

Values, Behavior, and Conflict in Modern Camping Culture

by Roger N. Clark, John C. Hendee, and Frederick L. Campbell

Research findings suggest that campers and managers subscribe to similar goals associated with camping, but they disagree about the types of activities appropriate to attaining those goals. In addition, there seem to be important differences in the way both groups perceive behavioral problems in campgrounds. Campers express less concern than managers about problems such as vandalism, theft, and nuisance behaviors. These differences are thought to be attributed to the social goals and urban behavior patterns of campers compared to the more traditional, natural environment-oriented expectations for camping behavior held by recreation managers. Certain changes in recreation user populations and in the organization of public campgrounds are discussed in relation to behavior problems. A strategy is recommended to avert problems inherent in continued change in the camping scene.

KEYWORDS: CAMPING, SOCIAL GOALS, RECREATION MANAGEMENT, PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION, CAMPING BEHAVIOR, ORGANIZATION OF DESIGN.

Introduction

The meaning and organization of recreational activities are basic questions in the study of leisure. In recent years, attention has increasingly been focused on the meaning of camping as one form of outdoor recreation (Burch 1965, Moncrief 1970, Hendee and Campbell 1969). Camping is frequently thought of as a relatively unregulated form of recreation carried out in the isolation of the natural environment. However, most camping takes place in large, intensively developed campgrounds which are highly organized and supervised. Such campgrounds reflect complex social systems involving interaction of several groups, with one of the most important between campers and recreation managers (Hendee and Harris 1970).

This paper explores the notion that there are differences in the camping orientation of users and managers in intensively developed campgrounds. These differences may be attributed to the social goals and urban behavior patterns of campers compared to the more traditional, natural environment-

The authors are Doctoral Candidate, University of Washington; Recreation Research Project Leader, Pacific Northwest Forest & Range Experiment Station, U.S.D.A. Forest Service; and Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Washington.

Research reported in this paper was conducted under cooperative agreement by the U.S. Forest Service and the University of Washington, College of Forest Resources and Institute for Sociological Research.

Manuscript received March 4, 1971; revised May 24, 1971.

oriented expectations for camping behavior held by recreation managers. Such a disparity may produce disagreements about the appropriateness of certain camping activities and the legitimacy of campground rules and lead to misunderstandings about campground policy. We further propose that these conditions result from the evolutionary change in predominant camping styles and the development of separate camping cultures favoring developed versus primitive areas.

In the following we present: 1) a discussion of certain changes that we feel have occurred in recreation user populations and in the organization of public campgrounds; 2) data on campers' and managers' attitudes toward camping experiences in highly developed areas and campground behavior problems; and 3) some further implications of the social process we see operating and a strategy recommended to avert problems inherent in continued change in the camping scene. Some of the ideas expressed are not easily tested; and although we do present data, many of the ideas are speculative, calling for discussion and further research.

Changes in Camping Patterns

Traditionally, camping has been valued as an opportunity to isolate oneself, to experience the primitive attractions of the natural environment, and to temporarily escape the complexities of urban life. These traditional camping values may still apply to some degree, but conditions in modern public campgrounds have changed since Americans first began to camp for pleasure. Many campgrounds, once primitive and small, are now large and intensively developed with water systems, flush toilets, paved roads, increased supervision, and special facilities for trailers that now house nearly half of all campers. The tenting equipment available to yesterday's camper was crude and provided little isolation from harsher aspects of the natural environment. In contrast, today's camper can insulate himself from the natural environment to almost any desired degree with modern fabric or aluminum "pickup campers" and trailers. Campers are no longer required to forfeit many comforts of the urban environment to enjoy outdoor recreation. Equally important, the range of available camping behaviors, once limited by primitive conditions, has increased. Activities formerly possible only in more urban environments are now carried out routinely in modern campgrounds.

All these changes have expanded the appeal of camping to a more diverse group of people and coupled with continued population growth and increased leisure time, have produced a larger and more varied camping population. The growth of the camping population has led, in turn, to an increase in such problems as crowding, increased contact between recreationists, and competition for scarce facilities.

Changes in the size and character of the outdoor recreation population have, in turn, led to changes in campground organization. For example, many modern, intensively developed campgrounds have evolved from small, informally established camps in naturally attractive locations. Managers, concerned with simultaneously providing recreationists a pleasurable experience and preserving the environment, often adapted to problems of increasing use by more intensively developing popular campgrounds. This reduced primitive incon-

veniences to campers and insulated them from direct contact with the natural environment. Such areas thereby appealed to persons other than those with strong environmental orientation. Consequently, a new camping style emerged with associated behavioral expectations less dependent on direct environmental contact, more compatible with highly developed structures, and increasingly social conditions.

