Journal of Leisure Research
2009, Vol. 41, No.3, pp. 313–335

Journal of Leisure Research
Vol. 1, No. 2, Spring, 1969

The Social Circles of Leisure: Competing Explanations

by William R. Burch, Jr.

This paper illustrates some theoretical possibilities for research on leisure behavior. There is an attempt to make explicit two hypotheses which often are implicit in our explanations of variation in leisure behavior. The origins, utility and limitations of these two hypotheses – "compensatory" and "familiarity" – are examined by using data on three styles of family camping. When confronted with these data, it appears that both familiarity and compensatory desires converge upon a specific activity. To understand the sources of this convergence, a third hypothesis – "personal community" – seems a useful alternative. This hypothesis suggests that the nature of those intimate social circles which surround the individual may be the crucial determinant of variation in leisure style. Our data on family camping suggest that future research should consider such a possibility.

After many centuries of speculation and nearly a decade of intensive research on leisure behavior [1] we may be at a point where we can question our received wisdom. Our speculation seems to have run at too grand a cultural level or too primary a biological level to encourage the crucible of testing, while our research seems to have gone its independent way filling many a computer bank with collections of abstract facts. Yet, even at this most fundamental level, our standard variables – income, age, race and sex – furnish only a slight explanation of the extremely diverse behavior possibilities found in leisure [2].

Social class position or income level, for example, seems to be associated with some forms of leisure activity; however, intra-class variations slip through this wide-mesh explanation. The activity may be something of a monopoly held by a particular class, yet only a small proportion of the likely participants actually engage in the activity. We might be able to say that few lower class persons will be found sailing yachts, but we cannot say that all upper class persons will be yachtsmen. Nor can we say that as a class position improves there is a corresponding propensity to become a yachtsman.

The consistently poor fit between standard social variables and leisure behavior suggests that just the facts, even when manipulated by sophisticated statistical techniques, are inadequate for planner and researcher alike. These data only permit us to talk of yesterday when we wish to anticipate tomorrow. To get any value from the facts we need a set of hypotheses which permit us to account for variations in leisure behavior so that predictions of future events may be possible.

Secondly, the nature of our data collection often compels us to treat statistical aggregates as if they were social groups. Most often, class is a statistical

William R. Burch, Jr. is with the School of Forestry at Yale University. He credits Ramon Oldenburg, Wiley Wenger, Jr., Ted Johannis, Elwood Shafer and Wilbur LaPage for their assistance with this report.

aggregate posing as a social group. Reflection should suggest that command over an income level, though setting minimum and maximum limits of participation, does not determine a life style. One gains an income but one must learn a life style, and learning requires an organized group concerned with imparting normative standards. A collection of people scattered over a vast territory and unknowingly placed in common cause because they happen to share a similar income level are not likely to develop such a coherent training program.

Since our data, in fact, are collected from individuals rather than social groups the tendency is to account for deviations from aggregate trends on the basis of individualistic causes. Robert Havighurst, a sociologist discouraged by such variations, seems typical in arguing that leisure activity choice is shaped by personality traits or basic personality needs rather than social factors [3]. That is, our explanations become shaped by our own sense of uniqueness, especially as reflected in our "choosing time."

Consequently, when we develop hypotheses to explain leisure behavior they, like us, tend to be of an individualistic nature. This essay will consider two such hypotheses which either in a systematic or implied way tend to inform many explanations of leisure behavior. It will attempt to suggest their origins, examine their explanatory value and suggest some possible limitations. We will also examine a third hypothesis which might be considered a useful alternative in future research designs. The intent is twofold – to encourage a more theoretical approach in leisure research and to suggest a hypothesis which may permit the study of social groups as well as individuals and social aggregates.

Obviously this essay will not consider all possible hypotheses nor will it consider all forms of leisure. Nor are we after systematic proofs and generalizations tightly confined to our data. This is an exercise in theory building based upon data collected for other purposes and has all the limitations associated with such an exercise.

For convenience the three hypotheses will be called "compensatory," "familiarity" and "personal community." We will examine each of these hypotheses in some detail. Data on family camping will be used to illustrate the argument. A description as to how these data were collected follows.

Research Procedure

A sample of wilderness and auto campers was taken in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area, Oregon, and adjacent auto camps during the summer of 1962. The problem of obtaining a representative sample of wilderness campers, who tend to be small groups widely scattered over a vast amount of undeveloped territory, has compelled most students to be satisfied with a convenience sample. Fortunately, this study was based upon a systematic sample of wilderness campers as names of all campers were drawn from the records of a

continuing study of un-manned wilderness registration stations [4]. Campers' names were also obtained from interviews made in auto campgrounds. Interviewer travel routes permitted the sampling of a wide range of campgrounds (different locations, principal activities, and levels of development) at different times of the day and week. At each campground encountered on the scheduled travel route, the interviewer contacted all groups occupying the campground. When no member of a group was present, the available automobile license was recorded and names of owners were obtained from the state agency.

On December 31, 1962, 997 camping groups were sent a detailed questionnaire. A cover letter and two follow-ups brought an 89.7 percent response. Telephone interviews with a sample of nonrespondents indicated that those who responded were fairly representative of the total sample. Of the returns, 740 represented family groups who camped overnight or longer. All analyses are based on this group.

