the fact that this camper, as well as others, felt proud of themselves for achieving higher levels of certifications and/or moving up through classes.

Indeed, many campers (14/20) pinpointed specific examples of using their past successes to move to more advanced challenges. Using their past successes allowed some to set their sights on higher certification levels and/or more advanced classes. Successful completion of a class, for example, may have bolstered the idea that they possessed the competency and skill set to move up to these classes. For example, Tom, a third year Sea Camper, indicated that because he got through his physically demanding Rescue Diver class the previous summer, he felt capable to take Master Diver (the highest level of dive certification at camp). The notion of using the past success of a physically demanding class enabled Tom to strive for the highest level of dive certification. In the same way, Hannah, a third year Sea Camper, indicated that when she began to doubt her ability to sail offshore, she reminded herself that she had accomplished the same feat the previous summer, thus, giving her the confidence to sail offshore again. In other words, these campers not only believed that they could take on new challenges, but also had prior successes that told them they could overcome new challenges. Thus, building up repertoires of success encouraged these campers to strive for higher challenges.
The successes of eight campers influenced their views on what they believed they generally “can do.” For some, it is the “realization” that they have the capabilities to tackle new things or overcome obstacles. Lorraine, a fourth year Sea Camper, explained overcoming obstacles “makes me feel like I can get through things now…it’s less stressful because of experience.” Thus, as a couple campers explained, success in one area can equate to feelings of being capable of success in similar areas. Falling back on her successes at camp enabled Samantha, a fourth year Sea Camper, to try new things at home. Though she lacked experience in cross country, she remembered, similarly, she had no prior experience with sailing or diving before coming to camp. Her successes in these areas at camp provided her with the impetus to try track and cross country at home.

Does camp provide campers with mastery experiences that can affect their self-efficacy? As noted in the literature review, mastery experiences can substantiate background knowledge in a particular area (Bandura, 1986; 1987). Camp allows the space to not only try new things (as over half of the campers indicated), but also provides the idea that campers are capable of mastery. Mastery is bolstered by succeeding in basic classes first. The successes in basic classes provide campers with the tools and experiences they need to better judge if they have the capability to try similar activities. Though mastery may not be the desire for all campers, they may unconsciously ‘walk away’ with the feeling of being capable to accomplish and master tasks at camp.

Another important consideration concerning mastery regards how achievements were procured. As Bandura (1997) explained, if the individual underwent severe hardship and increased amounts of effort in order to master something, he/she may doubt
his/her ability to succeed in this area in the future. While nearly all of the campers indicated that they faced challenges while at camp, no one indicated these challenges were insurmountable. Challenges, when encountered, were relatively “small.” This idea is furthered by the notion that eighteen campers indicated they would not give up trying to reach their goals at camp. As Tom, Finn, and Maya, all third year Sea Campers, indicated, they would do whatever was necessary to reach their goal of obtaining their Master Diver certification. As Maya stated, “[I] wouldn’t leave the island until I did it [received her Master Diver certification].”

Vicarious experiences: The roles of the staff and campers

Many campers’ indicated that they wanted to emulate staff and/or campers’ skill capabilities, personality traits, or both. Additionally, emulation is also reflected in campers’ statements regarding whom they obtain help and guidance from when faced with challenges.

Fourteen of the twenty campers indicated they wanted to mimic and/or identify with staff members (i.e., instructors and counselors). A few campers stated that watching their instructors ‘in action’ provided an impetus for them to want to achieve the same skill set. For example, Samuel, a third year camper, indicated that as he watched his skin diving instructors dive through the kelp, he decided that he wanted to copy them. In a similar way, Hannah mentioned that her interest in sailing stemmed from watching the sailing instructors as a young camper. Three Sea Camps later, sailing catamarans has become one of Hannah’s favorite activities. Other campers indicated wanting to emulate instructors’ and counselors’ personality traits. For example, Dayna, Violet, and Hannah
mentioned that watching staff members’ interactions with others helped them realize that it was acceptable to be yourself at camp because, as Dayna mentioned, the counselors can be “goofy” and everyone in camp is “OK with that.” Similarly, Hannah believes that because “everyone [staff and campers]... [Is] their own person [at camp]” she also could be her own person, too.

Sixteen campers identified their peers as people they want to identify with or emulate. Fellow campers are close in age and a more realistic comparison (in terms of skill and ability) than their instructors or counselors. Nine campers, for example, said that they learn by watching others in their classes. For example, Casey, a third year Sea Camper, specifically named a classmate who she believed was extremely proficient in skin diving. Watching this person excel at breath holding and diving, made her realize she “can be better... [there are] more things to do [in class].” This caused her to “to step it up” and try harder. Finn indicated that not only would he look to classmates in his Rescue Diving class, but he would also elicit the help from campers who took (and succeeded in) the class the previous summer.

As the oldest campers at Sea Camp, the Cs have the potential to provide modeling behaviors. Many of the Cs have attended camp for several summers; even if they have not, they are older, and, perhaps, viewed as wiser campers. Five campers indicated that as As and Bs they watched the Cs’ behavior and attitudes as a guide for ‘how to act’ at camp. For example, Megan, Violet, and Samuel (fifth, fourth, and third year Sea Campers, respectively) remembered watching the Cs have fun by “being themselves.” As a result, these three campers understood that being themselves at camp equated to
having fun. In other words, the older Cs demonstrated that there was no need to act timid or quiet at camp. Thus, these three campers followed suit.

While instructors and counselors inspire campers through their actions, their status as instructors and counselors also provide wisdom and guidance. For example, while fourteen campers indicated they would go to their instructors for help, nine of them indicated they chose instructors because they “knew the most.” In their eyes, instructors are “experts” in their fields and trust their opinions because they provide the best information and help to the campers. Likewise, out of the eleven campers who said they would go to their counselors for help, five chose counselors they knew and/or trusted because, as Maya described, they are people she “can trust their morality and judgment.”

Though staff members provide campers with help, thirteen campers identified their friends or peers as people they would turn to if they ran into challenges. As Samantha explained, “we [she and her friends] are in the same boat.” In other words, Samantha believes that because her friends also share the experience at camp, they make an excellent choice to ask for help since they ‘get it.’

Undoubtedly, many campers model their capabilities, attitudes, and behaviors after staff members and peers. Staff members have the potential to exemplify the upper echelon of success in their respective areas. They are, after all, dive instructors, sailing instructors, science instructors. Thus, what they say and do ‘matters’ and campers are cognizant of this. Likewise, young adults, as discussed in the literature review, often model their peers as a means to judge their efficacy (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Thus, camper to camper emulation, especially in regard to younger campers ‘looking up’ to
older campers (the Cs), may provide an individual with a better estimate of what is actually possible because campers are similar in age and, if they are in the same classes, may have similar capabilities. Additionally, fellow campers share the experience of camp: the classes, activities, triumphs, and struggles. They are, indeed, “similar others” (Schunk & Meece, 2006, p. 73). This shared experience, perhaps, bonds them together; thus, the influence that they have on one another may carry more weight (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998). While it may be difficult to gauge whether campers’ self-efficacy has increased by imitating others, what is apparent is the fact that campers heavily use and rely on staff and, perhaps more importantly, other campers.

The role of verbal persuasion

Camp challenges some of its campers. In order to cope with these challenges, many campers persist until they succeed in their endeavor and many also ask for help. Asking others for help encompasses the idea of going to knowledgeable and/or trusted individuals; asking a qualified person. At camp, these are the staff and/or other campers. Thus, these trusted experts are likely to provide the camper with some sort of positive affirmation or encouragement. Indeed, nowhere in my research did I encounter campers’ statements as having received any negative reinforcement or criticism when they asked for help. For example, Casey described she never felt as though her instructors were “pushy” nor did they make her feel badly when she struggled with something. As Dax explained, “no one” gets frustrated with you for asking questions because, as Lorraine put it, instructors “want you to succeed.”
Twelve out of twenty campers indicated they received positive reinforcement/encouragement from staff members. Instructors, especially, have the potential to offer legitimate advice because they are deemed as ‘experts.’ Of the nine campers who said they would go to their ‘expert’ instructors because they knew the most, six specifically gave examples of receiving positive affirmations and encouragement from them. Samuel, for example, explained that when he struggled with a scuba skill, his diving instructor provided guidance, encouraging Samuel to take “baby steps” when he was practicing this skill. Similarly, Sandy, a fifth year Sea Camper, said she practices with her instructors until she is able to master a skill. As these campers practice their skills, they are undoubtedly given positive reinforcement by their instructors. Several campers echoed this notion when they stated that the instructors framed their feedback in a positive light. Campers spoke of receiving “second chances” which reinforces the idea of positive feedback. As Amanda, a fourth year Sea Camper, explained, second chances are “freely given.” Failure, then, is not considered a failure because, according to Amanda, Lorraine, and Megan, you can always try again at camp.

Ten campers acknowledged receiving positive affirmations/encouragement from fellow campers. As Megan and Casey explained, they rely heavily on their friends for guidance and support. Casey explained that when she tells others her goals, she is often encouraged to try to achieve them. Megan also shared that her cabin has a “tradition” of talking about their “highs and lows each day.” Highs are usually met with “congratulations!” and the lows are met with her friends “chiming in to help.” In this
way, Megan and Casey both feel they have a “support system” at camp. Campers, then, are also purveyors of positive reinforcement.

What does encouraging statements from staff such as “You can do it!” mean to campers? While there is not a universal answer, it appears, coinciding with the literature, that when staff provide support and encouragement, the campers really ‘hear’ them. Perhaps this is partially owed to the esteem campers imbue to their instructors and counselors. Again, these adults are considered qualified experts in a plethora of fields, and, as Bandura (1986; 1997) suggests, are best equipped to provide the necessary feedback, help, and expertise that incite campers to pick themselves up and try again when they stumble. Not only are the staffs’ opinions and help held in high esteem, they are also justified because they are the experts who are properly equipped to provide realistic assessments (Bandura, 1986, p. 400) of campers’ capabilities.

As previously stated, while campers may not have the expertise of the staff members, they can also provide positive encouragement. Whether it is in regard to social or class issues, peers can also offer realistic encouragement as they also share the experiences of camp. In essence, fellow campers have an ‘on the ground’ perspective the staff may lack. The campers, especially the Cs, have the unique perspective of teenagers; they can illuminate possibilities and offer encouragement to their peers. Given the six campers who responded that they were influenced by the Cs as younger campers, the Cs’ standing within camp allows them to not only provide emulating experiences for younger campers, but also affords them the opportunity to encourage younger campers. For example, Megan and Chad, who were Cs at the time of the interview, noted that as young
campers, they received encouragement from their older peers to try new things. Fellow campers, especially those who are older, more experienced, and exhibit proficient skills and knowledge can have an impact. Lorraine, for example, explained that in her rock climbing class she seeks out other class members who have succeeded in climbing certain routes because they have the best advice. *They* are also about the same age.