Such changes suggest a process of invasion and succession which may occur in many campgrounds as they become more intensively developed. Campers seeking high levels of isolation and communion with nature can no longer get satisfaction in such areas and many, at this point, may move on to more primitive sites with their places being taken by campers less oriented toward natural environmental contact. Unfortunately, as the displaced traditionalists move on to increase use at more primitive locations, management may again respond by developing sophisticated facilities, thus attracting less environment-oriented campers and setting in motion another wave of invasion and succession (Hendee and Campbell 1969).¹

Simultaneously, many campers not displaced by the invasion and succession process may respond to the prevalence of increasingly developed and structured conditions with different behavior and expectations appropriate to the new physical and social environment. Modern campers, who are relatively unconcerned about a primitive experience, thus respond with new camping behavior norms consistent with the highly developed and crowded recreation settings that they have sought out for themselves or to which they are willing to adapt.

Additional study and speculation suggests a flow-over time of camping tastes and preferences with some campers originally attracted to developed areas eventually graduating to preference for more challenging, primitive recreation experiences (Krutilla 1967, Burch and Wenger 1967). The dynamic model of camping clientele may thus be complicated by changing membership over a time from groups with modern to those with more traditional environment-oriented preferences.

Conflict Between Camping Cultures

Some research supports the purported change in camper perspectives by revealing stronger social and weaker environmental orientations among campers typically visiting developed areas versus those who participate in more primitive forms of camping (Burch and Wenger 1967, Hendee 1967, Hendee *et al.* 1968, Etzkorn 1964). In an earlier stage of this study, we found varied and non-traditional activities and incentives common in developed campgrounds and concluded that camping for many people in such areas is more of a social than environmental experience (Hendee and Campbell 1969; Campbell, Hendee, and Clark 1968). This social orientation generally involves high

1. A more comprehensive ecological approach by Burch suggests, on the basis of archival data, seven stages of campground evolution described as dispersal, concentration, decentralization, segregation, invasion, succession, and climax-stabilization. William R. Burch, Jr. 1968. The evolution of camping: A study of the relationship between administrative and recreational behavior. Unpublished research proposal. Yale University School of Forestry. 32 p.

levels of interaction with other campers, a preference for activities often associated with urban environments, and developed facilities which take precedence over contact with the natural environment. Thus, recreationists bring with them radios, record players, television sets, and motorcycles and often prepare to spend a weekend visiting, meeting new people, and engaging in group activities such as games and parties. While such orientations and associated activities may be highly satisfying to many recreationists, they deviate markedly from traditional views of camping.

The disparity between traditional concepts of camping and what actually occurs in modern, congested, developed campgrounds is frequently emphasized. Traditionalist writers have described modern campgrounds as "camping slums" (Frome 1969, Hardin 1969) and have decried the deterioration of lost camping values and standards of behavior (Bennett 1969, Tinker 1969). Such indictments of the modern camping scene reflect the harsh judgment of those subscribing to strictly traditional views of camping. Their standards generally hold that undiluted contact with the natural environment is the appropriate focus of outdoor recreation, and those not holding such a position should be converted.

It is ironic that despite the highly developed nature of modern campgrounds, traditional views of camping form the basis for most campground rules and regulations and constitute managers' expectations of appropriate campground behavior. This study indicates the nature and magnitude of some of these differences between the views of managers and recreationists.

Research Methods

Data for this study come from three sources: 1) participant observation conducted during the summer of 1968 in a large, well-developed National Forest Campground in Washington State to familiarize ourselves with problem behaviors in modern campgrounds, to formulate hypotheses, and to collect primary data using structured observation schedules (Campbell, Hendee, and Clark 1968; Campbell 1970); 2) questionnaires personally submitted during the summer of 1969 to campers in seven campgrounds in Washington State inquiring about their knowledge of and attitudes toward undesirable behavior in public campgrounds; 3) questionnaires, mailed to recreation managers in the National Parks and National Forests in Washington and Washington State Parks.

The campgrounds were selected for similarity as follows.² They were all heavily used with frequent weekend overflow crowds, located along major scenic routes, water-oriented, charged a user fee, had resident park rangers, and contained similar highly developed features such as paved roads, flush toilets, piped water systems, and individual camp units with tables and fireplaces.

2. Campgrounds selected were Lake Kachess Campground, Wenatchee National Forest, Spirit Lake Campground, Gifford Pinchot National Forests; Kalaloch Campground, Olympic National Park; Ohanapecosh Campground, Mt. Rainier National Park; Chelan, Ocean City, and Birch Bay State Parks. Questionnaire data were collected during two staggered weekends at Lake Kachess, Kalaloch, and Lake Chelan and during one weekend at Spirit Lake, Ohanapecosh, Ocean City, and Birch Bay.

