3-1974

Interaction Patterns in the Campground

Dennis Lee Rockwood
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Other Sociology Commons](#), and the [Tourism Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Rockwood, Dennis Lee, "Interaction Patterns in the Campground" (1974). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2040.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2039>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Dennis Lee Rockwood for the
Master of Science in Sociology presented March 26, 1974.

Title: Interaction Patterns in the Campground

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Lee J. Haggerty, Chairman

Robert W. Shotola

Charles D. Bolton

The purpose of this project was to examine interaction patterns in various campground settings and to elaborate on camping literature which has suggested that the campground is a social event with high rates of interaction. In exploring this phenomenon, this report utilized observational techniques to document the temporal, spatial, familiarity, numerical, and behavioral dimensions of the observed interactions.

The data suggested that young adults and middle-aged persons were observed to be involved in, and initiated the highest proportions of, interactions. In general, males displayed far greater proportions of initiations than females. The highly developed campground ex-

hibited higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the less developed campground; but the overall sociability of the campground was blunted by the tremendous extent of "no interaction" in both types of campgrounds. Besides the differences in population size and density of the two campground types, the non-demographic properties of the campground were also shown to be an influencing factor in interaction behavior. The major finding of this report was that regardless of the type of campground, having and not having previously existing acquaintances within the campground played a prominent role in influencing the patterns of interaction. The total interaction proportion was much higher for units with previously existing acquaintances than for units without previously existing acquaintances in the campground. The report also demonstrated that social interactions were predominantly between units who knew each other from outside the campground.

The data also suggested that while population size and density, and the ecological field of a setting, played roles in influencing interaction patterns, it was the familiarity dimension that yielded the most fruitful insights and played one of the more prominent roles in influencing campground interactions.

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Dennis Lee Rockwood presented March 26, 1974.

[REDACTED]
Lee J. Haggerty, Chairman

[REDACTED]
Robert W. Shotola

[REDACTED]
Charles D. Bolton

APPROVED:

[REDACTED]
Don C. Gibbons, Head, Department of Sociology

[REDACTED]
David T. Clark, Dean of Graduate Studies

INTERACTION PATTERNS IN THE
CAMPGROUND

by

DENNIS LEE ROCKWOOD

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Variables Influencing Interaction Patterns ...	2
Adaptations to the City	8
Contribution of Louis Wirth	11
Personal Interaction	15
Impersonal and Personal Interaction	16
Campground Development and Tisdale	17
Campground Literature	18
Definitions and Design	19
Summary	23
II DATA GATHERING	26
Highly Developed and Less Developed Camp- Ground	26
Dates of Observation	29
Selection of Sites	30
Number of Units Selected	34
The Time Observation Schedule	36
Dimensions of Interaction	39
The Schedule	40
The Conclusion	43
III DESCRIPTION OF THE CAMPGROUNDS	45
Activities and Services Available	45

CHAPTER

PAGE

Wallowa Lake	
Fort Stevens	
Magone Lake	
Union Creek	
Comparing the Campgrounds	57
Differences in Shelter Type	
Where Unit Was From	
Distance from Activities and Services	
Review of Campground Differences	
Physical Size and Campsite Density	66
Physical Barriers	68
Population Density	70
Composition of Units	
Length of Stay	
Conclusion	73
IV A DAY IN THE CAMPGROUND	74
Ethnography	74
0600 - 0759 Highly Developed Campground	
0600 - 0759 Less Developed Campground	
0800 - 0959 Highly Developed Campground	
0800 - 0959 Less Developed Campground	
1000 - 1159 Highly Developed Campground	
1000 - 1159 Less Developed Campground	
1200 - 1359 Highly Developed Campground	
1200 - 1359 Less Developed Campground	
1400 - 1559 Highly Developed Campground	
1400 - 1559 Less Developed Campground	
1600 - 1759 Highly Developed Campground	
1600 - 1759 Less Developed Campground	
1800 - 1959 Highly Developed Campground	
1800 - 1959 Less Developed Campground	
2000 - 2159 Highly Developed Campground	
2000 - 2159 Less Developed Campground	
2200 - - Highly Developed Campground	
2200 - - Less Developed Campground	
Conclusion	116

CHAPTER	PAGE
V ANALYSIS	118
Measurement of the Participation in Interaction	119
Measurement of the Rate of Interaction	121
Characteristics of Interactants	124
Who is Involved in Interaction	
Initiator of Interaction	
Initiator by Campground Type	
Initiator by Familiarity	
Interaction Variability	
Ecological Properties	140
Familiarity of Units	147
Finer Dimensions of Interaction	153
Heterogeneity	
Temporal - the period of the week	
Familiarity - stranger and non-stranger	
Spatial Dimensions	
VI CONCLUSION	196
Who is Interacting?	199
Campground Development and Ecological Properties	200
Familiarity of Units	201
Finer Dimensions	202
Functions of the Campgrounds	206
Other Differences Between the Campgrounds .	206
VII EPILOGUE	209
Utility of Group Analysis	209
Reaction to Observer	212
REFERENCES	217
APPENDICES	220

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	People Involved in Interactions	126
II	People Involved in Interaction by Campground	127
III	Initiator of Interaction	130
IV	Initiator of Interaction by Campground	132
V	Initiator of Interaction: With and Without Family and/or Friends	135
VI	Unit Interaction Variability	139
VII	Total Participation and Rates	142
VIII	Total Participation and Rates: With and Without Family and/or Friends	149
IX	Camper Type	156
X	Camper Type: With and Without Family and/or Friends	159
XI	Week-day, Week-end	163
XII	Week-day, Week-end: With and Without Family and/or Friends	166
XIII	Stranger - Non-Stranger	171
XIV	Stranger - Non-Stranger: With and Without Family and/or Friends	174
XV	Spatial Relationships of Interacting Units	183
XVI	Where the Interaction is Taking Place	187
XVII	Conducive Activity	192

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is a fundamental postulate of sociology that man is largely a product of his interactions with other men, and furthermore, that the patterns of interaction and interdependence with other men are supported by factors of the physical as well as the social environment. This study, by taking an ecological perspective, views man's adjustment to his world not through independent actions of individuals but through the organization and coordination of individual actions which form functional units. This view stresses and incorporates not only a social action perspective in investigating man's adjustment to and with other men but also the ecological perspective which is concerned with the organization of man adjusted to, or in the process of adjustment to, a given unit of territory (environment). (15, chapter 4) In this particular study, patterns of interaction and interdependence among individuals and groups of individuals will be observed within the socio-physical environment of the campground. The major concern of this study is to investigate the nature (form) of interaction patterns in the campground and the conditions under which certain patterns of interaction occur.

I VARIABLES INFLUENCING INTERACTION PATTERNS

Social scientists have produced a voluminous literature dealing with the linkages between the social-physical environment and patterns of adaptation to social and physical constraints. One of the basic theoretical concerns of the ecological perspective in examining the patterns of adaptation involves the phenomenon of inevitable crowding of man upon limited resources. This crowding process produces mechanisms for interaction among men and of man within his environment. In the course of continual adaptation, individuals learn to adjust to one another in different ways which are conducive to effective utilization of territory. To point out various factors that are thought to be important in affecting patterns of interaction among men we turn to previous research, to demonstrate how these factors might be valuable for a study of the campground.

Barker in discussing environment and behavior stated that:

One property of behavior settings which varies widely and is widely believed to have important consequences for the functioning of settings and for the behavior of persons within them is the number of human components. (2, p. 11)

Barker continues his discussion by citing a study conducted by Gump and Friesen wherein they looked at two schools, one large in population and the other small in population, and found differences in such things as activities and responsible positions engaged in by the student. They found that students in the less populated school reported more

satisfactions and engaged in more activities than the students from the larger school. The differences they reported were not in total numbers of reports but in the "content" of the satisfaction the activities provided. Barker concludes by stating that:

These data indicate that the environment is sometimes much more than a source of inputs to behavior arranged in particular array and flow patterns. They indicate, rather, that the environment provides programs of inputs with controls that regulate the inputs in accordance with the systemic requirements of the environment, on the one hand and in accordance with the behavior attributes of its human components on the other. This means that the same environmental unit provides different persons, and different inputs to the same person if his behavior changes. It means, further, that the whole program of the environment's inputs changes if its own ecological properties change, if it becomes more or less populous, for example. (2, p. 13)

It is being suggested, then, that as the ecological properties of a setting change, people engaged in a particular activity may display different kinds of behavior. In translating this to the campground, if the campground changes in population size or if different campgrounds within different population sizes are examined, then different kinds of behavior may be observed.

In looking at the "activity setting" and social interaction, Gump and Sutton-Smith conducted a field study which used young boys (ages 9-12) at the University of Michigan's Fresh Air Camp. What Gump and Sutton-Smith suggest in regards to this study, is that it is not the activity-setting as such but rather, the ecological field (the physical and demographic properties) of the activity-setting that affects be-

havior. In other words, people can camp in a variety of different campsites and still be camping; but it is the characteristics in and around the activity setting that can affect behavior. Their final analysis reports that:

The basic characteristics of the activity-setting, not the activity-setting as such determine the impact upon participants. The problem for research is the delineation of these characteristics and the discovery of their relationship to the participant's behavior and experience. This problem may be approached by determining what are the major behavioral limitations and opportunities presented by typical settings and by their standard patterns of performances. (13, p. 760)

The "activity setting" study, as the previously mentioned study, was concerned with characteristics of the ecological field. But instead of discussing behavior in general, Gump and Sutton-Smith focused on the differences in interaction when different characteristics of the activity setting were changed. Gump and Sutton-Smith suggest that:

....the properties of the activity-setting produce significant and general effects upon the respondent social behavior of its participants. In the settings investigated, these effects were noticeable in the amount and kind of interaction, in the types of interaction sought from or offered by these different persons. (13, p. 759)

The meaning of activity-setting that Gump and Sutton-Smith were discussing included not only the activity that the participants were engaged in but also the immediate environment in and around the activity. In the present report the activity setting would generally

be the campground. While the campground itself is too large to be observed adequately by a few researchers, the campsite will be the focus of attention as the activity setting. The limitations and opportunities presented by the campsite as an activity setting would include; the number of people within the setting, the closeness to other campsites, the closeness to the main campground attractions (lakes, river, etc.), and the physical barriers within the campsite and throughout the campground.

Another study, similar to the previous studies, was conducted by Raush, Dittmann, and Taylor. Their main interest was in delineating the extent of interaction among children in different settings. This study was carried out in the Child Research Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health. In their analysis they state:

The unique confluence of child and setting contributed far more to behavior than did the summative effects of individual difference and setting components. In fact, the potency of situational influences on behavior was somewhat obscured until setting variations were examined for each child individually; similarly individual differences were more closely related to behavior when each setting was examined individually. It is not surprising to find interactive effects - that situations have different, though consistent, behavioral 'meanings' for different people. (25, p. 374)

The postulate set forth by Raush et al is that potential interaction in settings varies from one setting to another just as interaction within an urban area may vary from one setting to another. As suggested previously, the variable aspects of the setting would include population

size and density, the closeness of campsites to one another, and the physical barriers within the campground. The important point being repeated is that the environment plays an important role in shaping human behavior and that changes in the ecological field lead to corresponding changes in the behavior, specifically human interaction.

In somewhat similar discussion, Hall, in referring to physical density reports that:

Children in too small a room will spend their time fighting. The same children studying the same subject taught by the same teacher will behave differently depending on how much space they have. (14, p. 72)

Hall mentions that people have both a personal space and a territorial space and that as certain conditions arise (for example, an increase in physical density in a limited setting or a decrease in setting size, i. e., campsites being close together, with the same density) may produce differences in behavior. Besides referring to physical density Hall's important contribution to this report is in suggesting the possible effects for patterns of interaction as the setting size decreases or increases. This study is investigating campgrounds and campsites that not only have different population densities but which also exhibit different degrees of physical size. It is felt that in the campground, interaction patterns among campers may vary as the physical size of the campgrounds vary.

Carrying the literature to its extreme in discussing the linkages

between the socio-physical environment and patterns of adaptation to social and physical constraints Morris, in The Naked Ape, states:

We already know that if our populations go on increasing at their present rate, uncontrollable aggressiveness will become dramatically increased. This has been proven conclusively by laboratory experiments. Gross overcrowding will produce social stresses and tensions that will shatter our community organizations long before it starves us to death.
(24, p. 177)

We can see that with increased crowding (more people camping and more elaborate camping facilities) even the campground, which has been one means by which urban man has been able to experience a somewhat different environment than that of the city or suburb, may begin to exhibit similarities to the city and suburb, particularly with reference to patterns of interaction.

