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Holly L. Wegman

THE ASSOCIATION OF CAMP EXPERIENCES WITH
CIVIC ATTITUDES AND INTENTIONS IN LATE ADOLESCENCE

Thesis under the direction of Christy M. Buchanan, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology.

In this study, associations between camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions were examined among late adolescents. Various lines of research suggest a positive association of camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement with more positive civic attitudes and intentions. To examine this possibility, 163 late adolescents completed surveys about camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions. Possible mediators (e.g., individual religiosity, social capital resources related to civic engagement, identity exploration) of the relation between camp experiences and civic attitudes/intentions were also examined. Results suggest a trend toward higher levels of civic attitudes and intentions among late adolescents who attended a camp emphasizing both religiosity and social justice/community involvement than among adolescents who attended other kinds of camps. Although camp type predicted the proposed mediators, these constructs did not predict civic attitudes or intentions, resulting in little evidence for the hypothesized mediated associations. Results did indicate a consistent pattern in which adolescents who attended a camp emphasizing both religiosity and social justice/community involvement perceived more positive changes in their civic attitudes and intentions as a result of camp experiences than did
adolescents who attended any other kind of camp; somewhat more evidence of mediation emerged in predicting perceived impact.
INTRODUCTION

Each summer more than 10 million children and adolescents attend a camp of some kind, from day camps in the local neighborhood to overnight camps sponsored by churches, independent operators, or not-for-profit youth agencies (Henderson, Whitaker, Bialeschki, Scanlin, & Thurber, 2007). Camps have a wide variety of emphases, from athletic skills to outdoor adventures, constitutional history to community service. Colloquially, many people reminisce about their experiences at summer camp, recalling the unforgettable memories they made and the life-changing impact the camp experience had on their lives. Despite the potential influence these relatively short, intense, yet infrequent experiences may have on the long-term development of attitudes and intentions, empirical assessments of the impact a camp experience may have on campers’ lives have been surprisingly scarce.

The purpose of this study was to examine whether and how a specific type of camp experience, one that emphasizes religiosity and social justice/community involvement, might influence civic attitudes and intentions in late adolescence. It was hypothesized that this kind of camp experience would predict positive civic attitudes and intentions; specifically, there is reason to believe it might have an influence on such attitudes and intentions beyond what a camp emphasizing only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement might have. Furthermore, this study also examined a number of possible mediators of this hypothesized relationship in an effort to understand possible mechanisms through which the camp experience might be associated with civic attitudes and intentions. The model tested in this study is presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Hypothesized model: A main effect of camp experience on civic attitudes and intentions, mediated by 6 constructs.

Understanding the potential influence of the camp experience would advance theoretical knowledge of the predictors of civic attitudes and intentions, and applied knowledge concerning how to cultivate positive civic attitudes and intentions in adolescence.

The foundation for this study comes from previous research on the development of civic engagement. In what follows, I first define civic engagement, paying particular attention to the developmental issues of adolescence as related to civic engagement. Next,
the relationship between religiosity and civic attitudes will be reviewed. Then, the association between service and civic attitudes and intentions will be reviewed, paying particular attention to the suggested influence of service-learning programs on civic attitudes and intentions. Next, evidence linking camp experiences with positive developmental outcomes will be reviewed, including consideration of the possibility that camp experiences that involve service promote positive civic attitudes and intentions. Finally, the possible relationship between a particular kind of camp experience – one that emphasizes both religiosity and community service/social justice – and civic attitudes and intentions will be considered. Based on these streams of empirical research, the current study is proposed as a way to examine the convergence of a number of potentially powerful influences on civic engagement in late adolescence.

Civic Engagement

What is Civic Engagement?

Researchers have debated the proper use of the term “civic engagement” in research (e.g., Obradović & Masten, 2007; Walker, 2002; Youniss, McLellan, Su, & Yates, 1999). The terms civic engagement, civic competence, and civic responsibility are often used interchangeably yet indicate a number of specific attitudes, intentions, or behaviors. In some cases, these terms are used to refer only to political involvement: knowledge of government structure and function, attitudes toward political behavior, actual political behavior (e.g., voting), and participation in civil society (Youniss et al., 2002). In contrast, some researchers prefer to think of civic engagement as constituted by two domains: citizenship, which includes traditional political involvement such as voting, lobbying, and general knowledge of political issues; and volunteering, which does not
have to be overtly political, but includes commitment to community service and work for the well-being of others (Obradović & Masten, 2007; Walker, 2002). Although some researchers argue that citizenship and volunteering are similar but unrelated, others argue that these two aspects of civic engagement are really part of a unified construct and report significant associations between the two (Youniss, McLellan, Su, & Yates, 1999). For the purposes of the present paper, the term civic engagement will be used to refer to both the political or citizenship domain and the volunteering or service domain in order to cast civic engagement as a general, positive orientation toward and action in one’s society.

Civic Engagement as a Developmental Asset

A full understanding of civic engagement, including the factors that serve to promote and/or maintain it, is important because democratic societies benefit from civically involved citizens (Lerner, 2004) and because of the potential for positive outcomes associated with civic engagement in individuals. In one review of civic engagement, Balsano (2005) reports a number of findings suggesting that civic engagement is an important resource in adolescence for personal development, social development, and future vocational aspirations. For example, increases in civic engagement tend to be associated with higher school performance as indicated by school attendance, motivation for learning, motivation in school, grade point average, and academic self-esteem. Individuals who regularly participate in community service, one indicator of civic engagement, also tend to have higher levels of political knowledge, have more political conversations with their families, and have a higher sense of political efficacy than individuals who do not participate in community service (Niemi, Hepburn, & Chapman, 2000). In addition to promoting additional political and community
involvement, participation in civic behaviors such as community service is also associated with adolescents’ greater awareness of their own competencies, higher self-esteem, higher internal locus of control, and greater willingness to become involved in and ability to help solve interpersonal issues (Balsano, 2005).

Civic Engagement during Adolescence

Experiences that promote and reflect civic engagement might be especially important at adolescence for three reasons: first, civic involvement might expose adolescents to positive and supportive role models; second, civic experiences might provide an ideological framework within which other pro-social experiences can be organized and given meaning; third, such experiences might provide opportunities for identity exploration. According to Erikson (1968), adolescence is a time when the individual faces a conflict between achieving identity and role confusion. Identity is achieved when an individual makes a commitment to who they are and becomes aware of the self as unique, whereas role confusion is characterized by an inability to identify a core, unified identity. Civic engagement might provide adolescents a number of resources that are especially important during this time of identity development.

First, there are social aspects of identity development that might be addressed through civic involvement. Identity formation requires not just individual introspection, but also observation of others (Erikson, 1968). Using these observations, the task of an individual is to differentiate one’s self from others. Furthermore, the individual must perceive how others might be judging the self and incorporate this judgment into one’s own sense of self. Civic involvement gives adolescents exposure to positive role models and the potential opportunity to feel one is doing something important in the eyes of
others. Combined, these influences could help the adolescent to move toward developing a positive, achieved identity by both observing others and perceiving the self as good and unique in the eyes of others.

Second, Erikson (1968) also states that adolescence is a time when the ideological structure of the contextual environment becomes especially important for identity development. Some sort of ideological structure enables adolescents to simplify, organize, or give meaning to their experiences. Civic involvement has the potential to provide some sort of ideological framework through which adolescents can organize their pro-social experiences and give greater meaning to the things they are doing.

Finally, in order to move toward identity achievement, the individual must first explore a number of possible identities before committing to a unique identity. Civic involvement provides the adolescent opportunities for exploration of altruistic tendencies, skills that can be used in service, awareness of their own reactions when faced with the needs of others, and opportunities to make a difference in one’s community. Civic involvement therefore provides an important stimulus for identity development through provision of opportunities for the adolescent to connect the “self” with society and to explore various social, political, or moral “identifications” that might provide direction and meaning in the individual’s life (Youniss & Yates, 1997). Thus by providing opportunities for identity exploration, civic involvement might serve an important role in furthering development of a positive identity in adolescence.

In sum, civic engagement is important to study because of the many potential benefits it might convey to the individual, especially adolescents working toward identity achievement. I will argue that civic experiences provided within the context of a camp
that also explores and emphasizes religious values might be especially likely to promote personal endorsement of and commitment to civic attitudes and intentions. This is because such a camp experience is especially likely to provide exposure to positive role models, education about ideological principles, and opportunities for identity exploration. To illuminate the basis for my argument, I will first review evidence for the role of religiosity in development of civic attitudes and intentions. Then I will review evidence demonstrating an association between service experiences, particularly service-learning experiences, and civic attitudes and intentions. Next, I will discuss research addressing general camp experiences and reported associations with positive developmental outcomes. Based on parallels between service-learning and camp experiences, I will then argue that service done in a camp setting might also promote civic attitudes and intentions. I will then discuss related evidence for an association between a camp experience that emphasizes religiosity and social justice/community involvement with civic attitudes and intentions. Based on this previous research, I will then test the proposed relationship between various kinds of camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions.

**Religiosity and Civic Attitudes and Intentions**

“Religiosity” as it is used in the present study encompasses a broad definition that includes both *individual spirituality, or commitment to ideas that transcend the self and bestow value to life,* and participation in *institutional or organizational practice,* including adoption of an institution’s doctrine about the divine (King & Benson, 2006; Lerner, Alberts, Anderson, & Dowling, 2006). Although some research suggests the importance of a distinction between religiosity and spirituality (e.g., Donnelly, Matsuba,
Hart, & Atkins, 2006; King & Benson, 2006), the present study is interested in any spiritual or religious elements of the individual’s life; therefore, we use a broad definition of religiosity that is inclusive of both institutional religiosity and individual “spirituality.”

The Importance of Religiosity in Adolescence

Religiosity in adolescence is associated with a number of positive developmental outcomes, including adolescent “thriving.” Thriving is an indicator of two broad areas of development: individual positive development, including general mental health, happiness, and functioning; and development of individuals’ capacity to contribute to their family, community, or society (for example through school engagement, positive relationships with adults, or valuing diversity; King & Benson, 2006). King and Benson (2006) propose three possible mechanisms through which religiosity may affect adolescent thriving. First, if the individual is involved with a religious institution (church, temple, etc.), local congregations might serve as an important source of social capital for adolescents, building social ties, nurturing social trust, and shaping social norms, beliefs, and actions (King & Furrow, 2004). Second, religious congregations might provide individuals an environment in which they experience the self as part of a larger whole, developing an ideological framework that fosters individual values, meaning, compassion for others, identity, and a sense of belonging to something larger than oneself (King & Benson, 2006). Third, religiosity might provide adolescents a safe outlet in which they can explore life’s existential questions about individual purpose and one’s place in the world, as well as what their individual identity may be within this picture. The available social resources, explicit ideological structure, and facilitation of identity exploration
often available to the adolescent through religiosity might enable effective identity
development (Erikson, 1968) which in turn might enable thriving.

The Association between Religiosity and Civic Engagement

Research examining the relationship between religiosity and civic engagement has generally demonstrated a positive association. In a review of research on the relationship between religiosity and civic engagement (broadly defined as adolescents’ personal goal of contributing to their country and society through political volunteering, voting, community service, etc.), Donnelly, Matsuba, Hart, and Atkins (2006) document a robust, positive, and possibly bi-directional relationship between religiosity and civic engagement. Similarly, Youniss, McLellan, and Yates (1999) found that adolescents who indicated that religion was important in their lives were almost three times more likely to do service, one indicator of civic engagement, than adolescents who did not indicate that religion was important in their lives. Furthermore, this positive association between religiosity and community service held regardless of whether religion was considered on an individual or institutional level. Additionally, some research suggests the possibility that the relationship between religiosity and civic engagement extends into young adulthood. For example, Donnelly et al. (2006) found that individuals who had high levels of religious involvement as seniors in high school were more likely to vote 8 years later than individuals who were not religiously involved as seniors in high school.

Although some studies suggest that certain aspects of religiosity – such as denomination or extent and nature of individual involvement – may be more important in predicting civic engagement than are general measures of religiosity (e.g., Driskell, Lyon, & Embry, 2008), there does appear to be a fairly robust, positive relationship between
individual religiosity and civic attitudes, intentions, and behaviors. Some studies have examined this relationship longitudinally (e.g., Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007) and suggested that higher levels of religiosity promote community service; yet, the possibility that community service promotes religiosity has been suggested by correlational or cross-sectional data (e.g., Serow & Dreyden, 1990; Youniss, McLellan, Su, & Yates, 1999), although this possibility has not been tested longitudinally. The directionality of this relationship is therefore unclear. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that religious experiences can promote civic engagement; coupling religious experiences with an emphasis on service in a camp context might be especially likely to promote civic attitudes and intentions. Next, then, I review evidence for an association between service experiences and civic attitudes and intentions.

Service and Civic Attitudes and Intentions

Service Experiences

Although it is often assumed that participation in community service will increase an individual’s civic attitudes and intentions, findings on service experiences done without formal discussion or reflection integrated with the service experience are limited and mixed, raising questions about any direct influence on civic attitudes and intentions of these kinds of service experiences (Jahromi & Buchanan, 2009). For example, in a nationwide survey of high school students, Niemi, Hepburn, and Chapman (2000) found that regular participation in community service predicted a number of politically-oriented civic outcomes including higher levels of political knowledge, more discussions with family about politics, certain political skills (e.g., speaking in public at a meeting), and certain aspects of political efficacy (e.g., personal understanding of politics). Although
these findings persist even after including a number of controls (grade in school, gender, ethnicity, academic performance, language spoken at home, parents’ education, family and school characteristics, public/private school, and students’ view of school openness), the cross-sectional design of the study precludes conclusions of causality or direction of relationships. Thus, as Niemi et al. acknowledge, it is possible that civic attitudes and intentions lead to community service. Furthermore, a number of the civic outcomes tested in this study were not significantly predicted by regular community service (e.g., tolerance and political efficacy).