Camper questionnaires were handed out to the head of each camping party on either Friday evening or Saturday morning. Completed questionnaires were deposited in collection boxes posted in the campground or were personally collected by research assistants. Campers who had not returned their questionnaires by Sunday evening or Monday morning were given preaddressed envelopes to return by mail. Of the 3,702 questionnaires distributed, a total of 2,055 or 55.5 percent were returned.

To obtain a higher return rate, three to four uniformed research assistants contacted each camper a minimum of four times during the weekend to collect or encourage them to complete questionnaires. Although the return rate seemed to vary directly with the intensity of such efforts, our experience would indicate poor returns for on-site questionnaire studies conducted in campgrounds of this type.

The manager questionnaire was mailed to all personnel involved in the management of developed campgrounds in two national parks, five national forests, and all state parks in Washington State.³ Two follow-up letters, 10 days apart, were mailed to increase the response rate. Of the 318 questionnaires mailed, 82.8 percent or 261 were returned. Respondents included 105 from the U. S. Forest Service, 44 from the U. S. Park Service, and 112 from the Washington State Parks.

Although three management agencies were included, it is not the intent of this paper to differentiate by agency, but to discuss the broader populations defined as: 1) campers frequenting modern developed campgrounds, and 2) recreation managers of such areas. A preliminary check for an agency bias in our results indicated small variations by agency for both campers and managers, but *in all cases* those differences were a matter of degree and not direction of response. Thus, agency differences do not affect any major conclusions of this paper.

The question of nonresponse bias in the camper data is of more concern. A check was made of the 19 percent who mailed rather than handed in their questionnaires under the assumption that they were "potential nonrespondents" and were likely to resemble nonrespondents (Ellis, Endo, and Armor 1970). This check indicated no substantively significant differences in the major variables. However, the possibility of nonresponse bias cannot be ruled out with the data that are available. On the other hand, the manager questionnaire fared quite well, yielding a respectable 82.8 percent return for which any potential nonresponse bias would not be considered serious.

Our statistical treatment of the data for this paper warrants explanation. By virtue of the nonprobability sample of campers and large sample size, standard tests of statistical significance would be meaningless.⁴ Attention in this paper is focused simply on tabular presentation of differences between

3. Mt. Rainier and Olympic National Parks; Mt. Baker, Snoqualmie, Wenatchee, Olympic, and Gifford Pinchot National Forests.

4. If one is willing to assume that all measurement error was random, i.e., differences between campers' views and managers' perceptions of those views are due to random measurement error, a test of significance could logically be computed. This was done using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Blalock 1960), and in all cases the alternative hypothesis that the differences were due to random measurement error was rejected at the .001 level of significance.

campers' attitudes and managers' perceptions of those views thought to be of *substantive importance*. The purpose of the paper is not to claim that the findings hold universally but to identify important differences between campers' and managers' views and to point out that such differences have broad implications for campground management. Further research will, of course, be necessary to establish the generality of these findings.

Results

Camping Motives

Traditionalists (and some managers) might conclude that most campers visit modern developed campgrounds because of their availability and that if given a choice, many would prefer to be elsewhere, such as wilderness, backcountry, or a more natural setting. However, most respondents in our study were camping in the developed campgrounds because they preferred them; also they most often camped in developed areas. When asked what kind of area they *most preferred* to camp in, 67 percent said "developed car campgrounds", 14 percent said "undeveloped car campgrounds", 16 percent "wilderness or backcountry", (away from roads), and 3 percent indicated "other" preference. Response to an item asking what kind of area they *most often camped in* indicated 71.3 percent in "developed car campgrounds", 14.2 percent "undeveloped car campgrounds", 9.3 percent "wilderness or backcountry", and 5.2 percent "other."

Response to questionnaire items in Table 1 indicate that recreationists, at least verbally, subscribe to what we consider traditional views of camping. A majority of users feel that "teaching my children about the out-of-doors", enjoying "solitude and tranquility", and appreciating "unspoiled beauty" are very important reasons for visiting highly developed campgrounds.

However, subscribing to these very traditional camping goals does not necessarily specify or reflect behavior. It is quite possible that users of modern highly developed campgrounds share the same general values as environment-oriented campers but have different notions of what behavior leads to these values and different standards of judging their attainment.

This is demonstrated by the apparently contradictory response of campers to two questionnaire items about "solitude" and "getting away from campers not in my camping party." While in one item 65 percent designated solitude and tranquility as "very important", only about one-fourth so indicated getting away from other campers. Apparently, many of these respondents felt they could pursue the above implied traditional goals even in large, crowded, developed campgrounds.