While many studies have stressed the patterns of adaptation to social and physical constraints in schools, cities, and experimental labs, relatively little attention has been paid to patterns of interaction and interdependence which emerge as adaptations to the peculiar combination of social and physical environmental features unique to the campground situation. Some of the features unique to the campground setting that may affect patterns of interaction include: 1) the ecological field of the campground, that is, the physical layout of the campground, the size of the campground, the layout of the campsites, the number and types of facilities, the closeness to the main attractions of the campground, the relationship of the campground to the surrounding

population centers, activities and services, and the transitoriness of shelters and campers within the campground; 2) the size of the camping population, that is, the total population of the campground, the the density of the population per square mile, and the transivity of the population; and 3) the campsite setting, that is, the number of people in the campsite, the closeness of one site to another, the distance from the campsite to the road, the distance from the campsite to the main campground attractions, the distance of the campsites from campground facilities, and the natural physical barriers within and between campsites. A major difference between this study and other research tapping patterns of adaptation to physical and social constraints (in schools, cities, and experimental labs) is that the campground represents man at his leisure. People are not forced to go camping as they are "forced" to live in or near cities. The people in a campground are there, to a large extent, because they choose to be there.

II ADAPTATIONS TO THE CITY

Before commenting on recent campground research, which has suggested that the campground is being defined as a social event, let us review several insights that previous social scientists have discussed regarding adaptations to the city, which will serve as a basis of comparison to the camping literature and also serve as an aid in

spelling out the frame of reference and design this study has taken.

Simmel, one of the first sociological thinkers to write about the city, in discussing urban personality stated:

The same factors which have thus coalesced into the exactness and minute precision of the form of life have coalesced into a structure of the highest impersonality; on the other hand, they have promoted a highly personal subjectivity: there is perhaps no psychic phenomenon which has been so unconditionally reserved to the metropolis as has the blasé attitude This mental attitude of metropolitans toward one another may be designated, from a formal point of view, as reserve. If so many inner reactions were responses to the continuous external contacts with innumerable people as are those in the small town, where one knows almost everybody one meets and where one has a positive relation to almost everyone, one would be completely atomized internally and come to an unimaginable psychic state. Partly this psychological fact, partly the right to distrust which men have in the face of the touch-and-go elements of metropolitan life, necessitates our reserve. As a result of this reserve we frequently do not even know by sight those who have been our neighbors for years. (27, p. 327)

Simmel was writing about urban man's impersonality as a response to the money economy which gives rise to mental habits of precise calculation and cool reserve for competitive purposes.

Keyfitz, in discussing density and social life, supports Simmel by stating:

Each of us as city people has contact in a day with as many individuals as the villager meets in the course of a lifetime, this includes store clerks, bus conductors, taxi drivers, students, colleagues, theatre ushers, not to mention those we pass as we walk or drive along the street. It would destroy us

if we had to react to every one of them as people.
 We want to know about each of them only enough
 to cover his particular relationship with us.
 (20, p. 870)

He goes on in his article by stating what he thinks the condition of urban man to be:

The well adapted citizen of the high income metropolis has learned to protect himself against its potentially infinite stimulation. In some measure he becomes blase¹; whatever happens he has seen something more exciting. (20, p. 870)

If, as Simmel and Keyfitz have posited, the frequency of encounters creates a blase¹ attitude and necessitates reserve in urban man, is there anything man can do to reduce the encounters? Tucker and Friedman conducted a study which also supports Simmel's statement that as population density goes up, interaction between persons will decrease correspondingly. They explain this as a psychological means of reducing the effects caused by an increase in population density. The study looked at interaction patterns among students in cafeterias at three universities with varying population densities. In their summary they stated:

With increased population density comes a corresponding increase in unavoidable intrusive interpersonal encounters which can produce stress in the person. This stress is very likely cumulative to some extent and can only be reduced by retreating from the situation either physically or mentally. If there is no means of physical retreat, the person uses what means he has at his command to mentally reduce the interpersonal encounters - namely, not interacting with as many persons. (31, p. 749)

This notion of retreat is interesting, particularly in regards to physical retreat, as from the city. Keyfitz makes this statement about the refuge:

The ultimate refuge against the pressures of the metropolis is flight. A quiet place in the country becomes the ideal of all and in one form or another the seasonal recuperation of most. But with the acceleration of the population growth, and especially with the improvement of transportation through the private automobile, that quiet place in the country, the most precious of resources, is bound to become more scarce. We not only are a larger population, and able to get out of the city more easily, but a larger fraction of us has the means to travel.
(20, p. 870)

So far, in discussing man's adaptation to his environment, we have stressed that as population density increases, as represented in the city, we can expect certain kinds of behavior to occur. One such behavior is that as the density increases (in situations) interaction tends to decrease and encounters tend to be more impersonal. We have also briefly mentioned one way of relieving oneself from these pressures, and that is to escape or retreat.

III CONTRIBUTION OF LOUIS WIRTH

In bringing this study's frame of reference together and relating it to the campground situation, we now turn to Louis Wirth's theory of urbanism.

Urbanism, as it was viewed in this study, comes from Wirth's article "Urbanism as a Way of Life." In this article he stated:

Urbanization no longer denotes merely the process by which persons are attracted to a place called the city and incorporated into its system of life. It refers also to that cumulative accentuation of the characteristics distinctive of the mode of life which is associated with the growth of cities and finally to the changes in the direction of modes of life recognized as urban which are apparent among people who have come under the spell of the influence which the city exerts by virtue of the power of its institutions and personalities operating through the means of communication and transportation. (35, p. 5)

It is suggested that "urbanism" is not a phenomenon solely belonging to the city, but instead is a phenomenon which has attributes that individuals have internalized and carry within themselves. Allen, in discussing a "representative" urbanite going to work states the situation this way:

Likely enough, he passes through territory that is largely unexplored and unfamiliar and he has continual contacts with individuals with whom he is unacquainted. He has lurking anxieties in dealing with a wide range of unpredictable situations. He may develop the social callouses and aggressive behavior frequently observed in the residents of large cities. In a measure, the city dweller has lost his identity in a social melange that is diffuse and uncertain - a continual fall shuffle. (1, p. 14)

In discussing the consequences of organized social life, Wirth presented propositions concerning three factors he felt important - size, density, and heterogeneity. (26, p. 69-77) Wirth saw that, as a town or city grows, it becomes less likely that any resident would know all the others personally. Hence, the character of social relationships would change. For example, Wirth states that "the con-

tacts of the city may be face to face but they are nevertheless impersonal, superficial, transitory, or segmental." (35, p. 12) Simply stated, this means that people expect less of those with whom they are in contact in the city. This allows the individual to immunize himself against the personal claims and expectations of others. Another proposition of Wirth's was that physical contacts in the city are close, whereas most social contacts are relatively superficial. In looking at possible or potential encounters, if we may change Wirth's physical and social contact into physical and social density, we may begin to understand what takes place when a population is increased in numbers.

Hawley, in discussing population density in the city, speaks of social density, stating that this kind of density has become independent of physical density because social density grows more rapidly (for example, the mass media - radio, TV, newspapers). (16, p. 524) Another way of looking at social density is discussed by Kephart as he discusses a quantitative analysis of intragroup relationships. He lays out formulas which yield interactive type situations for potential relationships which can arise for the groups as a whole or for a specific member of the group. One is immediately struck by the tremendously rapid geometric rate at which potential relationships begin to arise when more than two people come under the influence of each other

(interact with each other).¹ (19, p. 546-549) Hawley, in his article on population density in the city, goes on to say that "density ... encourages an impersonality in relationships, a view of one's fellows as a means to ends, and in general an exploitative attitude of persons toward one another." (16, p. 524)

It should be made clear that Hawley states that this kind of density posits both advantages and disadvantages for the individual. He ends the article by suggesting that "periodic escapes into sheltered places provide a respite from incessant attacks upon one's sensory organs." (16, p. 526)

Finally in discussing interaction, Wirth mentions that:

• The larger the number of persons in a state of interaction with one another, the lower is the level of communication and the greater is the tendency for communication to proceed on an elementary level. (35, p. 23-24)

Therefore, the main argument as put forth by Wirth, was that individuals incorporate modes of life which can be labeled urban in character; therefore, lending themselves to interactions which promote imper-

¹In Durkheim's view there exists a distinction between physical density and social density. The former simply refers to the ratio of population to land area, while the latter pertains to the actual or potential frequency of contacts and interchanges among the members of a population. (15, p. 196)

One simple way of determining potential social density would be to calculate the combinations of potential interactants taken two at a time. For example, if the physical density was 4 people, the potential social density would be $4 \cdot 3 / 2 \cdot 1 = 6$ possible interactions. For 5 people, there would be 10 potential interactions.

sonal and formally prescribed relationships. Dr. Hamburg states:

We must remember that cities do crowd strangers. Everyday, people come into contact with strangers whom they will never see again -- and with whom they compete for a short supply of everything from parking spaces to sexual partners. (29, p. 23)

While the campground is in many ways different from the city, it is also a place where strangers are sometimes crowded together. Thus, by utilizing the theory of Wirth, we would expect to observe urban type adaptations in the campground setting. This would mean that camping units keep to themselves and do not interact with other units; or, if they are "forced" to interact, e. g., by someone asking a question, the interaction would be brief.

IV PERSONAL INTERACTION

While Wirth contributed to the image of urban man by suggesting that many of the interactions taking place in the city are impersonal, superficial, and fragmentary, there has been research which shows that by our own daily living we come in contact with friends, family, and/or neighbors where the interaction is generally not impersonal or segmental. Smith, Form, and Stone, in an article discussing local intimacy in a middle-sized city, looked at friendship as a type of social relationship characterized by a high degree of intimacy.

The results of the investigation reported here call into question those propositions of urban sociology which suggest that the city, a place of specialization, segmentalization and anonymity, denies its residents

the opportunities for the kinds of intimate social relationships that contribute to social integration. Such relationships are prevalent in the city and are to be found both throughout the city and within local areas of residence. (28, p. 283)

The question for this project, in a further attempt to clarify these arguments was: In the campground setting, did the interaction take place between strangers or between units who knew each other from outside the campground?

V IMPERSONAL AND PERSONAL INTERACTIONS

From these two views of urban interaction patterns, it is suggested that encounters with strangers will follow the pattern described by Wirth and Simmel, that is, the interacting will tend to be impersonal, contractual, and segmental. But it is also suggested that there will be encounters, whether planned (as a camping trip) or by-chance which bring potential interactants into close, friendly, and personal interaction. This study has attempted to demonstrate how frequent and under what conditions various kinds of interactions took place by asking these kinds of questions: 1) Did the patterns of interactions and activities among units in the campground situation reflect a high degree of carry-over of urban or impersonal solutions to interaction? 2) Did these patterns reflect an application of personal or intimate type interactions?, or, 3) what degrees of each type was being displayed?

The answers to these kinds of questions may be dependent upon:

1) The degree of prior acquaintance of the camping units; and 2) the ecological properties or level of campground development.

VI CAMPGROUND DEVELOPMENT AND TISDALE

Tisdale makes the statement that "cities are not creatures of spontaneous generation with life of their own, but gradual accumulations in the grand concourse of a society, made possible by population surpluses, replenished and nurtured by the society as a whole." (30, p. 314) In other words, Tisdale is stating that the increase in population, of a particular setting, gives the particular setting its form and focus. (30, p. 315)

Essentially, if we were investigating a campground which had an ecological field that contained such things as high population density, hot and cold water, showers, medical facilities, highways nearby, daily garbage service, stores, and services of different kinds and were to compare this type of campground to one which had low population density, cold water, pit toilets, and maybe a small store, we would say that the former was more highly developed than the latter.

In using Tisdale's argument in the campground setting, we would expect to find a continuum of settings with differing degrees of development. For purposes of this project, though, two contrasting levels of development were looked at: 1) the highly developed camp-

ground, and 2) the less developed campground. Thus, as technology and population increase, the level of development increases. With this frame of reference, we suggest that adaptations to the campground would vary as characteristics of the campground's ecological field vary, and, as population size and density changes.

VII CAMPGROUND LITERATURE

Recent campground studies have suggested quite different adaptation patterns. Hendee and Campbell, have observed that camping for many people is a social event, wherein "one is expected to speak to his neighbor and people seem to be defined as initially friendly rather than as hostile or indifferent." (17, p. 21) As Hendee and Campbell travelled to three highly developed campgrounds in Washington State, they observed that:

Within a few hours, the new arrivals would have exchanged names, pleasantries, and relevant information about the area with other campers. Children quickly formed play groups; and friendships, antagonisms, and rivalries were soon clearly established. (17, p. 21)

They go on to suggest that "many" campers thought of camping as a chance to meet new people (strangers) and "several" campers wanted even denser campgrounds so they could make contact with their neighbors more easily.