Other studies reflect a similar pattern of results. In a study of 1,768 first year students at a Canadian university, Henderson, Brown, Pancer, and Ellis-Hale (2007) examined the relationship between reports of community service in high school and civic attitudes, intentions, and behaviors during the freshman year at college. Results indicate that participation in community service in high school was a significant predictor of attitudes toward volunteering in college, and sustained participation in community service in high school was a significant predictor of political interest in college. However, participation in community service in high school did not predict a number of community- and politically-oriented civic attitudes, including confidence in public or private institutions, media exposure, or cynicism. Yet, this study again utilizes a one-time correlational methodology, restricting causal conclusions that can be drawn from this data. Using methodology and analyses that predict civic attitudes longitudinally controlling for earlier attitudes tends to provide less evidence for any impact of simply engaging in service on such attitudes (Jahromi & Buchanan, 2009). Furthermore, effects of community service indicated in research on the impact of service might actually be an
artifact of inclusion of service-learning experiences in basic measures of service (Jahromi & Buchanan, 2009). Although links between participating in community service on the one hand and civic attitudes and intentions on the other are inconclusive, data concerning the impact of service-learning on civic attitudes is more convincing. I review findings on service-learning next.

**Service-Learning Experiences**

In comparison to the mixed and often contradictory research findings about the nature of the relationship between participating in service and civic attitudes and intentions, research on service-learning programs tends to demonstrate a more consistently positive relationship between the service experience and civic attitudes and intentions. Many different types of service-learning exist, but the component common to all service-learning programs is explicit integration of service experiences with opportunities to reflect on these experiences, whether the reflection occurs in relation to another topic of study (e.g., American Government) or is focused on the service experience alone (Stukas, Clary, & Snyder, 1999). A review of service-learning as related to civic attitudes and intentions documented a number of personal and civic benefits from service-learning experiences: enhanced public and private self-image and self-concept; improved understanding of the world and its citizens; enhanced feeling of fulfillment of humanitarian and altruistic values; strengthened sense of purpose and skill set that could lead to a career in a related field; fulfillment of perceived social expectations; and some protection from negative life stresses (Stukas et al., 1999). The research upon which these conclusions are based is much stronger (i.e., longitudinal or quasi-experimental) than the research examining service more broadly (reviewed above).
This research on service and on service-learning suggests that the opportunity for meaningful reflection on and discussion about service experiences might be critically important for benefits to accrue from service. However, research also suggests that in order to be most effective, service-learning programs should facilitate autonomy and choice for the individual, focus on finding a good match between individual goals and service activities, foster relationships among the participants in the program, and provide sufficient opportunities for individual reflection (Stukas et al., 1999). It might be suggested, therefore, that other experiences facilitating these aspects of a service experience might also promote civic attitudes and intentions. Next, I discuss camp experiences as one setting in which these important characteristics of service experiences might be found.

Camp Experiences and Civic Attitudes and Intentions

Research about the impact of a camp experience on adolescent development is perhaps relevant to consideration of the development of civic attitudes and intentions because this research suggests a number of positive developmental outcomes of the camp experience. For example, Thurber, Scanlin, Scheuler, and Henderson (2007) demonstrated (by having campers fill out questionnaires before and after camp) significant increases immediately after camp experiences in four domains: positive identity, social skills, physical and thinking skills, and positive values and spirituality (Henderson, Thurber, Whitaker, Bialeschki, & Scanlin, 2006; Thurber et al., 2007). Responses to a follow-up questionnaire administered six-months after camp demonstrated that most of these increases were maintained or demonstrated additional
growth. The increases were argued to be greater than what one would expect based on maturation alone, although no control group data were available.

These data suggest positive developmental outcomes from a general camp experience. One might expect that a camp experience that puts special emphasis on service and/or a consideration of social justice would have an important impact on the development of civic attitudes and intentions specifically. Despite the fact that a number of camps offer opportunities for service and/or consideration of social justice issues, there is very little research on the impact this kind of experience might have on the development of civic attitudes and intentions. However, because service done in a camp setting would be similar in several respects to service-learning, findings concerning the association between service-learning and civic attitudes and intentions are relevant.

Camp experiences, by nature, have the potential to display many of the characteristics suggested by research on service-learning to be critical in facilitating civic attitudes and intentions such as opportunity for individual reflection, cultivating social relationships, and facilitation of individual autonomy and choice. Variation in quality and nature of camp experiences certainly exists, yet service in the context of camp experiences might be especially likely to have the characteristics that enable development of civic attitudes and intentions in adolescence as a result of that service. For example, by nature of being done in a group of peers working toward similar goals, service experiences at camp might provide increased opportunities for meaningful reflection with peers and leaders about the service experiences and their meaning for the individuals’ lives. Because camps are often attended with similar-aged peers who the adolescent may not have known before going to camp, the camp experience can also foster the
development of relationships with peers. Camps that emphasize service experiences might provide even greater facilitation of social relationships as adolescents work together toward common goals. Finally, camp experiences in general often provide adolescents opportunities to spend a significant amount of time away from their parents, perhaps leading to a greater feeling of autonomy or choice in their daily activities than they feel at home. Adolescents might also feel a greater sense of autonomy if they have chosen to attend the specific camp than they typically feel at home. Service experiences in camp settings might be particularly influential for a person’s civic attitudes and intentions.

In addition, service done in a religious camp setting might have a greater influence on civic attitudes and intentions in adolescence than service in a secular camp setting. In the next section, I argue why this might be.

*A Camp Experience that Emphasizes Religiosity and Service as related to Civic Attitudes and Intentions*

Although research on the association between service experiences in a religious camp setting and civic attitudes and intentions is scarce, three relevant studies were found: the first study examines the associations among all of the variables of interest, albeit with methodological limitations; the second study examines service in a religious camp setting but does not consider the association with civic attitudes and intentions; and the third study examines the relationship of service in a religious setting with civic involvement but in a context outside of camp.

The first study was a dissertation (with no related publications that I could find; Kidd, 1994) that examined the potential impact of a camp emphasizing both religiosity
and service on a number of civic attitudes and intentions, such as empathy for others, appreciation for community, concern for the needs of others, and commitment to serving others. Participants were 34 adolescents who attended one of three Christian service camps in the Appalachian region. Participants were interviewed four times using semi-structured interviews and observed throughout the camp experience. Based on these data, Kidd suggests that service done in a Christian camp might promote the ability to empathize with others, appreciation for community, concern for the needs of others, and commitment to serving others. However, because this study utilized only qualitative methodology, did not conduct statistical analyses of the data, and had a restricted sample, the results are only suggestive and cannot be generalized to a larger population. Nonetheless, this study suggests that service done in a religious camp setting might predict high levels of certain civic attitudes and intentions.

The second relevant study addressed the impact of service in a religious camp setting but did not measure civic attitudes or intentions. This study is only mentioned, not fully reported, in a review of the association between religiosity, community service, and identity in adolescence by Youniss, McLellan, and Yates (1999). The authors discuss ongoing observations of about 300 high school students who attended local Catholic churches (in the suburbs of Washington, DC) and who also volunteered at a camp where they worked to restore homes of poor rural citizens. During this eight-day camp experience, the campers did service work and also discussed the religious significance of their physical labor. Essays were collected from the students on the last day of camp. Qualitative analyses of the essays indicated that the campers experienced an emotional uplift from working together and living with peers in a constructive
atmosphere, learned lessons from “seeing” God through the needy, felt a sense of fulfillment of their Christian duty, and were motivated to think about issues of justice inherent in the disparity between their own wealth and the poverty of the people they were helping (Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1999). In general, these adolescents expressed feeling a deeper sense of relationship with God through helping the poor in this context. By doing service within an intensive religious setting, the campers were able to interpret their experiences in terms of religious meaning and significance. The findings from Youniss, McLellan and Yates demonstrate a relationship between a camp experience that combines religious faith and social justice/community involvement and several of the mechanisms proposed to link camp experiences with civic attitudes and intentions in the present study: individual religiosity, belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, social capital resources related to civic involvement, and commitment to ideological principles. However, the results of Youniss, McLellan, and Yates’ study do not directly address the impact of this camp experience or the potential mediators on civic attitudes and intentions.

Finally, the third relevant study evaluated the impact on future voting and volunteering of service experiences in a non-camp religious setting (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007). Results of this study demonstrated that, even after controlling for a number of demographic variables (i.e., gender, ethnicity, SES, religious affiliation), young adults (eight years after high school) who did community service within a religious context during their senior year in high school were 33% and 64% more likely to volunteer in the community as young adults than were young adults who did community service outside of the religious context as seniors in high school or young
adults who did no community service as seniors in high school, respectively. Although this study did not examine the combination of service experiences and a religious context within a camp setting, the results suggest that service experiences in a religious context might have a stronger influence on civic outcomes (indicated in this study by future volunteering and voting) than do service experiences outside of the religious context. In other words, this study suggests a stronger effect of religiosity and social justice/community involvement on civic attitudes, intentions, and behaviors beyond any potential effect of just social justice/community involvement or just religiosity (although the latter comparison was not made directly). Extrapolating to the camp context, attending a camp that emphasizes religiosity and social justice/community involvement might predict more positive civic attitudes and intentions than does attending a camp emphasizing only religiosity, only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement.

In sum, although quantitative research specifically linking service in a religious camp setting with civic attitudes and intentions is not available, the current literature suggests that the convergence of these influences – of religiosity, service, and the camp experience – might convey especially potent benefits for civic attitudes and intentions in adolescence beyond what would be expected from any of these influences alone. This literature and theory also highlight some of the mechanisms possibly underlying the impact that a camp experience emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement might have on civic attitudes and intentions. Specifically, service experiences in a religious camp setting are proposed to influence civic attitudes and intentions by facilitating increases in individual religiosity, strengthening individuals’
belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, providing social capital resources relevant to civic engagement, providing opportunities for commitment to ideological principles relevant to civic engagement, and providing opportunities for identity exploration (see Figure 1).

**The Present Study**

The present study will examine whether late adolescents who have attended a camp that emphasizes both religiosity and social justice/community involvement report higher levels of civic attitudes and intentions than do adolescents who have attended a camp that emphasizes only religiosity, only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement. Specifically, it is hypothesized that attendance at a camp emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement will predict more positive civic attitudes and intentions than does attendance at a camp emphasizing only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement. It is also hypothesized that attendance at a camp emphasizing only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement will predict more positive civic attitudes and intentions than does attendance at a camp emphasizing neither. Assuming an association will be found between the camp experience and civic attitudes and intentions, the following variables will be considered as potential mediators: individual religiosity, belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, social capital resources related to civic engagement, commitment to ideological principles, and identity exploration (see Figure 1).
METHOD

Participants

Participants were 163 students (66% male) in Introductory Psychology courses at Wake Forest University who were required to participate in research studies to earn course credit (students who did not wish to participate were offered alternative assignments). Eighty-four percent of the sample was white/non-Hispanic and 16% of the sample was persons of color (5% Asian or Asian-American, 7% African or African-American, 2% Latino/Hispanic, and 2% “other”). Eighty-four percent reported mothers attaining a college degree or higher, and 82% reported fathers attaining a college degree or higher.

Based on responses provided to questions administered during a mass testing session of all Introductory Psychology students who chose to participate in research (see Appendix I), participants were selected to include only freshman who reported having attended one of four kinds of camps since 9th grade: a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement \((n = 45)\), a camp that emphasized only religiosity \((n = 42)\), a camp that emphasized only social justice/community involvement \((n = 35)\), or a camp that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement \((n = 41)\). Individuals who reported attending a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement were assigned to this group, regardless of whether they had attended other relevant types of camps. Participants who reported having attended camps that emphasized only religiosity and camps that emphasized only social justice/community involvement were assigned to one of the two groups based on the following rules: if the individual attended one type of camp but not
the other in 2008, he/she was assigned to the type of camp attended in 2008; if neither camp or both camps were attended in 2008, the individual was assigned to the type of camp at which he/she had spent the most time (based on reported number of times attending that type of camp and average number of days spent at that camp each time). Participants who reported never having been to one of these three types of camps but who attended some other type of camp were assigned to the “neither” group. See Table 1 for information about the history of camp attendance by camp group.

Seventy-five percent of participants reported attending camps that lasted one week or less, and 87% reported attending a residential (overnight, not day) camp. Most camps (83%) were co-educational. Twenty-four percent of participants reported having been a leader at camp before, and 42% indicated that they planned to be a leader in the future. Twenty students indicated having attended a camp that emphasized political awareness or involvement, a factor that was taken into account in my analyses (see Results).

Procedure

Participants were given the opportunity to sign up online to participate in the study if they indicated in mass testing that they had one of the four types of camp experiences. After signing up, participants were provided with a link that directed them to the survey. A consent form appeared at the start of the survey (see Appendix II). If students agreed to participate, they completed the survey at any time convenient for them. They were asked to do so in a quiet, private location where no one would influence their responses. Participants from the four groups were given slightly different forms of the
Table 1  
Information about Attendance at All Camps by Main Camp Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Group</th>
<th>N Camp Group</th>
<th>N Attended in 2008</th>
<th>M #Times Attended Camp of this Type</th>
<th>M # Days at Camp of this Type</th>
<th>N Attended Religious Camp</th>
<th>N Attended Service Camp</th>
<th>N Attended Other Type of Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religiosity &amp; Social Justice/Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religiosity</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Justice/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neither</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA(^a)</td>
<td>NA(^a)</td>
<td>NA(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All values reported reflect reported attendance at camps of each type since completing 9\(^{th}\) grade.