Respondents were classed into three camping categories on the basis of their camping patterns over the previous five years. These groups were: (1) *easy access* or auto camping only (n = 254); (2) *combination* or wilderness and auto camping (n = 424); and (3) *remote* or wilderness camping only (n = 62). Comparison with relevant Oregon census data was possible since a large proportion of the sample were residents of Oregon [5].

These types of camping styles represent clusters of social meaning whose differences are greater than the apparent differences in specific location and recreation activity [6]. In considering easy access and remote camping styles there is a sharp division of choice along the dimensions of relative comfort and discomfort, activity milieus offering extensive sociality or intensive sociality, and attitudes of earning pleasure in the impersonal terms of cash and earning pleasure by the personal investment of feeling and effort. In short, these clusters of social meaning reflect tendencies of life style decisions which transcend the confines of a particular activity.

In the following section, an attempt will be made to identify some of the factors which shape life style patterns.

The Compensatory Hypothesis

The compensatory hypothesis suggests that whenever the individual is given the opportunity to avoid his regular routine he will seek a directly opposite activity. The idea implies a safety-valve effect; whenever boredom or monotony of routine builds up the individual requires a sharply different experience or he will break down.

The reader will recognize this hypothesis as an echo of the surplus energy theory developed independently by Friedrich Schiller and Herbert Spencer in the 19th century. Following them, Karl Groos identified some limitations of the

surplus energy theory, yet placed great emphasis upon the safety valve or catharsis function of play [7]. In such a way Groos managed to push the origins of the hypothesis back at least as far as the Aristotelian theory of drama.

Harold Wilensky indicates than in the 1960's the ideas of a "compensatory leisure hypothesis" still furnish guidance to the critics of industrial and mass society. Certainly some variant of the compensatory hypothesis has structured the thinking and rhetoric of contemporary conservationists and professional recreation directors. The rhetoric stresses that playgrounds and wilderness areas and campgrounds are being demanded by individuals who "need" release from the tensions of modern occupational and urban life. The force of Arnold Green's critique of this rhetoric suggests the still solid weight and prevalence of the compensatory leisure hypothesis [8].

The hypothesis as applied to this study's data suggests that an individual who has time freed from structured decisions will seek to fill that time with activities and locales opposite to those found in his ordinary activities. If his routine activity is sedentary, then he will seek vigorous play; and if his routine locale is urban, then he will seek a rural locale.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's (ORRRC) national study of wilderness tends to support the compensatory hypothesis. Its findings suggest " . . . that the city people are more likely to escape to the country for their vacations while those born (or living) in the country are more likely to be pulled to the attractions of the city" [9].

This study's data on forest camping would seem to add further support to the compensatory hypothesis. As Table 1 indicates, the great majority of all campers presently live in urbanized areas. There are few campers from farm areas, while those from urbanized areas are greatly over-represented when they are compared with the percentages of people found in the state at large. Using state residence figures and assuming that camping was a purely random phenomenon, one would expect that almost 34 percent of the campers would presently reside on farms or in rural areas; however, only 7.7 percent of the campers live in rural areas. It appears that urban residence is associated with camping.

A chi-square examination of these data indicates a significant difference between present places of residence and particular camping styles. However, the chi-square reflects a considerable variation from the compensatory hypothesis. The chi-square is accounted for, in order of magnitude, by: overrepresentation of rural dwellers in the remote style (5.00), and underrepresentation of urban dwellers in the remote style (2.89). Such a pattern, linking the most primitive style of camping and rural residence, suggests that future research should reconsider the easy generalization of the ORRRC reports. Perhaps rural residents are not heading for the cities but are seeking solitude away from the crowded rural areas?

TABLE 1

Present Residence of Respondents, Classified by Three Camping Styles, and Distribution of the State's Population by Location in Percentages

Location	Camping Styles						Total		State of Oregon *
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Farm	0	0	2	.4	2	3.2	4	.5	27.8
Rural Non-Farm (1,000 and below)	17	6.7	28	6.6	8	12.9	53	7.2	5.8
Small Town (1,001 – 5,000)	37	14.6	33	7.8	7	11.3	77	10.4	8.9
Small City (5,001 – 50,000)	78	30.8	162	38.4	26	41.9	266	36.1	17.9
Large City (50,000 – more)	84	33.2	170	40.3	16	25.8	270	36.6	24.0
Suburb (within 15 miles of large city)	37	14.6	27	6.4	3	4.8	67	9.1	15.6
Total	253	99.9	422	99.9	62	99.9	737	99.9	100.0
Unidentifiable	1		2						

$X^2 = 9.55 \quad .05 > p > .02 > .01.$

Note: In the computation of Chi-square State percentages were excluded while rows one and two, three and four, and five and six were combined to give a three-fold table with four degrees of freedom.

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Number of Inhabitants, Oregon.* Final Report PC (1) – 39A. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. pp. 39 – 11.

However, ORRRC Study Report Three says: "The more urban the environment in which a wilderness user grew up, the more likely he is to be a frequent user of the wilderness" [9, p. 135]. Perhaps the more significant influence is not urban residence alone, but being raised in an urban setting. Table 2 indicates that the modal class of childhood residence was, for all three styles of camping, farm residence. Twenty-nine percent of the easy access campers, 31.8 percent of the combination campers, and 34.4 percent of the remote campers spent the majority of their early years on a farm. A chi-square test indicates no significant difference in childhood residence for the three camping styles.