This kind of behavior was also described in Etzkorn's studies. He stated that campers have a tendency not to relate the benefits of

their camping experience to particular natural resources provided; but instead, they "derive major satisfactions from the social resources of the social system of the camp." (10, p. 78-79)

In an article discussing camping as a play world with certain identifiable play actions, Burch mentions sociability "in which the pleasure of the individual is closely tied up with the pleasure of the others." (4, p. 606-607)

The main criticism of this literature is that while the research by Barker, Gump, Sutton-Smith, Stone, Hall, Hawley, etc., dealing with size, density, heterogeneity in different settings has some comparability and a theoretical frame of reference, most of the literature concerned with camping lacks comparability and/or a common theoretical frame of reference particularly when discussing the "social" atmosphere of the campground.

Another criticism of previous research, which is of concern to this project, centers around the issue of familiarity. Previous research has failed to establish, while noting the sociability of campgrounds, whether the interactions taking place are between family, friends, or strangers. It could be that the interactions taking place occur between groups who are related or are friends and not strangers.

VIII DEFINITIONS AND DESIGN

In this study, interaction, especially inter-unit interaction, will

be defined as occurring when two or more units (people from different campsites) come under the influence of one another. It lasts as long as the units continue to be influenced by one another without a shift away from the immediate contact. It is terminated when the contact is broken. (9, p. 441)

Patterns of interactions between camping units will be observed under varying conditions of 1) attributes of the campground setting which are urban in their nature (such as location of and characteristics of the campground within an ecological field); and, 2) the physical density of the campground (such as degrees of concentration of camping units, number of campers per unit space, and total number of persons per square mile within the campground).

While we have characterized interactions as being either friendly or indifferent, it should be stressed that for this study, interactions have been defined and scored as a continuum or at different levels of interaction. The continuum consists of no interaction at one end and social interaction at the other. Filling in the middle are the social contacts. Thus the three levels of interaction are:

1. "Social" inter-unit interaction which will be defined as behavior which demonstrates various combinations of the following kinds of qualities: eye contact, allowing people into one's campsite, inviting people into one's campsite, walking into other people's campsite, being invited into

other people's campsite, initiating interaction, being friendly (i.e., greetings), talking freely (i.e., giving opinions, advice and direction), and all interaction that lasts longer than 30 seconds. The main criteria for establishing an inter-unit interaction as social will be the temporal element. The other items will aid in the description of the interaction.

2. "Social contact" type interaction will be defined as interaction which demonstrates various combinations of these kinds of qualities: little or no eye contact, brief encounters, "forced" encounters, not actively seeking interaction, curt greetings, attempting to avoid interaction, and all encounters lasting less than 30 seconds. These contacts could range from hostile encounters or reprimands to rather friendly exchanges. Here, as in the social category, the temporal element is the main indicator of social contacts while the other items are incorporated to help describe the behavior taking place.
3. "No" inter-unit interaction will be defined as behavior wherein the unit being observed makes no attempt to interact in either a social interaction or social contact manner.

The reason for using the temporal dimension of 30 seconds as the criterion for determining whether an interaction was social or a

social contact was based on a pre-test where it was observed that most interactions that lasted 30 seconds generally tended to last much longer than 30 seconds and in many cases longer than the observation period. Those interactions lasting less than 30 seconds tended generally to fall well below 30 seconds in length.

Previous campground research suggests that campers tend to exhibit more social interactions than either social contacts or "no interactions," that is, the interactions tend to be social in nature, rather than segmentalized, etc. That interactions in the campground should take on these characteristics is theoretically puzzling for two reasons:

1. Most campers live in cities or have been influenced by cities to a great extent and have consequently developed "urban" modes of dealing with strangers. Why are these adaptive patterns apparently discarded when interacting with strangers in the campground setting, as suggested by current camping research?
2. The number of people, per unit of space, in some campgrounds is greater than in many residential neighborhoods. If density is seen as an important contributor to "urban" type interaction patterns in urban neighborhoods, why should we find different patterns of interaction under similar small space density regimes?

This project has attempted to observe inter-unit interactions and activities in the campground, paying close attention to the actual behavior of interacting units so as to document the behavior of the interactants, the composition of interactants, the temporal relationships to the interactions (i. e., the duration), the spatial relationships of interactions (i. e., to include natural and man-made barriers), and the familiarity of the interactants (i. e., family, friends, or strangers). By making these observations under varying conditions of density and technology, we were able to investigate the relationship between these attributes of the campground and the patterns of interaction which emerged.

IX SUMMARY

In summary, research into the extent and degree of inter-unit interaction is almost nil. What has been done has been unsystematic, with other issues having primary importance, and inter-unit interaction being treated as a side interest.

In an attempt to demonstrate what is "really" going on in the campground setting, with regard to inter-unit interaction, this report intends to document (having used observational techniques) the temporal, spatial, familiarity, numerical and behavioral dimensions of the interactions among camping units.

The report is written within a specific temporal frame of

reference. It is felt that in order for the reader to get an idea of camping within this frame of reference, it is necessary to provide a central theme, which will aid in the understanding of the campground experience as we observed it, and as those we observed lived it. This report will take the reader through a camping day, which for us started at 0600 hours and ended at 2300 hours.

The report will provide a synthesis reporting of 28 days in camp at four different campgrounds. After discussing methods which will include sampling, dimensions of interaction, and various forms used, we will begin the analysis of camping.

The first step in discussing campground interactions entails a fairly concise description of the campgrounds that were observed. Maps of the campgrounds are included in this description to help orient the reader to the ecological field of the campground.

The description of the campgrounds is followed by a temporal description of a day in the campground that will proceed by two hour time periods starting at 0600 hours in the morning, travelling through the day to 2300 hours. This description will provide insights on what was going on within the observer's entire field of observation, plus actions which were observed outside the systematic observational periods.

The analysis of the interaction patterns follows the temporal description and will consist of a discussion of the various interaction

dimensions as they were related to interaction patterns in the campground.

The analysis is followed by an evaluation of the theoretical implications of the findings and an epilogue commenting on future campground research and participant observation.

CHAPTER II

DATA GATHERING

While it is understandably justified to press for high standards of sampling, it is a general feeling throughout sociology that research which utilizes less stringent rules for sampling can be of value in leading the way to further research and hopefully higher standards of reliability and validity. This type of reporting has been given the dubious title of exploratory research and it is under this shield that this project was designed. (7. Chapter I)

I HIGHLY DEVELOPED AND LESS DEVELOPED CAMPGROUND

In looking at the patterns of interactions and activities within the campground (with special concern for the ecological field and the size, density, and heterogeneity of the campground) we essentially want to contrast two different kinds of campgrounds. The first is the highly developed campground, whereas, the second is the less developed campground. (30, p. 314)

The sample utilized consists of two highly developed campgrounds and two less developed campgrounds in Oregon. The reason for selecting at least two campgrounds in each category is to interject

some potential variability with regard to such criteria as the characteristics of the campers and the potential differences in interaction patterns among camping units. It should be made clear that any generalizations which are made in this report are restricted to the campgrounds that were observed (at that particular time, etc.).

In the actual selecting of the campground, the only restricting criteria were: 1) that the campgrounds allow trailers, camper-trucks, and tents into the camping setting; and, 2) that the campground have more than 25 sites available to insure the chances of locating enough people in the campground for observation.

Having eliminated a small fraction of the campground universe, we then selected the campground on two additional criteria which were designed to get at two contrasting campgrounds. First was the popularity of the campground. With regard to popularity, we had three main sources: The first source was the people we came in contact with before and during the fieldwork (people in the Department of Sociology at Portland State University were asked their opinions about campgrounds and people in the field influenced our decisions of where to go). At Wallowa Lake, while conversing with several campers on campgrounds (with a small population) it was suggested that Magone Lake might be the spot to go. This suggestion was further reenforced when we stopped at a National Forest Service Information Station in Joseph, Oregon and were told that the camp-

ground we had originally picked, Coyte-Vigne, "is a good place to go if you want to get away from people, because all you'll find up there is wind, a few trees, and probably a dried-up stream." A slightly different situation occurred in the selection of the second low urbanness campground. After having arrived at Abbott Creek it was discovered that there were no people there to observe. We traveled from Abbott Creek to Huckleberry Creek, about three miles and again no people. It was then decided that what was needed to attract people was a lake. Looking at the map, Huckleberry Lake was closest and, even better, it was on top of the mountains where it would be cooler. After traveling 12 miles up a gravel and dirt road, it was discovered that besides no people at Huckleberry Lake there was no lake. The lake was dry for the season. Again, looking at the map, but instead of using logic, we used "instinct" and picked Union Creek which was slightly larger than we intended but was "fitted" to meet immediate needs.

A second indication of popularity came from television reports. On Thursday nights on the 11:00 p.m. News, a camping report was given to inform campers where sites were available. The program also showed slides and pictures of various campgrounds (all State or National Parks). A third source indicating popularity was the literature that was available describing the various camps. This literature was acquired at the Portland State University library and also

at the Chamber of Commerce office in downtown Portland.

The second criterion for selecting the four campgrounds was the actual ecological field of the campground. The highly developed campgrounds would include such things as electrical hook-ups, hot showers, flush toilets, laundry facilities, theaters, drinking water, concessions, police protection, daily garbage pick-up and maintenance, utility buildings, and nature trails. They would be located near town or city populations and in general would offer a wide variety of activities and services for people who camp there. The campgrounds, which were selected to represent the highly developed settings, were Wallowa Lake State Park and Fort Stevens State Park.

The less developed campground would have these kinds of things in its ecological field: drinking water, wood stoves, pit toilets, and nature trails. The less developed campgrounds that were investigated were Magone Lake and Union Creek.

II DATES OF OBSERVATION

Related to the picking of campgrounds was the order in which the campgrounds were to be observed and the length of time to be spent in each campground. It was believed that in case something should cut the field work short, an alternation pattern should be used to ensure some data on both types of campgrounds. Therefore, the order in which the campgrounds were observed was: Wallowa Lake,

Magone Lake, Fort Stevens, and Union Creek. It was also determined that because of our lack of time and our desire to observe behavior over an extended period of time, one week in each campground would be sufficient. This meant that one day would be called an arrival and departure day and six days would be spent in observing behavior.

To ensure a campsite, reservations were made at both Wallowa Lake and Fort Stevens, thus structuring not only the order of field work but also the actual dates of field work.

This, then, was the schedule of field work: July 2 - 8 at Wallowa Lake; July 9 - 15 at Magone Lake; July 16 - 18 rest and relaxation at home; July 19 - 25 at Ft. Stevens; and July 26 - August 2 at Union Creek.

III SELECTION OF SITES

Having picked the campgrounds to be used as the camping setting, the next task was to select a sample of units to observe within the universe of the campground. A unit is defined in this report as all members of a camping party maintaining a single campsite. By using this definition in observing inter-unit interaction, several matters of importance should be delineated. We were basically interested in the interaction between units, not the interaction within a single unit. This criterion was set down as an integral part of the

research design to investigate inter-unit interaction. But in order to describe patterns of campground behavior and activities which might preclude or make possible inter-unit interactions, it was deemed necessary to observe and record the behavior and activities of all the units selected in the sample.

An inter-unit interaction was said to take place when any member of one unit made contact with anyone from outside that particular unit. This meant that it was not necessary to have the entire unit engaging in interaction at the same time.

In selecting units to be observed, it was decided that the first step would be the dividing of the campground into sections. (See Appendix C) At both Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, this procedure had already been done for us in the sense that both of these campgrounds are sectioned off into loops; whereas at both Magone Lake and Union Creek we, ourselves, sectioned the campground into four areas of observation. Having previously decided to observe in four different areas of each campground, the process of selecting sections went like this: 1) At Wallowa Lake, we drove throughout the entire campground and found that there were five loops labeled A through E. All of the loops except C (which has 62) have approximately 35 campsites in them. Loop C was then divided into two loops, both having 31 campsites. We then chose at random four sections to observe. The sections chosen were A, B, C (sites 1 - 31) and section E.

2) At Ft. Stevens, we discovered that there were fourteen sections all with approximately the same number of campsites, labeled A through O. The four sections randomly chosen to be observed were A, E, H, & M. 3) At Magone Lake, there were no labeled loops or sections. The ecological field, (a hill separating the campground) was used in dividing the campground into two sections (labeled the East and West sections). From here the East and West sections were divided into two sections (one close to the lake and one farther from the lake). This gave a total of four sections to be observed. 4) As with Magone Lake, Union Creek had no labeled sections, so we again had to use the geography of the campground to improvise sections. It so happened that a creek ran through the campground dividing the camp into two sections. It also had, about halfway into the campground, a bridge which provided a man-made construction that divided the campground again, thus yielding four rather equal sections to be observed. We labeled the sections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

With this accomplished, the next step in picking units to observe was the random selection of one site in each observation section. This site provided each section with a focal site (or point) from which the units to be observed were chosen. At Wallowa Lake, this procedure of unit selection was modified slightly. The focal sites selected were A27, B2, C28T, and E30. It was quickly discovered that our location and field of observation within our own site provided for greater

understanding of the campground than the short periods of observation at the selected points of observation. It was on this criteria that it was decided that our own campsite would be considered the focal site of that particular section. Thus it turned out that B21, not B2, was the focal site at Wallowa Lake. One indication of the value of using our own site as a focal site was the legitimacy it gave us for sitting at the picnic table and just observing camping as campers might. It should be added that the value of using the researcher's own site has a tendency to be different in different campgrounds. But the idea of systematically observing, recording, and understanding behavior was far greater when those being observed were close and could be seen and heard at times other than formal observation periods.