\(^a\)This data was not collected for participants reporting having been to a camp that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement.
survey; each form contained a paragraph reminding the participants of the particular type of camp they reported having attended (during mass testing) and instructions to think about experiences at this type of camp when responding to questions about the camp experience. The on-line survey took approximately 30 minutes. After completing the survey, participants were awarded credit for research participation toward their Introductory Psychology requirement. A copy of the complete survey including instructions and items grouped by concept is found in Appendix III.

Measures

Grouping Variable: Camp Attendance

During mass testing in the psychology department at Wake Forest, participants reported whether they had attended the following kinds of camps since completing ninth grade: camps that emphasized religious faith but did not specifically emphasize volunteerism/community involvement; camps that emphasized volunteerism/community involvement but did not specifically emphasize religious faith; camps that emphasized both religious faith and volunteerism/community involvement; or any other type of camp (e.g., outdoor/adventure, political awareness/involvement, sports, music, fine arts, leadership building, or educational). Participants also indicated whether they attended each camp in 2008 (the previous summer), the number of times they attended each type of camp, and the length of each camp experience.

Demographics

Participants reported basic demographic information including sex, birth date, year in school, ethnicity, and mother’s and father’s highest level of education (an indicator of socioeconomic status). Mothers’ and fathers’ reports of highest level of
educational attainment were averaged to create a parental education variable ($M = 4.10$, approximately equivalent to a college degree, $SD = .81$).

**Characteristics of the Camp Experience**

Participants reported information about their most recent experience at one of the four specific types of camp (the type specified for the participant in the instructions) including how long the camp lasted, whether the camp was a residential (overnight) or day camp, and whether the camp was coeducational or single sex. Then, thinking about all of their experiences at this type of camp, participants indicated whether they had served or planned to serve in a leadership position at this type of camp. Finally, participants also rated their agreement with 13 statements describing their experience at camp. These items were included to serve as a check on whether the actual camp experiences matched the type of camp experiences expected from each camp: emphasis and opportunity for reflection on religiosity, social justice/community involvement, or the explicit integration of religiosity and social justice/community involvement. Items were rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Sample items include, “Religious faith was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions,” “Being at this camp stimulated me to talk or think about taking action for social justice,” and “The connection between faith and community involvement was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions.” This set of items was developed specifically for this study.

In keeping with conceptual aims, three composites were created to indicate reflection and emphasis on: (a) the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement, (b) religious faith, and (c) social justice/community involvement. Composites were created by averaging the items included in each
conceptual category. All demonstrated sufficient reliability: emphasis and reflection on
the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement (4 items), \( \alpha = .93 \); emphasis and reflection on religiosity (4 items), \( \alpha = .97 \); and emphasis and
reflection on social justice/community involvement (5 items), \( \alpha = .97 \).

Social Desirability Check

Participants completed the 12-item short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social
desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) as developed by Reynolds (1982).
Participants rated 12 statements as true or false. Sample items include, “No matter who I
am talking to, I am always a good listener” and “I’m always willing to admit it when I
make a mistake.” One point was awarded for each socially desirable answer and points
were summed. Thus, low scores indicate low social desirability bias and high scores
indicate high social desirability bias. Because the constructs measured in this study were
susceptible to social desirability bias, it was important to assess the extent to which
participants were responding with socially desirable answers. This measure, therefore,
served as a control. Principle components analysis with varimax rotation indicated a
four-component solution (based on eigenvalues > 1); however, no apparent meaning or
pattern could be discerned from the component loadings. Therefore, the principle
components analysis was repeated specifying a one-component solution. Ten out of 12
items loaded above .40 on this component. The items that did not load sufficiently high
stated, “There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others”
and “On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of
my ability.” Excluding these two items from the composite produced the scale with the
best reliability (\( \alpha = .68 \)). Thus, social desirability scores reflect the sum of ten items.
Proposed Mediator: Individual Religiosity

For means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for all remaining variables (i.e., proposed mediators and dependent variables), see Table 2.

Religious well-being. The Religious Well-Being subscale (intended to assess an individual’s relationship with a higher power) from Ellison’s (1983) Spiritual Well-Being scale was used. Participants rated ten items from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Sample items include “I believe there is a higher power” and “I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with a higher power” (reverse-scored). Three items were reverse-scored, and the items were averaged.

Quest/interactional religiosity. The quest/interactional religiosity subscale (intended to assess an individual’s orientation toward religion as a quest) from Batson’s (1976) Religious Life Inventory was used. Participants rated 5 items from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Sample items include “It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties” and “Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers.” A principal components analysis of the items was conducted and one item, “I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years” (reverse-scored) did not load on the same component as the other items. Additionally, this item reduced the overall reliability of the measure. Therefore, this item was not included in the composite. The remaining four items were averaged.

Perceived impact of camp on individual religiosity. Participants rated their agreement with three items that assessed their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their individual religiosity (e.g., “My experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in my personal religiosity”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Proposed Mediators and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Reliability (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent. for Fut. Community Involvement</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent. for Fut. Political Involvement</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Efficacy</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Trust</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarianism</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Commitment to Civic Values</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Commitment to Moral Values</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Civic Attitudes and Intentions</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Well-Being</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest/Interactional Religiosity</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection btw. Faith Involvement</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital Resources</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Ideological Principles</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Exploration</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. The items were averaged.

*Proposed Mediator: Belief in the Connection between Religious Faith and Social Justice/Community Involvement.*

*Direct report of belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement.* Three items from Kerestes, Youniss, and Metz’s (2004) measure of religious perspective were used to assess individuals’ beliefs in the connection between their religious faith and involvement in the community or with issues of social justice. Items were rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Items from the original measure that were excluded assessed individual religiosity, not the connection between faith and action. The items used were “I believe that helping others is an important part of my religious beliefs,” “Promoting fairness and justice is a part of my religious beliefs,” and “My faith/spirituality helps me to answer questions about myself and the world around me.” The three items were averaged.

*Perceived impact of camp on belief in the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement.* Participants rated their agreement with three items

| Impact on Individual Religiosity | 3.90 | 1.97 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.92 |
| Impact on Con. btw. Faith/Involvement | 3.70 | 1.83 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.93 |
| Impact on Social Capital Resources | 4.08 | 1.66 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.96 |
| Impact on Com. to Ideological Principles | 4.25 | 1.70 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.92 |
| Impact on Identity Exploration | 5.11 | 1.27 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.81 |
that assessed their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their belief in the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement (e.g., “My experiences at camp strengthened my beliefs about the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. The items were averaged.

Proposed Mediator: Social Capital Resources Related to Civic Engagement

Direct report of social capital resources related to civic engagement. Participants rated 11 items assessing the extent to which they felt they had social capital resources related to civic engagement from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Sample items include “I feel a strong sense of community with other people who share my values and beliefs about social issues” and “I do not have people in my life that encourage me in my religious faith” (reverse-scored). This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis with varimax rotation indicated a two-component solution; the first component included the seven positively worded items and the second component included the four negatively worded items. However, when the four negatively worded items were reverse-scored and all items were averaged to create the composite, items showed adequate reliability. Therefore, four items were reverse-scored and the items were averaged.

Perceived impact of camp on social capital resources related to civic engagement. Participants rated their agreement with ten items assessing their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their social capital resources related to civic engagement (e.g., “Being at camp gave me more people that I can relate to about issues of community
involvement or social justice” and “My experiences at camp increased the number of people with whom I can discuss my faith”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis with varimax rotation indicated a two-component solution; the first component included items that referred to resources related to religiosity and the second component included items that did not mention religiosity. However, when all items were averaged to create the composite, items showed adequate reliability. Therefore, all the items were averaged.

**Proposed Mediator: Commitment to Ideological Principles**

*Direct report of commitment to ideological principles.* Participants rated eight items assessing the extent to which they felt connected to some larger purpose from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Sample items include “My personal values, beliefs, and moral commitments give a sense of meaning and/or purpose to my daily actions,” and “Working for social justice makes me feel connected with some larger purpose.” This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. One item was reverse scored and the items were averaged.

*Perceived impact of camp on commitment to ideological principles.* Participants rated their agreement with six items assessing their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their commitment to ideological principles (e.g., “My camp experience changed how I think about my everyday actions”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study.
Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. The items were averaged.

*Proposed Mediator: Identity Exploration*

*Direct report of identity exploration in breadth and depth.* Participants completed the Exploration in Breadth and Exploration in Depth subscales from the Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (Lucckx et al., 2008). Participants rated ten items assessing how often they do each of the things described in the statements, from 1 = almost never to 5 = very often. A sample item from the Exploration in Breadth subscale (five items) is “Think about the direction I want to take in my life” and a sample item from the Exploration in Depth subscale (five items) is “Talk regularly with other people about the plans for the future I have made.” Principle components analysis with varimax rotation indicated a three component solution; however, no apparent meaning or pattern could be discerned from the component loadings. Reliability of each of the following was examined: exploration in breadth subscale, exploration in depth subscale, and all items together. All items together demonstrated higher reliability (α = .88) than either the breadth (α = .85) or depth (α = .78) subscales alone. Therefore, all the items were averaged.

*Perceived impact of camp on identity exploration.* Participants rated their agreement with four items assessing their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their identity exploration (e.g., “My camp experience encouraged me to think more about who I am”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. The items were averaged.
**Dependent Variables: Civic Attitudes and Intentions**

*Intentions for future community-oriented involvement.* Participants rated their intentions for community-oriented civic engagement using Metz, McLellan, and Youniss’ (2003) future conventional civic involvement measure. The measure consists of one item: “How likely is it that you will volunteer in the upcoming year?” rated from 1 = not at all likely to 5 = definitely will. Because this measure was originally designed for high school students, the wording was modified for the present study to assess college students (“after graduating high school” was changed to “in the upcoming year”).

*Intentions for future politically-oriented involvement.* Metz et al.’s (2003) future unconventional civic involvement scale was used to measure intentions for politically-oriented future civic engagement (i.e., boycotting a product, demonstrating for a cause, and working on a political campaign in the future). Participants rated three statements assessing the likelihood of unconventional civic behaviors in the future from 1 = not at all likely to 5 = definitely will. The items were averaged.

*Political efficacy.* Participants rated two items from the Political Efficacy Scale (Niemi, Hepburn, & Chapman, 2000) from 1 = not true at all to 5 = very true. The two items were “Politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on” and “My family doesn’t have any say in what the federal government does.” The two items were reverse scored and averaged so that high scores indicated high levels of political efficacy.

*Civic efficacy.* Three items from Jahromi and Buchanan (2009) were used to assess the extent to which participants felt they could have an impact of their community. Participants rated statements (“I can change my world for the better by getting involved
in my community,” “I can make my community a better place by helping others in need,” and “There are things I can do to make the world a better place”) from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The items were averaged.

_Social responsibility._ A subset of items from Pancer’s Youth Social Responsibility Scale (Pancer, Pratt, Hunsberger, & Alisat, 2007) was used. Participants rated ten statements assessing general feelings of responsibility for addressing social needs from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Sample items include “Everybody should volunteer some time for the good of their community” and “Young people have an important role to play in making the world a better place.” Three items were reverse scored, and the items were averaged.

_Social trust._ Participants rated how much they trust seven different groups of people; six of the items were drawn from Uslaner’s (1998) social trust scale. The group “adults” was not on the original scale; it was added because it seemed to be a relevant group for late adolescents. Items were rated from 1 = strongly distrust to 5 = strongly trust. The items were averaged.

_Humanitarianism._ Katz and Hass’s (1988) humanitarianism scale was used to assess humanitarian beliefs. Participants rated five statements from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree (e.g., “Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things”). Reliability analyses indicated that one item, “In dealing with criminals, courts should recognize that many are victims of circumstances,” reduced the overall reliability of the scale (α = .61 for all items), and this item was therefore not included in the composite. Thus, four items were averaged.
**Personal commitment to civic values.** Participants rated the extent to which they felt a strong personal commitment to a number of values and actions on a scale ranging from 1 = not at all committed to 5 = very committed. The six items included in this scale were: feeling connected to others, contributing to my community, being involved in my community, influencing politics or policies in my community, participating in community events, and helping others in my community (Jahromi & Buchanan, 2008). The items were averaged.

**Personal commitment to moral values.** Participants rated the extent to which they were committed to moral values and actions from 1 = not at all committed to 5 = very committed. The six items were: getting to know a diverse group of people, equality for all, performing actions that benefit others, understanding the perspectives of others, improving the lives of others, and making the world a better place (Jahromi & Buchanan, 2008). The items were averaged.

**Perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions.** Participants rated their agreement with ten items assessing their perception of the impact the camp experience had on their civic attitudes and intentions (e.g., “I am more aware of my responsibilities as a citizen now than I would have been if I had not gone to camp”). Each item was rated from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This set of items was developed for this study. Principle components analysis indicated a one-component solution. The items were averaged.
RESULTS

Descriptive Information

Descriptive information for dependent variables and mediators is in Table 2.