TABLE 2

Place Where Husbands Were Raised (Spent Most of Early Life Before Age 18) – By Three Camping Styles

Place	Camping Style						Total	
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm	71	28.5	134	31.8	21	34.4	226	30.9
Small Town	66	26.5	106	25.2	9	14.8	181	24.8
Small City	50	20.1	84	20.0	15	24.6	149	20.4
Large City	49	19.7	69	16.4	15	24.6	133	18.2
Suburb	13	5.2	28	6.7	1	1.6	42	5.7
Total	249	100.0	421	100.0	61	100.0	731	100.0
No Response	5		3		1			

$X^2 = 4.62 \quad .05 < p < .70 > .50.$

Note: Chi-square was computed by combining the last two rows for a four by three table with six degrees of freedom.

Though present residence and childhood residence do not offer the expected accounting of variations in camping style, one might push the idea further by considering spatial mobility patterns as reflecting a propensity to seek, or avoid, new opportunity and new experience. That is, one might expect persons who had made dramatic shifts from rural childhood residence to present urban residence would be more likely to seek the demanding compensatory experience of remote camping.

Yet, when one considers spatial mobility in terms of the husband's move from where he was raised to where he presently resides, there seems to be further confusion, though a general reflection of the national movement to urban areas. (See Table 3.) About 40 percent of the easy access campers who

TABLE 3

Comparison of Husband's Locational Changes From Childhood Residence to Present Residence – By Three Camping Styles

Spatial Mobility Patterns	Camping Style: Easy Access N	%	Combination N	%	Remote N	%	Total N	%
Rural to Urban	97	39.1	194	46.4	20	32.8	311	42.8
Urban to Rural	12	4.8	22	5.3	3	4.9	37	5.1
Rural to Rural	40	16.1	46	11.0	10	16.4	93	13.2
Urban to Urban	99	39.9	156	37.3	28	45.9	283	38.9
Total	248	99.9	418	100.0	61	100.0	727	100.0

$X^2 = 8.31$ $.05 < p < .30 > .20$.

were raised in rural areas now reside in large cities or suburbs. A somewhat larger percentage of the combination campers who were raised in rural areas now reside in large cities or suburbs. Remote campers show the least movement from rural areas to urban areas. Only 14.3 percent of those raised in rural areas have moved to large cities or suburbs. A chi-square test indicates no significant difference among the three groups.

In considering the earliest age at which the respondent first began to enjoy the out-of-doors, one finds that most campers had such experience before they were 12 years of age. (See Table 4.) Yet, significantly larger numbers of easy access campers evidence a later age of attraction than the other two styles of camping. The general pattern indicates that more of the remote campers were exposed earlier and, therefore, have had longer experience and perhaps greater depth of involvement with outdoor activities. Also, when one considers the place where the respondent first began to enjoy the out-of-doors, there is considerable similarity for the three groups. (See Table 5.) Most of the campers had their initial exposure to the outdoors in farm, rural or campground settings. A chi-square comparison indicates no significant difference among the three camping styles.

TABLE 4

Earliest Age at which Respondent First Began To Enjoy the Out-of-Doors – By Three Camping Styles

Age	Camping Style						Total	
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6 or Under	101	43.7	192	46.2	26	44.1	318	45.2
7 – 12	99	42.8	192	46.2	29	49.2	320	45.3
13 – 18	8	3.5	25	6.0	0	0	33	4.7
19 or Over	23	10.0	7	1.6	4	6.8	34	4.3
Total	231	100.0	416	100.0	59	100.1	706	100.0
No Response	23		8		3			

$X^2 = 28.53$ $.001 > p.$

It would appear that regardless as to how one considers it – present residence, childhood residence and experience, or spatial mobility patterns – the compensatory hypothesis seems less relevant than the attraction of familiar activities and locales. Perhaps the familiarity hypothesis is the more plausible explanation.

The Familiarity Hypothesis

The familiarity hypothesis assumes that persons have worked out a comfortable routine for social survival and that the rewards of security outweigh any possible rewards bought by the high costs of uncertainty. The reader may recognize that the hypothesis attempts to summarize a fairly consistent notion in social-psychological literature. Very often the discussion is concerned with the "force of habit" which keeps the individual on a steady and, one assumes, familiar behavior pattern. There is a similar notion in discussions of the individual's tendency to avoid situations which produce tension and the individual's tendency towards consistency of behavior. In short, "... like valences attract, and unlike valences repel" [10].

The idea of a familiarity hypothesis seems to be present in Gardner Murphy's discussion of canalization. He says:

TABLE 5

Number of Respondents and Places Where They First Began to Enjoy Outdoors – By Three Camping Styles

Place	Camping Style						Total	
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm	68	30.6	117	30.4	15	25.9	200	30.1
Rural Area	31	14.0	39	10.0	12	20.7	82	12.3
City Parks	0	0	1	.3	1	1.7	2	.3
Vacant Lot	4	1.8	5	1.3	1	1.7	10	1.5
Organization Trips or Camps	30	13.5	81	21.0	6	10.3	117	17.6
Camping	74	33.3	108	28.1	15	25.9	197	29.6
Fishing Trips	12	5.4	26	6.8	6	10.3	44	6.6
Hunting Trips	3	1.4	8	2.1	2	3.4	13	2.0
Total	222	100.0	385	100.1	58	99.9	663	100.0
Other	13		32		4			
Unclassifiable	3		5		0			
No Response	16		1		0			
Total	254		424		62			

$X^2 = 6.35 \quad .05 < p < .50 > .30.$

Note: The Chi-square was computed by excluding the last three rows, and combining row one and two, row three and four, row five and six for a four by three table with six degrees of freedom.