At Ft. Stevens the focal sites were A18 (our reserved site), E17, H5T, and M23T. The "T" at the end of the site number means that particular site had electrical and water hook-ups for camper trucks, trailers, and motor homes. (Of course this did not mean that camper trucks, trailers, or motor homes had to stay in such sites).

At Magone Lake the focal sites were 1E (our site), 4E, 7W, and 12W. It should be noted that although there were some numbered campsites, it was difficult to determine exactly how many sites were there. This being the case, we numbered the sites starting with our

own site.

At Union Creek the sites were numbered 1 - 99. The focal sites randomly chosen for observation were 12, 15, 41 (our own site), and 55.

The purpose of the focal site, it should be remembered, was to aid in the selection of the units of observation. The idea behind the use of the focal site was to pick 3 or 4 units which were close to the focal site, the focal site itself being observed if occupied. Another criteria in selecting the units close to the focal site was to pick 3 or 4 units which could be observed from one observation point. At times this latter criteria prevailed over original intentions. For example, at Union Creek, because of the spacing of the campsites and people within the campground, focal sites 41 and 55 were rarely used because of the lack of units in the immediate area. At these instances, sites 99 and 90 became the actual focal sites because it was in these areas that people camped.

IV NUMBER OF UNITS SELECTED

This technique for selecting units, then, "ideally" provided 12 to 16 units for observation per day. Theoretically, the number of observations for the highly developed and less developed campgrounds ranged from 24, as a minimum, and 182, as a maximum (if it can be assumed that each unit stayed at least one day.) The data that

will be presented were based on 107 observed units in the highly developed campgrounds and 54 observed units in the less developed campgrounds. Quickly looking at these numbers one could immediately say that units at highly developed campgrounds exhibited a higher turn-over rate than those at less developed campgrounds. While this is substantiated in the results, a qualifier must be brought out here.

At the highly developed campgrounds, campsites were close together and the population density was high; whereas at the less developed campgrounds the campsites were far apart and the population density was low. While it was generally possible to observe 12 - 16 units per day at Wallowa Lake and Fort Stevens because of the ecological field of the campgrounds and the population density exhibited there, it was generally possible to observe only 8 - 14 units at Magone Lake or Union Creek for the same factors -- ecological field and population density.

Another factor which related to the total number of observational units used was that once selected to be observed, the same unit was observed until it was vacated, at which time one of three alternatives was chosen: 1) A new unit moved into the site thus allowing us to continue observing that site; 2) the site that was vacated remained empty, forcing us to select a different site which was in close proximity to the other units being observed; or, 3) the site that was

vacated remained empty forcing us to observe less than our quota of units because of the unobservability of an alternative site.

This kind of sampling technique can be summarized as being both flexible and structured. It is flexible in that it allows for change or replacement of units. It is structured in that it lends itself to comparability if systematically followed. This technique of sampling, once in the campground, also allows for variability within the campground by placing the researcher in three randomly chosen areas of the campground with the fourth area being around that of the researcher's campsite.

V THE TIME OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

With the sampling completed, the next major issue was the method of observation. Such questions as, when to observe; how long to observe; what and how to record observations; and what and how to record demographic and descriptive data concerning the unit and section in setting up and implementing the research design needed to be answered.

From a pilot study, it was learned that using the technique of participant observation based on systematic observation all the time, while in the field, would lead to our being completely overwhelmed by data. In order to give time to such things as eating, relaxing, going over notes, writing field notes, taking head counts, map

drawing, and preparing to observe, it was decided there would be six hours of systematic observation per day divided into three, two-hour blocks of time. Because people may interact at various times of the day, a time-rotation observational technique was used which allowed for systematic observation within the limited time span of two hours. Ideally, then, by using the sampling technique just described, 12-16 units would be observed in each of the two-hour observation periods. Breaking this down further, groups of 3-4 units would be observed for periods of 1/2 hour each on a rotation basis. This procedure continued until the two-hour observational period was over. At the start of the next two-hour observational period, instead of beginning with the same set of units as in first observational period, we rotated the units so that the second group of units were first to be observed and the previous group of units became the last group of units to be observed. (See Appendix A)

In reviewing the time-unit rotation observational schedule at least four items should be mentioned. First, in scanning the schedule, it becomes apparent that the observational periods are 35 minutes long instead of 30 minutes. The purpose of tacking on the extra five minutes is to allow for travel to the next observational post. Second, because of the way in which the schedule is made up, there were two times a day that were never systematically observed; from 11:20 - 12:00 a.m., and from 5:20 - 6:00 p.m. Although no systematic time

was devoted to these two times, because of the structure of the schedule and lack of time in the field, less systematic observation of the campground was a continuous process. Third, there are certain time periods which received more attention than others during the week (for example, the hour 6:00 - 7:00 a.m. was only observed twice during the week, the hour 7:00 - 8:00 a.m. was observed four times, as well as, the 8:00 - 9:00 a.m. hour, but the hour 9:00 - 10:00 a.m. was only observed three times). Fourth, the week had been divided into four week days (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday) and three week-end days (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday). It was felt that Friday, as a day when people travel to the campground to secure a campsite, should be included as a week-end day. This decision was based upon the assumption that higher densities would prevail on Friday and Saturday nights thus possibly eliciting different kinds of interactional patterns than during the week when lower densities would prevail. Sunday was also included as part of the week-end although as Friday is the day people arrive, Sunday is the day people leave the campground. At least, this is what was thought. Such things as the gas shortage had an effect of keeping people in the campgrounds until Monday. At Wallowa Lake, several campers verbally indicated to us that they would leave on Monday or Tuesday because of the gas shortage. Also, at Wallowa Lake, a Park Manager stated: "Oh, there are as many people here as last year, but what

I've noticed is the lack of out-of-state campers - must be the gas shortage." At Magone Lake, campers again verbalized their hesitancy to travel on Sunday. Members of the Whiskey Gulch Gang were gathered together on Saturday when one of them mentioned leaving on Sunday, "Oh, you don't wanna do that; most likely you won't get far with this gas shortage on."

VI DIMENSIONS OF INTERACTION

As observing inter-unit interactions was the main research objective, it seemed reasonable to delineate some of the different dimensions of interaction that were looked at in this report. Those dimensions which were of particular interest were:

1. The behavioral and spatial dimensions, which include such items as; how the units behaved in and around the campsite; what kind of action was taking place; were the interactants walking, sitting, running, standing, or playing; who initiated the interaction; were the interactions friendly or were they distant (mere recognitions); did the units appear to be seeking interaction or were they trying to avoid interaction; what was the spatial relationship of the interactants; where was the action taking place?
2. The numerical dimension, which included such items as: what was the age and sex breakdown of the observed units?

3. The temporal dimension, which included such items as:
did the interaction take place during the week or during
the week-end; how long did the interaction last?
4. The familiarity dimension which included such items as:
were the units that were interacting strangers or did they
know each other from outside the campground?

VII THE SCHEDULES

In recording these dimensions, an observational schedule was used. Over the period of four weeks two different schedules were used. During the first two weeks, a rather structured schedule was used (See Appendix B1). This schedule was quite compact, leaving little room for elaboration, particularly for the behavioral dimension which became the main source from which all of the other dimensions were derived. At the top of the schedule going from left to right, we have indicated what type of camping unit was being observed; i. e., Tt = tent, Tr = trailer, and Ct = camper truck. Next was the week-day - week-end breakdown, followed by the hour of the day in two-hour time periods. On the right side of the schedule the unit numbers were the adjacent units in that section being observed in reference to the focal unit being observed. Next was the total number of days of observation which was followed by the weather, name of the campground, and the date and time. The rest of the schedule should be

self-explanatory.

During the second two weeks, some major changes were made in regard to the form of the schedule (See Appendix B2). At the top of the schedule the type of unit, the week-day - week-end breakdown, the hour of observation, the unit indicator, date and time were only slightly changed in position and/or form. The addition made was the indication of how many times that particular unit was observed with 21 being the maximum. The rest of the schedule was left blank. This allowed flexibility and space to record behavior without the frustration of having to skip all over the schedule as previously required.

Observing and recording behavior of camping units was only half the job if any attempt to relate this behavior to the ecological field of the campground was to be attempted. Demographic and descriptive data on at least three levels was required. The first level was the individual unit. A unit inventory schedule was developed to get at different kinds of demographic and descriptive data (See Appendix B3). Such things as type of car, shelter, kinds of camping equipment, kinds of city equipment, and any man-made additions to the site were noted.

Other things noted on the unit inventory were the unit composition, site characteristics (location in reference to restrooms, activity areas, water, garbage, etc.) physical barriers both natural and man-made, and unobtrusive measures (i. e. , bumper stickers,

appearance, voice tone).

As with the observational schedule, the format of the unit inventory schedule changed during the second two weeks. It was felt the spacing and/or location of particular items made it difficult to fill out. It was also felt that the items, dates of observation (number of days observed) and length of stay were data that were available on the observational schedule so were dropped during the second two weeks (See Appendix B4).

The second level in collecting demographic and descriptive data included the section inventory (See Appendix B5). As indicated by the title, the section inventory deals with the observed section as a whole. The kinds of information needed on the section included the general characteristics of the section (i. e. , location in relation to other features of the campground), the number of sites available, the number of sites filled and breakdown of camper type, and the density of the section given in three different ways: 1) the ratio of the number of sites occupied to the number of sites available; 2) the approximate number of people in the section; and 3) the concentration of people per square mile.

(It may be noticed that on the inventory the concentration of people was worded as a concentration of people per acre. Since the calculation of concentration of people was not done until our return from the field, it was decided that in order to compare the campground

concentration of people to city concentrations of people, a single unit of measurement was necessary. Thus the square mile is used as the unit of measurement to comply with census data for purposes of comparison.)

The third level of demographic and descriptive data was obtained by using the campground characteristics schedule (See Appendix B6). This schedule asks for essentially three kinds of information: 1) What does the campground offer, to include natural scenery, trails, lakes, rivers, activities, stores, restaurants, and other services in and around the campground? 2) How is the campground controlled and maintained? Included here is how often does the garbage get picked up, how often do the police cruise through the campground, how often and what kinds of maintenance activities take place? 3) What is the population density (given in three different ways): ratio of sites occupied to number of sites available, the approximate number of people in the campground, and the concentration of people per square mile in the campground (not per acre as printed in the schedule) ?

The main difference between the section inventory and the campground schedule was the section only dealt with the observed sections whereas the campground schedule dealt with the entire campground.

VIII CONCLUSION

One further statement concerning the scope of this project should

be cited in order to forewarn the reader as to the range of generalizations which will be made about campground behavior. Because of the criteria which have been set down in the design, this report is not a reporting of campground behavior per se, but more specifically it is an account of campsite behavior with applicability to inter-unit interactions.

Before continuing with the comparison of campgrounds, it should be noted that before we engaged in any field work, a letter of legitimacy was obtained from Dr. Don Gibbons, Sociology Department Chairman at Portland State University. The purpose of the letter was to legitimize our presence in the campground. Fortunately, the letter never had to be used, but we are grateful to Dr. Gibbons for extending his written protection to us.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE CAMPGROUNDS

Before starting the temporal journey through the four campgrounds that were observed, a description of the ecological field of each campground is in order to get an understanding of the physical similarities and differences that these campgrounds exhibit.

In focusing on the characteristics that lead us to consider Wallowa Lake and Fort Stevens as highly developed settings and Magone Lake and Union Creek as less developed settings, several kinds of differences between the campgrounds were explored.

I ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES AVAILABLE

The first area of difference between the campgrounds was what activities and services were available inside the campground and/or in the immediate vicinity. It should be noted that unless specified, all campsites have a picnic table and fire box.

Wallowa Lake

Wallowa Lake State Park is located in the Northeast corner of Oregon, 131 miles east of Pendleton by way of LaGrande, Enterprise,

and Joseph. The town of Joseph, with a population of 839, is five miles from the campground. Enterprise is next in size with 1,680 people. Joseph is located at the North end of the Wallowa Lake while the campground is at the foot of the Wallowa Mountains at the South end of the lake. Before actually reaching the campground, the Wallowa Lake Lodge and cabins are passed. They are located on the South shore of Wallowa Lake. Across the street from the lodge is a gas station, trading post (grocery store), and ice machine (block), and a go-cart track (\$1.25 for adults and \$.75 for children).