On the other hand, Table 1 suggests that when managers were asked how important they felt certain attractions were to campers, they underestimated the importance campers attached to the expected environmentally related attractions. Perhaps managers with a traditional point of view find it hard to understand the importance of environmental features to campers favoring such developed areas. The data highlight a problem of defining environmental attractions. "Wilderness" is apparently in the eye of the beholder, and, while managers were unable to comprehend the nature-related appeal of "modern, congested, developed campgrounds", such attractions were clearly important

TABLE 1
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION, "WHEN YOU GO CAMPING, HOW IMPORTANT ARE THE FOLLOWING?"

	(N)	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
----Percent----				
A. Getting completely away from people other than my camping party				
Campers' views	(1,831)	28.3	28.6	43.1
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	10.8	33.6	55.6
B. Teaching my children about the out-of-doors				
Campers' views ¹	(1,635)	71.1	18.8	10.0
Managers' perception of camper views	(262)	34.7	32.8	32.4
C. Getting emotional satis- faction from solitude and tranquility				
Campers' views	(1,823)	65.4	22.4	12.2
Managers' perception of camper views	(258)	39.5	36.4	24.0
D. Gaining awareness of unspoiled beauty				
Campers' views	(1,850)	83.1	12.8	4.1
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	43.7	39.1	17.2

¹ Referring only to those respondents who have children.

to a great many campers in such areas. This helps explain previous reports of campers in developed campgrounds referring to their "wilderness experience" (LaPage 1967).

Similar findings in Table 2 indicate that "additional rules and regulations", "sounds of other campers talking and singing", "people bringing city conveniences to the campgrounds", "people camping next to you", and "people using motorbikes in campgrounds" evoked nowhere near the repulsion that managers anticipated. Even "stricter enforcement of rules" repelled campers much less than managers thought it would, as the item was acceptable to eight out of ten campers, whereas managers thought only half of them would go along with such a notion.

The data in Tables 1 and 2 illustrate an apparent difference in orientation of campers and managers. Managers underrated the importance of environmental attractions to campers in modern developed campgrounds, but they didn't see that most campers are not "uptight" about manifestations of the modern camping scene that seemingly counteract traditional views of camp-

TABLE 2

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION, "WOULD THE FOLLOWING DETRACT FROM YOUR CAMPING EXPERIENCE?"

	(N)	NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	A GREAT DEAL
-----Percent-----				
Additional rules and regulations				
Campers' views	(1,833)	52.8	26.3	20.9
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	24.1	32.2	43.7
Sound of other campers talking and singing				
Campers' views	(1,854)	68.2	19.9	12.0
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	32.0	45.9	22.0
People using motorbikes in campgrounds				
Campers' views	(1,873)	26.4	16.9	56.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(262)	1.9	10.7	87.4
People bringing city conveniences to the campgrounds				
Campers' views	(1,851)	42.3	20.6	37.2
Managers' perception of camper views	(262)	24.8	23.3	52.0
Children engaged in playground- type behavior				
Campers' views	(1,836)	75.3	16.9	7.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	53.7	34.0	12.3
Campers with alcoholic beverages				
Campers' views	(1,846)	51.7	19.9	28.4
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	36.0	31.8	32.2
People camping next to you				
Campers' views	(1,832)	67.4	20.9	11.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	58.6	29.5	11.9
Stricter enforcement of rules				
Campers' views	(1,844)	79.3	13.0	7.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	50.5	32.6	16.9

ing, such as getting away from other people and their annoyances. This may be the result of three factors. First, while managers continuously view the "urban" behavior of users, they cannot as easily appreciate the actual meaning of such behavior to recreationists. Second, managers may also have con-

tact with wilderness of back-country campers who hold higher standards of natural environmental quality than most campers who frequent car campgrounds. Third, the managers' environmental perspectives are in part a product of their professional training and other occupational influences. As a result, users of developed campgrounds are actually more satisfied with the campground scene than managers might expect them to be.

Identifying Campground Problems

Previous research has indicated that behavioral problems are common in highly developed campgrounds. Littering, rule violations, theft, and vandalism all occur frequently and represent major problems in campground management (Campbell, Hendee, and Clark 1968). The ability to control such behaviors is partly based on the degree to which managers and campers agree on the seriousness of the problem.

Several questionnaire items asked about the current status of certain problem behaviors: Are they 1) not now a problem, 2) becoming more of a problem, or 3) now a major problem? On this continuum of importance, suggested problem behaviors were generally viewed with greatest personal concern by managers and the managers' views of how campers felt. However, response by campers reflected much less concern with the suggested issues. These include such problems as "theft", "nuisance behavior", "excessive noise", "littering", "rule violations", "vandalism", "trouble in general", and "improper management" (Table 3). The same relationship held in response to two other items not included in this table. Campers more readily agreed than did managers that "this campground is relatively free of problem behavior", but campers less readily agreed than did managers that "campgrounds now have more behavior problems than five years ago."