> The process is one of progressive increase in the strength of the association between a specific object and a specific type of satisfaction, so that in subsequent behavior the satisfaction is sought by pursuing this particular object rather than some other object which might serve the drive just as well.

Later he suggests:

> We can be depended upon, year after year, to cling to much that we have learned to love, and likewise to maintain the aversions and avoidance of an earlier period . . . There is a

> great deal of self-stimulation, a great deal of continuity, in the pattern of acquired tastes, which maintains itself without outer reinforcement, and indeed often in defiance of very great external pressures [11].

In the leisure-study field, the familiarity hypothesis suggests that when given the freedom to dispose of his time the individual will seek activities which continue his familiar routines. For example, in a volume on leisure in America, James Charlesworth says, "another arresting fact is the more monotonous a worker's job the more monotonous the recreation he seeks in his free time" [12]. However, the "habits" of work are not the only sources of routine. In a study of camping, K. Peter Etzkorn suggests:

> From our questionnaire data and our personal observation of the activities of this camp and a similar camp in the same area we failed to detect leisure type activities which differ radically from those that are generally characteristic of the home environments of the campers [13].

The idea that the "habits" of work and home carry over into leisure has also been noted by David Riesman and others who have hoped that leisure would take a compensatory form rather than a routine form. That is, unlike the compensatory hypothesis which sees a constant increase in new experience-needs pressing against limited supplies of appropriate settings, the familiarity hypothesis sees persons so locked into secure routines that they never desire compensatory activities.

In applying the hypothesis to this study's data, one would expect that camping would be more attractive to manual workers than professionals, as much of camping play involves routine manual labor and entry costs are low. Therefore, prestige values are low and, also, there is an opportunity to avoid strangers. Further, one would expect those professionals who camped would seek the greater cost, comfort, and social contact of easy access camping, while manual workers would be attracted to the less expensive and more repetitive physical demands of remote camping.

Table 6 gives some indication that in camping there is a tendency to reverse familiarities. Campers have higher social status than could be expected from a random distribution of the state's occupational positions [14]. When compared to the state distributions, professionals and middle non-manual occupations are greatly overrepresented in camping while manual workers are greatly underrepresented. Further, those with "soft" patterns of physical labor seem more likely to seek the isolation and exertion of remote camping; while those with "hard" patterns of physical labor seek the ease and sociability of easy access camping.

The major contributions to the chi-square indicate that the lower the occupational status the more likely the person is to be found in the easy access style of camping. Easy access campers are underrepresented in the professions

TABLE 6

Husband's Occupational Status for Three Styles of Camping and State Percentages

Occupational Category	Camping Style						Total		State of Oregon*
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers	51	21.5	144	35.8	16	27.6	211	30.3	10.6
Upper Non-Manual	18	7.6	42	10.4	7	12.1	67	9.6	14.0
Middle Non-Manual	70	29.5	91	22.6	13	22.4	174	25.0	13.3
Middle Manual	30	21.1	74	18.4	10	17.2	134	19.2	20.2
Lower Manual	45	19.0	43	10.7	6	10.3	94	13.5	34.6
Farmers	3	1.3	8	2.0	6	10.3	17	2.4	7.3
Total	237	100.0	402	99.9	58	99.9	697	100.0	100.0
Student	1		15		3		19		
Unemployed	1		0		0		1		
No Response and Deceased	8		7		1		16		
Retired	7		0		0		7		
Total	254		424		62		740		

$X^2 = 23.60$ $.05 > p < .01 > .001.$ $C = .17$ $\bar{C} = .19$

Note: Chi-square is computed only for the first five rows for a five by three table with eight degrees of freedom.

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Detailed Characteristics, Oregon.* Final Report PC (1) – 39D. Table 120, pp. 39 – 240 – 245.

(6.63) and upper non-manual occupations (1.09), and overrepresented in the lower manual occupations (5.28). The combination campers are overrepresented in the professions (3.97) and underrepresented in the lower occupations (2.24). While remote campers tend to be distributed as the total sample.

Gerstl's evidence [15] of the considerable differences in life style among dentists, admen and professors encouraged an examination as to whether specific occupations within the professional class were associated with a particular camping style. Table 7 indicates that a large proportion of remote campers are technical persons, having a distribution almost identical to that of the state; while combination campers overrepresent those professionals who could be classed as intellectuals [16]. One would anticipate that the linguistic lines of intellectuals and technicians would offer different perspectives of nature. The intellectual would more likely emphasize the aesthetic and abstract qualities while the technician would more likely emphasize the practical and concrete aspects of nature, such as the challenges met, the number of miles traveled and the number of trophies collected [17].

Also, Table 7 indicates that when professionals are classed as to their specific occupations, there is little difference in the kind of professional furnished to the styles of camping. This is similar to ORRRC findings [9, p. 190]. However, it is interesting to note that both foresters and medical practitioners furnish a large proportion of the remote campers. It would seem that the forester follows a familiar line of action while the "motives" of medical practitioners lead them to new experiences.

In the previous tables and discussion, even when familiarity seemed a more plausible explanation than compensatory "drives," there were important variations. Perhaps the conduct of a leisure style represents crosstrends which converge on a similar set of actions though different meanings are derived. The forester or farmer may have constructed a desire to minimize social interaction into an involving occupation, and his leisure becomes a continuation of the rewards of work. While the urban professional may be attempting the construction of alternative identities which permit him the freedom of role distance in his thickly peopled world of work.