Continuing North on the road from Joseph instead of going into the campground area, there are several different kinds of services and activities available within two miles of the campground. These include horse corrals for renting horses, two gift shops, two restaurants, a laundromat, a recreation hall for dances and roller skating, a gondola tramway which takes people to the height of 8,200 feet on top of Mount Howard, two sets of cabins, a miniature golf course, a go-cart track, the Eagle Cap wilderness pack station, a power house, and an outdoor chapel. Also, near the campground, the marina and yacht club can be found. Besides renting life-preservers, boats, motors, canoes, and water bikes the marina also has a fishing tackle and gift shop. Included at the marina is free boat launching, a gas pump, and a restroom. Just to the East of the marina is the roped-off swimming area. South of the swimming area is the picnic

area which has approximately 50 picnic tables, several open kitchens with coin operated electric stoves, several water hydrants for drinking and washing, and the Wallowa river flowing down to the lake providing stream fishing. Across the street from the picnic area is the campground itself.

Several different kinds of services are provided in the campground. First, there is police protection. The Oregon State Police cruise through the camp at least twice a day. Second, every other day trucks come into the campground and stock the woodbins with wood. Third, the camper's garbage is picked up on a daily basis. Fourth, maintenance men or park managers clean the restrooms on a daily basis besides mowing grass or unplugging waste disposals.

As one enters the campground to camp, the first thing to notice is the registration booth. This is a small building with a 'Stop' sign in front of it. The purpose of the registration booth is to register all in-coming campers, assign them to a site, and charge them the appropriate fee. The fees for camping at Wallowa Lake are \$3.00 for sites with electrical and water hook-ups and \$2.00 for all other sites. At Wallowa Lake State Park one can reserve a campsite ahead of arrival; but this carries an additional \$1.00 charge which is paid upon arrival at the campground.

By looking at the map, (See Appendix C-1) it will be noticed that the campground has 210 campsites of which 117 (56%) are

equipped with electrical and water hook-ups. This leaves 93 campsites (44%) without electrical and water hook-ups. The 210 sites are divided into five sections labeled A - E. The letter T on the numbered campsites post identifies the site as having electrical and water hook-ups. There are 32 water hydrants in the areas where water hook-ups are not located and a total of 66 trash cans throughout the campground. The campground has two utility buildings and three rest stations. The utility buildings are essentially luxurious rest stations in that besides having flush toilets and hot running water, the utility buildings also have hot showers and a laundry facility (no machine though). Outside each of these restrooms, there is a newspaper stand. Near the entrance of the campground is a dumping station for trailers and motorhomes to dump their wastes. Firewood is supplied and is located in six woodbins which are located throughout the campground. There are two public pay telephones inside the campground; one is located near the entrance to the campground and the other is located near the utility building in Section C.

In Section A, the only horseshoe pit is located; while near Section B is located the theater where slide programs are held at 9:00 p.m. each evening. Winding around the outside of the campground are several short nature trails which lead to and from the theater and/or lake.

The seven-day camping limit at Wallowa Lake may seem to be

a short period of time, but our data indicate that campers seem to be quite transient in a highly developed campground, with many leaving long before the seven-day limit.

In setting up certain criteria for selecting a highly developed campground, Wallowa Lake meets all of the standards. The campground is located near populated areas, and has a large number of campsites with over half designed with electrical and water hook-ups. The immediate area surrounding the campground offers a variety of services ranging from grocery stores to gondola lifts. The campground is set up on a reservation system, it supplies fire wood to the campers, picks up the campers' garbage, has hot water, and police protection. If we had not made it clear that a campground was being described, one might think that this was a description of a city.

Fort Stevens

Fort Stevens State Park is located in the Northwest corner of Oregon, five miles Northwest of highway 101. Seaside is 14 miles to the South with a population of 4,402, and Astoria is nine miles to the North and East with a population of 10,244. The town of Hammond, with a population of 500, is one mile North of Ft. Stevens and the city of Warrenton with 1,825 people is three miles North and East of Ft. Stevens.

The main kinds of services and activities in the vicinity of the

park are not located as near as those at Wallowa Lake. Whereas a car is a convenience at Wallowa Lake, it is almost a necessity at Ft. Stevens. Fort Clatsop National Memorial is eight miles Southwest of the park. A replica of the Lewis and Clark winter encampment is there, plus a museum with a short film and graphic description of their journey. In the city of Astoria, tourists and campers are encouraged to see the Astoria Column, Coxcomb Hill, and the Bumble Bee Seafood Company. Closer to Ft. Stevens are the charter boats and fishing equipment available at Warrenton and Hammond, as well as Astoria.

Within the park, but not inside the camping area, are attractions such as Battery Russel, a deactivated concrete emplacement which at one time was armed with two 10-inch rifles on disappearing mounts. This is located 3/4 of a mile North of Ft. Stevens. The Peter Iredale is another attraction. It is located one mile West of the campground half buried in sand, right on the ocean beach. It was a cargo ship at one time, was wrecked and is now only a hunk of rusting steel. Coffenburg Lake, located only a few hundred yards west from the south end of the campground, offers swimming, fishing, and boating.

Two other services that should be mentioned are police protection and maintenance. Ft. Stevens is protected daily by three different law enforcement agencies: the Warrenton and Hammond Police Departments, and county Sheriff's Department, and the Oregon

State Police. Police cars cruise the campground all day long. There is daily garbage pick-up as well as daily maintenance of the restrooms and woodbins. It is interesting to note that it was observed that after a unit left their site and before a new unit moved in, a maintenance crew would go into the site, rake the sand, pick up litter, and pile up the scattered wood, making the site appear neat and unspoiled.

Besides these services and activities, such things as churches, cabins, restaurants, and grocery stores are available in any of the towns or cities mentioned above.

Ft. Stevens has a registration booth which performs the same functions as did the registration booth at Wallowa Lake. The charge for a night's stay is the same as at Wallowa Lake, and reservations can also be made at Ft. Stevens under the same guidelines. The campground provides 223 or 37% of the campsites with electrical and water hook-ups and 380 or 63% of the campsites without electrical or water hook-ups for a total of 601 campsites, divided up into 13 sections labeled A - O. (See Appendix C2)

The letter T on the campsite post identifies the site as one with an electrical and water hook-up. There are 116 water hydrants near those sites which do not have water hook-ups and a total of 210 trash cans throughout the campground, as well as dumping station at the entrance to the park. There are eight utility buildings and six rest

stations with the same description as those at Wallowa Lake. Twenty-five woodbins are scattered throughout the campground supplying firewood to the campers. There are two main play areas equipped with swings, slides, and sand; both located in the North end of the campground; plus nature trails which lead to such places as Battery Russel, the dumping station, Coffenbury Lake, and the Pacific Ocean.

Near the registration booth there is a four-way intersection (with a flashing red street light), which at times gets quite congested. To the North of this intersection are four telephone booths, several newspaper stands, and an information board with a map and history of the campground. Ft. Stevens has a theater, as did Wallowa Lake, located at the North end of the campground, which seats approximately 500 people. It begins its slide program at 9:00 p.m. each evening. The limit for staying at a particular campsite is seven days as is the case at Wallowa Lake and all State Parks in Oregon. As was noted at Wallowa Lake, the transitory character of the camper's stay fits very well within a week limitation. This proved to be the case at Ft. Stevens with as many as five different units being observed in one campsite during one week's observation.

Fort Stevens, then, is another example of a highly developed campground. Such structural characteristics as being close to outside populations like Seaside and Astoria, exhibiting a large number of campsites with 37% of them equipped with electrical and water

hook-ups, having the campground on the reservation system, providing services such as hot running water, firewood, garbage pick-up, police protection, and having a variety of services and activities available in the near vicinity of the campground all combine to give Ft. Stevens the image of being a highly developed campground.

Magone Lake

Magone Lake, a National Forest campground, is located in Northeastern Oregon 22 miles North of John Day which has a population of 1,566; and 26 miles Northeast of Mt. Vernon which has a population of 423. There are three roads that lead to the campground, all of which are dirt and gravel and differ only in length. The lake itself has an interesting history, as it was formed by an earth slide that re-directed a creek into the area that the lake now occupies. The lake is approximately 200 yards at its widest point and close to a half mile long, running East and West. The lake got its name from Major Magone, who in the late 1800's discovered the lake and noted that it must have been recently formed by an earth slide because of the angle of the trees in and around the lake. An historical marker at the entrance of the campground describes the earth slide and how the lake got its name. The marker also directs the reader to a 1/4 mile nature trail which ends at the scene of the earth slide.

The closest services outside the campground are located in

John Day and Mt. Vernon thus putting the camper 20 miles from "civilization." The campground itself offers rather sparse services and activities in comparison to either Wallowa Lake or Ft. Stevens. There are a total of 34 campsites, 12 of which have no individual driveway in the campsite. (See Appendix C3) This means that people have to carry their equipment and supplies from the vehicle to the site which ranged in distance from 25 to 100 feet from the road. The other 22 campsites all have private driveways which allow the vehicle to be within the campsite itself. There are a total of 6 pit-toilets, 3 designated for males and 3 designated for females; 7 water hydrants; and 16 trash cans throughout the campground. On the West side of the campground, there is a boat launch (cement) and a wooden dock. Since the lake is small and has logs sticking out of the water, no motor boats are allowed on the lake. While camping is restricted to the North shore, there is a nature trail all around the lake.

An interesting and different point to make about Magone Lake in comparison to Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens is that, whereas at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens people were generally assigned a campsite (the exception being those who reserved a particular site), at Magone Lake the people choose their own site. Another point of difference is that at Magone Lake, camping was limited to 14 days in any one site and there was no charge to the camper. The most popular area to camp in was near the lake and in the Eastern section of

the campground. During the week of observation, the Oregon State Police visited the campground twice, once to check fishing licenses and the other time just to cruise by. The managers of the campground were also in the campground twice during our stay. They were doing several various tasks: picking up garbage, delivering toilet paper, and refinishing the tops of the picnic tables.

In recalling the criteria for labeling a campground a less developed campground, Magone Lake fits quite well. With such salient characteristics as being 22 miles from a population area on a gravel road, exhibiting a rather small number of sites, none of the sites with electrical or water hook-ups, displaying some campsites as lacking driveways, having only pit toilets and infrequent cold water hydrants as services, not being supplied with wood, and having the freedom to choose one's site, there begins to be clear structural differences between the types of campgrounds being developed here.

Union Creek

Union Creek campground, a National Forest campground, is located on highway 62, 10 miles North of Prospect (which as a county subdivision, has a population of 1,063) and 23 miles Southwest of Crater Lake. The campground, itself, is located half a mile West of Highway 62. As the name of the campground suggests, there is a creek that runs through the campground going from East to West and at the West end of the campground is met by the Rogue River running

South. Three quarters of a mile from the campground is a resort and cafe. The resort offers cabins, lodge rooms, a country store (groceries, tackle, camping supplies, fishing and hunting licenses), and a gift shop. Across the highway there is a cafe and a gas station. All of these services are open seven days a week, from about 7:00 a. m. to 9:00 p. m. Within ten miles of the campground, there are approximately seven other campgrounds; Abbott Creek, Huckleberry, Boundary, Woodruff Bridge, Natural Bridge, Farewell Bend, and Foster Creek. Outside Union Creek are many points of interest up and down Highway 62. To name a few, there is: the natural bridge where the Rogue River drops out of sight into a lava tube and reappears 300 feet downstream; the Rogue River Gorge, North of the campground, where the Rogue River plunges through a narrow, deep canyon of lava rock; and, of course, there is Crater Lake.

There is a \$1.00 charge per day at Union Creek, and like Magone Lake the limit is 14 days. There is a self-registration box where the camper fills out a card and deposits it with a dollar in the box. There are 99 numbered and posted sites, although about one-third of these have no picnic table or fire boxes. (See Appendix C4) There is a total of 13 water hudsons, 9 sets (1 male and 1 female) of pit-toilets, and 39 trash cans throughout the campground. Like Magone Lake, the people at Union Creek choose their own campsite, which turned out to be mostly along the creek. As in the previous weeks of observation,

campground managers were seen in the campground. The two times they were observed (all females, whereas at Magone Lake they were all male, and at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, they were mixed - male and female) they were engaged in garbage pick-up and cleaning of the pit-toilets. We observed no law enforcement people in the campground, but did observe National Forest trucks driving through the campground on a daily basis.

Located near the Northeast section of the campground there is an open kitchen where people come to picnic. The picnic area is small with only six tables located inside the open kitchen. This is also the location of the weekly campfire program which begins at 9:00 p.m. on Saturday and consists of slides and discussion.