It is important to note, however, that camp can produce negative peer reinforcement. One camper indicated she received negative reinforcement from other campers during a class. Though she did not indicate numerous negative instances, it still is relevant to acknowledge that camp, like the real world, can have some negativity. However, the overwhelmingly lack of criticism and negative reinforcement in the interviews implies that for the most part, staff and campers provide positive verbal persuasion. It is a place where, if you falter, you are encouraged to pick yourself up and try again. It is a place where the instructors, as Lorraine articulated, want you to succeed.

**Physical and mental feelings at camp**

Thus far, the analysis has explored the ways camp can promote and provide mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, and verbal persuasion for its campers. However, how do campers feel when they are at camp? Why do they feel as though they can master activities, emulate others, and ‘hear’ what others have to say? According to campers, Sea Camp is a place where they can be themselves and try new things, without the stressors of home. It is a place to build the self. Thus, the positivity that camp exudes is embodied in the statements campers made with regard to the physiological/affective states, the fourth component of self-efficacy, while at camp: having positive
moods/feelings, feeling proud/confident of oneself, feeling less stressed, feeling supported and encouraged, and feeling accepted.

Eighteen out of twenty campers indicated positive moods and feelings while at camp. A common thread linking their statements together regards the attributes they assign to camp: it is a safe place. Their statements identify a safe place as one where you are free to be yourself, find yourself, come out of your shell, and become outgoing. It is one that allows Jane, a fifth year Sea Camper, to feel “socially comfortable” and one that makes Hannah “want to be myself.” Several campers stated that camp is full of enthusiastic, fun people that create, according to Hannah and Chad, a “fun atmosphere.” In this “Godly awesome” place, the positivity and enthusiasm of everyone (campers, counselors, and instructors) creates an environment that helps Lela, a third year Sea Camper, “recharge [her] batteries.” It makes Amanda and Lorraine want to sing and dance to the music in their cabins. Camp is meant to be fun and, according to six campers, it is a home and a community. In essence, camp promotes positive feelings and moods because camp is a safe place. After all, as Megan said, it is “CIMI, not CIMean.”

These positive moods and feelings extend the realm of possibilities for many campers. The sheer amount of choices, the directions they get to choose to follow, is echoed in thirteen camper responses of feeling pleased that they can take control of what activities and classes they enroll in. As Amanda explained, choosing her classes is “liberating.” These reflections led four campers to view the possibilities at camp as endless. As Samuel explained, camp is “jam packed” with fulfilling activities. While camp offers an array of classes, Samantha indicated there was never a time in her four
summers at Sea Camp where she felt like there was nothing she could not do. Thus, camp is not only revered as a place where new and unique opportunities abound, but is also a place of accomplishment.

These statements about positive moods and feelings at camp are bolstered by the eleven campers who made statements about feeling proud and/or confident at camp. Interestingly, many of these statements were in direct reference to accomplishing (i.e. mastering) a specific skill or task. For example, Megan was proud of the fact that not only was she the only girl in her mountain biking class, but that she also made it up a hill that challenged her the previous summer. Her proudest moment, however, took place during her fourth summer at Sea Camp where she was chosen by the counselors to lead her Olympic (akin to a field day) team to victory. Proudly, Megan shared this memory and explained that it was the “most pumped I’ve ever been in my entire life… [I] relive it all the time.” Similarly, Mick, a third year Sea Camper, was also chosen to lead an Olympic team. Though his team was not victorious, he, too, reflected on this experience. Megan and Mick (both Cs) indicated they felt not only proud that they were chosen by the counselors but they were also proud of the fact that they were able to lead their peers.

Notably, three of these campers talked specifically about the confidence they felt once they overcame fears at camp. For example, Lela explained she overcame her fear of the ocean by taking sailing classes. As a result, she now feels confident skippering boats. Likewise, Samuel overcame his fear of kelp during his skin diving class with the help of his instructor. Now, not only can he confidently dive through kelp, but he can also explain to others why they should not fear it.
What makes camp feel so safe to be yourself, to come out of your shell? Why are campers confident and proud at camp? While there is no simple answer, it seems there is a composite of several different attributes such as reduced stress/anxiety, feeling supported/encouraged, and feeling accepted that contribute to this feeling of safety.

Sea Camp, to ten campers, is a place of feeling less stressed and anxious. According to Violet, when she arrives at camp she feels “a weight lift of my shoulders.” Lela also shares this view mentioning the relaxed atmosphere at camp is something that even “new campers can see.” Further, camp is well organized, according to Samuel, and, thus provides a sense of stability and cohesiveness. In this sense, the campers ‘know’ what to expect in terms of their activities; nothing is left up in the air. Camp itself provides a space where, according to Dayna, it is “easy to learn” and is a place where she does not feel nervous in any of her classes. This differs from home as Sandy, Megan, and Anne explain because at home they encounter more pressure which can make home a “tense” place. This “easy place to learn” sentiment is also reflected in Casey’s statement regarding feeling safe at camp because “they [the instructors] have your back …they make you feel safe [during your activities].” Further, “no one [campers or instructors] laughs at you when you can’t do something.” Instead, you can try again without negative repercussions. Camp, according to Tom, was like “therapy” because it is not as stressful and hectic as home.

Just as campers indicated that they received positive affirmations from staff and/or counselors, fifteen campers provided statements regarding feeling supported and encouraged at camp. For example, Lorraine stated she did not feel “alone” at camp; just
as Megan and Casey stated they had strong “support systems” comprising of campers and staff. The idea of a supportive network of people reinforces the idea of a safe place to try things and, perhaps, illuminates why sixteen campers indicated they try new things at camp. For example, Casey feels as though she can try new things and overcome obstacles because “[You] might as well try to overcome challenges here because you are supported…it won’t be the end of the world if you don’t do it.” Statements such as these indicate the degree to which some campers feel as though they receive support and encouragement; you cannot fail at camp because there is always room to improve and try again.

Closely tied into the idea of feeling supported and encouraged at camp is the idea of acceptance; twelve campers firmly believe that camp is an accepting place. Acceptance lies largely with the commonly held belief that at camp there is no judging or bullying. In other words, regardless of your sex, race, socio-economic status, and physical capability, you are accepted and treated equally at camp. As part of the first night at camp, the campers are reminded and encouraged, as seven campers explained, to be positive and tolerant of others. Adherence to this sentiment allows campers to feel unencumbered expressing themselves. As Tom explained, it does not matter what you wear or how you act because people will be accepting. Chad echoes this sentiment because he feels that regardless of how you act or your personality, you will never be excluded from activities.

It should be noted, as with verbal persuasion, not all experiences at camp are positive. Four campers indicated that there is, to some degree, social challenges (judging
and “drama”) at camp. Though these campers did share some negative social experiences, these negative sentiments did not overwhelm their interviews. In fact, each of these campers stated they felt supported, encouraged, and proud of themselves at camp. Additionally, each of these campers also stated that while they face challenges at camp, they ask for help from their peers and/or the staff and refuse to give up even when they are met with adversity. This suggests though there can be negative social experiences at camp, they do not overpower the camp experience and are often a passing occurrence. Each of these campers were able to shrug off negative social experiences and still enjoy their time at Sea Camp, leading one to believe that while there may be some negative social experiences at camp, camp is overwhelmingly a positive and safe place for young adults.

For most campers, camp provides a fun, positive atmosphere. This atmosphere is internalized and is best exemplified in camper statements that reflect their positive moods/feelings, confidence levels, reduced stress, support, and acceptance. These physical and mental feelings then, tie into Bandura’s (1986; 1997) assertion that an individual takes into consideration their mental and physical states as a signpost for their capabilities and ability to learn. For example, Casey’s statements about feeling physically safe during her ocean activities and feeling mentally confident that she would not get “laughed at” if she did not perform a skill conveys two things. First, it suggests that Casey, who also said she is working on overcoming her fear of the ocean, is confident enough in her abilities to try to further her skills. Though she may be nervous, she does not give up. Secondly, her response in regard to knowing that she will not be
ridiculed even if she is unsuccessful speaks to the idea of having a positive mood and mentality going into these activities. If she believed that there would be negative repercussions or had encountered negativity before, she would perhaps not try to overcome these fears. However, that is not the case; Casey has taken skin diving and sea kayaking classes during each of her three summers at Sea Camp. Though Casey may feel nervous or a little anxious, she does not let these feelings control her, coinciding with Bandura’s (1998) argument that it is not necessarily the strength of these thoughts and feelings; rather, it is how a person controls their fears/anxieties that are relevant.

The physiological and affective statements the campers provided indicate that, even though there can be some negativity experienced at camp, a vast majority of campers can and do try new things at camp for many reasons. Campers physically and mentally feel like they can. They are surrounded by positive people in an encouraging environment. This opens up a world of possibility. As Samuel explained, “You never know ‘til you try.”

Goals

The analysis thus far has centered on how the four components of self-efficacy are manifested in the thoughts and actions of twenty returning campers. Campers feel as though they can master activities, emulate others’ behaviors, and receive positive feedback all in a safe environment. The role of efficacy, then, may provide an insight regarding why campers set and meet goals at camp.

In order to contextualize and understand campers’ goals, it is important to delineate how campers characterize goals. First, goals are personal and individualistic;
they are, according to four campers, something for you. Thus, it is up to the individual to set the parameters and expectations around a goal. Second, goals, as thirteen campers indicated, are something to accomplish and complete; they are, as three campers explained, something to strive for. Further, as Megan and Maya explained, one should strive for *attainable* goals and avoid setting lofty ones.

In this working definition of a goal (a personal, attainable aspiration that one wishes to achieve), it is also important to recognize that goals, especially at camp, are not static. As seven campers explained, it is, in fact, perfectly acceptable to have your goals change at camp because goals can fluctuate for many reasons. For example, seven campers said that their goals change once they are realized. As Tom explained, once he achieves a goal he wants to “ramp it up a bit” by setting more, difficult goals. This line of thinking ties directly into mastery; Tom takes his success and ‘runs with it.’ This idea is shared by seven other campers who also stated that they may want to create more goals for themselves. Tom also said that he creates “weekly goals…to see where I stand” that allows him to regularly evaluate how he is ‘doing.’ Thus, he is not only reactive, but he is also proactive because he continually assesses his capabilities. Similarly, Amanda believes in taking “baby steps.” She explains this as a process, a “build up,” of setting small goals, meeting them, and progressing to the next (presumably more difficult) goal.