This study's analysis suggests that though the familiarity and compensatory hypotheses seem logically opposite explanations, there is some tendency for convergence at the level of group membership. That is, one should be careful of assumptions which view these factors as fairly constant pressures toward a specific behavior, particularly when one has some indication that manifestations may be shaped by pressures within groups rather than within individuals. Perhaps one can improve the understanding of variations in leisure behavior by considering interactional contexts such as occupational milieu.

TABLE 7

Types of Professionals Found in Three Styles of Camping and Similar State Distributions

Profession	Camping Style: Easy Access N	Easy Access %	Combination N	Combination %	Remote N	Remote %	Total N	Total %	State of Oregon* %
Intellectual									
Public School Teachers	12	26.7	25	19.8	2	14.3	40	21.1	15.6
College Teachers	4	8.9	20	15.3	1	7.1	25	13.2	4.7
Lawyers	2	4.4	6	4.6	0	0	8	4.2	4.9
Clergymen	1	2.2	4	3.1	0	0	5	2.6	5.1
Journalists, Photographers, Writers	0	0	3	2.3	1	7.1	4	2.1	2.0
Physicists, Chemists	3	6.7	7	5.3	1	7.1	11	5.8	2.2
Total	22	48.9	66	50.4	5	35.6	93	49.0	34.6
Technical									
Other Academic	4	8.9	0	0	0	0	4	2.1	N.C.†
Medical and Dental	5	11.1	17	13.0	3	21.4	25	13.2	7.8
Foresters, Land Professions	1	2.2	18	13.7	3	21.4	22	11.6	4.0
Engineers	11	24.4	28	21.4	2	14.3	41	21.6	13.8
C.P.A.'s, Accountants	2	4.4	2	1.5	1	7.1	5	2.6	9.0
Total	23	51.0	65	49.6	9	64.2	97	51.1	34.5
All Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.9
TOTAL	45	99.9	131	100.0	14	99.8	190	100.1	100.0

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Detailed Characteristics, Oregon.* Final Report PC (1) – 39D. Table 120, pp. 39 – 240 – 245.

†No comparative data.

The Personal Community Hypothesis

The personal community hypothesis assumes that gross social issues and psychological drives are significantly filtered and re-directed by the social circles of workmates, family and friends [18]. At this study's data level, the hypothesis would suggest that transactions with and socialization by one's workmates, parents, spouse and friends will shape the nature of one's leisure style.

As indicated above, occupational milieu seems a stronger influence upon style of camping than social class position. Table 8 demonstrates that socialization by parents is another important determinant of adult leisure style. A chi-square comparison of husband's present style of camping and his experience with parents indicates a significant difference among the three camping styles. Of most interest is the tendency toward continuing the camping style learned in childhood.

TABLE 8

Husband's Style of Camping with Parents and Present Style of Camping – Three Camping Styles Compared

Prior Camping Experience with Parents	Present Camping Style: Easy Access N	%	Combination N	%	Remote N	%	Total N	%
Easy Access	74	30.8	108	26.0	15	24.2	197	27.5
Combination	42	17.5	148	35.7	13	20.9	203	28.3
Remote	15	6.3	34	8.2	20	32.4	69	9.6
None	109	45.4	125	30.1	14	22.5	248	34.6
Total	240	100.0	415	100.0	62	100.0	717	100.0
No Response	11		5		0			
Don't Know	4		4		0			

$X^2 = 74.67 > .001$: with six degrees of freedom.

$C = .30 \quad \bar{C} = .34$

Continuity in camping style is most clearly illustrated by the contributions to the chi-square. Remote campers are overrepresented in having childhood experience in remote camping (33.69); underrepresented in having easy access

experience (3.68); and underrepresented in having no experience with parents (2.55). Easy access campers are underrepresented in having no childhood experience in combination and remote camping (9.87 and 2.84 respective contributions), and overrepresented in having no childhood experience (8.14) and in having easy access experience (1.25). Combination campers are overrepresented in having childhood experience in combination camping (7.92), and underrepresented in having no childhood experience (2.38). In sum: adult males are very likely to be exposing their families to a style of camping they experienced with their own parents. This tendency towards generational continuity in style of camping is more characteristic of remote and combination campers than of easy access campers who are more likely to be novices.

The influx of novices into a leisure activity provides another point for interaction analysis. A look at the percentages in Table 8 indicates that, though continuity is the general pattern, there is a sizeable amount of shifting in camping style. The small percentage of present easy access campers who had childhood experience in combination or remote camping contrasts with the 26 percent of present combination and 24.2 percent of present remote campers who had only easy access experience with their parents. These data suggest that if a person remains in camping, he is more likely to shift towards the more demanding styles rather than the reverse. As suggested previously, such movement permits the traditional campers to recapture past and imagined qualities of childhood experience when "the campgrounds weren't so crowded," or when "campers were a better class of people" [19]. Perhaps a Gresham's law of leisure operates where there is a continuing influx of novices. The more demanding styles having reached the limits of exclusiveness, they remain stable from generation to generation. Whereas children of today's easy access pioneers may shift in their adulthood to the more demanding styles as they attempt to retain the imagined quality of childhood experience.

While the influx of "novices" may induce shifts from childhood locations, transactions with one's spouse may offer another intervening factor. After all, an activity like camping may reward the wife with merely a further series of routine household duties, but staged under more demanding and primitive conditions. This study is concerned with the reciprocal restraint and guidance which might occur between husbands and wives as they blend their biographies to make family leisure decisions.