Similar findings appeared in eight other questionnaire items asking, "Have you found that campgrounds such as this one have any of the following problems?" (Table 4). Campers, for the most part, thought the problems referred to were fairly unimportant, e.g., "too much litter", "too much noise and overcrowding", "a great deal of theft", "facilities which are badly mistreated", and "many people doing undesirable things." On the other hand, managers expressed their *personal* belief that such problems were much more serious. Perhaps more significant, the managers clearly generalized their personal beliefs as to how they thought campers felt. Managers seemingly tended to think that campers were as concerned as they were about campground problems.

Three other items in Table 4 further illustrate the recreation managers' greater response to campground problems. Recreation managers indicated more personal concern than did campers with "regulations which are too often broken" and "poor management by campground officials", but again were incorrect in thinking that campers felt the same way. Interestingly enough, neither managers nor campers were personally very concerned about "too many regulations", but managers incorrectly thought that campers were concerned about this problem.

Obviously, as the foregoing data indicate, the seriousness ascribed to the suggested campground behavior problems differs according to whether one

TABLE 3
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE MAJOR PROBLEMS
IN CAMPGROUNDS SUCH AS THIS?"

	(N)	NOT NOW A PROBLEM	BECOMING MORE OF A PROBLEM	NOW A MAJOR PROBLEM
		-----Percent-----		
Theft				
Campers' views	(1,823)	70.1	28.2	1.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	26.7	55.0	18.3
Managers' own views	(262)	15.3	67.8	16.9
Nuisance behavior				
Campers' views	(1,831)	63.1	33.9	3.0
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	20.7	55.9	23.4
Managers' own views	(261)	11.9	72.8	15.3
Excessive noise				
Campers' views	(1,838)	59.1	35.1	5.9
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	23.2	46.7	30.1
Managers' own views	(259)	18.1	62.9	18.9
Littering				
Campers' views	(1,844)	48.8	41.2	9.9
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	21.1	31.9	46.9
Managers' own views	(260)	9.2	47.5	43.3
Rule violations				
Campers' views	(1,820)	55.5	39.1	5.3
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	30.2	43.9	26.0
Managers' own views	(262)	11.5	59.4	29.1
Vandalism				
Campers' views	(1,819)	62.2	31.3	6.5
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	20.0	36.2	43.9
Managers' own views	(260)	10.4	57.3	32.3
Trouble in general				
Campers' views	(1,808)	78.2	20.4	1.4
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	41.4	45.6	13.0
Managers' own views	(261)	23.8	69.6	6.5
Improper management				
Campers' views	(1,828)	90.0	8.6	1.4
Managers' perception of camper views	(258)	68.9	21.2	10.0
Managers' own views	(260)	59.7	32.6	7.8

TABLE 4

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION, "HAVE YOU FOUND THAT CAMPGROUNDS SUCH AS THIS ONE HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS?"

	(N)	NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	A GREAT DEAL
-----Percent-----				
Too much litter				
Campers' views	(1,852)	79.1	14.4	6.5
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	40.4	30.2	29.4
Managers' own views	(262)	18.5	30.5	50.9
Too much noise and overcrowding				
Campers' views	(1,862)	54.9	28.2	16.9
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	12.2	38.3	49.4
Managers' own views	(261)	8.8	27.6	63.6
A great deal of theft				
Campers' views	(1,831)	90.6	6.5	3.0
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	47.3	38.8	13.8
Managers' own views	(260)	40.3	37.7	21.9
Facilities which are badly mistreated				
Campers' views	(1,856)	72.1	18.2	9.7
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	26.6	36.3	37.1
Managers' own views	(259)	18.8	34.1	47.1
Many people doing undesirable things				
Campers' views	(1,856)	76.2	16.3	7.5
Managers' perception of camper views	(258)	35.6	41.0	23.3
Managers' own views	(261)	31.0	45.3	23.7
Regulations which are too often broken				
Campers' views	(1,839)	68.1	20.2	11.8
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	27.9	34.0	38.1
Managers' own views	(262)	14.9	25.3	59.8
Too many regulations				
Campers' views	(1,852)	90.5	6.5	3.0
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	41.2	28.6	30.2
Managers' own views	(262)	81.2	12.3	6.5
Poor management by campground officials				
Campers' views	(1,852)	91.6	5.8	2.6
Managers' perception of camper views	(261)	61.5	26.0	12.6
Managers' own views	(262)	56.7	29.1	14.2

is a camper or a manager. The recreation managers' perspectives reflected greater sensitivity to campground problems which violate the traditional behavioral norms they feel are appropriate to such areas. Campers, either responsive to a different standard or having had only limited contact with such problems, were not as concerned. Furthermore, managers incorrectly assumed that recreationists felt the same as they did about campground behavior problems. This point is reinforced by Lucas' study (1970, p. 9) of Michigan campers in which he found managers seriously underrating the recreation resource quality compared with users.