Validity of Camp Type Categorization

Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) predicting each of the three characteristics of the camp experience variables (emphasis/reflection on the integration of religious faith and social justice/community involvement, emphasis/reflection on religious faith, and emphasis/reflection on social justice/community involvement) from the four-category camp type variable were conducted to determine whether the four-category camp type variable was a valid measure of the camp experiences of interest. All three characteristics of the camp experience differed significantly by camp type: emphasis/reflection on the integration of religious faith and social justice/community involvement, $F(3, 159) = 81.98, p < .001, \eta^2 = .61$; emphasis/reflection on religious faith, $F(3, 159) = 143.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .73$; and emphasis/reflection on social justice/community involvement, $F(3, 159) = 67.76, p < .001, \eta^2 = .56$.

Three planned orthogonal contrasts were examined to explore the source of these differences. The contrasts were as follows: (a) individuals who attended camps that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement were compared with individuals who attended any other camp type (camps that emphasized religiosity only, social justice/community involvement only, or neither); (b) individuals who attended camps that emphasized only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement were compared with individuals who attended camps that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement; and (c) individuals who attended camps that
emphasized only religiosity were compared with individuals who attended camps that emphasized only social justice/community involvement. All three contrasts were significant for each of the characteristics of the camp experience, indicating that: individuals who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of each characteristic of the camp experience than did individuals who attended any other type of camp; individuals who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of each characteristic of the camp experience than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized neither; and individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity reported higher levels of emphasis/reflection on the integration of religious faith and social justice/community involvement, higher levels of emphasis/reflection on religious faith, and lower levels of emphasis/reflection on social justice/community involvement than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized only social justice/community involvement.

These results demonstrated that reports of actual camp experiences matched the type of camp experiences expected from participants’ camp type assignment, establishing the validity of this assignment. The categorical camp type variable, therefore, was used as the independent variable in all subsequent analyses.

**Determining Control Variables**

Participant demographics and descriptive camp information were compared by camp type to determine which background variables should be used as control variables in subsequent analyses. Associations were examined with two conceptualizations of camp type: (a) a 4-category variable compared all four camp groups to determine whether
differences existed among any of the groups; and (b) a dichotomous variable compared camps emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement with all other camps (camps emphasizing religiosity, camps emphasizing social justice/community involvement, and camps emphasizing neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement) combined. Associations were tested between these camp type variables and the following background variables: gender, ethnicity, parental education (average of mothers’ and fathers’ highest level of educational attainment), length of camp stay, whether the camp was a day camp or residential/overnight camp, whether the camp was coeducational or single-sex, whether the participant had been a leader at this type of camp, whether the participant planned to be a leader at this type of camp in the future, whether the individual had attended a camp with a political focus (in addition to the camp type in which they were grouped), and social desirability. Results of the Chi-Square analyses examining categorical potential control variables are shown in Table 3. Results of ANOVAs (for the four-category camp variable) and t-tests (for the dichotomous camp variable) examining continuous potential control variables are shown in Table 4.

Five variables differed significantly by the four-category camp group variable: gender, length of camp stay, whether the camp was a day camp or a residential/overnight camp, whether the camp was coeducational or single-sex, and whether the individual planned to be a leader at this type of camp in the future. These five variables were included as controls in all subsequent analyses using the four-category camp type variable. Two variables differed significantly by the dichotomous camp group variable: gender and whether the camp was a day camp or a residential/overnight camp. These two
Table 3
Chi-Square Tests of Potential Control Variables for Camp Group Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Religiosity and Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Religiosity</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Neither Religiosity nor Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>Chi-Square Comparing 4 Camp Groups, $df = 3$</th>
<th>Chi-Square Comparing 2 Camp Groups, $df = 1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Color</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Camp</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Overnight</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campers</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Sex</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variable</td>
<td>Camp Emphasizing Religiosity and Social Justice/Community Involvement</td>
<td>Camp Emphasizing Religiosity</td>
<td>Camp Emphasizing Social Justice/Community Involvement</td>
<td>Camp Emphasizing Neither Religiosity nor Social Justice/Community Involvement</td>
<td>Chi-Square Comparing 4 Camp Groups, ( df = 3 )</td>
<td>Chi-Square Comparing 2 Camp Groups, ( df = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected  Reported</td>
<td>Expected  Reported</td>
<td>Expected  Reported</td>
<td>Expected  Reported</td>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been a Leader</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.80 14</td>
<td>10.00 6</td>
<td>8.40 10</td>
<td>9.80 9</td>
<td>3.92 .27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.20 31</td>
<td>32.00 36</td>
<td>26.60 25</td>
<td>31.20 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan to be a Leader</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19.00 23</td>
<td>17.80 20</td>
<td>14.80 17</td>
<td>17.40 9</td>
<td>9.44 .02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.00 22</td>
<td>24.20 22</td>
<td>20.20 18</td>
<td>23.60 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attended Political Camp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.50 3</td>
<td>5.20 6</td>
<td>4.30 8</td>
<td>5.00 3</td>
<td>6.05 .10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.50 42</td>
<td>36.80 36</td>
<td>30.70 27</td>
<td>36.00 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4
Tests of Continuous Potential Control Variables for Camp Group Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Religiosity and Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>Camp Emphasizing Neither Religiosity nor Social Justice/Community Involvement</th>
<th>ANOVA comparing 4 Camp Groups, $df = 3, 159$</th>
<th>Independent Samples t-test comparing 2 Camp Groups, $df = 161$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Education</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Length of Camp</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Desirability</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table entries include mean and standard deviation (SD) values for each control variable across different camp group comparisons, along with statistical test results for ANOVA and independent samples t-test.
variables were included as controls in all subsequent analyses using the dichotomous camp type variable.

**Relationships among Dependent Variables**

Correlations among dependent variables are presented in Table 5. In order to group dependent variables meaningfully in multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs), a principle components analysis using oblimin rotation (because I expected the components to be correlated with one another) was conducted for the nine measures of civic attitudes and intentions. Results indicated two components with eigenvalues > 1. The first component consisted of seven “community-oriented” attitudes and intentions: personal commitment to moral values (pattern matrix component loading = .75), civic efficacy (.74), social responsibility (.69), personal commitment to civic values (.67), humanitarianism (.67), intentions for future community-oriented involvement (.64), and social trust (.45). The second component consisted of two “politically-oriented” attitudes and intentions: political efficacy (.81) and intentions for future politically-oriented involvement (.70). Subsequent MANCOVAs thus tested differences between camp groups on these two sets of civic attitudes and intentions: community-oriented and politically-oriented.

**Predicting Civic Attitudes and Intentions with Camp Type**

A MANCOVA predicting the seven community-oriented dependent variables with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Wilks’ Lambda (.82) indicated marginally significant group differences, \( F(21, 419.78) = 1.44, p = .094, \eta^2 = .07 \). To explore the marginal difference, analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) predicting each of the seven dependent variables were examined. Six ANCOVAs demonstrated no significant group differences:
Table 5
Correlations among Civic Attitudes and Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intentions for Political Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intentions for Community Involvement</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political Efficacy</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Civic Efficacy</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Responsibility</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Trust</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Humanitarianism</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commitment to Civic Values</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Commitment to Moral Values</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10.  * p < .05.  ** p < .01.  *** p < .001.
personal commitment to moral values, $F(3, 152) = .56, ns, \eta^2 = .01$; civic efficacy, $F(3, 152) = 1.24, ns, \eta^2 = .02$; social responsibility, $F(3, 152) = .55, ns, \eta^2 = .01$; humanitarianism, $F(3, 152) = 1.43, ns, \eta^2 = .03$; intentions for future community-oriented involvement, $F(3, 152) = .61, ns, \eta^2 = .01$; and social trust, $F(3, 152) = 1.33, ns, \eta^2 = .03$. Only the ANCOVA predicting personal commitment to civic values demonstrated significant group differences, $F(3, 152) = 3.22, p = .024, \eta^2 = .06$. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described above) were examined to explore the source of this difference. Only the first contrast was significant, $t(153) = 2.12, p < .05, r = .17$, indicating that individuals who attended camps that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement had higher commitment to civic values ($M = 3.89, SE = .10$) than did individuals who attended any other type of camp ($M = 3.64, SE = .11$).

Next, a MANCOVA predicting the two politically-oriented dependent variables with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Wilks’ Lambda (.96) indicated no significant group differences, $F(6, 306) = 1.20, ns, \eta^2 = .02$. Because of the theoretical interest in camps emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement, another MANCOVA predicting the two politically-oriented dependent variables with the dichotomous camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier, was conducted in order to isolate this camp group of interest. Wilks’ Lambda (.96) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(2, 158) = 3.01, p = .052, \eta^2 = .04$. To explore the marginal difference, ANCOVAs predicting each of the two dependent variables were examined. Both the ANCOVA predicting political efficacy, $F(1, 159) = 3.91, p = .050, \eta^2 = .02$, and the ANCOVA predicting intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, $F(1, 159) = 3.99, p = .047, \eta^2 = .02$ indicated significant differences among
camp groups. Individuals who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of political efficacy ($M = 4.00, SE = .13$) and higher intentions for future politically-oriented involvement ($M = 3.15, SE = .14$) than did individuals who attended any other type of camp (political efficacy, $M = 3.70, SE = .08$; intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, $M = 2.82, SE = .08$).

**Predicting Perceived Impact of Camp with Camp Type**

An ANCOVA predicting perception of the impact of the camp experience on civic attitudes and intentions with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Results demonstrated significant group differences in perception of the impact of the camp experience on civic attitudes and intentions, $F(3, 154) = 23.01, p < .001, \eta^2 = .31$. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were conducted to examine the source of this difference. Results of these contrasts were as follows: (a) individuals who attended camps that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement ($M = 4.87, SE = .19$) reported significantly higher perceived impact than did individuals who attended the other camp types combined ($M = 3.72, SE = .21$), $t(154) = 5.88, p < .001, r = .43$; (b) individuals who attended camps that emphasized only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement ($M = 4.20, SE = 2.06$) reported significantly higher perceived impact than did individuals who attended camps that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 2.77, SE = .22$), $t(154) = 6.92, p < .001, r = .49$; and (c) individuals who attended camps that emphasized religiosity ($M = 3.92, SE = .20$) did not differ significantly from individuals who attended camps that emphasized social justice/community involvement ($M = 4.47, SE = .21$), $t(154) = -1.584, ns, r = .13$. 
Relationships among Proposed Mediators

Proposed mediators were conceptualized in two categories: participants’ direct reports of the proposed mediators and participants’ reports of the perceived impact of camp on the proposed mediators. Correlations among the direct reports of the proposed mediators are presented in Table 6 and correlations among the reports of perceived impact of camp on the proposed mediators are presented in Table 7. In order to group the proposed mediators meaningfully as dependent variables in MANCOVAs, a principle components analysis using oblimin rotation (because I expected the components to be correlated with one another) was conducted for the eleven proposed mediators (including direct reports of proposed mediators and perceived impact of camp on the proposed mediators). Results indicated two components with eigenvalues > 1. The first component consisted of measures of the perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators: impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement (pattern matrix component loading = .91), impact on commitment to ideological principles (.88), impact on individual religiosity (.82), impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement (.82), and impact on identity exploration (.64). The second component consisted of direct reports of proposed mediators: religious well-being (.84), commitment to ideological principles (.79), belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement (.76), social capital resources related to civic engagement (.64), and identity exploration (.63). Quest/interactional religiosity loaded most highly (.52) on the perceived impact of camp on the proposed mediators component and had a low negative loading on the direct reports of proposed mediators.
Table 6
Correlations among Reports of Proposed Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Mediators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quest/Interactional Religiosity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connection btw. Religiosity and Involvement</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Capital Resources</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commitment to Ideological Principles</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identity Exploration</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01. *** p < .001
Table 7

Correlations among the Perceived Impact of Camp on Proposed Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Mediators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact on Religiosity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impact on Belief in Connection btw. Rel. and Involvement</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impact on Social Capital Resources</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact on Commitment to Ideological Principles</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td>.88***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact on Identity Exploration</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p < .001$
mediators component (-.18). However, because the measure of quest/interactional religiosity is conceptually distinct from the perceived impact measures, it was kept separate from both clusters of mediators. Subsequent MANCOVAs thus tested differences among the four-category camp groups on two sets of proposed mediators: direct reports of mediators and perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators. ANCOVA was used to test differences among the four-category camp groups on the quest/interactional religiosity proposed mediator.

Predicting Proposed Mediators with Camp Type

A MANCOVA predicting the five direct reports of proposed mediators with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Wilks’ Lambda (2.00) indicated significant group differences, $F(15, 339.95) = 2.00, p = .015, \eta^2 = .08$. To explore the group differences, ANCOVAs predicting each of the five mediators were examined. Two ANCOVAs indicated no significant group differences: belief in the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement, $F(3, 127) = 2.07, ns, \eta^2 = .05$; and identity exploration, $F(3, 127) = .28, ns, \eta^2 = .01$. Three ANCOVAs indicated significant group differences: religious well-being, $F(3, 127) = 3.92, p = .01, \eta^2 = .08$; social capital resources related to civic engagement, $F(3, 127) = 3.50, p = .018, \eta^2 = .08$; and commitment to ideological principles, $F(3, 127) = 4.83, p = .003, \eta^2 = .10$. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were examined to explore the source of these differences for each significant ANCOVA. All three contrasts were significant for each mediator. For religious well-being, social capital resources related to civic engagement, and commitment to ideological principles, the following group differences were found: individuals who attended a camp emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community
involvement reported higher levels of each mediator than did individuals who attended any other type of camp; individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of each mediator than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized neither; and individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity reported higher levels of each mediator than did individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only social justice/community involvement. Results of the contrasts and group means are reported in Table 8.