Table 9 indicates there is a significant difference among the three camping styles when childhood camping experience of husband-wife pairs are compared. Of most interest are the subtle variations which occur as husbands and wives sort out childhood experiences to schedule leisure activities.

The proportional tendencies and the cell contributions to chi-square suggest some of the following variations:

(1) Easy access husband-wife pairs are more likely to have never camped with their parents than pairs in the other two styles (3.52 contribution).

TABLE 9

Prior Camping Experience with Parents — Husband-Wife Pairs Compared — By Three Camping Styles

Camping Experience	Camping Style: Easy Access N	Easy Access n	Easy Access %	%	Combination N	Combination n	Combination %	%	Remote N	Remote n	Remote %	%	Total
No Experience	75		31.8		95		23.4		10		16.4		180
Some Experience	90		38.1		178		43.8		24		39.3		292
Same Exp.:													
Both Auto		43		18.2		51		12.5		6		9.8	
Both Hiking		25		10.6		74		18.2		12		19.6	
Variation:													
Husband Auto/ Wife Hiking		4		1.6		14		3.4		1		1.6	
Husband Hiking/ Wife Auto		18		7.6		39		9.6		5		8.2	
Difference													
Husband Some/ Wife None	41		17.4		101		24.9		21		34.4		163
Auto		24		10.2		33		8.1		7		11.5	
Hiking		17		7.2		68		16.7		14		22.9	
Wife Some/ Husband None	30		12.7		32		7.9		6		9.8		68
Auto		20		8.5		13		3.2		5		8.2	
Hiking		10		4.2		19		4.6		1		1.6	
Total	236		100.0		406		100.0		61		99.9		703
Don't Know	4				2				1				
Both No Response	14				13				0				
Wife No Response	0				3				0				
TOTAL	254				424				62				

$X^2 = 18.40 \quad p > .01$

Note: Chi-square is computed for rows one, two, seven and ten (see underscored N) for a three by four table with six degrees of freedom.

(2) When compared with the other camping styles, more easy access wives have greater camping experience than their husbands (3.42 underrepresented in the "husband-some/wife-never" cell and 2.27 overrepresented in the "wife-some/husband-never" cell).

(3) When compared to the other styles of camping, remote husbands are more likely to have had greater experience than their wives (3.37 contribution).

(4) When compared to the other two styles of camping, remote husband-wife pairs are more likely to have had camping experience with their parents (2.01 contribution).

(5) When husbands and wives have had variations or differences in camping experience, husbands have more likely had remote experience. Looking at the "variation" rows, husbands in all camping styles have more often had hiking experience and wives have had auto experience, rather than the reverse. Looking at the "difference" rows, where husbands have had some experience and wives none, the combination and remote husbands predominate in hiking experience cells, while easy access husbands predominate in the auto camping cells. Where wives have had some experience and husbands none, it has more often been auto camping, except for combination husband-wife pairs.

In sum: a relatively greater proportion of easy access husband-wife pairs have had no camping experience. When husband-wife pairs have had prior camping experience, easy access pairs tend toward auto camping while combination and remote pairs tend toward hiking. A large proportion of combination and remote husbands, whose wives have had no prior camping experience, hiked with their parents rather than auto camped. On the basis of camping experience with parents, many wives lead their families into camping, though easy access wives are more likely to be such leaders than wives in the other camping styles.

Considering data from both Tables 8 and 9, it seems that family of orientation is a significant reference for some adult male leisure decisions while family of procreation is a significant referent for married females. It would appear that in camping (at least for combination and remote campers) the husband is an important socializing agent for the wife. A similar pattern for the context of American sport has been reported by Gregory P. Stone [20]. However, this general tendency cannot ignore the fact that many married women are the prime guides for family camping. Also, the numbers and ages of children in the family further influence family leisure style. As demonstrated elsewhere, there is a tendency for family leisure activities to alter with the changing stages of the family life cycle [21].

A final exploration of the personal community hypothesis concerns the influence of close friends upon leisure style. Chi-square tests of data in Tables 10 and 11 indicate no significant difference among the three camping styles in proportions or numbers of friends sharing their tastes and activities. However, these data indicate that a large proportion of campers in all styles have close

friends who participate in similar recreational activities and close friends who camp as much as they do. Though the data permit no way of determining whether close friends are cause or consequence of leisure activity, it seems reasonable to assume that this circle of close friends constrains an actor to remain within a given style of leisure. To opt out of a leisure style may also mean leaving a particular circle of close friends.

TABLE 10

Proportion of Close Friends Who Participate in Similar Recreational Activities – By Three Camping Styles

Proportion of Close Friends	Camping Style						Total	
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Most	85	34.4	157	37.1	21	35.0	263	36.0
Some	96	38.9	171	40.4	25	41.7	292	40.0
Few	37	15.0	67	15.8	8	13.3	112	15.3
Very Few	23	9.3	24	5.7	3	5.0	50	6.8
None	6	2.4	4	.9	3	5.0	13	1.8
Total	247	100.0	423	99.9	60	100.0	730	99.9
Uncodable – No Response	7		1		2			

$X^2 = 9.50$ $p < .50$: with 80 degrees of freedom.