However, for reasons discussed in the verbal persuasion and physiological/affective sections of this analysis, three campers believe that it is acceptable not to meet their goals because you can always try again. With these thoughts in mind, one can begin to understand how and why campers feel as though they can set and meet goals at camp.
Fifteen out of twenty campers indicated that they set goals at camp. Casey, for instance, is motivated by the “support and camaraderie” at camp to set “fun goals” for herself. By comparison, eighteen campers said they set goals for themselves at home. Why is there a difference? Anne, a third year Sea Camper, explained that camp is not “real life… [There] is more pressure at home.” Though Anne does not speak for every camper, her statement provides an insight into how there is a direct ‘need’ to set more goals (“life oriented goals” according to Casey) at home than at camp. More ‘serious’ goals, then, are meant for home, not for camp.

While some campers view their goals at camp as “fun,” fourteen campers mentioned wanting to improve their skill set in specific classes. For example, Sandy indicated that she wanted to improve in her surfing class so that she could “surf across the waves.” Hannah strove to sail catamarans on her own. While fourteen campers set physical goals at camp, eight campers set physical goals at home. The prevalence of these physical goals at camp compared to home perhaps speaks to the accessibility to nature, equipment, instruction, and encouragement found at camp.

A similar pattern develops concerning campers’ emotionally and/or socially oriented goals. At camp, twelve individuals expressed their desire to meet more friends, be a ‘nicer’ person, enjoy their time at camp, have fun, etc. In contrast, only four campers indicated these same types of goals at home. Again, why is there a difference? It is perhaps useful to reflect on the twelve responses concerning the uniqueness of camp, especially in terms of the diversity of people and opportunities. As noted above, camp affords accessibility to not only physical opportunities, but also provides an opportunity
to interact and engage with diverse people. According to Amanda, there is more diversity at camp than home. Similarly, some campers, such as Maya, view this diversity as a “culture shock.” Camp can be a way to meet new people and expand campers’ horizons that can allow individuals, such as Casey, to “be who I want to be [at Sea Camp].”

Interestingly, five campers said they did not set goals at camp (compared to one camper who does not set goals at home). These “no/not really” responses are interesting because they seem on the surface to deny goal setting. However, while these campers did not affirm that they set goals, our conversations included endeavors that each of them wanted to accomplish at camp. For example, while Samantha indicated that she did not set goals, she later revealed she wanted to complete her exploring class because it would be “physically satisfying.” Samantha also provided a definition of a goal as “something you strive for.” These five responses suggest camp is not a place where it is ‘necessary’ to set goals because camp is meant to be fun, a ‘break’ (four of these five respondents indicated that they have positive feelings and moods when they are at camp). While these campers may not set goals for themselves at camp, they all set goals at home because as one camper explained, “Camp is not real life.”

Twelve campers indicated that they meet more goals at camp than at home for a variety of reasons. Aside from four campers responding that goals are more “fun” to accomplish at camp, there, again, is an overwhelming feeling of safety at camp. This idea of safety includes the ability to ask and receive more help and support, and being judged less. As Lorraine articulated, her “capabilities are realized more at camp.” Other reasons provided for meeting more goals at camp stem around the issue of time. For
example, Lela described her goal accomplishment as having a specific time frame of three weeks. Because there is limited time to meet her goals, her accomplishments at camp are special. Likewise, although Violet and Dax did not provide statements regarding whether they met goals at camp, they both indicated their level of determination was also dependent on time. The proximate goals at camp have an expiration date: three weeks.

Sea Camp provides campers with the opportunity to set and meet goals. According to goal theory, more complex goals give rise to higher performance levels (Locke & Latham, 2002; 1990). The argument contends specific goals foster an individual to motivate him/her to meet the goal, thus increasing self-efficacy. Additionally, as noted in the literature review, the degree of challenge and future proximity of those goals can impact an individual’s motivation and efficacy. Do these components of goal theory mesh with the camp experience?

While some campers admitted to setting goals such as ‘having fun’ and ‘getting the most out of camp’ other campers had specific aspirations for themselves. For example, three campers indicated they specifically wanted to obtain their Master Diver certification at camp. Other campers indicated they longed to become more social by making more friends and make more of an effort to talk and engage with others at camp. However, to what degree are these goals challenging or complex to the individual? This question, perhaps, cannot be answered since goals are, as the campers’ working definition of a goal suggests, individual and subjective. In other words, what is challenging to one camper may not necessarily be challenging to another. A camper may
not, for example, necessarily view his/her goals of ‘having fun’ or ‘being nice’ as an unspecified, simple goal; these goals may actually be a struggle for him/her to achieve. Campers’ goals, verbalized or not, are personal and therefore specific to that person.

Camp does, as several campers noted, have a time limit of three weeks. This time limit can serve as a motivating force. Thus, camp can provide the tools and help to provide those who seek to meet their goals the opportunity to do so. Camp places its participants in the driver’s seat, allowing them to choose their level of challenge, the amount of effort they put into achieving their goal, and their perseverance levels all within an encouraging, positive environment. How they choose their goals, handle challenges, and overcome obstacles allows them to build their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Bandura & Locke, 2003).

Based on the responses from campers regarding their physical and emotional/social goals at camp, it seems that camp not only provides these opportunities of personal and physical growth, but, and perhaps more importantly, campers are taking advantage of them to empower themselves. Whether they realize it or not, many campers do set goals and, for most, meet them. In turn, they are able to use the experiences of goal setting and goal accomplishment at home.

Getting in the outdoors: Direct experiences with nature

Sea Camp, as noted in Chapter Three, is a summer camp with an emphasis on outdoor programs; campers are constantly exposed to nature throughout the duration of camp. As Mick, a third year Sea Camper, explained, camp is a “total immersion experience in nature.” This “total immersion experience” provides countless
opportunities for campers to have direct, positive interactions with the environment that, as fifteen campers shared, are lacking at home. These encounters can provide campers with hands-on experience that can connect them to Sea Camp and, by extension, Catalina Island. All twenty campers indicated that they have had positive direct experiences with the environment while at Sea Camp. As their comments demonstrate, these positive experiences have helped them to develop pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs and behaviors.

Eighteen campers indicated their positive, direct experiences in nature came from participating in their classes. The physicality of the activities places the campers directly in nature; the campers see, feel, hear, smell, and even taste the natural world directly with all of their senses. Therefore, contextual descriptions permeated the interviews. For instance, Lela described the “best snorkel ever” as one where she swam with sharks and seals in the rain and kicked up stingrays. To her, this was an overwhelmingly positive experience with nature. Paige, Samuel, and Dayna said that they loved the feeling of the ocean, specifically the wind and water. Others such as Casey, Lorraine, and Hannah were enthused with the wildlife they encountered during their classes. For Megan, it is “awesome when you get to dive with sharks.”

While classes provide many opportunities for positive direct experiences with the environment, six campers also described positive experiences outside of class. For example, Mick and Hannah described viewing the stars at night as special because they are unable to see stars at home. Likewise, Dax described watching nature “change” as he watched a sunrise from the beach. He explained, “You see it [the sun] come up from
behind the mountains…it’s really cool.” Lela is continuously reminded of camp and Catalina when she is at home, explaining when she sees lemonade berry shrubs and smells eucalyptus trees and bison dung she is instantly reminded of her time at camp.

These direct experiences extend far past momentary pleasure; they are more than just ‘fun classes’ to many campers. Some see their involvement with nature as an awakening. For a few of these campers, their experiences helped them better understand and become less fearful of nature. For example, Samuel explained prior to attending camp he did not see the ocean as “fragile.” Instead, he viewed the ocean as something to fear because it was “powerful and cold.” Three Sea Camps later, his attitudes and beliefs have changed, reflecting his new appreciation for the delicateness of what is above and below the water. Likewise, prior to camp, Casey and Lela shared a fear of the ocean. However, through positive, direct experience with the ocean over their summers at camp, they developed the confidence to face and overcome their fears. Indeed, as Samantha explained, “camp changes the way you look at things.” These types of direct experiences with nature can do more than just make campers such as Chad and Megan “appreciate” it. They can also bolster interest and fascination with the environment. For example, Amanda’s childhood interest in marine biology has “perked up” since she started attending camp. A fish is “not just a fish” according to Amanda. Rather, it is a specific type of animal that lives in a specific ecosystem with specific dietary needs. It is a smaller part of a greater ecosystem that campers, such as Lorraine and Samantha, want to protect. Amanda’s, as well as other campers’, statements epitomize the connection between positive direct experience with nature and pro-environmental attitudes and
Campers not only appreciate the environment, they also seek to conserve it for future generations; they view it as a responsibility and their attitudes and beliefs reflect this. Direct experiences in the ocean made Lorraine, for example, want to “protect the goodness out there.” Similar experiences in the ocean have inspired Sandy to want to protect the land and sea. Statements such as these indicate preserving the environment they cherish is a way of ‘giving back.’ For instance, because of Maya’s “history with the ocean and diving, I want to contribute more.” Likewise, Samantha wants to protect both terrestrial and “pristine” underwater environments so that her “children can see it the way I saw it.” Tom’s experiences in the ocean have led to him reading online about conservation issues. These campers are demonstrating pro-environmental attitudes and beliefs that extend far past the here and now. As young adults, they want to take responsibility for, and perhaps ownership of, the environment they love.

This sense of responsibility and ‘doing your part’ towards nature is reflected in seven campers’ statements regarding their pro-environmental behaviors at camp. Hannah explained she takes shorter showers at camp because she has learned to recognize the need for “not wasting it [water] so that other people can have it.” Lorraine ‘does her part’ at camp by throwing away trash and recycling, noting she “loves how easy it is to recycle here [at camp].” Undoubtedly, Lorraine is referring to the numerous trash and recycling bins around camp. The accessibility and “easiness” she describes may be a contributing factor explaining why other campers recycle, pick up and throw away trash, and up-cycle. For example, Megan stated she was “so used” to picking up trash and recycling that she
does not even “think twice about it at home.” Similarly, though Hannah explained that recycling at home can be difficult, she got into the ‘habit’ of recycling at camp and “especially since last summer [at Sea Camp] I try to find a place to recycle [at home].”

While there are an abundance of trash receptacles at camp, campers cite other reasons for collecting trash. Anne and Samantha both vividly remembered participating in their conservation class’s beach clean up in Avalon the previous summer. During the clean up, Anne remembered thinking two things. First, her class could have filled several more bags of trash. Second, she remembered reading signs indicating high levels of water pollution in the bay and being shocked that parents would allow their children to swim in such polluted water. During our interview Anne explained that she disliked seeing trash floating in the ocean during her kayaking class. In order to combat this, she began collecting the debris during class and placing it in her kayak. She told me, proudly, that her friends affectionately call her a “trash freak.”