Caution is necessary to avoid overstating the practical importance of these results. "Problem behaviors" might appear to be a product of the managers' sensitivity to violations of strongly held environmental values and feelings of responsibility for keeping things under control. But it is possible that campers, caught up in the zeal of their activities, are unaware of the development of serious behavior problems and do not realize the collective impact of singularly insignificant behaviors. The truth, no doubt, lies between the two extremes. Campground behavior problems do exist, yet they are in part a matter of definition. As an environmentally sensitive group whose views hold official sanction, campground managers must strive for more accurate definition of problems.

Reaction to Undesirable Behavior

When several situations were proposed to campers and managers in which they would be observers of specific undesirable acts, there were clear differences in how they said they would respond (Table 5). A continuum of possible reactions were proposed including 1) do nothing, 2) report later, 3) report immediately, 4) speak to offender, and 5) interfere with the actions. The questionnaire items asked respondents what they would do as bystanders if they saw "someone littering the campground", "someone stealing", "someone destroying public property", "someone damaging the natural environment", and "someone threatening another camper."

The *personal views* of recreation managers were, understandably, more severe in response to these items and indicated in most cases that they would at least report the incident immediately or speak to the offender. On the other hand, *managers thought* most campers would express an apathetic attitude in such situations—likely to do nothing or at most report the incident. But this was not so. Campers reflected responsible intentions, generally indicating that they, too, would at least report such incidents immediately or speak to the offender. Two exceptions to the foregoing trend involved the possible experience of seeing "someone stealing" or "someone threatening another camper." In these two cases, managers more correctly identified the good intentions of many campers to at least report the incident immediately, speak to the offender, or directly interfere. Even in these two cases, however, campers expressed more severe intentions than managers thought they would.

The foregoing results are further highlighted by participant observation data from an earlier stage of the study in which bystanders' reactions to more than 400 depreciative acts were recorded (Clark, Campbell, and Hendee 1969). These incidents included littering, vandalism, nuisance activity, and

TABLE 5
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION, "GIVEN THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS,
WHICH ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN BY CAMPERS?"

	(N)	DO NOTHING	REPORT LATER	REPORT IMMEDI- ATELY	SPEAK TO OFFENDER	INTERFERE WITH THE ACTIONS
----- Percent -----						
Someone littering the campground						
Campers' views	(1,825)	7.4	7.4	34.1	46.9	4.1
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	57.3	26.0	8.0	8.4	0.4
Managers' own views	(262)	2.3	3.5	29.3	59.8	5.0
Someone violating camp- ground rules						
Campers' views	(1,792)	7.5	10.0	51.1	29.5	1.9
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	30.2	48.9	16.8	4.2	0.0
Managers' own views	(262)	1.2	3.1	61.9	31.5	2.3
Someone stealing						
Campers' views	(1,852)	0.3	0.4	66.4	7.0	25.8
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	4.6	18.0	67.4	1.5	8.4
Managers' own views	(261)	0.0	0.0	72.3	3.8	23.8
Someone destroying public property						
Campers' views	(1,853)	0.3	0.7	64.7	13.9	20.4
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	13.8	32.2	43.3	5.7	5.0
Managers' own views	(261)	0.0	0.0	66.5	9.6	23.8
Someone damaging the natural environment						
Campers' views	(1,846)	1.2	3.0	51.4	28.6	15.8
Managers' perception of camper views	(259)	28.5	37.3	19.2	11.5	3.5
Managers' own views	(260)	0.0	0.0	52.1	25.9	22.0
Someone threatening another camper						
Campers' views	(1,840)	2.6	0.3	56.7	6.9	33.4
Managers' perception of camper views	(260)	15.4	8.5	60.4	4.2	11.5
Managers' own views	(260)	0.8	0.0	72.7	6.5	20.0

rule violations. In over 70 percent of these instances, the bystanders did nothing; and in all but a very few cases, the most severe reaction was to express irritation and discuss the matter with other bystanders. A few cases were reported to authorities later, but in no instance did anyone directly confront an offender.

These data indicate that despite good intentions, a norm of noninvolvement prevails in modern campgrounds, as it does in other public places. The fact that campers might profess more responsible intentions than they carry out is not surprising and is supported by other studies (e.g., Barth *et al.* 1966). One must conclude that there is little potential for controlling campground behavior unless the norm of noninvolvement can be changed, which does not seem likely in the near future.