To recapitulate, the personal community hypothesis suggests that as occupational milieu varies so does the nature of leisure activity. University professors will seek a different style and set of leisure meanings than dentists. Within the array of leisure opportunities seen as likely for a given occupational group, an important determinant of specific choice is furnished by parental socialization. Involving leisure styles, such as wilderness camping, are likely to exhibit considerable generational continuity. However, these tendencies can be re-directed through movements of novices into former childhood locations, transactions with one's spouse, or stage of family life cycle. Further, once a person has sorted out his range of leisure alternatives he tends to have a circle of friends which reinforces his remaining within this range.

TABLE 11

Number of Close Friends Who Participate in Similar Camping Activities – By Three Camping Styles

Number of Close Friends	Camping Style						Total	
	Easy Access		Combination		Remote			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Zero	16	9.2	45	13.3	9	17.6	70	12.4
1 – 3	38	21.8	73	21.6	6	11.8	117	20.8
4 – 8	70	40.2	126	37.2	22	43.1	218	38.7
9 and Above	50	28.7	94	27.8	14	25.5	158	28.1
Total	174	99.9	338	100.0	61	100.0	563	100.0
Uncodable and No Response	80		86		1			

$X^2 = 5.62$ $p < .50$: with 6 degrees of freedom.

Conclusions and Summary

This paper has illustrated some theoretical possibilities for research on leisure behavior. It attempts to overcome the limited explanatory value of statistical aggregates by making explicit two often implicit hypotheses. It uses data on family camping to suggest that both familiarity and compensatory desires often converge to shape behavioral choice. Yet, to understand the sources of this convergence, one must go to social settings where persons are reciprocally influencing one another.

Interaction in specific occupational, familial and friendship settings seem likely locations to search for determinants of leisure behavior. The values which attract and are imposed upon the individual in specific occupations may predispose him towards a general pattern of leisure action. The husband's leisure socialization by his parents seems an important factor in directing his adult leisure style. The transactions between husband and wife with, at least in outdoor sports, the husband gradually training his wife seem an essential factor in shaping leisure actions.

It seems likely that post-industrial man, just as his tribal and peasant counterparts, finds the shape of his free time formed within small circles of workmates, family and friends. Further investigation of these small social circles seems a worthy task for the prophets and pessimists of a leisured future.

Notes

1. Leisure is that aspect of life which, in contrast to labor or work, permits one to have a relatively greater range of activity options. This does not mean that leisure is free of normative constraint, but rather that less formal, less bureaucratic constraints operate. It is the discovery of the operation and nature of these informal constraints which should occupy the sociologist. We are also aware of the aristocratic definition of leisure used by deGrazia, Arendt and others, and of the neat separation of play, recreation, and diversion from the hallow sanctity of leisure. However, for the purposes of this paper, leisure as "choosing time" seems a useful general definition which includes play, recreation, and diversion. Some definitions of leisure may be found in:

   Clawson, Marion. "How Much Leisure, Now and in the Future?," *Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse?* Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, April, 1964, p. 16.

   DeGrazia, Sebastian. *Of Time, Work and Leisure.* New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1962, pp. 233-235.

   Burch, Jr., William R. and Taves, Marvin J. "Changing Functions of Recreation in Human Society," *Outdoor Recreation in the Upper Great Lakes Area.* Station Paper No. 89. St. Paul: Lake States Forest Experiment Station, August, 1961, pp. 8-16.

   Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1959.

2. In the Survey Research Center's national survey, a multivariate analysis of the data found "significant" association between level of outdoor recreation activity and such factors as sex, age, race, religion, place of residence, education of head of household, income and life cycle. However, they suggest that "Taken together these factors account for approximately 30 percent of the variance in the measure of outdoor recreation activity," a finding which suggests that the standard variables do not provide a very high level of prediction about leisure behavior. *Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report No. 20,* p. 69.

   As Phillip H. Ennis suggests, leisure occupies a peculiar place in our society. To paraphrase his argument: (1) unlike work, church, or politics, leisure is not contained in any particular area but invades all; (2) leisure time has the capacity to fulfill a variety of functions for the individual; however, there is no hierarchial valuation among the possible uses of one's free time that has community consensus . . . there is an 'unpriced cafeteria selection' quality to leisure; (3) leisure is normatively indefinite, an individual matter. The consequences of not going to work are fairly clear; what are the consequences of say, switching off the T.V.? In Dorbriner, William (ed). *The Suburban Community.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958, p. 258.

3. Havinghurst, Robert J. "The Leisure Activities of the Middle-Aged," *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. LXII (September, 1957), pp. 159-162.

4. Wenger, Jr., Wiley D. "A Test of Unmanned Registration Stations on Wilderness Trails: Factors Influencing Effectiveness." U.S. Forest Research Paper PNW-16, 1964.

   _____and Gregersen, Hans Miller. "The Effect of Nonresponse on

Representativeness of Wilderness Trail Register Information." U.S. Forest Service Research Paper PNW-17, 1964.

These studies by Wenger and Gregersen offer a farily complete census of the Three Sisters Wilderness Area. They found that 76.8 percent of the users registered at stations placed on all trails into the area. Further, the bulk of the non-registrants were horsemen and solitary fishermen, two groups which are less relevant to the interests of the present study.

5. Burch, Jr., William R. and Wenger, Jr., Wiley D. "The Social Characteristics of Participants in Three Styles of Family Camping." U.S. Forest Service Research Paper PNW-48, 1967. This study found that 87.5 percent of combination campers, 95.1 percent of remote campers, and 87.6 percent of easy access campers were Oregon residents.
6. For detailed discussion see: Burch, Jr., William R. *Nature as Symbol and Expression in American Social Life.* (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1964.)
7. Schiller, Friedrich. *Essays Aesthetical and Philosophical.* London: Bell, 1875.

Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Psychology.* Vol. I. London: William and Norgate, 1870. Especially pages 79-86.

Groos, Karl. *The Play of Man.* New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1901, p. 367. We should also mention the undoubted influence of W. I. Thomas' four wishes, one of which was "new experience" and another was "security."

Thomas, W. I. with Znaniecki, Florian. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.* Vol. I. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1918-20, p. 73.

8. Wilensky, Harold L. "Work, Careers and Social Integration," *International Journal of Social Science,* Vol. XII (1960), p. 544.

Green, Arnold W. *Recreation, Leisure and Politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

9. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. *Wilderness and Recreation — A Report on Resources, Values, and Problems.* Study Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Wildland Research Center, University of California, 1962, p. 136. It should be noted that wilderness campers as studied by ORRRC are contained within the categories of combination and remote campers as used in this study.
10. For example see Munn, Norman. *Psychology: The Fundamentals of Human Adjustment.* 3rd Ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956, p. 105. Also Newcomb, Theodore M.; Turner, Ralph H. and Converse, Philip E. *Social Psychology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965, p. 77.
11. Murphy, Gardner. "Social Motivation," *Handbook of Social Psychology,* Vol. XI. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954, pp. 611-612. Some aspects of the new theory of cognitive dissonance seem to fit the way the term "familiarity" is used in this study. The individual, when confronted with a relatively unattainable desire, tends to confer upon his present routines a high degree of satisfaction, thereby minimizing dissonance. See Brehm, Jack W. and Cohen, Arthur R. *Explorations in Cognitive Dissonances.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
12. Charlesworth, James C. "A Comprehensive Plan for the Wise Use of Leisure," *Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse?* Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, April, 1964, p. 32.

13. Etzkorn, K. Peter. "Leisure and Camping: The Social Meaning of a Form of Public Recreation," *Sociology and Social Research,* Vol. XLIX (October, 1964), p. 83.
14. These status categories of husband's occupation were determined in the following manner: professional, technical and kindred workers used the standard census classification. Upper-non-manual were managers, officials, large-scale proprietors, farm managers and owners. Members of this category were sifted from the respondents who seemed to fit the classification, i.e., where the total family income before taxes indicated that such placement was reasonable (a minimum income of $7,600 was necessary), or when a firm's net worth in excess of $40,000 verified the classification. Owners of Dairy Queens, small stores and shops, gas stations and others were not classified as upper-non-manual. If respondents gave such titles as sales manager, manufacturer and others, and if income or business value so indicated, they were placed in the upper-non-manual group. Middle-non-manual were those in sales, clerical and similar work, and proprietors of small shops. Middle-manual were craftsmen and foremen, skilled operatives and members of the higher services such as beauty operators, barbers, auto mechanics, carpenters, painters and others. Lower-manual were operatives, unskilled labor and members of lower services such as janitors, gas station attendants, household servants, timber cruisers and others. Farmers were those who did not specify type of farming or when the farming operation was not sufficiently determinable to place the respondent in the upper-non-manual. As it turned out, all those who listed as owning or running a ranch or farm were placed in the farmer category. In general, the few farmers encountered in this study were owners or operators of fairly small family farms.
15. Gerstl, Joel F. "Career Commitment and Style of Life in Three Middle Class Occupations." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1959.)

    _____. "Leisure, Taste and Occupational Milieu," *Social Problems,* Vol. XIX (Summer, 1961), pp. 56-68.
16. There were a considerable number of occupations classed as professional by the Census Bureau which were not uncovered in this sample. There were no actors, airplane pilots, architects, athletes, chiropractors, designers, entertainers, pharmacists, public relations men, veterinarians, nurses, among others. Future research may well find it useful to concentrate upon specific types of occupations associated with leisure style.
17. For futher discussion of the value divergence between campers with technical and intellectual occupations see Burch, Jr., William R. *Nature as Symbol and Expression in American Social Life.* Chapters 8-9. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1964.)
18. This term is discussed in Henry, Jules. "The Personal Community and Its Invariant Properties," *American Anthropologist,* Vol. LX (October, 1958), p. 827.
19. There is some evidence that "value" loyalties provide the best link of continuity between generations in the family. The children, upon assuming adult responsibility, may express deviation from the parents' consumption patterns: However, religious values, and perhaps highly involving leisure values, are retained.

    See: Aldous, Joan and Hill, Reuben. "Family Continuities Through Socialization Over Three Generations." Paper presented to A. S. A. Annual Meetings on August 28, 1963 in Los Angeles. These writers found that the greatest generational loyalty was to "value" affiliations such as religion. "Almost two thirds of their sample maintained the same religious affiliation over three generations," p. 10. In their interviews and written comments, many of the campers in my sample expressed

attitudes toward nature and camping which are best described as religious. See also Burch, (Note 6), Chapter 9, "Commitment and Involvement in a Play Role," pp. 374-436.

20. Stone, Gregory P. "Some Meanings of American Sport," Columbus, Ohio: College Physical Education Association 60th Annual Meeting, 1951, pp. 6-29. (Mimeo)
21. For an analysis of the influence which state of family life cycle has upon leisure style see: Burch, Jr., William R. "Wilderness – The Life Cycle and Forest Recreational Choice," *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. LXIV (September, 1966), pp. 606-610.