Though there was an overwhelming amount of statements regarding positive experiences with nature at camp, there were, however, six campers who described negative experiences with nature. These negative experiences included feeling physically uncomfortable while participating in activities (such as getting blisters, tar on their feet, being cold), having difficulty within the environment (becoming tangled in kelp, seeing a charging bison, feeling uneasy about waves), and seeing dead wildlife. The commonality among these negative experiences is that they were fleeting. More importantly, none of these six campers indicated any amount of disdain for the environment. Instead, these particular experiences were more of a passing annoyance or
a temporary inconvenience. This is very telling since it suggests though there can be some discomfort while participating directly with nature, it is not enough to deter these campers from continuing to positively engage with nature while at camp.

As these twenty campers demonstrate in their responses, Sea Camp provides positive and direct experiences with nature. The continual exposure to the environment does seem to leave lasting impressions on these returning Sea Campers and is illustrated in their responses regarding their pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. As noted in the literature review, research in this field suggests a causal relationship between positive, direct experiences with nature and pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors (ERBs) especially when individuals are exposed to nature at a young age. As Amanda illustrated, these direct experiences with nature can bolster an individual’s curiosity and wonder (Gill & Dresner, 1994). It can also, as Palmberg and Kuru (2000) state, create a sense of compassion with and understanding of nature. Lorraine, Hannah, Megan, Anne, and Samantha epitomize this sentiment in their descriptions, and subsequent actions, of feeling saddened by seeing trash on the ground and the desire to pick it up. These experiences, especially at early ages, may, as Ewert et al. (2005) suggest, “precondition” (p. 234) individuals to cultivate pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors as adults.

Sea Camp is structured in such a way that allows campers to choose their outdoor adventures and classes that will be the most positive for them. This tactic seems to be succeeding as all twenty campers provided statements about having positive experiences in nature at camp. Further, Sea Camp’s encouragement of pro-environmental behaviors and attitudes is put into action by providing campers the opportunities (such as furnishing
numerous trash and recycling receptacles throughout camp) to practice them at camp. As a result and in accordance with the literature, many campers not only indicated that they hold pro-environmental attitudes, but that they also engage in pro-environmental behaviors both in and out of camp.

**Indirectly experiencing nature at Sea Camp**

As discussed above, Sea Campers spend nearly every moment of their time at camp outdoors. While direct experiences with nature clearly play a role in shaping campers’ environmental ethics, camp also provides indirect experiences with nature. Fourteen out of twenty campers made statements identifying indirect experiences with nature as being formative. These included: observing others (especially counselors and instructors), conversations, guest speakers, and/or examples of witnessing environmental degradation as all being important indirect environmental experiences that have affected their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.

Just as campers wanted to emulate their peers and staff members’ skill capabilities and/or personality traits, as discussed in the analysis of vicarious experiences of self-efficacy, a similar pattern emerges in regards to emulating environmental ethics. As the campers themselves attest, these people have an effect on campers’ environmental behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs. Thus, their involvement with the campers on a day to day basis can have profound significance on how campers view the environment and their subsequent environmental ethics.

Four campers indicated they were influenced by the actions and behaviors of others at camp. As Mick explained, instructors heavily emphasize the importance of
staying on the hiking trails and not littering. Hannah and Lorraine also recalled instructors and counselors encouraging them to recycle and conserve water by taking shorter showers. Additionally, both mentioned when they saw the instructors and counselors recycle, it made them want to follow in their footsteps. As Hannah explained, when people at camp try to conserve water for others to use it is “very unlike L.A. [her home].” The instructors’ and counselors’ attitudes and behaviors, in her eyes, were “green.” Thus, the idea of emulating their green behavior is evident in her actions. The instructors’ and counselors’ behaviors are incredibly important; they are watched closely by the campers. Their actions speak louder than words. As a result, Hannah and Lorraine made the conscious choice to follow the staff’s pro-environmental behaviors.

CIMI, as an entity, can also provide a source of emulation because, as three campers indicated, camp leads by setting and following its own examples. As discussed in the direct experiences portion of the analysis, CIMI provides numerous trash and recycling bins all over camp, quietly encouraging campers to recycle and throw away trash. During the 2011 summer, CIMI instituted and encouraged campers to up-cycle, placing clearly labeled up-cycling containers throughout camp. CIMI, therefore, encourages pro-environmental behaviors in its campers by promoting water conservation, recycling, and picking up trash. These pro-environmental behaviors are manifested in the actions and behaviors of the entire staff and are transferred to the campers leading some, such as Amanda, to view CIMI’s use of biodegradable plates and cutlery as well as up-cycling as “cool.” As Lela explained, “Sea Camp talks about doing your part.” CIMI not only talks about “doing your part,” but also does its part in the eyes of campers.
While campers may look to their instructors, counselors, and CIMI itself, for models of pro-environmental behavior, seven campers also provide other informative examples of indirect experiences with nature. For instance, Amanda believes her conversations with others in her classes have contributed to her understanding the environment. Instead of just replying “yes or no,” she feels as though she is able to learn from others’ experiences from their conversations. Maya, for instance, takes very seriously what she has learned in her Hot Topics in Marine Conservation class and was pleased her instructor provided her with Monterrey Bay sustainable fish guides. With these guides in hand, she thinks she will be able to make better consumer decisions in the future and “be aware of what I eat.” Aside from learning from others, Samuel, Casey, and Hannah indicated camp’s instructional labs, especially the hands-on exhibits in the Shark Lab and Marine Mammal Hall, provided them with deeper insight to the environment. Both Hannah and Samuel indicated that the sea turtle exhibit was especially enlightening. As Samuel explained, the exhibit (which explains the impact that trash has on wildlife) made him realize litter has far reaching consequences that cause a “chain reaction” throughout the environment. He listed several species of animals that are negatively affected by trash, which led him to conclude that “symbiotic relationships” were in danger. This particular exhibit, as Hannah explained, serves as one of the many “reminders” around camp of the simple steps individuals can take to help protect the environment.

Each summer CIMI invites guest speakers to give presentations about environmental issues or environmental research. Hannah and Lorraine mentioned these
guest speakers were very informative. Lorraine specifically remembered a guest speaker from two summers ago.\textsuperscript{32} This particular speaker gave a presentation about plastic in the ocean. Coinciding with the speaker’s presentation, Lorraine mentioned the conservation class that year went into Avalon to pick up trash from the beach. When the campers displayed their results to the rest of camp, many were appalled by the sheer amount of plastic found at the Avalon beach. As a result, Lorraine said “everyone” at camp stopped using plastic water bottles in favor of reusable bottles.

For eight campers, witnessing environmental degradation while at Sea Camp, (identified by campers as seeing litter, graffiti, and the destruction from the 2007 fire), affected their environmental ethics. Indeed, seeing trash in and around camp raised negative reactions from five campers. For Megan, Paige, and Tom seeing trash at camp is “sad[denning].” Megan admitted she gets angry when she sees balloons floating in the ocean because they “kill turtles.” As a result, she cuts up 6-pack pop holders to save “the turtles and fish.” Additionally, Megan mentioned that seeing graffiti, such as names carved into a tree, is upsetting because what was once “beautiful and cool…gets wrecked” by people which ruins the aesthetic beauty for everyone. These attitudes and behaviors illustrate the campers’ sense of ownership of camp, their home for three weeks.

The concerns about trash at camp are but a few of the observations eight campers mentioned about witnessing environmental degradation. Three campers mentioned the

\textsuperscript{32}Several campers explained their concerns about plastics in the ocean, which could coincide with this particular speaker, suggesting the far reaching effects of his presentation and the impact it had on the campers pro-environmental behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs.
2007 Catalina Island fire that ravaged 4,780 acres, including part of camp, as especially poignant. Its aftermath had a substantial impact on Megan, a fifth year Sea Camper. When she arrived at camp a few months after the fire, she had a “wow” moment: in her earlier years at camp, she did not "really appreciate the island." However, when she returned to the island two months after the fire, she became fascinated with the new types of plants that were germinating. As a result, she was “inspired” to enroll in AP Biology and take Catalina Green Team (a Sea Camp course where campers participate in island restoration activities such as removal of invasive species). Casey, a third year Sea Camper, explained watching the island recover over the summers, noting “When I look around this year [2011] it is really grown out and nice…a huge difference.”

Based on these fourteen camper responses, indirect experiences with nature also carry a significant amount of importance. As four campers mentioned, they were inspired to emulate the pro-environmental behaviors they saw from others, especially staff members. These statements correspond with Dresner and Gill’s (1994) view that role models are indeed important because of their ability to increase environmentally responsible actions in others. Arnold et al. (2009) refer to these others as “influential people” (p. 29) in their discussion of the development of environmental leaders’ views about nature; Schunk and Meece (2006), in their discussion of vicarious experiences of self-efficacy, refer to them as “similar others” (p. 73).

As discussed in the vicarious experiences of self-efficacy analysis, fourteen campers indicated they wanted to mimic staff members; nine of which viewed these people as having the most knowledge in a particular field. Taking these responses in
conjunction with the four respondents who attributed their behavior as being influenced by staff members, one may begin to link these complimentary ideas together. Staff members represent “similar others” and fulfill the position of role models. Campers emulate them in regard to their pro-environmental attitudes and actions. Though these “similar others” offer emulating experiences, this does not necessarily explain why only four campers indicated this. Perhaps this indicates directly experiencing nature has a more profound effect on the individual than sheer emulation alone, while the combination of direct and indirect experience has the most significant impact.

To a lesser degree, campers indicated the influence of other campers on their environmental views and behaviors. While a few campers, such as Lorraine and Amanda, indicated that the actions and words of others influenced them, it appears that much influence comes directly from the staff and, perhaps more importantly, from CIMI as a whole. For example, as part of recreation time, campers are free to explore camp; this includes all of the labs and the beach. Along the way, campers can interact with the instructors and counselors who are on watch during this time. It is not uncommon, then, for campers to strike up a conversation with these staff members and vice versa. During these informal interactions, the staffs have a tremendous influence on campers because even outside of class, the campers can converse with these role models about a variety of topics, environmental or otherwise. This leads to campers seeing their instructors and counselors not only as role models, but also as people with many years of experience and knowledge under their belt.

Returning campers are attuned to the environment at camp and its subsequent
changes. The eight campers who provided examples of noticing environmental degradation at camp indicates they are aware of their surroundings at camp. For example, they are able to describe their displeasure when observing negative events such as trash and graffiti. Others, such as Megan, take these attitudes and put them into action. As Samuel noted, the ramifications of doing nothing about pollution, have serious adverse consequences.

These fourteen statements are perhaps more telling than positive direct experiences because in order for a person to have an indirect experience, they must recognize, reflect, and then choose to act or think a certain way. In other words, while campers may not necessarily equate their love of the ocean to their scuba diving class, they can observe, listen, and critically think about why they love the ocean and what needs to be done to protect it. They must, as Chawla (1998) indicated, amass all they have learned and experienced, directly and indirectly, to begin to make decisions and form opinions.