Discussion

The data presented in this paper support our general thesis that significant differences exist in the camping orientation of users and managers in highly developed campgrounds. There were three ways in which this difference appeared. First, recreationists and managers do not share the same concept of what constitutes an environmental experience. Although recreationists seem to subscribe to the traditional goals associated with camping such as contact with the environment and isolation, they apparently feel that they can pursue such values in highly developed campgrounds. Managers, however, fail to recognize the importance of these traditional goals to users of such areas. Second, there are important differences in the way campers and managers perceive behavioral problems in the campground. Recreationists generally find conditions common to the urban environment such as noise, litter, and the actions of other campers less important than do managers. Further, campers do not express the same concern for illegal behavior, such as vandalism and theft, as do managers. Third, these data repeatedly indicate that managers' perceptions of camper views appear to be largely a reflection of the managers' own feelings on the issues and are often at variance with what the campers' expressions of sentiment are. An alternative explanation is that managers interpreted user sentiment and values by observing their behavior which seemingly contradicts the values they expressed.

The differences indicated between the views of managers and campers have many implications. One important consequence is in the area of deviant behavior. Deviant acts are frequently explained by examining the characteristics of offenders. However, situations are often created which lead people into inappropriate or illegal behavior regardless of their intentions. For example, the most common type of campsite provided by managers is that intended for one family. Campground regulations often prohibit larger groups in such areas to prevent rapid deterioration of the site. Many campers, however, unaware of the environmental considerations implicit in the campsite design, disregard the one-family rule so that they can camp with additional parties of family and friends—a legitimate objective in their opinion. Our data reflect such differences in the views of campers and managers which may create conditions in public campgrounds for "deviance by definition", that is, the perceived legitimacy of behavior depends on whether one is a camper or a manager.⁵ Certain forms of depreciative behavior in forest campgrounds may, therefore, be of a relative nature where one man's moral turpitude may be another man's innocent pleasure.

Of course not all deviant behavior in modern campgrounds is of this type. Theft, vandalism, and rowdiness occur in campgrounds, as elsewhere, and are universally frowned upon. There are obviously many depreciative acts which evoke a common response, but whether or not some behaviors are depreciative may depend on one's position.

We suggest that tradition influences recreation management in modern

5. Sutherland's theory of differential association (cultural deviance) provides a framework in which one can view these results (Sutherland and Cressey 1966). For example, behaviors frowned upon by a dominant minority (managers) are considered deviant even though they may be legitimate to a majority of the users.

campgrounds despite modern development, along with reinforcement by outdoor recreation ideology. This ideology, effectively brokered by conservation groups and outdoor clubs, implies that the legitimate focus of outdoor recreation is to promote appreciation of natural values. Proponents of this outdoor recreation ethic form a powerful political force influencing use of resources, the focus of recreational policy, and the appropriate types of use and norms of behavior for outdoor recreation areas. These interests continually interact with recreation resource managers and, through mutual reinforcement, they come to assume that their own views and definitions of appropriate behaviors are commonly held by the rest of society (Foss 1966). If not assuming the universality of their views, a moralistic stance justifies the resource manager's position. For example, one prominent conservation spokesman states that ". . . if our outdoor recreation policies and our management programs are going to be based on the current whims and wishes of the city dwellers, I'm afraid we're heading into trouble. If the planning and development of the land and water resources which provide outdoor recreation are going to be based only on current public behavior and desire, we may well pursue a national policy of deliberately destroying the qualities of an outdoor experience which make it worthwhile in the first place. . . . The question, of course, is whether or not we are going to adopt policies to meet the trends or policies to meet the true needs of the American people, regardless of whether or not they themselves recognize or desire those needs." (Kimball 1966, p. 55) As "moral entrepreneurs", there are persons who desire to improve all men, believing that their expectations are most appropriate for others. Whether or not such a view is legitimate in formulating policy is open for debate; but we would argue that as a minimum, managers should recognize how users really feel.

The problem we see highlighted in our data is the different expectations held by managers and modern campers. To the extent that managerial decisions are based on traditional perspectives of camping, the modern camping scene may be plagued by deviant activity of a definitional nature and user satisfaction may be impaired. We suggest that the expectations of modern campers are legitimate, are merely contemporary manifestations of traditional values, and that managers should provide for such use, but in locations and settings selected to minimize encroachment on irreplaceable environmental features.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that this study was concerned only with campers and managers of highly developed modern campgrounds. The findings imply that managers and users march to somewhat different drums in their behavioral expectations. Traditional outdoor recreation values of natural environment appreciation appear to permeate both managers' and users' perspectives toward camping, but different means of satisfying their goals through appropriately sanctioned behavior are clearly present. Managers see isolation and primitive interaction with the environment as necessary; users apparently find the highly developed, structured setting of the modern campgrounds and its associated social environment as appropriate.