Next, a MANCOVA predicting the five measures of perceived impact of camp on the proposed mediators with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Wilks’ Lambda (.32) indicated significant group differences, $F(15, 414.49) = 14.26, p < .001, \eta^2 = .34$. To explore the group differences, ANCOVAs predicting each of the five mediators were examined. All five ANCOVAs indicated significant group differences: perceived impact on individual religiosity, $F(3, 154) = 43.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .46$; perceived impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, $F(3, 154) = 37.02, p < .001, \eta^2 = .42$; perceived impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement, $F(3, 154) = 34.70, p < .001, \eta^2 = .40$; perceived impact on commitment to ideological principles, $F(3, 154) = 42.39, p < .001, \eta^2 = .45$; and perceived impact on identity exploration, $F(3, 154) = 4.23, p = .007, \eta^2 = .08$. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were examined to explore the source of these differences for each significant ANCOVA. All contrasts except one (contrasting perceived impact on identity exploration means for individuals who attended camps that emphasized religiosity with means for individuals who attended camps that emphasized
Table 8
Results of Contrasts and Group Means for Perceived Impact of Camp on Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tested Mediator</th>
<th>Contrast&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (X vs. Y)</th>
<th>$t$&lt;sup&gt;(df=154)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Effect Size $r$</th>
<th>Group X Mean</th>
<th>Group Y Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.37* .19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.96*** .30</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.09*** .31</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16*** .32</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02* .16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.42* .19</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. To Ideological Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.96** .23</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75** .22</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61*** .28</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest/Interactional Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.35* .19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.19*** .32</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.72 .14</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.34*** .45</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.75*** .58</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.93*** .54</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tested Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tested Mediator</th>
<th>Contrast&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (X vs. Y)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Group X Mean</th>
<th>Group Y Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>df</em> = 154</td>
<td><em>t</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact on Belief in Connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Belief in Connection</td>
<td>9.34***</td>
<td>7.06***</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size r</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Mean</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Y Mean</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact on Social Capital Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Social Capital Resources</td>
<td>6.86***</td>
<td>9.08***</td>
<td>3.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size r</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Mean</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Y Mean</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact on Com. to Ideological Prin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Com. to Ideological Prin.</td>
<td>7.81***</td>
<td>9.53***</td>
<td>4.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size r</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Mean</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Y Mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact on Identity Exploration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Identity Exploration</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
<td>3.43***</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size r</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Mean</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Y Mean</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Contrasts are as follows: 1 = camp emphasizing both religiosity and social justice/community involvement (Group X) vs. camp emphasizing religiosity, social justice/community involvement, or neither (Group Y); 2 = camp emphasizing religiosity or social justice/community involvement (Group X) vs. camp emphasizing religiosity or social justice/community involvement (Group Y); 3 = camp emphasizing religiosity (Group X) vs. camp emphasizing social justice/community involvement (Group Y)

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.
social justice/community involvement) indicated significant group differences in the predicted directions. In other words, for each of the perceived impact mediators (with the exception mentioned earlier), the following group differences were found: individuals who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of impact on each mediator than did individuals who attended any other type of camp; individuals who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of impact on each mediator than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized neither; and individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity reported higher levels of impact on each mediator than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized only social justice/community involvement. Results of the contrasts and group means are reported in Table 8.

Finally, an ANCOVA predicting quest/interactional religiosity with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier, was conducted. Results of the ANCOVA indicated significant group differences, $F(3, 153) = 6.28, p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were examined to explore the source of these differences. The first two contrasts indicated significant group differences; individuals who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of religiosity as a quest than did individuals who attended any other type of camp, and individuals who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of religiosity as a quest than did individuals who...
attended a camp that emphasized neither. Results of the contrasts and group means are reported in Table 8.

Testing the Mediational Model for Reported Levels of Civic Attitudes and Intentions

The dependent variables that were significantly predicted by the four-category camp type variable were personal commitment to civic values and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions. All proposed mediators, except belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement and identity exploration, were significantly predicted by the four-category camp type variable. Therefore, analyses were conducted to test the possibility that the nine proposed mediators reduced or eliminated the relation between the four-category camp type variable and these two dependent variables. The dependent variables that were significantly predicted by the two-category camp type variable were political efficacy and intentions for future politically-oriented involvement. All proposed mediators, except individual religiosity, belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, and identity exploration, were significantly predicted by the two-category camp type variable. Therefore, analyses were conducted to test the possibility that the proposed mediators reduced or eliminated the relation between the two-category camp type variable and these two dependent variables.

Personal Commitment to Civic Values

To test mediation, three ANCOVAs predicting personal commitment to civic values were conducted as follows: (a) personal commitment to civic values was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and the three significant direct reports of mediator variables (religious
well-being, social capital resources related to civic engagement, and commitment to ideological principles); (b) personal commitment to civic values was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and the five significant perceived impact of camp mediator variables; and (c) personal commitment to civic values was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and quest/interactional religiosity. As before, three planned orthogonal contrasts were examined to explore the source of camp type differences for each significant (or marginally significant) ANCOVA.

Results of the first ANCOVA (controlling for significant direct reports of proposed mediators) indicated significant group differences, $F(3, 150) = 3.39, p = .020, \eta^2 = .06$. Thus, the impact of camp type remained significant even when controlling for these mediators, indicating no mediation according to the criteria of Baron and Kenny (1986). Commitment to ideological principles was the only direct report of a proposed mediator that emerged as a significant predictor of personal commitment to civic values, $F(1, 150) = 5.68, p = .018, \eta^2 = .04$; both religious well-being, $F(1, 150) = .10, ns, \eta^2 < .01$, and social capital resources related to civic engagement, $F(1, 150) = .10, ns, \eta^2 < .01$, were non-significant predictors of personal commitment to civic values. Lack of significant prediction of personal commitment to civic values by the latter two tested mediators also indicated no significant mediation in this model. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the camp type difference. Results of these contrasts indicated no significant group differences. An examination of group means were as follows: participants who attended
a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement, $M = 3.89$, $SE = .10$; participants who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity, $M = 3.57$, $SE = .11$; participants who attended a camp that emphasized only social justice/community involvement, $M = 3.85$, $SE = .12$; and participants who attended a camp that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement, $M = 3.52$, $SE = .12$. The overall group difference, then, seems to be accounted for by a pattern different from that tested by the contrasts.

Results of the second ANCOVA (controlling for significant perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(3, 148) = 2.44$, $p = .066$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, none of the perceived impact of camp variables had a significant relation with the dependent variable: impact on religiosity, $F(1, 148) = .46$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, $F(1, 148) = .01$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement, $F(1, 148) = 1.40$, $ns$, $\eta^2 = .01$; impact on commitment to ideological principles, $F(1, 148) = .12$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; and impact on identity exploration, $F(1, 148) = 2.29$, $ns$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Lack of significant prediction of personal commitment to civic values by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the marginally significant camp type difference. Results of the first contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized both religiosity and social justice/community involvement ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .12$) reported higher levels of personal commitment to civic values than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized
only religiosity, only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement \((M = 3.65, SD = .14)\), \(t(148) = 2.1, p < .05, r = .17\).

Results of the second and third contrasts were not significant: \(t(148) = 1.30, ns, r = .11\), and \(t(148) = -2.20, ns, r = .18\), respectively.

Results of the third ANCOVA (controlling for quest/interactional religiosity) indicated significant group differences, \(F(3, 152) = 2.73, p = .046, \eta^2 = .05\). Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, quest/interactional religiosity was not a significant predictor of personal commitment to civic values, \(F(1, 152) = 2.01, ns, \eta^2 = .01\). Lack of significant prediction of personal commitment to civic values by the tested mediator indicated no significant mediation in this model. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the camp type difference. Results of these contrasts indicated no significant group differences.

In sum, the tested models do not provide evidence for any significant mediation of the association between the four-category camp type variable and personal commitment to civic values.

**Political Efficacy**

To test mediation, three ANCOVAs predicting political efficacy were conducted as follows: (a) political efficacy was predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier and the two significant direct reports of mediator variables (social capital resources related to civic engagement and commitment to ideological principles); (b) political efficacy was predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated
earlier and the five significant perceived impact of camp mediator variables; and (c) political efficacy was predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier and quest/interactional religiosity.

Results of the first ANCOVA (controlling for significant direct reports of proposed mediators) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(1, 157) = 3.30$, $p = .071$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, neither social capital resources related to civic engagement nor commitment to ideological principles were significant predictors of political efficacy; $F(1, 157) = .02$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$, and $F(1, 157) = .01$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$, respectively. Lack of significant prediction of political efficacy by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of political efficacy ($M = 4.00$, $SE = .14$) than did participants who attended any other kind of camp ($M = 3.70$, $SE = .08$).

Results of the second ANCOVA (controlling for perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(1, 154) = 2.85$, $p = .093$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, none of the measures of perceived impact were significant predictors of political efficacy: impact on religiosity, $F(1, 154) = .76$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, $F(1, 154) = .28$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement, $F(1, 154) = .82$, $ns$, $\eta^2 = .01$; impact on commitment to ideological principles, $F(1, 154) = .34$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$; and impact on identity exploration, $F(1, 154) = .56$, $ns$, $\eta^2 < .01$. Lack of
significant prediction of political efficacy by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of political efficacy ($M = 4.01$, $SE = .15$) than did participants who attended any other type of camp ($M = 3.70$, $SE = .09$).

Results of the third ANCOVA (controlling for quest/interactional religiosity) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(1, 157) = 3.10$, $p = .080$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, quest/interactional religiosity was not a significant predictor of political efficacy, $F(1, 157) = 1.75$, $ns$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Lack of significant prediction of political efficacy by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/ community involvement reported higher levels of political efficacy ($M = 3.98$, $SE = .13$) than did participants who attended any other kind of camp ($M = 3.71$, $SE = .08$).

In sum, the tested models do not provide evidence for any significant mediation of the association between the two-category camp type variable and political efficacy.

**Intentions for Future Politically-Oriented Involvement**

To test mediation, three ANCOVAs predicting intentions for future politically-oriented involvement were conducted as follows: (a) intentions for future politically-oriented involvement were predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier and the two significant direct reports of mediator variables (social capital resources related to civic engagement and commitment to ideological principles); (b) intentions for future politically-oriented
involvement were predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier and the five significant perceived impact of camp mediator variables; and (c) intentions for future politically-oriented involvement were predicted with the two-category camp type variable, controlling for the two background variables indicated earlier and quest/interactional religiosity.

Results of the first ANCOVA (controlling for significant direct reports of proposed mediators) indicated marginally significant group differences, $F(1, 157) = 3.87$, $p = .051$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, neither social capital resources related to civic engagement nor commitment to ideological principles were significant predictors of future politically-oriented involvement: $F(1, 157) = .28$, ns, $\eta^2 < .01$, and $F(1, 157) = .31$, ns, $\eta^2 < .01$, respectively. Lack of significant prediction of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement ($M = 3.16$, $SE = .14$) than did participants who attended any other type of camp ($M = 2.82$, $SE = .09$).

Results of the second ANCOVA (controlling for perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators) indicated significant group differences, $F(1, 154) = 5.07$, $p = .026$, $\eta^2 = .03$. Thus, the impact of camp type remained significant even when controlling for these mediators, suggesting no significant mediation according to the criteria of Baron and Kenny (1986). Perceived impact of camp on identity exploration was a marginally significant predictor of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, $F(1, 154) =
3.14, \( p = .078, \eta^2 = .02 \). The other four measures of perceived impact were not significant predictors of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement: impact on religiosity, \( F(1, 154) = .23, \) ns, \( \eta^2 < .01 \); impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, \( F(1, 154) = 1.87, \) ns, \( \eta^2 = .01 \); impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement, \( F(1, 154) = .10, \) ns, \( \eta^2 < .01 \); and impact on commitment to ideological principles, \( F(1, 154) = .00, \) ns, \( \eta^2 < .01 \).

Lack of significant prediction of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement by the tested mediators indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement (\( M = 3.23, SE = .16 \)) than did participants who attended any other type of camp (\( M = 2.79, SE = .09 \)).

Results of the third ANCOVA (controlling for quest/interactional religiosity) indicated marginally significant group differences, \( F(1, 157) = 3.15, \) \( p = .078, \eta^2 = .02 \). Thus, the impact of camp type was reduced, consistent with mediation. Yet, quest/interactional religiosity was not a significant predictor of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, \( F(1, 157) = .86, \) ns, \( \eta^2 = .01 \). Lack of significant prediction of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement by the tested mediator indicated no significant mediation in this model. Comparison of group means indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement (\( M = 3.13, SE = .14 \)) than did participants who attended any other type of camp (\( M = 2.84, SE = .09 \)).
In sum, the tested models do not provide evidence for any significant mediation of the association between the two-category camp type variable and intentions for future politically-oriented involvement.

Testing the Mediatinal Model for Perceptions of the Impact of Camp on Civic Outcomes

To test mediation, three ANCOVAs predicting perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions were conducted as follows: (a) perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and the three significant direct reports of mediator variables (religious well-being, social capital resources related to civic engagement, and commitment to ideological principles); (b) perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and the five significant perceived impact of camp mediator variables; and (c) perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions was predicted with the four-category camp type variable, controlling for the five background variables indicated earlier and quest/interactional religiosity. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were examined to explore the source of these differences for each significant (or marginally significant) ANCOVA.