Besides fishing in the creek, there are nature trails along both Union Creek and the Rogue River. The trail on the Rogue River goes for several miles North of the campground and offers some good scenery and fishing holes.

II COMPARING THE CAMPGROUNDS

In comparing these differences among campgrounds to the urban ecological field, two lines of comparison have been proposed. First, although services and activities of various kinds are available in cities of different degrees of development there appear to be some cities which offer a wider range and variety of services and activities

than others. For example, in the large city there is potentially more housing, more jobs, more parks, etc., than potentially exist in the smaller city or town. Likewise, in the highly developed campground there are more campsites, more organized activities (i.e., slide program, go carts, etc.), and more fairly close out-of-campground services (whether tourist attractions or restaurants) than the less developed campground. Second, by delineating these campgrounds into "ideal" types in no way covers the range of development to be found in campgrounds. Just as New York City and Portland both may be considered metropolitan areas, it must be stressed that there are very distinct differences in the ecological fields of the two cities in the areas of services and activities. This kind of distinction also applies to campgrounds. For example, Magone Lake and Union Creek have been inspected as generally fitting the less developed category when, in fact, if looked at separately Magone Lake is less developed than Union Creek in the sense that Magone Lake is 20 miles from the closest highway, has no store, has no cafe, has no lodge, has fewer sites, and is located near no "mapped" point of interest which would attract campers.

In looking further into the kinds of distinctions between the highly developed and less developed campgrounds and relating them to notions of the urban scene, several other kinds of differences can be noted.

Differences in Shelter Type

Interesting differences in types of shelter were observed across campground types. At the less developed campgrounds, there were (25) 46% in tents, (11) 20% in camper trucks, and (18) 33% in trailers. In the highly developed campground (39) 36% were using tents, (22) 21% were using camper trucks, and (46) 43% were using trailers. This indicates that those at the highly developed campground were not only camping in a high urban-ness area but also were bringing more technical and probably more expensive shelters into the campground than those at the less developed campgrounds. These figures and percentages are not representative of the total number of shelters observed. In several cases more than one type of shelter was used. For example, a unit may have a trailer and a tent within the site. In these cases a category system of priority was used. The shelter that was the most sophisticated was used in categorizing the entire unit - i. e., Trailer, Camper Truck, and Tent. It was also the case that units used motor homes, fold-up tents and trailers, and vans as shelters. Because of the low number of these cases, motor homes and fold-up trailers (those with plastic or metal siding) were classified as trailers, fold-up tents (those with canvas sides) were classified as tents, and vans (7 and 9 passenger, utility, and campers) were classified as camper trucks.

Where Unit Was From

Another interesting difference between the campgrounds that should be noted and related to the urban scene was where the unit was from. In the large and highly urban city, people would be expected to be migrating to and from the city from many different parts of the world. This migratory pattern would be expected to be less extensive in a less urban city. This also proves to be the case in regard to campgrounds. In the highly developed campground, 50% of the vehicles observed had Oregon license plates, while 70% of the license plates in less developed campgrounds were Oregon. In the highly developed campgrounds, a total of 80% of the vehicles had either Washington, Oregon, or California plates, while in the less developed campground 96% of the plates indicated a Washington, Oregon, or California origin. This indicated a greater tendency for both out-of-state and other than West coast people to camp in highly developed campgrounds than in less developed campgrounds.

Distance From Activities and Services

Part of the urban scene is the notion of how far certain activity areas and services are from one's residence. For example, if residence is used as a base from which specific activities and services are looked for, the chances are that the more urban the city, the further away the residences will be from those specific activities and

services. For instance, take the activity area "work" or job location. It seems reasonable to assume that as a general trend, as the city develops and grows more complex, the distance from one's job and residence increases. Of specific relevance in the campground setting are the distances of the campsites to the lakes, rivers, and ocean which the campground has been built around. In comparing the two types of campgrounds, it was observed that in the highly developed campgrounds all the campsites were from 1/4 mile to one mile from the lake, with 77% of the observed units being 1/3 to 1/2 mile from the lake. This compared with 85% of the campsites in the less developed campground (only Magone Lake had a lake) being within 100 yards of the lake and the remaining 15% of the campsites being within a 1/4 mile of the lake.

This distance relationship also held true when comparing the distances from the rivers. At the highly developed campground (Ft. Stevens did not have a river to report) 100% of the campsites observed at the less developed campground (Magone Lake did not have a river to report) were within 100 yards of the river (78% of the campsites were within 100 feet of the river). Ft. Stevens was the only campground near the ocean, but still all of the campsites were at least one mile from the surf.

As the city grows more complex it also has a tendency to offer repeated services and activity areas. For example, in comparing a

large city with a small city, it appears that the larger city has more dwelling units to offer, has a more and greater variety of restaurants, theaters, and parks; and in general is the place to go for specialized items which are generally not available in smaller cities (e. g., special automobile parts). The point here is that the smaller city may or may not offer a particular service or activity area but if it does it will do so on a smaller scale. Again, the distinction being made here has limitations.

The foremost limitation, which is not unique to the typology used in this report, is that while the distinctions may prove to be correct between these types of cities, there is the possibility that there may be greater variation within any one category than between categories. In other words, there may be cities of equal complexity but with an unequal distribution of services and activity areas. For example, some cities have more universities than others, some cities rely on industry while others depend on retailing, and some cities are blessed (or cursed) with natural resources and a natural habitat which allows for certain services and activity areas to grow and multiply.

In translating what is perceived to be the case in the urban scene to the campground's ecological field, several distinctions concerning services can be mentioned for those units that were observed. At the highly developed campgrounds (94) or 88% were within 100 feet of a toilet while on (13) or 12% were between 100 and 200 feet from a toilet.

This compares to (42) or 77% of the observed less developed campground units being within 100 feet of a toilet and (12) or 23% of them being between 100 and 200 feet from a toilet. This indicates that those units at the highly developed campground are closer to a toilet than those at the less developed campground. This is a reflection of the total number of toilets in each type of campground and the campsite density. Both of those items increase in going from the less developed campground to the highly developed campground.

The same relationship holds when looking at the distance from the campsites to the water hydrants and trash cans. One hundred and five or 98% of the units observed in the highly developed campground were within 20 feet of a water hydrant while only (13) or 24% of the less developed units were within 20 feet of a water hydrant. Most of the less developed units were in the 20 to 50 feet range from a water hydrant. The highly developed campgrounds also had (86) or 81% of their observed units within 20 feet of a trash can while the less developed units had (27) or 50% within 20 feet and (27) or 50% between 20 and 75 feet from a trash can.

This indicates that as the campground grows in complexity (i.e., more campsites, more water hydrants, more toilets, and more trash cans) that the units occupying a particular site will be closer to these kinds of services. This also relates to the function of repeated services in the ecological field of the city mentioned above.

Review of Campground Differences

In reviewing what the campgrounds have to offer in order to get a clear picture of the two campground types used in this report, we can pick out at least five distinct areas of difference. The first area of difference is the sheer size and gross number of such things as sites, trash cans, water hydrants, etc. At both Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, there were many more sites than at Magone Lake or Union Creek. The second area of difference comes in the realm of facilities inside the campground. At Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, there were such things as flush toilets, hot running water, and hot showers available while at Magone Lake and Union Creek, there were only pit toilets and cold running water. There were electrical hook-ups, water hook-ups, and waste disposals at Wallowa and Ft. Stevens but not at Magone Lake or Union Creek.

Management and control make up the third area of difference between the two types of campground. Such things as garbage pick-up, toilet clean-up, delivery of firewood, and police protection were a daily affair at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens; while these same services were on a twice-a-week schedule at Magone Lake and Union Creek. In fact, it should be noted that there was no firewood provided at all at either Magone Lake or Union Creek. The maximum suggested length of stay was twice as long at Magone Lake and Union Creek (14 days). The charges were either nothing or at most a dollar at Magone

Lake and Union Creek in comparison to the \$2.00 or \$3.00 charge at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, and at Magone Lake and Union Creek people were given the freedom to choose their own site while at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens the camper was given a place to camp.

The fourth area of difference concerned the services and activities in the immediate vicinity of the campground (say, 10 miles). At both Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens, we noted local city and town populations which provided such diversified services as stores (grocery and variety), charter boats, dancing, roller skating, horseback riding and packing, restaurants, cabins, lodges, gas stations, boat rentals, miniature golf, go-carts, museums, and points of interest. While some of these services and activities were also available in the immediate vicinity of Union Creek (lodge, cabins, general store, gas station, cafe, and points of interest) and even to a lesser degree at Magone Lake (points of interest only) it must be stressed that the number and variety of services and activities at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens far exceeds those at Magone Lake and Union Creek.

The fifth area of difference lies in the two distance relationships discussed. The first was, if the main attraction of the campground was looked at (e.g., lakes, rivers, ocean, etc.) and was available in both types of campgrounds; there would be a greater distance between that attraction and the available campsites in the highly developed campground than in the less developed campground. The second

distance relationship proposed that as the campground grows in complexity there would be a tendency for repeated services and activity areas (e.g., toilets, garbage cans, etc.), making the average distance to any one service area shorter in the highly developed campground than exhibited in the less developed campground.

III PHYSICAL SIZE AND CAMPSITE DENSITY

Having described what the campgrounds have to offer, the next comparison deals with the physical size of the campgrounds in square miles. What was measured was not the entire campground 'per se' but that area within the campground where people were allowed to camp, that is, the actual camping area. The purpose of doing this kind of measurement was threefold: 1) To aid in figuring the approximate physical density; and, 2) to point out the tremendous difference in size of camping area and campsite development; and, 3) to demonstrate in reference to #2 the differences in campsite density, that is, how close or how far one site is to another.

Point number one will be dealt with later; but numbers 2 and 3, being similar and directly related to the issue at hand, will be dealt with here to further explicate the differences in the two types of campgrounds.

In looking at the highly developed campgrounds in respect to approximate size, Ft. Stevens was largest, covering .11 square miles

of space and Wallowa Lake covers .03 square miles of space. In looking at the less developed campgrounds, Union Creek was largest with .08 square miles of land coverage and Magone Lake covers .01 square miles of land. Notice that in just square miles, Union Creek covered over twice as much area as Wallowa Lake. To put these measurements into perspective, the number of campsites was looked at. In the highly developed campgrounds, with respect to campsite development, Ft. Stevens had 601 campsites on .11 square miles of land and Wallowa Lake had 210 campsites on .03 square miles of land. The less developed campgrounds on the other hand, displayed 99 campsites on .08 square miles at Union Creek and 34 campsites on .01 square miles at Magone Lake. There seemed to be a sharp difference between these two campgrounds when the number of campsites and square miles of the campground were looked at. One way of clearly demonstrating this phenomenon was by looking at the number of campsites as though each campground had an area of one square mile. This was the result: For Ft. Stevens, there would be 5,463 campsites per square mile; for Wallowa Lake, there would be 6,999 campsites per square mile; for Union Creek, there would be 1,238 campsites per square mile; and for Magone Lake, there would be 3,400 campsites per square mile. By representing campsite density, these figures give an indication of how close campsites were to each other. From the above data, we can accurately suggest that campsites were closest

to each other at Wallowa Lake and Ft. Stevens and that campsites were furthest from each other at Union Creek and Magone Lake.

The implication in demonstrating the differences in campground size and the difference in campsite density was to propose that these kinds of differences were similar to city differences. For example, the highly urban city will most likely exhibit both greater physical size in terms of square miles, and greater housing density per square mile. What was unique in this study was that while Wallowa Lake exhibited high campsite density as expected, the area measured as "camping area" displayed the least square mileage.

IV PHYSICAL BARRIERS

The campsite density factor was only part of the phenomena of campsite closeness. In the city, there are physical barriers which allow people to have "privacy" even though the housing structures are quite close. Such things as curtains, locks on doors and windows, shrubs, trees, and fences are all physical barriers which can be used to give the resident the option for privacy. Similarly, in the campground, physical barriers exist or are created to give options for privacy. In comparing the two types of campgrounds, several interesting points should be made that further explicate the notions of campsite closeness and the option for privacy. At the highly developed campgrounds, (16) or 15% of the observed campsites had very little except

their shelter that could be called a physical barrier. In most cases, these units were open to the public because there were only a few bushes or maybe a tree within the site. There were no campsites at the less developed campgrounds that fit this description. There was (41) 38% of the observed campsites at the highly developed campground which could be described as fairly open, that is, both trees and bushes were scattered around the site. This compares to (10) or 19% of the less developed campsites which fit the fairly open description. Of the campsites observed at the highly developed campgrounds (32) or 30% could be described as fairly closed, meaning that trees and bushes or a vehicle blocked the view of one or two sides of the campsite. This kind of a description fits (24) or 44% of the campsites at the less developed campground. For a campsite to be considered closed, trees and bushes were tall and thick enough to close off most of the site with the exception of the driveway. This description fit (16) or 15% of the campsites at the highly developed campground and (7) 13% of the campsites at the less developed campground. Finally, at the highly developed campground (2) 2% of the campsites observed were completely closed, that is, they exhibited all of the characteristics of a closed site and in addition, a vehicle, a shelter, or a tarp was used to block the entrance of the site. A completely closed campsite was exhibited by (13) 24% of the units at the less developed campground. This indicates that while the less developed

campgrounds not only exhibited lower campsite density than the highly developed campgrounds, the less developed campgrounds exhibited greater degrees of physical barriers than did the highly developed campgrounds; enhancing even further, the factor of campsite density, and suggesting that the physical structure of the campsite allowed for a greater potential to have privacy in the less developed campgrounds.