If, as we suspect, the campers' perspective is the product of increasing urbanization of society and necessary adaptation to structured conditions, then we may expect continued reflection of this urban influence in the modern

camping scene. This poses a potential problem to managers with traditional expectations for use of recreational resources. Previous establishment of modern campgrounds may be explained by an ecological process of creeping campground development in response to increasing use accompanied by behavioral adaptation of users not displaced or attracted in the scheme of invasion and succession. Such a process need not continue in uncontrolled fashion. Developed campgrounds can be located on the forest or park fringe where there are virtually unlimited opportunities for expansion without encroachment on areas appropriate for uses that are dependent on environment. Increasingly environment-oriented recreation sites along portals to the forest or park interior would provide opportunity for campers to voluntarily select their portion of the camping elixir. A diverse range of outdoor recreation opportunities would thus be preserved which would also allow for and help guide graduating environmental interests of modern campers seeking more challenging primitive experiences.

References

- Barth, Ernest A. T., Watson, Walter, and Blanchard, Wayne. 1966. Parent-child relation in mass society. p. 167-177 in *A Sociological Framework for Patient Care* by Jeanette Folta and Edith Deck. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bennett, Joseph W. 1969. *Vandals Wild*. Metropolitan Press for Bennett Publ. Co. Portland, Ore., 237 p., illus.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. 1960. *Social Statistics*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. p. 203-206.
- Burch, William R., Jr. 1965. The play world of camping: Research into the social meaning of outdoor recreation. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXX, No. 5, p. 604-612.
- Burch, William R., Jr., and Wenger, Wiley D., Jr., 1967. The social characteristics of participants in three styles of family camping. Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, USDA Forest Service. Res. Paper PNW-48, 30 p., illus.
- Campbell, Frederick L., Hendee, John C., and Clark, Roger. 1968. Law and order in public parks. *Parks & Recreation*, December, p. 51-55.
- Campbell, Frederick L. 1970. Participant observation in outdoor recreation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2(4): 226-236.
- Clark, Roger N., Campbell, Frederick L., and Hendee, John C. 1969. Depreciative behavior in forest campgrounds—an exploratory study. Paper presented to the Northwest Scientific Assoc., Cheney, Washington, March 1969. (Abstr.) in *Northwest Sci.*, 43(1): 33. Feb. 1969.
- Ellis, Robert A., Endo, Calvin M., and Armor, J. Michael. 1970. The use of potential non-respondents for studying nonresponse bias. *Pacific Sociological Review*. 13(2): 103-109.
- Etzkorn, Peter K. 1964. Leisure and camping: The social meaning of a form of public recreation. *Sociol. & Soc. Res.* 49: 76-89.
- Foss, Phillip O. 1966. The issues underlying outdoor recreation policy. National Conf. on Policy Issues in Outdoor Recreation, Utah State Univ. and Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; U.S.D.I.
- Frome, Michael. 1969. Camping slums. *True Magazine*. April, p. 32-35, 109-110.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1969. The economics of wilderness. *Natural History*, June-July.
- Hendee, John C. 1967. Recreation clientele—the attributes of recreationists preferring different management agencies, car campgrounds or wilderness in the Pacific Northwest. PhD Thesis on file Coll. of Forestry Library, Univ. of Washington. 290 p.

- Hendee, John C., Catton, William R., Jr., Marlow, Larry D., and Brockman, C. Frank. 1968. Wilderness users in the Pacific Northwest—their characteristics, values, and management preferences. Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, USDA Forest Service Res. Paper PNW-61, 92 p., illus.
- Hendee, John C., and Campbell, Frederick L. 1969. Social aspects of outdoor recreation—the developed campground. *Trends in Parks and Recreation*. October, p. 13-16.
- Hendee, John C., and Harris, Robert W. 1970. Forester perception of wilderness user attitudes and preferences. *Journal of Forestry*, December 1970, 68(12): 759-762.
- Kimball, Thomas. 1966. Special interest—conservation's greatest cross to bear. National Conf. on Policy Issues in Outdoor Rec., Utah State Univ., and Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S.D.I., p. 52-56.
- Krutilla, John V. 1967. Conservation reconsidered. *Amer. Econ. Rev.* 57(4): 777-786.
- LaPage, Wilbur. 1967. Camper characteristics differ at public and commercial campgrounds in New England. USDA Forest Service Res. Note NE-59. 8p., illus.
- Lucas, Robert C. 1970. User evaluation of campgrounds on two Michigan National Forests. Research Paper USDA. Forest Service, NC-44, 9p.
- Moncrief, Lewis W. 1970. Trends in outdoor recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 2(2): 127-130.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Cressey, Donald R. 1966. *Principles of Criminology*. 7th Ed. J. B. Lippincott Co. Philadelphia, Penn. 721 p.
- Tinker, Frank. 1969. The recreation killers. *Kiwanis Magazine*. June: 27-30.