Results of the first ANCOVA (controlling for significant direct reports of proposed mediators) indicated significant group differences, $F(3, 151) = 21.12, p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .30$. Thus, the impact of camp type remained significant even when controlling for these mediators, suggesting no significant mediation according to the criteria of Baron and Kenny (1986). Although the four-category camp type variable continued to predict
the perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, individual religiosity and commitment to ideological principles were also significant predictors of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions: $F(1, 151) = 4.91, p = .028, \eta^2 = .03$ and $F(1, 151) = 6.47, p = .012, \eta^2 = .04$, respectively. Social capital resources related to civic engagement was not a significant predictor of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, $F(1, 151) = .36, ns, \eta^2 < .01$. These results would be consistent with mediation (according to the criteria of Baron and Kenny, 1986) had there been a reduction in the association between the camp type variable and the perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions when controlling for the direct reports of proposed mediators. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the camp type difference; results of the contrasts indicated the same pattern of group differences as analyses that did not control for proposed mediators. Specifically, results of the first contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement ($M = 4.87, SE = .19$) reported higher levels of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity, only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 3.72, SE = .21$), $t(125) = 4.62, p < .001, r = .38$. Results of the second contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized either religiosity or social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions ($M = 4.27, SE = .21$) than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 2.63, SE = .22$), $t(125) = 4.50, p < .001, r = .37$. 
Results of the third contrast indicated no significant group differences, \( t(125) = -1.52, \text{ns}, r = .13 \).

Results of the second ANCOVA (controlling for perceived impact of camp on proposed mediators) indicated significant group differences, \( F(3, 149) = 6.19, p = .001, \eta^2 = .11 \). Although the four-category camp type variable continued to predict the perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, this association was reduced (original \( F = 23.01 \)), consistent with mediation. Also consistent with mediation, four of the perceived impact of camp proposed mediator variables were significant predictors of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions: impact on religiosity, \( F(1, 149) = 4.75, p = .031, \eta^2 = .03 \); impact on social capital resources related to civic engagement, \( F(1, 149) = 14.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09 \); impact on commitment to ideological principles, \( F(1, 149) = 8.62, p = .004, \eta^2 = .05 \); and impact on identity exploration, \( F(1, 149) = 15.59, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09 \). Impact on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement was not a significant predictor of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, \( F(1, 149) = .001, \text{ns}, \eta^2 < .01 \). These results indicate partial mediation in the present model. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the significant camp type difference; results of the first and third contrasts indicated the same pattern of group differences as analyses that did not control for proposed mediators. Specifically, results of the first contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement (\( M = 4.27, SE = .16 \)) reported higher levels of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity,
only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 3.94$, $SE = .18$), $t(149) = 2.14$, $p < .05$, $r = .17$. Results of the second and third contrasts were not significant: $t(149) = 1.87$, $ns$, $r = .15$, and $t(149) = -4.27$, $ns$, $r = .33$, respectively.

Results of the third ANCOVA (controlling for quest/interactional religiosity) indicated significant group differences, $F(3, 152) = 18.31$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .27$. Although the four-category camp type variable continued to predict the perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, this association was slightly reduced (original $F = 23.01$), consistent with mediation. Also consistent with mediation, quest/interactional religiosity was a significant predictor of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions, $F(1, 152) = 7.70$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .05$. These results indicate partial mediation in the present model. Three planned orthogonal contrasts (as described earlier) were then conducted to examine the source of the camp type difference; results of the contrasts indicated the same pattern of group differences as analyses that did not control for proposed mediators. Specifically, results of the first contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement ($M = 4.87$, $SE = .19$) reported higher levels of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized only religiosity, only social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 3.72$, $SE = .21$), $t(152) = 5.44$, $p < .001$, $r = .40$. Results of the second contrast indicated that participants who attended a camp that emphasized either religiosity or social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions ($M = 4.20$, $SE = .21$)
than did participants who attended a camp that emphasized neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement ($M = 2.77$, $SE = .22$), $t(152) = 6.11$, $p < .001$, $r = .44$. Results of the third contrast indicated no significant group differences $t(152) = -1.97$, $ns$, $r = .16$. 

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the association of camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement with civic attitudes and intentions. I hypothesized that this particular kind of camp experience would be a potentially powerful predictor of civic attitudes and intentions. A number of potential mediators of the hypothesized relationship between camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions were also examined. Finally, because the study was a one-time correlational study that could not directly address cause and effect, individuals’ perceptions of the impact of their camp experiences on their own civic attitudes and intentions and the proposed mediators were examined. Results indicate three general conclusions.

First, there was some support for my hypothesis that camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement would be associated with higher levels of civic attitudes and intentions than camp experiences emphasizing just religiosity, just social justice/community involvement, or neither. However, associations supporting this hypothesis were infrequent and only marginally significant and therefore must be interpreted tentatively. Second, there was a great deal of support for the hypothesis that camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement would be associated with higher levels of the proposed mediators. However, the constructs proposed as mediators generally did not predict civic attitudes and intentions; therefore they did not serve as mediators of the association of camp type with civic attitudes and intentions. Third, there was stronger support for the hypothesized model when predicting individuals’ perceptions of the impact of camp on
civic attitudes and intentions. Each conclusion will be discussed in terms of implications and limitations of the current findings and suggestions for future research.

Association of Camp Type with Civic Attitudes and Intentions

Camp type predicted three of the nine civic attitudes and intentions measured: personal commitment to civic values, political efficacy, and intentions for future political involvement. As predicted, for all three dependent variables, individuals who attended a camp emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported more positive civic attitudes and intentions than did individuals having been to any other type of camp. Admittedly, the significance levels of the multivariate analyses including these civic attitudes and intentions were only marginally significant, perhaps raising questions about whether I should have used follow-up analyses to explore results for individual variables. However, it is notable that all planned contrasts indicated differences in the predicted direction. If some results indicated the expected pattern and others indicated alternative patterns, it would seem likely that the differences were due to chance. Therefore, although the marginal results limit the certainty with which any conclusions can be drawn from these results, it seems worth noting that there is at least a trend toward a unique association of camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement with higher levels of certain civic attitudes and intentions.

Furthermore, results suggest that the association between camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions might be stronger when predicting politically-oriented civic attitudes and intentions than when predicting community-oriented civic attitudes and intentions. Of the seven community-oriented measures, only one differed significantly by camp type whereas both of the politically-oriented measures differed significantly by
camp type. This might be due to reduced variability in measures of community-oriented civic attitudes and intentions, as civic attitudes and intentions that differed significantly by camp type tended to have larger ranges and larger standard deviations than did civic attitudes and intentions that did not differ significantly by camp type.

In sum, the prediction that a camp experience emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement would be a potentially powerful predictor of civic attitudes and intentions because this kind of camp experience would likely provide the characteristics of service experiences suggested to promote civic attitudes and intentions (e.g., provision of an ideological framework within which service is done, social capital resources related to civic engagement, and emphasis on the integration of religiosity with social justice/community involvement) did not receive overwhelming support. There was no significant effect of camp type on six of the nine measures of civic attitudes and intentions. Nonetheless, there was a trend in the predicted direction for three dependent variables and as I will elaborate later, some limitations of the current study might have precluded illumination of a stronger effect.

Evidence for Mediation in Predicting Civic Attitudes and Intentions

Consistent with my hypotheses, camp type predicted several of the proposed mediators. The four-category camp type variable predicted nine proposed mediators: individual religiosity, social capital resources related to civic engagement, commitment to ideological principles, impact of camp on individual religiosity, impact of camp on belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, impact of camp on social capital resources related to civic engagement, impact of camp on commitment to ideological principles, impact of camp on identity exploration, and quest/
interactional religiosity. The two-category camp type variable predicted eight proposed mediators (these same mediators with the exception of individual religiosity). Furthermore, all contrasts but two indicated group differences in the expected direction. Specifically, individuals who attended a camp emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of each of these mediators than did individuals who attended any other type of camp; individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity or only social justice/community involvement reported higher levels of each of these same mediators than did individuals who attended a camp that emphasized neither; and individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only religiosity reported higher levels of each mediator than did individuals who attended a camp emphasizing only social justice/community involvement.

Despite these strong and consistent associations between camp type and the proposed mediators, there was little evidence that these constructs actually mediated a relation between camp type and civic attitudes and intentions. There are different ways one might analyze data to explore the possibility of mediated relations such as I proposed in my hypothesized model (see Figure 1). Baron and Kenny (1986) argue that a mediated relation requires the following: (a) a significant relation between the predictor and the dependent variable; (b) a significant relation between the predictor and the mediators; (c) a reduction or elimination of the relation between the predictor and dependent variable when mediators are controlled; and (d) a significant relation between the mediator and the dependent variable when the predictor is controlled. Guided by this approach, I tested the possibility of mediation for the three civic attitudes and intentions that were at least marginally predicted by camp type.
The first criterion required for mediation by Baron and Kenny (1986), a significant relation between the predictor and the dependent variable, was satisfied by three civic attitudes and intentions: personal commitment to civic values, political efficacy, and intentions for future politically-oriented involvement. The second criterion required for mediation, a significant relation between the predictor and the mediator, was satisfied by the proposed mediators listed above. The third criterion for mediation, reduction or elimination of the relation between the predictor and dependent variable when mediators are controlled, was sometimes met and sometimes not. However, in all of the models in which there was a reduction of the association of the predictor with the dependent variable, the fourth criterion for mediation, prediction of the dependent variable by the mediator, was not met. Thus, none of the models tested indicated mediation according to the criteria of Baron and Kenny.

An alternative approach to mediation is to examine the joint significance of the two mediating pathways (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002): in this case, the first mediating pathway requires prediction of the mediator by the predictor, and the second mediating pathway requires prediction of the dependent variable by the mediator. Using this approach, one can argue evidence for mediation if the two paths are significant regardless of the direct association between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. MacKinnon et al. (2002) argue that this approach has greater power and more accurate Type I error rates than other methods, including that of Baron and Kenny (1986). Using this approach, there is some evidence for mediation along two pathways. When predicting personal commitment to civic values, camp type was a significant predictor of commitment to ideological principles, and commitment to
ideological principles was a significant predictor of personal commitment to civic values, thus indicating mediation according to the criteria of joint significance of the two mediating paths (MacKinnon et al., 2002). When predicting intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, camp type was a significant predictor of perceived impact of camp on identity exploration, and perceived impact of camp on identity exploration was a marginally significant predictor of intentions for future politically-oriented involvement, thus suggesting possible mediation according to the criteria of joint significance of the two mediating paths.

In sum, tests of mediation according to Baron and Kenny’s (1986) criteria indicate no mediation in the hypothesized models, but tests of mediation according to the criteria of joint significance of the two mediating paths (MacKinnon et al., 2002) indicate some support for two mediated relationships in the hypothesized model. Regardless of which criteria for mediation are used, there is a paucity of evidence for mediation, primarily because the proposed mediators failed to predict civic attitudes and intentions.

Given the one-time correlational study design, even where data are consistent with the proposed model, it is possible that causal pathways are different than what I have hypothesized. For example, individuals with different levels of personal commitment to civic values and different levels of commitment to ideological principles are very likely to select their camps differently to begin with. To the extent that camp type is associated with any of the proposed mediators or dependent variables in the direction predicted, I cannot distinguish which came first: the camp experiences or the attitudes and intentions. In order to begin to get insight into possible causality within this study, I examined participants’ perceptions of the impact of camp on their own attitudes and intentions.
Association of Camp Type with Perceived Impact of Camp on Civic Attitudes and Intentions

Despite only weak support for an association between camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions, much stronger support was obtained for an association between camp experiences and perceived impact of camp experiences on civic attitudes and intentions. Specifically, college freshman who attended camps that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement were more likely than college freshman who attended any other type of camp to believe that camp influenced their belief in the connection between religiosity and social justice/community involvement, their level of social capital resources related to civic engagement, their commitment to ideological principles, their level of identity exploration, and their civic attitudes and intentions.

In the case of perceived impact there was also much more evidence consistent with the hypothesized mediated relationships. If using the criteria of Baron and Kenny (1986), five significant mediators are indicated; if using the criteria of joint significance of two the two mediating paths (MacKinnon et al., 2002), seven significant mediators are indicated. According to Baron and Kenny’s criteria, because the association between camp type and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions is not reduced when controlling for direct reports of proposed mediators, no direct reports of proposed mediators significantly mediate this relationship. According to the criteria of joint significance of the two mediating paths (MacKinnon et al., 2002), however, both individual religiosity and commitment to ideological principles are significant mediators of the relationship between camp type and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes
and intentions. Both Baron and Kenny’s criteria and joint significance of mediating paths criteria indicate mediation of the relationship between camp type and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions by the following: perceived impact of camp on individual religiosity, perceived impact of camp on social capital resources related to civic engagement, perceived impact of camp on commitment to ideological principles, perceived impact of camp on identity exploration, and quest/interactional religiosity. Each of these five variables predicted perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions and each contributed to a reduction of the relationship between camp type and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions when entered as controls.

Overall, these results suggest that individuals who attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and social justice/community involvement perceived significantly greater increases in their civic attitudes and intentions than did individuals who attended any other type of camp. Furthermore, this association appears to be partially mediated by a number of variables, although the main effect of camp type on perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions remains significant beyond what can be explained by the mediators alone.