V POPULATION DENSITY

The last issue to be mentioned in regard to the development of campgrounds deals with the number of people per square mile. The purpose of handling population density this way was to allow for comparability and use in other population based research, and to be able to compare the population densities in cities to the population densities found in the campgrounds. The questions to be looked at then, are: Did the campgrounds differ in respect to population density as expected; were the differences in population density associated with campsite density; and, did the difference in population density influence different patterns of interaction?

The answer to the latter question is the general topic of the following chapters. The answer to the first question is easy: yes, the campgrounds did differ in population density. The campgrounds differed in population as per definition of level of campground development. But as a check, the densities were as follows:

1) At Ft. Stevens the average week's population density was 14,184 per square mile, 2) at Wallowa Lake, the average week's population density was 25,429 per square mile, 3) at Union Creek, the average population density for a week was 1,667 per square mile, and 4) at Magone Lake, the average week's population density was 6,043 per square mile. Comparing the population density with the campsite density in answering the second question, indicates a perfect relationship. The campground with the highest campsite density also had the highest population density and the campground with the lowest campsite density also had the lowest population density. (For a look at population density broken down by campground, week-day and week-end, and by section observed, see Appendix D. Notice that in every campground, the total campground population density goes up on the week-end confirming the use of a week-day - week-end dichotomy.)

Composition of Units

Another aspect of the population density was the composition of the units under observation. While units were our primary interest, the individual elements that made up the unit were also felt to be factors that influence interaction among units. For this reason the composition of the units was categorized two ways. The first was the age breakdown of observed units in both types of campgrounds. To accomplish this task, six subjective age categories were used: elderly, middle-aged, young adult, teen-aged, child, and young child. (See

Appendix E) As Appendix E indicates, there were very few differences in the age and sex of the person engaging in camping at the two campground types; the largest difference being among the young adult males, where it appeared that they were found in the less developed campground more often than the highly developed campground population. The second way was to label the unit as to its sex make-up. To accomplish this task, seven categories were used: single adult, couple (male and female adults), adults with adults, adults with children, adults with adults with children, all female, and all male. Again, as with the age and sex breakdown, the differences in the composition of the units were only slight, indicating that in reference to the composition of the campsites the less developed campground was a scaled down highly developed campground.

Length of Stay

Another issue which related both to the composition of the campsites and the urban scene was the length of stay aspect. In comparing the large complex city to the smaller less complex city, it appeared that the large complex city exhibited greater degrees of transmigration than the less complex city. That is, people were on the move more often, residing in one place for short periods of time, while people in less complex cities moved less often. This was also found to be the case in comparing the two types of campgrounds. In the highly

developed campgrounds, (90) 84% of the units observed stayed three days or less; while only (17) 16% stayed between 4 to 6 days; (2) 2% stayed 6 days. In the less developed campgrounds, (32) 59% of the units observed stayed 3 days or less, while (22) 41% stayed between 4 to 6 days, (8) 15% stayed 6 days. These figures can be summarized more precisely by stating that in the highly developed campground the average stay was 2.6 days, while the average stay in the less developed campground was 3.4 days.

VI CONCLUSION

This description of the campgrounds has been intended to orient the reader to the distinction being made between the highly developed and less developed campground settings and how these differences relate to the urban scene.

It is hoped that with this orientation to the differences between the two types of campgrounds, the following discussions of the temporal day in the campground and of the interactional patterns will not only describe differences of inter-unit interaction between the two kinds of campgrounds, but also aid in suggesting how further and future inquiry into the campground setting may be accomplished.

CHAPTER IV

A DAY IN THE CAMPGROUND

I ETHNOGRAPHY

It was stated in the introduction that the analysis of the campground would provide not only a critique of the data and tables concerned specifically with inter-unit interactions, but also a temporal description (ethnography) which should aid in further clarifying and distinguishing the two types of campgrounds being examined. It is particularly worth noting that in orienting the reader as to the general behavior observed in the two types of campgrounds, insights that would have normally not been mentioned if the report strictly discussed only interaction behavior, are brought out in the hope of adding additional meaning to the analysis of interaction patterns.

To accomplish this, the ethnography is divided into nine blocks of time, of generally two hours each, with the first block of time starting at 0600 hours and the last block of time starting at 2200 hours. It is felt that this kind of description will provide a sensitivity and awareness of the campgrounds which is generally lacking not only in leisure research but in much sociological research as well. It is also

felt that by describing the campgrounds in this fashion, the reader will be given the closest possible experience of actually being out in the campground -- feeling the heat of the sun in the morning or feeling one's eyes burn from all the smoking fires in the evening.

This section will also describe what it was like to listen to the various sounds in the campground at different times of the day, the odors that permeated the air while in a campground, or the sight of police cars with their sirens turned on attempting to apprehend someone who was rushing through the bushes. All these things are very much a part of camping; but very rarely do they even get mentioned. Two possible reasons they are seldom mentioned might be that they either are not easily measured items, or they really are not part of the research design.

0600-0759 Highly Developed Campground

As the sun burns off the morning mist, the campground begins to come alive. In the highly developed campground, there were only a few fires from 0600 - 0659 as people began to wake up, scurry to the toilets and back, began to chop wood and build fires, sit by their fires drinking from steaming cups and occasionally smoke a cigarette. From 0700 - 0759 the potential for "sleeping in" was slim as more wood gathering and chopping and fire building continued in greater numbers of campsites. Most of the fires being built were in sites occupied by tenters who displayed some unique and dangerous methods of lighting camp wood. One method used was the blow torch and another method

was the pouring of gasoline onto a small flame, but the traditional match to paper and/or wood was the method used most often. Along with fire building the sounds of pots and pans, people coughing, children crying, an occasional car rolling down the street with a bad muffler and general increases in noise, we suggest might have had an effect on people when they began to emerge from their shelters. Breakfast began to be observed frequently at this time, although it was an activity that was observed right up to 1100 hours, when "lunch" began. Still another notable activity at this time was people breaking camp. This cut across all types of shelters and usually accompanied an early breakfast. It should be mentioned that not all of the observed units were up and moving around, but inactivity was generally limited to the trailer and motor home units which were usually self-contained (meaning that unit members need not leave their shelter) and had thicker walls (meaning that their shelter probably would protect them more adequately from the increased noise levels).

0600-0759 Less Developed Campground

At the less developed campgrounds, we observed that some people were up and around before our earliest observation period started (0600). These people were going fishing (only at Magone Lake). This occurrence was rare and the noise made, as they went fishing, was minimal as the rest of the campground slept. There was only one incident of wood/chopping between 0600 and 0659 that came to our attention and which broke the silence of the campground. There were

several cases of people taking trips to the toilet at this hour, but the general rule was, the units were not moving outside of their shelters.

From 0700 - 0759 the campground was essentially awake with only a few cases of units making no movement. Wood gathering and fire building seemed to be the most common activity at this time, with preparation of a meal and eating being a close second. There were more frequent trips made to the toilet because there were more people up. Since there were no restroom facilities (i.e., sinks and mirrors) in the less developed campground, it was not uncommon to see such activities as shaving, combing hair, removing curlers, and putting on make-up taking place near the site's picnic table. It was also not uncommon to see campers brushing their teeth and washing their faces near the water hydrant. These activities were particularly observable among tenters.

0800 - 0959 Highly Developed Campground

Between 0800 and 0859, most of the campers in the highly developed campground had either emerged from the shelters or had at least opened the curtains of their shelter indicating they were awake. Between half and two-thirds of these units had fires going, or were in the process of building a fire. This seemed to be the major activity at this time. Only a few of the fires were used for cooking or heating things and in some cases the fires were going all day, although the temperature got into the 90's. It appears that fire making and maintaining were viewed as essential and of great interest in the camping

experience. It was not uncommon to see close to a half-a-cord of wood stashed and split into various sizes inside a campsite. Along with fire building, wood chopping, at this time, was almost a universal task and was used either for building a fire or maintaining a personal cache of fire wood.

With people up and moving around in the highly developed campground, several other kinds of activities were engaged in. More and more people migrated to the restrooms and utility buildings carrying purses, shaving kits, towels, and in some cases changes of clothes. While at the utility buildings, besides taking care of biological needs, such things as hot showers, shaving, putting on make-up, brushing teeth, and changing clothes were sometimes engaged in.

Another major activity at this time, which was an extension from 0700 - 0759, was that of preparing and eating breakfast. Besides observing fires, eating was the most prevailing activity. It took place both inside the shelter (in the cases of camper trucks, trailers, and motor homes) or outside on the picnic table and near the fire. People used Coleman stoves most often and a few units were using electric grills and even fewer units used the open fire.

Other activities that took place at this time included preparing to leave, chasing chipmunks, sitting in lawn chairs, preparing for a baseball tournament or rodeo, preparing fishing tackle to go fishing, going to the utility building to iron, walking throughout the campground, reading the newspaper, playing with a dog, riding bicycles, and maintaining equipment. Each of these activities was engaged in by at least

a few units; but they all, more or less, revolved around the breakfast activity.

From 0900 - 0959, in the highly developed campground, eating was still one of the main activities - although cleaning up the breakfast dishes increasingly appeared. There were a few units just beginning to prepare breakfast by starting their Coleman stoves and there were a few units eating; but the majority were finishing breakfast and cleaning up and/or preparing for something else. In one case, a man in a "business" suit was observed breaking camp (a pup tent) while in other units kids were riding bikes and playing with beach balls and lawn darts. Washing dishes, checking over and repairing equipment, and preparing to leave the site and/or campground were the major activities at this time. In one case a man, after checking over his equipment, reported to me that his "water hose had been cut with a knife," indicating that vandals had done it. Other kinds of activities taking place at this time included hanging up wet clothes on a clothesline (put there by a unit), taking pictures of chipmunks atop woodbins, lying in a hammock, sitting in lawn chairs, walking throughout the campground, and riding bikes.

0800-0959 Less Developed Campground

From 0800 - 0859, in the less developed campground, fire building and eating were major activities as they were in the highly developed campground; but there were differences. In the less developed campground there were no woodbins, therefore, wood had to be gathered by walking through the campground picking up fallen sticks,

breaking or chopping branches, or chopping down trees. There were proportionately fewer fires in the less developed campground because of this. In cooking, Coleman stoves were used and the open fire was also used proportionately more often than in the highly developed campground. Other kinds of activity observed were people going to the pit toilets, people washing their faces and getting water at a water hydrant, taking bikes from under a canopy, getting food out of the car, checking oil and tires, etc., in their vehicle, preparing to go fishing, playing with dogs, cleaning rifles, sitting at tables or in lawn chairs, talking, going to work, reading, and preparing to leave.

From 0900 - 0959, eating remained the number one activity but, as in the highly developed campground, cleaning up from breakfast was beginning to be a major activity. Part of the clean-up process included carrying garbage to trash cans and getting water. Another major activity observed, at this time, was fishing. Several units were fishing (still and spin casting) from aluminum boats, rubber rafts, or from the bank. Besides fishing, sitting in lawn chairs (drinking, smoking, and/or talking), walking around within the campground, feeding and playing with a baby, and a rare instance of typing were activities engaged in at this time. The 0800 - 0959 time period, in both types of campground, was generally a time in which most activities were centered around preparing breakfast, eating breakfast, and/or cleaning up after breakfast. It was an organizing and planning time. And it was a time for maintenance - both self-maintenance and maintenance of equipment.

1000-1159 Highly Developed Campground

Between 1000 - 1159, in the highly developed campground, there was no observable main activity although this was a time for units, who have broken camp, to begin leaving in noticeable numbers. It was also a time when units piled into a vehicle and left the site for the morning and possibly the entire day. For those still in camp, playing lawn darts, frisbee, riding bicycles, chopping wood, sitting in lawn chairs, reading, talking, or sleeping were activities to be observed. Washing dishes and general campsite clean-up occurred at this time particularly among females who had been left alone in the campsite or who had been relieved of the responsibility of watching children.