The power of knowledge

Experiences, both direct and indirect, appear to have impacted campers’ environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. However, the knowledge they procured from classes has also influenced their environmental ethics. Knowledge was viewed by campers who provided responses as a new fact, idea, and/or behavior. While one camper indicated he did not learn anything about the environment, sixteen out of twenty campers believed they learned about the environment and/or about environmental issues.
Many campers attributed their knowledge, or increased knowledge, about the environment and/or environmental issues to specific classes. In many cases, these classes also involved direct experiences with nature. Ocean related classes such as diving, sailing, and marine biology taught twelve campers about the environment and, for some, influenced their environmental attitudes. For example, scuba diving taught Dayna, a fourth year Sea Camper, about the ecology of the underwater environment. Her classes allowed her to enjoy “what’s down there…how things coexist [and] how it differs from land.” Chad learned more about sharks, quelling his fears about these creatures. For Samantha, classes and the activities “reiterate the importance of conservation.”

Other classes such as Green Team and hiking taught some campers not only about the surrounding environment, but also the concept and enormity of pollution. Before attending camp, Maya indicated that because she lived around the world (“most are third world countries”) she was accustomed to living in polluted areas where “ravines full of trash” were a common sight. As a third year Sea Camper, she believes that activities such as hiking have made her “more aware of what is going on with the planet…pollution is not normal.” The stark difference between her previous experiences with the environment is echoed in five other campers’ ideas that camp is “clean” and pristine.

Four campers specifically mentioned Hot Topics in Marine Conservation as an especially informative class. Hot Topics focuses specifically on issues related to the ocean and students who wish to take the class must have taken Marine Biology. Thus, the campers who take this class illustrate an active interest in the marine environment and its current problems. According to Samantha, a fourth year Sea Camper, she “took more
away” from this class than any other class she has taken at camp. Anne, a third year Sea Camper, was similarly affected. She shared that she was very dismayed about the amount of trash in the ocean (a subject covered in Hot Topics the previous summer). Anne could not fathom why people fail to pick up their rubbish because, as she explained, “we essentially eat our own trash” from bioaccumulation. This class taught Maya about sustainable seafood practices, inspiring her to want to become more “aware” of the types of seafood she eats and if, necessary, was prepared to “boycott” unsustainable seafood at her school. Similarly, Sandy, was flabbergasted to learn about the desalination practices discussed in Hot Topics last summer, “I didn’t know they [the engineers] threw salt right back into the ocean…I thought they were smart enough to put it elsewhere, but apparently not.” These statements indicate campers are not only learning about environmental issues, but they are beginning to critically think about and, in some cases, take action. Three of these four campers also indicated they were currently involved in, or were going to join, environmental clubs at home.

Does this environmental knowledge shape campers’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors? Knowledge gleaned from classes and camp manifests itself in a variety of camper responses. For example, four campers believe they talk about the environment more since they started attending Sea Camp. Others believe they are more aware of the environment and/or environmental issues. Fifteen campers indicated that they could recognize and describe environmental problems at home such as noticing the change in water color and clarity from camp to the mainland and noticing invasive species
overtaking native vegetation. Samuel, for instance, believes that he is “more self aware” about conservation issues such as trash disposal and recycling.

Still, three campers indicated they wanted to learn *more* about the environment and its conservation issues; they are interested in taking Hot Topics in Marine Conservation the following summer. For Chad, taking this class is a responsible thing to do. He explained taking this class would enable him to give back to CIMI which would aid in his strong desire to help out CIMI any way he can. In his eyes, this class will enable him to teach others about important environmental topics, thus, allowing “future people” to enjoy camp the same way he did. In a similar vein, three campers mentioned they were upset that Green Team was not offered at camp. Not only would this class allow these campers to explore more of the island but, as Maya explained, this class would be a good way to learn and practice conservation in the place she “loves.”

Nine campers expressed interest in joining environmentally related clubs or activities. Maya, for instance, is required by her school to join a club of her choosing. Because of her experiences diving and learning about the ocean at Sea Camp, she plans on joining the Marine and Environmental Monitoring Systems Club where she will participate in beach clean ups and environmental monitoring. Similarly, in order for Casey to receive her Girl Scout Golden Award, she must choose a two year project. Though she could have chosen any project, she made the decision to organize beach clean ups near her home because “not a lot is done with it [the beach].” Other campers indicated they were not yet members in clubs for a variety of reasons, such as lack of school interest, not knowing when/where these clubs meet, or the complete lack of these
types of clubs in their areas. For others it was a time commitment issue. These statements are telling in that they convey the potential difficulty of joining clubs at home due to accessibility issues.

Four campers indicated current involvement in environmental clubs or activities. Samantha, for example, considers herself an activist in her local conservation club. In this club, she is a youth/teen representative where she “sways people because the environment is important to everyone, including kids.” Though she stated that her mother was also an active member in the club, she believes her confidence in talking to others about the environment, especially speaking with adults, was a result of interacting with adults at camp. Sandy recently started a Gardening Club with her friends that grows produce and transplants grass to barren patches of land. She decided to start this club and become vice president of the Science Club because camp made her feel like she could “dive right in.” CIMI also influenced Lela and Paige, both third year Sea Campers, to join clubs at school. Paige cited hiking and learning about plastic in the ocean at camp as the reason for joining a conservation club at school. Her club collects and returns water bottles to Dasani and is involved in beach clean ups (her idea) because “helping the planet is good…we need to treat it right.” Indeed, Lela’s statement regarding “Sea Camp talk[ing] about do[ing] your part” is put into action; these four campers are active members in environmental clubs, participate in environmental projects, and work with others to accomplish these tasks. These campers feel a sense of responsibility to the environment; they seek to do ‘their part’ to protect and conserve it. While some of their backgrounds may have influenced these behaviors and beliefs, their statements
demonstrate that Sea Camp has a direct and substantial impact on their environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.

Aside from clubs and activities, eleven Sea Campers spoke of other environmentally responsible behaviors away from camp. These behaviors manifested themselves in several ways. For example, Dax and Casey try not to be wasteful at home. While acknowledging the need to use resources at home, Casey indicated she does her best to use amenities in moderation. She and two others indicated that they pick up trash at home. Megan, for instance, not only picks up trash but also cuts up 6 pack holders to “save the turtles and fish.” Four campers indicated they recycle more at home. Megan stated because of recycling at camp, she makes it a point to look for recycling bins at home. She has become so “used to recycling things like soda cans and bottles” that she does not even "think twice about it.” Hannah explained that while there are no recycling bins near her home, she and her mother drive around looking for places to recycle paper. Five campers also indicated that they attempt to conserve electricity and/or water by turning lights off at home and taking shorter showers just as they do at camp.

At home and school, campers engage in other pro-environmental behaviors. Megan, for example, pursued her interest in biology because of the 2007 Catalina Island fire and its subsequent recovery. Samuel and Sandy both stated that they write papers for school about their experiences and the things they learned about the environment at camp. Tom indicated that he looks conservation issues up online. These are intellectually motivated behaviors. The desire to not only learn more about environmental issues, but to also explain them in writing, demonstrates that these
campers and likely many others, take what they learn and experience at camp and augment it with additional resources at home.

How does environmental knowledge influence campers’ behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs? Does camp provide opportunities for knowledge production? Out of the sixteen campers who made statements about having positive environmental attitudes and beliefs, fourteen also provided statements of engaging in pro-environmental behaviors. These results are similar to Meinhold and Malkus’ (2005) study that found adolescents who illustrated more environmental knowledge and attitudes also demonstrated more environmental behaviors. The campers’ responses reflect the idea the more knowledge one has, the more impetus there is for action. Knowledge, in conjunction with attitudes and beliefs can, as Palmberg and Kuru (2000) state, “form[s] a willingness to act” (p. 5).

Camp is not just a medium where campers are ‘taught’ things. Rather, it is a place that introduces topics that can spark curiosity. It allows campers to choose their own adventure and, in the process, lets them explore what interests them. In doing so, campers may learn about the environment without even ‘knowing it.’ This knowledge then transfers into their everyday life at home. After they leave Sea Camp, campers continue to learn about the topics that interest them. When they come back to camp, they can choose to learn even more, by advancing to other class levels or trying new things.

As their statements indicate, campers demonstrate pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in their everyday lives. Though some behavior may be as ‘simple’ as turning off a light switch or taking shorter showers, it is the linking back to camp that is important. Why they do the things they do has been changed or supplemented by the
knowledge they accrue at camp. For example, while Sea Camp has rules about littering, at the end of the day, campers have the choice to pick up trash they see in the ocean or while on a hike. They have the choice to be the “trash freak” that collects rubbish during camp activities. More often than not, this type of behavior would be applauded by other campers and, especially, the staff.

It indicates, just as Dresner and Gill (1994) found, that knowledge and awareness have an impact on subsequent environmentally responsible behaviors. Given repeated exposure to camp over many summers, it is not surprising that campers can pinpoint the beginnings of environmental ethics from their time spent at camp.

**Building Experience and Knowledge Builds Self-Efficacy and Environmental Ethics**

From learning about thermoclines and currents while diving, to learning about a squid’s anatomy through squid dissections during Invertebrates and Ichthyology class, campers are constantly learning. Whether they are cognizant of this or not, increased knowledge and experiences significantly impacts their environment ethics and self-efficacy. Campers use their direct/indirect experiences with the environment as well as the trials and tribulations they encounter during these activities to provide them with a sense of capability and action.

Camp allows its participants to take a chance, to try something new. The result is a strengthening of their beliefs about the things they can do; their efficacy. Indeed, this background knowledge and experience in trying new things and setting new goals for themselves speaks to their desires to achieve greatness at camp. A large contributor to this is the atmosphere of safety that permeates through camp and is reflected in twelve
campers’ responses regarding their ability to meet more goals at camp than at home. Additionally, twelve campers take this one step further and demonstrate forethought by taking their experiences and achievements at camp as a means of planning for the future. For example, some made a mental plan for themselves to take specific classes that will aid them in their career endeavors or can be generally useful outside of camp. These campers display mediating factors of self-efficacy: motivation and cognitive processes (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998) since they believe they can plan ahead, they can succeed, and they can take the things they learned at camp and apply them outside of camp. That they have thought a bit into the future and are thinking about the necessary steps to reach their future goals outside of camp, indicates they are setting themselves up for future success.