Although the conclusion that camp type (and associated experiences) predicts the perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions is also limited by the one-time correlational nature of this study, the problem of determining cause and effect does not seem as pernicious here as it does when predicting civic attitudes and intentions directly. Regardless of the actual direction of influence between camp experiences and civic attitudes and intentions, the individuals themselves seem to believe that the camp is affecting their civic attitudes and intentions in the ways I hypothesized. Furthermore,
there is some evidence of mediation in that perceived impact of camp on individual religiosity, perceived impact of camp on social capital resources related to civic engagement, perceived impact of camp on commitment to ideological principles, perceived impact of camp on identity exploration, and quest/interactional religiosity were linked to both camp type and perceived impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions.

Even with respect to perceived impact of camp, two possibilities for the process by which camp type might have an influence can be distinguished: (a) individuals attend camp, perceive changes in their own civic attitudes and intentions, and attribute those changes to their camp experience; or, (b) individuals believe that camp experiences can change civic attitudes and intentions and therefore attend camps that are perceived to be likely to bring about these kinds of changes, later endorsing the changes expected. In either case, however, individuals believe their civic attitudes and intentions change as a result of the camp experience.

What the present study can not address is whether this matters. Does an individual’s perception that camp “changed my life,” particularly civic attitudes and intentions, actually predict behavior or is it indicative only of fond memories? Longitudinal studies incorporating the perception of the impact of camp on civic attitudes and intentions with civic behavioral outcomes are needed to answer this question. If the individual’s perception of increases in civic attitudes and intentions predicts civic behavior independently of mean level changes in reported civic attitudes and intentions, this would suggest that the perception that camp changes the individual’s civic attitudes and intentions influences behavior through some mechanism other than changes in concurrent civic attitudes and intentions. Given the possible role of mediators such as
individual religiosity, social capital resources, and commitment to ideological principles, future studies should also ensure that these mediators and the individuals’ perceptions of the impact of camp on these mediators continue to be measured in studies predicting civic behaviors.

**Limitations and Future Research**

As already noted, one limitation of this study is that it utilized a one-time correlational methodology, which precludes any kind of causal conclusions. In other words, it is unclear if individuals’ civic attitudes and intentions are caused in part by their camp experiences or if their specific kinds of camp experiences were chosen in part because of their civic attitudes and intentions. Longitudinal or quasi-experimental studies of camp experiences are needed to address causality.

The present participants were freshman attending a private liberal arts university in the American southeast. The sample consisted primarily of European-American students from middle-class families. This sample is not representative of the population of late adolescents and generalizability of conclusions is therefore limited. By the same token, the homogeneity of the sample might have reduced variability in our measures, leading to restrictions in our ability to uncover the hypothesized associations. Future research with a larger, more diverse sample might provide greater statistical power, increasing the likelihood of illuminating any associations that truly exist in addition to increasing generalizability.

The approach to measuring camp type also might have error that interfered with an ability to uncover predicted associations. Participants reported whether and how often they attended various types of camps and were grouped with one of the four camp types
based on these reports. Measures of reported characteristics of the camp experience, including emphasis and reflection on religiosity, social justice/community involvement, and the integration of the two, were used to check the validity of the camp type variable. Because camp types differed in the predicted directions on reports of the characteristics of the camp experience, the categorical camp type variable was used as the independent variable. Still, it’s possible that a more powerful, less error-prone approach would be to use continuous measures of the characteristics of camp experiences believed to be important in predicting civic attitudes and intentions. Furthermore, although I assessed some basic descriptive information about what was emphasized in each type of camp, I did not measure how each camp conveyed its particular emphases to campers. For example, I do not know if camps emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement discussed the connection between these in a structured curriculum, during informal conversations, in small discussion groups, or in other ways. It is possible that the impact of a camp experience emphasizing themes such as the connection between religiosity and social justice/community service depends on the method by which the theme is conveyed; in other words, method of instruction might moderate the association of camp type with civic attitudes and intentions. If method of instruction differed significantly by camp type, it is possible that assessing this variable could help to illuminate more clearly differences in the association of camp type with civic attitudes and intentions.

Another limitation of this study is the reliance entirely on self-report measures, and the fact that a number of the measures were either developed or modified for the present study. Although the developed measures demonstrated adequate reliability
(Cronbach’s $\alpha > .70$), no tests of validity of the measures were conducted. The previously established measures did not always demonstrate adequate reliability (specifically, intentions for future political involvement, political efficacy, humanitarianism, and quest/interactional religiosity) although they had been previously tested for validity and reliability. Because the reliability and validity of some measures are not well established, the results of the study must be interpreted with caution. Future studies should evaluate the validity of the measures developed for this study in addition to modifying the established scales in order to improve the reliability of these measures.

Furthermore, many of the measures included in the present study are highly susceptible to social desirability biases. Although social desirability did not differ significantly by camp type, more objective behavioral or observational measures would help to reduce any potential impact of social desirability. Researchers could collect data from camp staff, parents of adolescents, and peers at camp to obtain multiple and more objective reports of the adolescent’s civic attitudes, intentions, and behaviors. In sum, future studies should obtain self-report, informant-report, and observational data from multiple reporters.

**Conclusion**

In this study, the association of camp experiences emphasizing religiosity and social justice/community involvement, just religiosity, just social justice/community involvement, or neither religiosity nor social justice/community involvement with civic attitudes and intentions was examined. A cautious conclusion of the study is that there might be some unique associations between attending a camp that explicitly emphasizes and integrates religiosity and social justice/community involvement on the one hand and
civic attitudes and intentions on the other. Despite the tentative nature of this conclusion, the data clearly indicate that late adolescents who have been to a camp that emphasizes religiosity and social justice/community involvement attribute significantly more positive changes in their own civic attitudes and intentions to that camp experience than do adolescents attending any other type of camp. This finding provides empirical support for the anecdotal observation that many people attribute great significance to their summer camp experiences. Future research should therefore focus more attention on camp experiences, seeking to understand not only the impact such experiences may have on adolescent development, but also the specific mechanisms through which camps might influence specific attitudes, intentions, and behaviors in adolescence.
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Appendix I
Mass Testing Materials

The following questions assess whether you have attended either of the following kinds of camps:

- camps that seek to develop, emphasize, or have a strong theme related to religious faith (e.g., Christian church camps, Jewish camps, Muslim camps)
- camps that seek to develop, emphasize, or have a strong theme related to volunteerism/community involvement (e.g., camps in which time is spent in service projects, camps that emphasize social justice, SPARC)

We need to identify people who have different amounts (including no) experience with such camps, so please be honest in your reports. Please consider participation in SPARC or PreSchool as camp experiences.

Have you ever attended a camp that emphasizes religious faith, but does not specifically emphasize volunteerism/community involvement?  Yes _____ No _____

- If yes, did you attend such a camp this past summer (2008)?  Yes _____ No _____
- How many times since completing 9th grade have you attended such a camp? _____ times
- If yes, approximately how long (in days) did you stay at such camps each time you attended? _____ days, on average each time

Have you ever attended a camp that emphasizes volunteerism/community involvement, but does not specifically emphasize religious faith?  Yes _____ No _____

- If yes, did you attend such a camp this past summer (2008)?  Yes _____ No _____
- How many times since completing 9th grade have you attended such a camp? _____ times
- If yes, approximately how long (in days) did you stay at such camps each time you attended? _____ days, on average each time

Have you ever attended a camp that emphasizes both religious faith and volunteerism/community involvement?  Yes _____ No _____

- If yes, did you attend such a camp this past summer (2008)?  Yes _____ No _____
- How many times since completing 9th grade have you attended such a camp? _____ times
- If yes, approximately how long (in days) did you stay at such camps each time you attended? _____ days, on average each time

Think of all the camps you have attended since completing 9th grade. How would you describe the focus of the camp(s) (check all that apply)?

- Outdoor/Adventure
- Music
- Political Awareness or Involvement
- Fine Arts
- Religious
- Leadership Building
- Community Service/Volunteerism
- Educational (please describe below)
- Sports
Appendix II

Participant Consent Forms

Dear Participant,

You have been selected to participate in this study because of answers you provided about camping experiences during previous testing sessions with the psychology department at Wake Forest University. The present study examines various summer camp experiences and the impact of such behaviors on a variety of attitudes, values, and behaviors.

What is involved?
If you agree to help out with this research, you would fill out a survey on-line at a time that is convenient for you. You can take this survey at home or any place you can get on the internet. Just make sure you are alone in a quiet and private place where you can answer honestly without anyone influencing your answers. The survey will take about 30 minutes. It will ask questions about your experiences, attitudes, goals, and behavior. For example, there are questions about what you’d like to do in the future and your beliefs and attitudes about being involved in the community and in political activities. There are also some questions about your religious beliefs and practices. There are no risks to filling out the survey different than if you talked about these topics in your everyday life.

What are my rights?
You can choose whether or not to complete the survey. If you decide to participate, you can skip questions you do not want to answer or stop whenever you want to. If you decide not to participate, no negative consequences will occur.

Why should I consider doing this?
If you participate, you will receive ½ credits toward fulfillment of course requirements for your Introductory to Psychology class. If you do fill out the survey, the information you give will help researchers and other people who work with young adults to understand how experiences at a summer camp might affect attitudes about religious faith and community activities. There will be no direct benefits to you, but the information you give will help others.

Who will see my answers?
If you fill out the survey, your answers will be kept confidential (private). We will not share your answers on the survey with any individual. Only the researchers at Wake Forest will see the information you give, and we keep all information confidential. No names or other identifying information will be connected with your survey answers, and all results of the study will be provided as group averages and percents.

All study information will be kept in secure, password-protected, computer files or in locked file cabinets in a secure office at Wake Forest University. Data files will be kept only for as long as they are scientifically useful and then they will be destroyed.
Has this study been approved?
This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of Wake Forest University--Reynolda Campus. This is a group of people whose job is to protect your rights as a research participant. Because this study is done on the internet, we can’t completely guarantee that your information will be private, but we will do everything we possibly can to keep it private.

What if I have questions?
If you have any questions about this study, contact Christy Buchanan at (336)758-5123 or buchanan@wfu.edu or Holly Wegman at (813)244-2377 or wegmhl7@wfu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, please call the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Wake Forest University (336)758-5888.

How do I take the survey?
The web site where you can take the survey is:

http://www.survey link.com

At the start of the survey you will be reminded of the information in this letter. At that time, you can indicate that you have read this information and your agreement to participate, if you choose, by proceeding to take the survey.

Thank you for your valuable help!

Christy Buchanan, Investigator
Wake Forest University

Holly Wegman, Investigator
Wake Forest University
Appendix III

Survey Copy

If you have any questions about the purpose of the research study “The Impact of a Camp Experience on Attitudes and Behaviors of Young Adults” please contact Christy Buchanan at buchanan@wfu.edu or Holly Wegman at wegmhl7@wfu.edu.

If you do not have questions about the purpose of the study or your rights as a participant, please read the following statement and indicate your agreement by clicking the “I agree to participate” button below.

I have received a consent form including information about the purpose of the study on “The Impact of a Camp Experience on Attitudes and Behaviors of Young Adults”. I have also been informed of my rights as a participant. I indicate my agreement by marking “I Agree to Participate” below:

Do you agree to participate in this study?
- I Agree to Participate
- I Do NOT Agree to Participate
- I would like to review the consent form

Next
Form A
During mass testing in the psychology department earlier this term, you indicated that, since completing ninth grade, you have attended a camp that emphasized religiosity and volunteerism/community involvement. As you take this survey, please keep the following things in mind:

- When asked about your camp experience, please think only about your experience at a camp that emphasized religiosity and volunteerism/community involvement.
- Not all questions are about camp experiences; questions relating to the camp experience will be explicitly stated as such.
- All other questions should be answered more generally – not just thinking about the camp experience.

Form B
During mass testing in the psychology department earlier this term, you indicated that, since completing ninth grade, you have attended a camp that emphasized religious faith, but did not specifically emphasize volunteerism/community involvement. As you take this survey, please keep the following things in mind:

- When asked about your camp experience, please think only about your experience at a camp that emphasized religious faith.
- Not all questions are about camp experiences; questions relating to the camp experience will be explicitly stated as such.
- All other questions should be answered more generally – not just thinking about the camp experience.

Form C
During mass testing in the psychology department earlier this term, you indicated that, since completing ninth grade, you have attended a camp that emphasized volunteerism/community involvement, but did not specifically emphasize religious faith. As you take this survey, please keep the following things in mind:

- When asked about your camp experience, please think only about your experience at a camp that emphasized volunteerism/community involvement.
- Not all questions are about camp experiences; questions relating to the camp experience will be explicitly stated as such.
- All other questions should be answered more generally – not just thinking about the camp experience.

Form D
During mass testing in the psychology department earlier this term, you indicated that, since completing ninth grade, you have attended a camp that emphasized neither volunteerism/community involvement nor religious faith. As you take this survey, please keep the following things in mind:

- When asked about your camp experience, please think only about your experience at a camp that emphasized neither volunteerism/community involvement nor religious faith.
- Not all questions are about camp experiences; questions relating to the camp experience will be explicitly stated as such.
- All other questions should be answered more generally – not just thinking about the camp experience.
There will be a few terms that you will see throughout this survey that you may or may not be familiar with. Please take a moment to review these terms below. Use the definitions provided to help you answer the questions that contain these terms.