Campers walk away from camp having learned something about the environment, as sixteen campers explained. They demonstrate their environmental knowledge in a variety of ways through their attitudes and behaviors at camp. It is the reason why Megan cuts up 6 pack holders and why Maya longs to take Green Team. Their feelings and affection for Sea Camp and, by extension, Catalina Island, build a relationship that, as Dresner and Gill (1994) indicate, can promote environmentally responsible behaviors. Camp becomes a place where they identify with skills and experiences that can remain with them long after their time at camp is over. Further, the knowledge they accrue over the years at Sea Camp can be, as Palmberg and Kuru (2000) indicate, ‘put to work’ while at camp. At Sea Camp, classes such as Green Team and Hot Topics in Marine Conservation provide campers the outlet to put their knowledge into practice. They can,
for example, pick up trash on the beach and explain to fellow campers what this means to the environment. And, as we have seen, this can lead to pro-environmental behaviors and attitudes away from camp.

Fourteen campers demonstrated environmental behaviors at home, such as turning off lights, taking shorter showers, recycling, joining environmental clubs, writing about the environment in school papers, and talking to others about the environment. Their knowledge is also reflected in the sixteen camper statements regarding positive attitudes and beliefs about the environment. Again, campers’ responses reveal the same tendency that Meinhold and Malkus (2005) describe: adolescents who exhibit more environmental knowledge and attitudes also demonstrate more pro-environmental behaviors.

The important idea to take away from this is that a vast majority of campers do not forget all of the things they learn about themselves and the environment at camp. For some campers, such as Sandy, their camp experiences have not only given them the knowledge to start an environmental club, but also the belief that they can.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

This research centered on my observations of returning Sea Campers as a five year employee of Guided Discoveries, Inc. With each passing summer, I observed their growing curiosity and enthusiasm in a variety of topics and activities. What is it about Sea Camp that encourages them to actively pursue their interests and try new things?

Before entering into this discussion, it is important to note a few points. Though my research included campers from different cohorts, it was not meant to deduce whether coming to Sea Camp two, three, or four times had differing levels of impact. Rather, it sought to understand if returning to camp impacted campers, especially their self-efficacy and environmental ethics. While acknowledging its importance, my research did not specifically focus on campers’ socio-economic status, race, and gender as it is beyond the scope of the study. Nor did it focus on the developmental aspects of these young adults. It is not meant to be a decisive, general overview of the camp experience. This section discusses the importance of providing a safe, positive camp environment and its impact on self-efficacy and environmental ethics.
Figure 5. The importance of a safe, encouraging environment at camp. Sea Camp provides a space for building self-efficacy and environmental ethics. When campers feel safe, they can 1.) Master certain skills while directly interacting with nature. These experiences can increase knowledge, subsequently providing a foundation for environmental ethics as well as increased goal setting; 2.) The safe environment also allows campers to gain positive reinforcement from others as well as mimicking their behaviors and attitudes. The behaviors and attitudes of others can also be manifested in indirect experiences with nature, which can increase knowledge, leading to the formation of environmental ethics and goal setting.

The Importance of Feeling Safe at Camp

A major finding in this study and, thus, underscoring the other findings of this research, was the impact of the positive physiological and affective states of campers while at Sea Camp (Figure 5). By and large, nearly every camper felt safe at camp. While safety had a variety of meanings to campers, it encompasses the idea of mental and physical security. Camp is a place to grow and overcome fears. A cornerstone of Sea
Camp’s influence lies squarely with its ability to provide a space that is accepting, positive, and encouraging. These positive moods and feelings have direct ramifications on other components of self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics.

As soon as Sea Campers step off the boat on their first day of camp, the first thing they encounter is the staff dressed in costumes, cheering, dancing, and laughing. In this way, campers instantly grasp that camp is meant to be fun. The safe, fun atmosphere at camp is further embodied in the enthusiasm and positivity of the staff and other campers. Campers soon learn that, for example, wearing a tutu on a snorkel is not just allowed, it is encouraged. Campers are free to be themselves at camp. As illustrated in Figure 5, these perceived freedoms and feelings of safety, coupled with the equalizing forces of camp discussed in the literature review (Garst et al., 2011), speak loudly to campers and sets the stage for the other sources of self-efficacy, goal setting, and environmental ethics to manifest themselves.

This research suggests the other sources of self-efficacy are built around the idea of providing a safe, encouraging, and accepting environment (Figure 5), highlighting the importance of creating a space where campers feel physically and mentally safe. Figure 5 illustrates when camp provides a safe and supportive environment, it allows campers to develop the other components of self-efficacy, countering the long held belief that mastery experiences are the prominent builder of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 1998; Schunk & Meece, 2006; Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). In other words, mastery may never have come to campers if they did not feel as though could try to do activities that are, in many cases, not accessible at home.
Nonetheless, mastery experiences are critical to building and strengthening self-efficacy. Additionally, mastery experiences, especially at a summer camp, also engage the individual directly with nature which can create an appreciation and bond with it. Mastering skills and activities while immersed in nature allows the individual to accrue knowledge and experience, which can lead to the development of environmental ethics as well as goal setting (Figure 5).

The atmosphere at camp also allows campers to mimic the behaviors and attitudes of fellow campers, especially the Cs, and the staff. As noted in the literature, the relationships at camp are the cornerstone of the camp experience (Henderson et al., 2006-2007) and are sources of vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion. Once an individual feels safe and secure, he/she can ask for and receive help; they can try to mimic other people’s behaviors and skills and can utilize positive feedback (Figure 5). Additionally, campers can learn from and mimic the pro-environmental actions and behaviors of others which can increase knowledge and inform an individual’s environmental ethic (Figure 5).

Mimicry is especially relevant when looking at the importance of intra cohort relationships. Based on the findings in the analysis, other campers, especially the Cs, have a strong influence on their peers. The Cs act as a conduit between younger campers and the staff. When the Cs exhibit positive behaviors and attitudes at camp, other campers follow suit, thus, perpetuating these attitudes and behaviors to other campers. This suggests that fellow campers, not just adults, have the ability to influence the development of other campers’ self-efficacy and environmental ethics. This coincides
with the literature’s assertion that young adults use their peers to assess their self-efficacy (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006).

Returning to camp each summer provides a sense of familiarity. Summer after summer returning campers are provided with a safe environment where they are given the opportunity and encouraged to try new things, challenge themselves, learn and do more. Most importantly, camp lets its participants put their accrued knowledge and skills to work. While research indicates returning campers 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 outdoor environment that allows them to stumble without fear of ridicule is paramount and its effects are far reaching.

Bringing it Home: Samuel’s Experience

The ramifications of camp are clear: camp’s safe, positive space, provides a launching pad for campers to branch out into new areas of interest, try new things, ask for help, receive positive reinforcement, learn about the environment, and achieve success. As discussed in Chapter Two, camps and adventure education programs can provide safe environments, positive reinforcement, support, and positive role models (ACA, 2006; Sibthorp, 2003). Camp itself is a builder of self-efficacy and environmental ethics. To illustrate this point, I include one last example.
Samuel, who was in his third year at Sea Camp at the time of his interview, provided a series of examples that illustrate the radiating effects of Sea Camp on both self-efficacy and environmental ethics that span over his multiple summers at Sea Camp. His description of his progression from skin diving to scuba diving not only illustrates the sources of self-efficacy, but also identifies his development of pro-environmental attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs.

When Samuel first attended Sea Camp, he had trouble equalizing his ears (an important requirement for scuba diving) and, instead, took skin diving. Skin diving presented him with physical and mental challenges. He physically struggled with the skills and mentally struggled with a fear of kelp. However, through a combined effort of watching his instructors, asking for and receiving help and encouragement from them, and practicing, he was able to build his ability. With his comfort level increased, Samuel chose to become a certified diver at home, so that when he came to camp the following year, he would be able to take the advanced scuba diver course. Now, based on his past successes overcoming obstacles, when Samuel has an issue in his diving class, he has no qualms about asking his diving instructor for help and is quick to offer help to others.

Additionally, his outlook on the environment has changed. Prior to attending Sea Camp, Samuel viewed the ocean as a powerful, cold entity. However, experiences in the environment coupled with learning about the detrimental effects of trash on countless organisms in classes and in the Marine Mammal Hall, Samuel now views the environment as “fragile.” He explained, “I realized there is more than just water in the ocean.” Through his classes and activities, he has learned to appreciate what is above
and below the ocean, prompting him to want to take Green Team because it would be a “cool feeling to know that a dolphin is alive because you picked up trash.” At home, Samuel *thinks* about conservation issues, encouraging a friend in student council to start a recycling program. He *writes* papers about his experiences at camp and *explains* to others why they should not fear kelp. Samuel is, in every sense, demonstrating pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors at camp and at home.

Though Samuel’s experience is not *the* experience of every camper to walk off of the Catalina Classic Cruise’s boat, his story provides an example of just how far reaching the effects of camp can extend. For Samuel, camp has allowed him to pursue his interests in marine biology and scuba diving, while learning about and overcoming his fear of the ocean.

And *that* is what camp is all about.
CHAPTER SEVEN: FINAL REMARKS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Avenues for Future Research

This research provided an initial assessment of the compounded effects of returning to Sea Camp over multiple summers. With more time, resources, and a wider array of campers, the results of my research can provide a launching point for future research regarding the effects on campers’ perceived self-efficacy and environmental ethics.

Indeed, other factors can influence campers’ sense of self-efficacy and environmental ethics. For example, as Ewert et al. (2005) explain, while activities in nature can serve to help form values, they may also “modify” pre-existing beliefs and attitudes. Campers are individuals who may come to camp with pre-conceived notions about their self-efficacy and environmental ethics. To better understand the impact of camp, it would behoove future researchers and camp directors to inquire into participants’ backgrounds to learn about, for instance, preexisting environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Investigation into the participants’ backgrounds can aid future research to learn whether environmental ethics have actually increased since attending camp.

While this research attempted to ascertain returning campers’ perceived self-efficacy prior to camp via survey, it may prove beneficial to send surveys out to these campers six months after camp, similar to the ACA’s (2005) study that sought to
determine developmental outcomes from attending camp. In this way, surveys after
camp could ask campers about their levels of self-efficacy at home. It can devise
questions inquiring whether participants are engaging in new activities at home and if
their environmental behaviors and actions have changed since the program’s end. In this
way, future research of camps and/or other environmental/outdoor education programs
can learn more about the far reaching effects of the studied experience: Do the effects of
camp wane three, six, or twelve months after attending the program? If so, how? These
insights could provide researchers, camp directors of both day and residential camps, and
educators with a better understanding of the long term effects of their programs.