- **Social Justice**: the principle that all people should receive fair treatment and equal access to the resources and benefits of society; issues of concern to advocates of social justice include poverty, HIV/AIDS, human rights, and education

- **Community Involvement**: includes helping the community by completing tasks (for example, helping to build a home or community center), serving other people (for example, working in a soup kitchen), or participating in local or national politics (for example, volunteering for a campaign or collecting signatures for a petition)

- **Religious Faith**: Please interpret this in whatever way is most meaningful to you.
Before beginning this survey, please make sure you are alone in a private place where no one will influence your answers.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Please enter your WFU ID number (this will only be used to link your current responses with your responses provided during mass testing and to assign you credit for participation; this will NOT be used to identify you in any way)

Are you:

_____ Male  
_____ Female

Your Birth Date:  
MM/DD/YYYY

What is your year in school?

_____ Freshman  
_____ Sophomore  
_____ Junior  
_____ Senior

What is your ethnicity (you may check more than one, if applicable)?

_____ Asian or Asian-American  
_____ African or African-American  
_____ White, Non-Hispanic  
_____ Latino/Hispanic  
_____ Other (please specify)

What is your mother’s highest level of education?

_____ Less than high school  
_____ High school degree  
_____ Some college or vocational school  
_____ College graduate  
_____ Graduate or Professional Degree

What is your father’s highest level of education?

_____ Less than high school  
_____ High school degree  
_____ Some college or vocational school  
_____ College graduate  
_____ Graduate or Professional Degree
CAMP EXPERIENCE

Thinking about your most recent time at the specific camp described above, please answer the following:

How long did the camp last?
   _____ Less than 1 Week
   _____ 1 Week
   _____ 2 – 3 Weeks
   _____ 4 or More Weeks

Was the camp an overnight/residential camp or a day camp (i.e., you stayed at your own house each night)?
   _____ Residential _____ Day

Who attended this camp?
   _____ Boys and Girls
   _____ Boys Only
   _____ Girls Only

How would you describe the major goals or mission of this camp?
Please take your time and answer the questions thoughtfully and honestly from your perspective. This is important for the research to be meaningful.

There are no right or wrong answers - it is important for us to know what YOU think.

Thinking about all of your experiences at the specific type of camp described above, please answer the following:

Have you ever served as a leader at this camp (counselor, counselor in training, junior counselor, etc.)?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

Do you plan to serve as a leader at this camp (counselor, counselor in training, junior counselor, etc.)?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

Why did you choose to attend this camp?

Do you believe that this camp changed important aspects of your values, goals, or identity as related to community service/social justice?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

If YES, how do you think you have changed?

If YES, what is it about going to camp that you believe caused these changes to occur? Please be as specific as possible.
As you read the following statements, please think about all of your experiences at the *specific type of camp* described above. Rate your agreement with each statement using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emphasis on Religious Faith**
- Religious faith was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions
- Spirituality was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions

**Emphasis on Social Justice / Service**
- Social justice was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions
- Community involvement was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions

**Emphasis on Faith + Social Justice / Service**
- The connection between faith and social justice was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions
- The connection between faith and community involvement was a central focus of many camp activities and/or discussions

**Reflection on Religious Faith**
- I discussed my religious faith with my peers and leaders/counselors at camp
- Being at this camp stimulated me to talk or think about my faith

**Reflection on Social Justice / Service**
- I discussed experiences doing service or working for social justice with my peers and leaders/counselors at camp
- Being at this camp stimulated me to talk or think about taking action for social justice
- Being at this camp stimulated me to talk or think about social issues, for example, poverty, HIV/AIDS, or human rights

**Reflection on Faith + Social Justice / Service**
- I discussed the connection between religious faith and service or social justice with my peers and leaders/counselors at camp
- Being at this camp stimulated me to talk or think about connections between religious faith and the needs of the world

**Choice / Independence**
- I was able to decide what activities I participated in at camp
- At least some of the time at camp, I had a choice in what kinds of activities I did or how I spent my time
- I felt a sense of independence at camp

**General Social Capital Gained**
- I felt connected with camp counselors, staff, and other adults at camp
- There was at least one person at camp who I looked up to as a role model
- I have stayed in touch with people (counselors or peers) I met through camp
- I had a chance to spend free time with the counselors or adults at this camp
INDIVIDUAL RELIGIOSITY

Religious Well-Being Scale
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately disagree, 4 = moderately agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree
- I don’t find much satisfaction in private prayer
- I believe there is a higher power
- A higher power loves me and cares about me
- I have a personally meaningful relationship with a higher power
- I don’t get much personal support from a higher power
- A higher power is concerned about my problems
- I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with a higher power
- My relationship with a higher power helps me not to feel lonely
- I am most fulfilled when I’m in close fellowship with a higher power
- My relationship with a higher power contributes to my sense of well-being

Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity
1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree
- I enjoy reading about my religion
- I attend religious services because it helps me to make friends
- It doesn’t much matter what my religious beliefs are so long as I am a good person
- It is important to me to spend time in private thought and prayer
- I have often had a strong sense of God’s presence
- I pray mainly to gain relief and protection
- I try hard to live all my life according to my religious beliefs
- What religion offers me most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow
- Prayer is for peace and happiness
- Although I am religious, I don’t let it affect my daily life
- I go to religious services mostly to spend time with my friends
- My whole approach to life is based on my religion
- I go to religious services mainly because I enjoy seeing people I know there
- Although I believe in my religion, many other things are more important in life than my religion

Quest/Interactional Religiosity
1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree
- It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties
- I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years
- I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to my world
- The “me” of a few years back would be surprised at my present religious stance
- Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers

Impact of Camp on Religious Faith
- My experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in my personal religiosity
- My experiences at camp increased my personal religious faith
- I think more about my religious faith now than I did before camp.
BELIEF IN THE CONNECTION BETWEEN FAITH AND ACTIVISM

Religious Beliefs Scale: Religious Perspective
1 = not true at all to 5 = very true
- I believe that helping others is an important part of my religious beliefs
- Promoting fairness and justice is a part of my religious beliefs
- My faith/spirituality helps me to answer questions about myself and the world around me

Impact of Camp on Belief in the Connection between Religious Faith and Social Justice/Community Involvement
- My experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in my beliefs about the connection between personal faith and social justice/community involvement
- My experiences at camp strengthened by beliefs about the connection between religious faith and social justice/community involvement
- I think more about how my faith connects to issues of social justice and my responsibilities to be involved in my community now than I did before camp.
SOCIAL CAPITAL RESOURCES RELATED TO CIVIC ENGAGEMENT  
1 = strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

- There is at least one adult in my life I feel comfortable talking to about topics such as my religious faith
- I feel a strong sense of community with other people who share my religious faith
- I do not have people in my life that encourage me in my religious faith
- There is at least one adult in my life I feel comfortable talking to about topics such as social justice or community involvement
- I feel a strong sense of community with other people who share my values and beliefs about social issues
- I do not have people in my life that encourage me to engage in community service or social justice
- There is at least one adult in my life I feel comfortable talking to about the connection between my faith and my responsibility to be involved in the community
- I feel a strong sense of community with other people who share my religious beliefs as they relate to social issues
- I do not have people in my life that encourage me to think about the connection between my religious faith and community involvement or social justice.
- I feel like I have a community outlet where I can discuss my values and beliefs
- I don’t feel connected to a larger community based on my values and beliefs.

Impact of Camp on Social Capital Resources Related to Civic Engagement

- My camp experience gave me the opportunity to connect with people who share my values, beliefs, and moral commitments
- I believe my experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in the number of people I can talk to about my faith
- My experiences at camp increased the number of people with whom I can discuss my faith
- Being at camp gave me more people that I can relate to about my religious faith
- I believe my experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in the number of people I can talk to about my involvement in the community
- My experiences at camp increased the number of people with whom I can discuss social justice
- Being at camp gave me more people that I can relate to about issues of community involvement or social justice
- I believe my experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in the number of people I can talk to about how my faith influences my community involvement
- My experiences at camp increased the number of people with whom I can discuss the connection between faith and social justice/community involvement
- Being at camp gave me more people that I can relate to about the connection between religious faith and community involvement or social justice
COMMITMENT TO IDEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES
1 = strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

- My religious faith gives me a sense that I am a part of some larger purpose
- Doing service makes me feel connected with some larger purpose
- Working for social justice makes me feel connected with some larger purpose
- My belief in the connection between my religious faith and social justice gives me a sense that I am part of some larger purpose
- My personal values, beliefs, and moral commitments give a sense of meaning and/or purpose to my daily actions.
- I try to make decisions about the things I do each day with some larger purpose in mind
- I feel that my day to day actions connect me with some larger purpose
- When I make decisions about the things I do each day, I do not have a larger purpose in mind

Impact of Camp on Ideological principles

- My camp experience changed how I think about my everyday actions
- I believe my experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in my feelings of being part of some larger purpose
- My camp experience helped me to feel that my religious faith connected me with some larger purpose
- My camp experience helped me to feel that being involved with the community or working for social justice connected with some larger purpose
- My camp experience helped me to feel that being involved in the community because of my religious beliefs connected with some larger purpose
- Being at camp made me feel that my faith and actions are an important part of some larger purpose.
IDENTITY EXPLORATION

How often do you do the following? (1 = almost never, 5 = very often)

*Exploration in Breadth*
- Think about the direction I want to take in my life
- Thank a lot about how I see my future
- Try to figure out regularly which lifestyle would suit me
- Think about what to do with my life
- Try to find out which lifestyle would be good for me

*Exploration in Depth*
- Think about the future plans I have made
- Talk regularly with other people about the plans for the future I have made
- Work out for myself if the goals I put forward in life really suit me
- Try to find out regularly what other people think about the specific direction I want to take in my life
- Think a lot about the future plans I strive for

*Impact of Camp on Identity Exploration*
- My camp experience gave me the opportunity to try doing new things
- My camp experience gave me the opportunity to try a new way of acting around people
- My camp experience encouraged me to think more about who I am
- Because of camp, I have more ideas for the type of person I want to be in the future than I would have if I had not gone to camp
CIVIC ATTITUDES, INTENTIONS, AND BEHAVIORS

Future Civic Involvement
1 = not at all likely, 5 = definitely will

Future conventional civic involvement
• How likely is it that you will volunteer in the upcoming year?

Future unconventional civic involvement
• How likely is it that you will boycott a product in the future?
• How likely is it that you will demonstrate for a cause in the future?
• How likely is it that you will work for a political campaign in the future?

Voting
• Did you vote in the presidential election (November 2008)?
• How likely is it that you will vote regularly in elections in the future?

Social Responsibility
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
• People in their teens can’t vote, so there is not really any reason for them to care about politics and government.
• Everybody should volunteer some time for the good of their community.
• It’s important for people in their teens to know what’s going on in the world.
• I have been following news and information about the upcoming presidential elections.
• By helping others, parents set an important example for their children.
• Teenagers should just enjoy themselves and not worry about things like poverty and the environment.
• Schools should stick to the basics and not spend so much time trying to teach students about moral or social issues.
• People should help one another without expecting to get paid or rewarded for it.
• Helping others gives a person a tremendous feeling of accomplishment.
• Young people have an important role to play in making the world a better place.
• It is important for people to know what’s going on in their communities.

Civic Efficacy
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
• I can change my world for the better by getting involved in my community.
• I can make my community a better place by helping others in need.
• There are things I can do to make the world a better place.
• I am interested in government and current events.
Social Trust
How much do you trust: (1 = Strongly Distrust and 5 = Strongly Trust)
- People you meet on the street
- Most People
- People at School or Work
- Your Family
- Government
- People Your Own Age
- Adults

Humanitarianism
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
- A good society is one in which people feel responsible for one another.
- Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.
- Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of the community is a major obligation for all persons.
- In dealing with criminals, the courts should recognize that many are victims of circumstances.
- Prosperous nations have a moral obligation to share some of their wealth with poor nations.

Personal Commitment to Civic and Moral Values
Thinking about who you are as a person, rate the extent to which you are committed to the following (1 = Not at all Committed, 2 = Somewhat Committed, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Committed, 5 = Strongly Committed):
- Getting to know a diverse group of people
- Helping others in my community
- Equality for all
- Performing actions that benefit others
- Understanding the perspectives of others
- Making the world a better place
- Improving the lives of others
- Feeling connected to my community
- Contributing to my community
- Being involved with my community
- Influencing politics or policies in my community
- Participating in community events

Political Efficacy
1 = not at all true, 5 = very true
- People might say, “Politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.” How true is this statement for you?
- People might say, “My family doesn’t have any say in what the federal government does.” How true is this statement for your family?
Impact of Camp on Social Justice/Community Involvement

- Since leaving camp, I have carried out ideas for community involvement or social justice I gained from my camp experience.
- I am more involved in community service now than I would have been if I had not gone to camp.
- I am more involved in politics now than I would have been if I had not gone to camp.
- I am more aware of my responsibilities as a citizen now than I would have been if I had not gone to camp.
- I am more tolerant and trusting of people different from myself now than I would have been if I had not gone to camp.
- I more strongly believe that my actions can make a difference in political processes now than I would have felt if I had not gone to camp.
- I have more ideas about the responsibilities people in society have for one another now than I would have if I had not gone to camp.
- I have thought more about my personal commitment to moral values now than I would have if I had not gone to camp.
- My experiences at camp resulted in significant changes in my attitudes toward community involvement or social justice.
- I more strongly believe that my actions can make a difference in the community now than I would have if I had not gone to camp.

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY

Mark whether each statement is true or false for you.

- It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged
- I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way
- On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability
- There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right
- No matter who I am talking to, I am always a good listener
- There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone
- I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake
- I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget
- I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable
- I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own
- There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others
- I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone
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