Much of the literature regarding developing an environmental ethic revolves
around the idea of exposing children to nature at an early age (Arnold et al., 2009; Ewert
et al., 2005; Orr, 1992; Perlman & Milder, 2004; Wells & Likies, 2006). Camps and
other programs with a wide age range and high participant return rate can design future
research to investigate whether coming to camp at an earlier age affects returning
campers’ self-efficacy and environmental ethics. For example, while some of the
participants in this study began coming to camp before the age of ten, others began camp
as teenagers. Are there differences in campers’ self-efficacy and environmental ethics
between those who began camp at an earlier age than those who began at a later age?
Further, does attending camp (or other environmental/outdoor educational programs) X
times more beneficial than a singular experience?
Recommendations

Children and young adults are bombarded with news of ice caps melting, rainforest degrading, and global warming. These are indeed complex, real world problems that they stand to inherit. How do we teach them not to despair? How do we encourage them to think about these issues? While there is not a simple answer, we do know these individuals must take control of their lives by actively taking steps and making decisions that significantly impact their lives. We know that while direct and indirect experiences in nature are limited, it is still, nonetheless, important in developing an environmental ethic. Lastly, we know that camps allow these young adults to simultaneously develop their self-efficacy and environmental ethic.

Camps provide not only a fun ‘break’ from home, but also allow young adults to personally grow and develop. Further, camps provide their participants with opportunities to try new things and are often out of their comfort zone. Often, these opportunities are a stark contrast to the opportunities afforded at home. Or are they? Many campers indicated they are unable to participate in the same types of camp activities at home. True, their home environment may not be conducive to participating in the same types of activities (i.e., sailing and diving) or environmental clubs at home. The lack of participation at home may be attributed to the campers’ lack of knowledge of how to become involved in activities and clubs. For many campers, once they leave camp, they do not feel as though they have access to the same types of tools and instruction as they do at camp. Perhaps a way to encourage more at-home involvement is
to show campers different types of activities they can do, no matter where they live. Additionally, camps can provide campers with the names and websites of national and local organizations. In this way, camps, including Guided Discoveries, can continue to promote pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors away from camp.

If campers feel as though they are unable or unsure how to become involved it may be beneficial to offer more leadership classes. For instance, Sea Camp offers a Leadership Training class for the oldest campers (17 year old Cs) where participants learn how to become role models to younger campers and organize evening activities (Guided Discoveries, Inc., 2011). In order to reach more campers, perhaps leadership classes should be expanded to allow younger campers to join, thus starting the leadership training at a younger age. This would allow younger campers to become more involved in leadership activities, while working with other groups of campers. A leadership class need not be limited to Sea Camp. Schools and other groups (such as day camps) can also incorporate leadership activities into their curriculum. With an adult facilitator, adolescents can design and implement their own activities based on their interests while working and engaging with others. Experiences working with others can allow young adults to further their social skills and their efficacy.

A safe, positive environment is paramount to the success of a camp and other programs that specialize in children and young adults. It is more than smiles and laughter. It is the genuine feeling of freedom to express yourself, to try new things. It is in this type of environment that young adults can flourish, explore, and grow. With each passing summer, returning campers know they are entering a place that, for many, is so
different than home. Sea Camp provides a safe space where campers, old and new, can test their limits and learn new things. In effect, camp provides the opportunities to develop self-efficacy and environmental ethics that have lasting influences on these young adults’ lives.
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Dear Parents/Guardians,

In this packet you will find information about a research project that a current Guided Discoveries employee, Kim Maravilla, would like to do this summer at Sea Camp. The research that Kim wants to do is for her Master’s at Humboldt State University. This summer will be Kim’s fifth summer at Sea Camp. She is currently on the Dive Staff.

Kim wants to research the effects that Sea Camp has had on your son/daughter’s life. Since your child has attended Sea Camp for at least two summers, they are eligible to participate in her study.

Kim’s research is voluntary; your child does not have to participate. Her research will be in two parts. The first part will involve a survey for your child to fill out. The survey is anonymous, so Kim will not be able to identify campers to their answers. The second part of her research, if your child is randomly selected, involves an audio recorded interview with your child during Sea Camp. The interviews are audio recorded so that Kim can review the interview at a later date. In order to protect your child’s identity, she will manually copy the interview in private after the interview, as soon as possible. After she copies down the interview, she will immediately erase the tape recording. The interview is confidential and will be done one-on-one with Kim during evening rec time. She has assured us that the interviews will not coincide with major social events such as the dance or the carnival.

In order for your child to participate, both you and your child must fill out and send back the enclosed forms. There is a stamped addressed envelope in this packet for your convenience.

Kristi and I support Kim’s research and have given her permission to conduct research at Sea Camp. We believe her research has great potential to not only help make Sea Camp an even better experience, but also to provide useful information about the impact that Sea Camp has on its campers.

This is the first time research has been done about Sea Camp. The results of her research will be published. However, all of the names of the participants will not be made public.
and you can be assured that your child’s privacy will be protected.

We understand that you may have questions about Kim’s research. Please feel free to contact us at our office at (909) 625-6194. You may also contact Kim at (219) 588-4524 or kmaravil@gmail.com.

We look forward to another exciting summer!

Sincerely,

signature

Ross and Kristi Turner
March 17, 2011

Dear Parents/Guardians,

My name is Kim Maravilla and I have been an employee of Guided Discoveries, Inc. for the past four summers at CIMI as a Marine Science Instructor and as a NAUI Dive Instructor. I am writing you today as a graduate student from Humboldt State University. Currently, I am in my second semester in the Masters of Arts in Social Science, Environment and Community Program and am preparing to begin my thesis research.

My master’s thesis aims to understand if Sea Camp has influenced returning campers’ (those who have attended Sea Camp for 2+ summers) lives. Specifically, I want to study if returning campers (ages 13-17) have changed their views of the environment since they started coming to camp. Also, I am interested in understanding how and if attending Sea Camp has positively influenced their lives. In order to do my research, I would like to conduct a survey during the spring and then interviews for a smaller number of participants during Sea Camp.

I would like your child to participate in this research because your son/daughter has spent at least two summers at Sea Camp. I have spoken with and received permission from Ross and Kristi Turner and Paul Kupferman (“Butterkup”) to conduct this research.

The survey will be sent to all returning campers during the spring, prior to Sea Camp, and should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. I will not be able to identify the campers to their answers. A smaller set of returning campers will be randomly selected to take part in individual interviews during evening free time while they are at Sea Camp. I expect the interview will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. All interviews will take place outside Butterkup’s office, a public and quiet place, to allow the campers to speak freely and comfortably. These interviews will be audio recorded so that I may go back (in private) and review the interview. To insure your child’s privacy, I will copy down the interview in a private area as soon as possible and then immediately erase the audio recording.

A detailed description of my research methods may be found in the attached consent form. For your convenience, I have included an extra consent form for you to keep with your personal records.
I understand you may have some questions about my research. I encourage you to contact either myself (219) 588-4524, kmaravil@gmail.com or my research advisor, Dr. Mark Baker, (707) 826-3907, j.mark.baker@humboldt.edu for any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Kim Maravilla  
kmaravil@gmail.com  
(219) 588-4524
Kimberly Maravilla is conducting research on the cumulative benefits-specifically, self efficacy and environmental ethics-on young adults (ages 13-17) who have attended Sea Camp for 2+ summers. This research attempts to better understand if returning to Sea Camp increases their belief that they have the ability to make and achieve goals that influence their lives. It also attempts to understand if they are more interested and active in their environment outside of Sea Camp. This research is being done in partial fulfillment of the M.A. degree in Social Science, in the Environment and Community Program, under the supervision of Dr. Mark Baker, at Humboldt State University.

This research will add to the limited literature we have concerning the cumulative benefits of returning to a summer camp. We are hopeful this research will assist teachers, camp administrators, camp coordinators, child development specialists, parents/guardians, and other professionals who work in the outdoor education field.

This research is made up of two phases. If you consent, your child will be involved in the first phase of research and may be selected to participate in the second phase of the research. The first phase will ask your child to complete a survey. The deadline to return the completed survey and the signed permission forms is April 15th, 2011. For your convenience, there is a stamped, addressed envelope included in this packet for you to use to mail back the survey and permission forms. The survey is designed to have your child rank to what degree they can do something. The survey should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. These surveys will be anonymous, as I will not be able to identify any participant to the survey.

The second phase of this research will be comprised of a smaller number of randomly selected participants. If selected, your child will be invited to be individually interviewed by me. These interviews will take place during Sea Camp. I have chosen to conduct these interviews during evening free time (the hour after dinner and before evening program) so that it does not interfere with your child’s classes. I will take care not to conduct these interviews on the evenings of major social events (for example, the carnival, the dance, and family day). The interviews will be conducted outside the office of Catalina Sea Camp Director, Paul “Butterkup” Kupferman’s office and last approximately 30-45 minutes. This area is a quiet, public place where your child will be given the opportunity to answer questions about his/her experiences at camp. During the course of the interview, participants will be audio recorded. As soon as
possible after the interview, I will manually copy the interview in a private office or room. Once I copy down the interview, I will immediately erase the audio tape recording.

Any information that is collected as a part of this study that can be identified specifically with your child or your family will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your written permission or required by law. The raw data collected during this research may be used by Guided Discoveries, Inc. for future use. However, all data will remain anonymous. The cumulative results of this study will be published, but the names or identity of participants will not be made known. All data/documentation as part of the project will be destroyed after three years.

Your child may indirectly benefit from participating in this research by being able to reflect on the experiences he/she has had at camp. Further, your child may be able to explain and identify the ways that Sea Camp has influenced his/her life. Your child will not be exposed to any more than minimal risk, such as feeling uneasy about participating in the research. Neither you nor your child will receive any compensation for participating in this study.

If you have any questions about this research you may contact the Kim Maravilla at (219) 588-4524, kmaravil@gmail.com or the researcher’s advisor, Dr. Mark Baker at (707) 826-3907, j.mark.baker@humboldt.edu.

This research has been explained to me by Kim Maravilla. I understand that my child’s and my participation in this research is completely voluntary, and I may withdraw my child from the study at any time without jeopardy. I understand that the investigator may terminate my child’s participation at any time. I understand that we will not receive any compensation for participating in this research.

I give permission for my child to participate in this study.

Child’s name: ____________________________

Parent/legal guardian’s printed name: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Parent/legal guardian’s printed name: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
MA Social Sciences: Environment and Community Program

Hello, Sea Camper!

I am doing this study to understand if young adults (ages 13-17), like yourself, benefit from returning to Sea Camp each summer. Specifically, I am interested in understanding if your experiences have influenced or increased your belief that you can set and achieve goals that influence your life. Also, I want to learn if you feel you are more active with your outdoor environment at home and if you think you are making more environmentally friendly decisions (for example: turning off the light when you leave the room, taking shorter showers, starting/joining environmental clubs, etc.).

If you agree to participate in my study, I am going to ask you to first fill out a survey during the spring, before you return to camp. The survey will ask you the level you feel you can do something. It should take you about 10-15 minutes to complete.

You may also be asked to be interviewed by me. I will have these interviews outside Butterkup’s office during evening rec time. The scheduled interview will take about 30-45 minutes. I will ask you questions about your camp experiences and ask you to share as much or as little as you want. These interviews will be recorded so I can review what we talked about during the interview. To make sure that your privacy is safe, I will copy down our conversation (in private) as soon as possible. After I copy down our conversation, I will immediately erase the tape. Remember, I am the only one who will listen to the tape: whatever you say to me is confidential and you cannot get into trouble for answering these questions.

Both the survey and interview questions should be answered honestly: there are no right or wrong answers. If you do not want to answer all of the questions, that is OK. If you are being interviewed, we can stop it at any time and you can return to rec time. Your answers to survey and interview questions cannot identify you. If you are interviewed, I will give you a fake name when I publish the results of this study. If you would prefer, you can pick out your name.

If you would like to be in this study, please print and sign your name on this paper. If you do not wish to participate, please do not sign your name. Your decision to take part
in this study is up to you. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate in this study and then change your mind later, that is OK. It is your choice.

Name of participant: __________________________  Date: ______________________
Signature of participant: _____________________
April 6, 2011

Greetings!

A couple of weeks ago you received some information about research that I plan on conducting for my Masters of Arts in Social Science, Environment and Community Program at Humboldt State University.

My research intends to understand if Sea Camp has influenced returning campers’ (those who have attended Sea Camp for 2+ summers) lives. If your child participates in this research, I will first ask him/her to complete a brief survey that is due this month. Your child may then be randomly selected to take part in an individual interview with me during Sea Camp this summer.

If you have already sent back the permission forms and the survey, I sincerely thank you. If you have not returned the forms and the survey, there is still time to do so! The due date for the forms and the survey is April 15, 2011.

If your son/daughter would still like to take part in this research, please send the completed forms and survey to:

Kimberly Maravilla
PO Box 155
Arcata, CA 95518

Please remember that it is entirely your decision to take part in this research. Participation is voluntary. If you have misplaced or did not receive the permission forms and survey, please let me know and I will be happy to provide you with another copy.

Additionally, if you have questions about my research, you may contact me at (219) 588-4524, kmaravil@gmail.com. You may also contact my research advisor, Dr. Mark Baker, (707) 826-3907, j.mark.baker@humboldt.edu.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Kim Maravilla
APPENDIX F—Camper Survey

Directions:

Thank you for taking this survey. There are no right or wrong answers, so please answer honestly. Please do not put your name anywhere on this survey. Remember, your responses are anonymous, so I won’t know who you are.

1. How old are you? ______
2. Are you a male or a female? ______
3. Please circle how many years you have come to Sea Camp.
   0 1 2 3 4 5
4. Please circle how many years you have come to Junior Sea Camp.
   0 1 2 3 4 5

For questions 5-30, please use the scale from 0-10 to rate how certain you are that you can do the following things. Please write the number you choose in the space provided at the end of each statement.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Cannot do at all       Moderately can do       Highly certain can do

In general, I can:

5. Be myself at Sea Camp. ______
6. Make friends easily. ______
7. Share my experiences of Sea Camp with others who have not attended camp. ______
8. Make a plan of action or set goals. ______
9. Meet my goals, even if I run into obstacles. ______
10. Solve problems that get in my way. ______

33 The framework and scale are modeled after Albert Bandura’s (2006b) self-efficacy scale.
34 This question is borrowed from Schwarzer and Jerusalem’s (2009) Generalized self-efficacy scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot do at all</td>
<td>Moderately can do</td>
<td>Highly certain can do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Accomplish tasks that others (like my teacher or parents) give me. _____
12. Complete tasks by myself. _____
13. Ask for help if I have a problem achieving my goal. _____

**While I am at Sea Camp, I can:**

14. Try new activities. _____
15. Use my past experiences at camp to help me set new goals. _____
16. Accomplish new tasks. _____
17. Get help with a problem from many people (friends, counselors, etc.). _____
18. Overcome new challenges while I am at Sea Camp. _____

**While I am at home, I can:**

19. Reflect about my experiences at Sea Camp. _____
20. Use my past experiences at camp to help me set new goals. _____
21. Use my experiences at camp to try new things. _____

**Since I started coming to Sea Camp I can:**

22. Participate in more outdoor activities. _____
23. Try new types of activities outside of camp. _____
24. Develop new areas (school subjects or activities) of interest. _____
25. Understand the importance to take action in local environmental issues. _____
26. Recognize if there are concerns about my local environment. _____
27. Explain to my family and friends why we need to use our natural resources wisely. _____
28. Take action about local environmental issues that are important to me. ______

In the future I can:

29. Use my past experiences from Sea Camp to help solve problems that may get in the way of achieving my goals. ______

30. Learn from my experiences at camp to help make new goals. ______

Is there anything else you want to share about your experiences at Sea Camp? Please use the space below for your answer.

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
Dear [Camper’s name],

You have been randomly selected to participate in an interview during Sea Camp by me. My research is trying to see if campers your age have positively benefited from returning to Sea Camp each summer.

This interview will happen on [Proposed date of interview], after dinner in front of Butterkup’s office. The interview should take 30-45 minutes, but it can be longer or shorter if you like. I am going to tape record our interview so that I can go back and review our conversation. To protect your privacy, I am going to copy down our conversation as soon as possible after our interview is over and then immediately erase the tape.

This interview is confidential: no one but me can hear what you have to say and you cannot get into trouble for answering the questions.

I will be asking you questions about your experiences at camp. For example, I may ask you questions like: “Why did you decide to come back to camp this year?” and “How would you describe camp to others?” Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. You can share as little or as much as you want.

If you decide that you do not want to do this interview that is OK. You may also decide later that you do not want to participate. That is also OK! This is voluntary and I appreciate you taking your rec time to talk to me.

If you or your parents/guardians have any questions or you do not want to do this interview, please contact me at (219-588-4524), kmaravil@gmail.com.

Thank you so much!

All the best,

Kim Maravilla
APPENDIX H-Interview Schedule

Interview Script:

Hi, (participant’s name). My name is Kim Maravilla. Maybe you have seen me on the Dive Deck; I have been on Dive Staff for four years. Thank you again for participating in this interview. I know you are giving up some of your free time, and I appreciate it. This evening I am going to ask you about your experiences at Sea Camp. If you do not understand or are confused about any questions, please ask me to clear it up.

Remember, there are no right or wrong answers to these questions: I just want to hear about your experiences at camp. Everything you say to me is confidential and you can not get into trouble for your answers. I will be audio taping this interview, but I will be the only one who is allowed to listen to it. If at any time you want to end this interview that is OK.

Are you ready to begin?

Introduction
1. How many summers you have come to Senior Sea Camp. Jr. Sea Camp? Where are you from? How’d you hear about it?
   a. Why did you come back this year? Other years? Do you go to other camps? What kind?
2. What classes are you in?
3. What are some of your favorite classes/activities at camp? Can you do them at home? Why/why not? Activities at home?
   i. Why do you like them?
      1. Have they always been your favorite classes? If not, why/when did they change? What were they before?
   ii. What is it about your experiences at camp that makes you feel like you can participate in these classes/activities?

Self Efficacy
4. Sea Camp lets you try new activities or move up in different classes. Have you tried new activities or moved up in different classes since coming to Sea Camp?
   i. What are they? Why did you try new activities or want to get higher levels/certifications in those classes?
   ii. Are you challenged by these activities/classes at camp? How?
      1. Have you faced new challenges since your first summer at Sea Camp? Have they changed over time?
a. If so, can you give me an example of how they have changed?
2. How do you overcome new challenges at camp? Can you give me an example?

5. How would you define a goal?
6. Is there something you are working towards in {X} class this summer? Is there something you want to accomplish by the end of camp?
   i. If no, then what about in other classes?
   ii. If yes, what are they?
   iii. When do you make them? Do they change while you are at camp? If so, why do they change? Do you think this has changed since you have come to camp? How?
   iv. How do you know if you are getting close to achieving your goal at camp? What does it feel like when you are getting close to accomplishing something/achieving your goal?
      1. Do you usually meet your goals at camp? Do you think about how you got it?
   v. What do you do if you run into problems/challenges reaching your goal at camp?
      1. Have you always asked for help to achieve your goal at camp?
      2. How do you think you will overcome challenges to your goal in the future at camp?
         a. Can you explain?
   vi. What does it feel like to overcome something that challenged your goal at camp?
   vii. Do you choose your own classes? Do your parents? How do you feel about choosing your own classes?

7. We talked about working towards {X} while at camp. Let’s talk about outside of camp. Is there something you work towards at home? Do you set goals for yourself at home?
   i. What are they?
   ii. How do you know if you are getting close to achieving your goal away from camp? What does it feel like when you are getting close to accomplishing something/achieving your goal?
      1. Do you meet your goals away from camp? Do you think about how you got it?
   iii. What do you do if you run into problems/challenges achieving your goal when you are away from camp?
      1. Have you always asked for help achieving your goal away from camp?
8. Do you think you have learned anything at Sea Camp that will help you set goals in the future? What are they? Overcoming challenges reaching your goals in the future?
   i. What does it do for your ability go out and try new things/take up new areas of interest?
9. Has there been a particular year at Sea Camp that stands out the most? Why?

Environmental Ethics/Stewardship
10. You said that you are in/have taken \{X\} classes. Has being in these classes changed the way you look at/understand the environment? In what ways? What did you learn/do?
   i. If so, which classes at camp contributed the most? Can you explain?
   ii. If not, have you learned anything about the environment?
11. Do you talk about these classes/activities home? How often? Who do you talk to about it? Has this changed since coming to camp? How?
   i. Do you talk about your experiences with the environment?
      1. What do you say about it? Do you think you talk more about the environment since you started coming to camp?
      2. Do you take what you’ve learned in \{X\} class and apply it at home? How? Past classes?
      3. Since coming to camp, are you in any environmental clubs/programs/activities at home?
         a. If so, please describe these activities/programs.
            i. When did you start? What is your part? How often do you participate? Have these things changed from year to year?
            ii. If not, do you think you will participate in the future? Conservation class here? What would it take?
         b. Why do you feel like you can participate in these types of activities?
12. Can you recognize if there is a problem with the environment? Home? What about at camp? Year to year?

Conclusion
13. I hear a lot of people say that at camp, you can “be yourself.” Do you think that’s true?
   i. Why do you think people say that? How is it different here than at home?
1. Can you give me an example?

14. Please finish this statement: “Because of camp…”\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{35} This question is borrowed from the American Camp Association ACA (2011).
APPENDIX I-Camper Biographies

All camper names have been changed to protect their identity. Thus, this section only includes pseudonyms and years spent at Sea Camp and Junior Sea Camp. Further, it should be noted that the campers’ number of years at Sea Camp includes the 2011 summer, when this research was conducted. For example, Amanda, at the time of the interview had previously spent three summers at Sea Camp. The summer of 2011 was her fourth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psudonym</th>
<th>Sea Camp</th>
<th>Junior Sea Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lela</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>