For those adults who had not been relieved temporarily of the responsibility of watching children, campground socialization became an interesting phenomenon to watch. Among the children, it was observed, if the unit knew no other units within the campground and if the number of children within a unit was small (3 or under) there was a slight tendency for the children to follow the adult of the same sex as themselves around the campsite. For example, in a unit which was preparing to leave, the adult female was inside the camper truck washing dishes, while the female child (6 or 7 years of age) was sitting on the camper steps watching the adult female. The adult male was kicking tires, checking oil, etc., and was being followed by two male children (8 and 5 years of age). The adult female asked for help inside the camper and the female child responded. As the unit was about to leave, the adult male asked the 5-year-old male if he

wanted to take home a pine cone. The young male child responded, "No," paused, and about ten seconds later asked, "what's a pine cone?"

Another incident of socialization that occurred, during this time period, was a case of a male child (10 years of age) running through the campsite of another unit. The adult female from his unit chastized him for "going through someone else's property", indicating that the \$2.00 or \$3.00 paid for a campsite makes that piece of earth private property with all the social values given a "normal" piece of private property outside the campground. Such phrases as "my site" and "my wood" indicated a possessive quality that campers attached to their campsites. The factor of territoriality would be an interesting subject for future inquiry.

Another interesting phenomenon observed in the highly developed campground, which was not observed in the less developed campground, was the presence of units which were other than white. In the two highly developed campgrounds, four ethnic units were observed camping. There were two Black units, one Indian unit, and one Oriental unit in the campgrounds. The lack of visible presence in the campground by ethnic groups seems to indicate that camping, as expressed by car camping in the Pacific Northwest, is a white activity, although this could be reflecting regional sampling biases. If it is not reflecting a sampling bias it would seem reasonable that future research might try to answer the question of why ethnic groups do not participate in camping.

Another interesting occurrence happened to us while in the highly

developed campground at this time and tends to demonstrate the quality of bigness and vastness that is part of the highly developed campground. A male child (8-10 years of age) was riding on a bicycle and passed our site several times. As he passed it the fourth or fifth time, he began to cry. After inquiring as to the problem, we discovered he was lost. The way in which the campground is laid out with sites close together and most of the campground looking the same, it seems reasonable that young children, such as this one, would tend to get lost -- particularly at Ft. Stevens, with its 601 campsites covering .1 of a square mile.

1000-1159 Less Developed Campground

In the less developed campground, there were still a few units eating breakfast. Those units that had finished breakfast were cleaning up from breakfast. Several different kinds of activities were observed at this time. Several new units were arriving and were setting up camp; while one specific unit moved to its favorite site from the one they were occupying. In informal conversations at both types of campgrounds, we discovered there was a strong tendency for units at the less developed campgrounds to be repeaters at a particular campground, more so than those at the highly developed campground, who tended to be first-timers. Besides moving and setting up camp, adult males were tinkering with the vehicles and shelters. Fishing was also a continuing activity, as was sitting in lawn chairs. A few not-so-common activities observed included washing windows of shelters, typing at the picnic table, using power saws to fell trees,

State Police cars cruising by, catching chipmunks, and shooting of a sling shot.

1200-1359 Highly Developed Campground

From 1200 to 1359 hours, several different kinds of activities and phenomena were seen that occurred with some regularity in the highly developed campground. First, at about this time the campground had more vacant campsites than at any other time. In some sections of a campground the depletion and/or turn-over rate was quite high. There were days (mostly week-days) when the depletion rate was in the 70% range in several sections of the highly developed campground. This was not including campsites that were vacant the night before. Another phenomenon occurring with regularity at this time was the occurrence of occupied campsites without the unit members present, that is, there were units which were not present in or around their campsite to be observed. Related to this was the fact that between 1200 hours and 1559 hours, there were higher rates of units not present than during the rest of the day.

Besides units leaving the campground or just leaving their campsite between 1200 and 1359, there began to be a trickling in of new units. One reason for this heavy outflow of units from the campsites may be explained by the 1400 hours check-out time in the highly developed campground when units must be gone or be charged another day's rent.

In discussing the going and coming of units in the highly developed campground another aspect of camping should be mentioned. There

were a few occasions when we were approached by campers who mistook us for campground officials, particularly when we were sketching the map of a particular campground, with pencil and clip board in hand. In these brief encounters, the topic of reserving a campsite was harshly criticized. The main argument against the system was that the entire campground could theoretically be put on reserve leaving no sites for the "common man." After becoming aware of this situation, attention was focused on the reservation system with two further criticisms which could be seen in our observations.

First, it was observed that because of the reservation system, freedom to choose a site which was vacant while in the campground did not exist. In several cases, campers would spot a vacant campsite and set up camp - only to find out that the site was reserved. Another related occurrence observed was moving within the campground. For example, if a unit pulled into Ft. Stevens on a Thursday with intentions of staying the full seven days without a reservation, the chances of getting and staying the full seven days in one site were very slim. It was more likely that the unit would be moved once, twice and even three times within a one-week period, because of the reservation system.

A slightly different problem, but nonetheless very much related to the problem of "getting" a site, occurred when the campground displayed its "full campground" sign at the entrance of the campground, when, in fact, as much as 25% of the campsites may have been vacant. Campsites were vacant, in that there were no physical traces of units

occupying them, but they were not vacant in that they were reserved. The irony of this reservation game, by our observations and knowledge of how the game works, is that having a site reserved does not ensure that the site will be occupied. In fact, from our observations in the early morning hours, there were still considerable number of sites vacant which had been reserved. Another irony was that, while these campgrounds turned away hundreds of campers because the campground was technically full, they also lost thousands of dollars because of the way the reserve system operates. The fee and reservation charge is not collected until the site is claimed by the unit who reserved it. One consequence of this, besides turning campers away, is that population densities (particularly at Ft. Stevens) would have been much higher if the campground would have been allowed to fill up as it most assuredly would have.

While new units were coming into the campground, activity being engaged in by those units already in or around their campsites was the preparing for, eating, and cleaning up of lunch. While lunch was being prepared activities such as chopping wood, building fires, sitting in lawn chairs, or just walking around were observed. The consumption of lunch was generally handled outside the shelter; but there were cases observed where consumption of meals took place largely inside the shelter (camper truck, trailer, or motor home). In referring to density at a mini-level, it was observed that tempers ran short several times when a meal took place inside crowded shelters. For example, an adult female yelling at her son (8 years old), "Eddy,

will you eat your sandwich and get out of here, you are fast driving me crazy. "

While lunch was being cleaned up, largely by females, several kinds of activities were observed; for example, playing cards, sitting and talking in lawn chairs, playing frisbee, bike riding, playing badminton, baseball throwing, football throwing, fire stoking, reading, sleeping, or planning the afternoon's events.

There were several other activities that occurred in highly developed campgrounds at this time that did not occur at the less developed campground at all. First, several trucks delivered wood each day, which allowed the campers to build fires more easily than the units at the less developed campground. The availability of wood partly explained why there were units who had fire going continuously even in 90° and 100° weather. If the woodbins were not convenient enough, campers would take wood from a vacant site, or even steal wood from a campsite whose occupants were absent. Second, another condition observed in the highly developed campground was the occurrence of completely barricading a campsite to allow maximum privacy. In several instances this meant a tarp approximately eight feet high, fencing in the site except for the driveway in which a truck was parked. Third, police seemed to be readily available in the highly developed campground, cruising throughout the campground making their presence known, while maintenance crews were mowing grass, painting

site numbers on the pavement, and unclogging sewers.

1200-1359 Less Developed Campground

In the less developed campground, the major activity was eating lunch. Along with and after lunch, sitting in lawn chairs, on stumps, or at the picnic table and talking, laughing or reading seemed to consume most of the time, particularly for the adults. The children and teenagers, who also ate at this time, were less likely to be sitting in lawn chairs but more likely to be preparing to go fishing or swimming. There was a strong likelihood that if a river was nearby, inner-tubing would be engaged in. Trail bike riding and bicycle riding also occurred at this time.

Having stated that the camper in the less developed campground stays longer, it might be of interest to describe how long some of them do camp in a particular campground. The official limit is 14 days in any one site; but at least two units remarked that they had stayed longer, or expressed the intent of staying longer in the campground. The first case was that of Bill "Whitebeard." He and his unit were locals (living fairly close to the campground) and he worked four days a week, even while camping. They had been in the campground over two weeks and planned to stay "until the weather cools!" They avoided being evicted by leaving the campground for a few hours every 14 days and when they returned they camped in a different site.

The case of George is somewhat different. He was 78 years of age and camped alone. He camped three months of the year, spending a month in each of the campgrounds he selected. It just so happened that George had been camping at the same three campgrounds since 1955. George used the same method for not getting evicted as did Bill "Whitebeard" in that every 14 days George would pack up his equipment, including his wood, and move to another campsite. The point of this illustration is to emphasize not only were there even greater "real" differences as far as the length of stay goes, than already examined, but also to begin to suggest for future research that there may be some social-psychological differences between the campers of highly developed campgrounds and campers of less developed campgrounds which may also explain, in part, the differences found in interaction patterns.

1400-1559 Highly Developed Campground

As was mentioned in the 1200 to 1359 time period, the highly developed campground was being vacated by campers going home or moving to another campground. This pattern continued from 1400 to 1559, but at a decreasing rate. Incoming campers who began to trickle in from 1200 to 1359 were now beginning to pour in; claiming their reserved site or hoping there was a site open. From 1400 to 1559 the entrance to the campground, that is, the registration booth

became quite crowded because each unit must register before setting up camp, which was different from the less developed campground where the unit could freely pick a site which was not occupied and register at its leisure, if registering was necessary. In stating that the registration booth got crowded at this time meant that a line-up of vehicles and shelters began to accumulate in front of the booth which looked not too dissimilar to commuters trying desperately to get home from work in a large city, but first must pay a toll (camp fee). The line was observed to extend at times at least 75 to 100 vehicles in length. Therefore, one activity of this time period was sitting in a vehicle and waiting to pay the "toll", if luckily the campground hadn't filled up. Another activity corresponding to and coming after paying the toll, was the setting up of camp. For those units having already been in the campground, a somewhat different array of activities were observed. For a few units, packing the vehicle and leaving the campsite was still going on. Getting into the vehicle and leaving the campsite was a frequently observed activity, as well as just walking out of the campsite. For those who remained in or near the campsite, sitting was the main activity observed. Sitting in lawn chairs was most frequently observed, but sitting at the picnic table, on the ground, inside a camper truck, trailer, or motor home also occurred. While sitting in these various places, several different but common kinds of activities were observed. Most common and frequent was talking.

Talking occurred in most sitting arrangements of two or more persons but generally another activity was taking place along with, or accompanying talking. Playing cards or another type of game was the most frequent activity accompanying talking. Watching and/or stoking a fire was another activity that took place while sitting and talking. Examples of other activities that took place while sitting included reading, sleeping, cooking, and observing children. Other activities were cleaning up activities such as vacuuming, washing dishes, and taking garbage to the garbage can; equipment maintenance activities such as checking the oil, changing flat tires, and washing windows; and play activities such as lawn darts, frisbee, chopping wood, bike riding, playing with a dog, and watching TV. Still another activity observed at this time was that of asking questions regarding directions. It appears that in the highly developed campgrounds, with the great number of campsites and campsite sections, people may get lost just trying to find their campsite. This occurred several times at the highly developed campgrounds when either by passing in a car or just walking, campers would ask other campers where a particular site was located and, in most cases, the response was that neither party knew, i. e., "I just got here myself," "I don't know, I barely found this site," or "It must be that way."

Another aspect worth noting in this time period was, the highly developed campground was used as a place not only where camping

takes place but serves a variety of functions. One of these functions was to provide cheap accommodations while visiting the immediate vicinity. Two examples of this occurred at the time when we were in the campground, with a rodeo and a baseball tournament taking place not far from the campground. During the time the rodeo and tournament were taking place, a noticeable number of units appeared dressed in either baseball hats and sometimes baseball uniforms, or in cowboy boots and hats. By this time of the day, the unit members and unit vehicles would be gone, leaving no one to observe in their campsites.

1400-1559 Less Developed Campground

The above functions did not seem to be present at the less developed campground; probably because of the distance away from any sizable population center. Although the two types of campgrounds differ considerably in many respects, including activities observed, there were some distinct similarities in activities from 1400 to 1559.

Sitting, which was observed as one of the major activities in the highly developed campground, was also a major activity in the less developed campground at this time. Sitting in lawn chairs was seen to be a frequent occurrence; although sitting at the picnic table, in a shelter, on a stump, on the ground, or on the bank of a creek with feet in the water was not uncommon. While sitting, various kinds of activities took place; eating, roasting hot dogs over a fire, peeling

potatoes, washing dishes, playing cards, reading, talking, sleeping, and watching activity only to mention those most commonly observed.

A few units were preparing and eating lunch, while others were snacking on beer and potato chips. This was taking place both inside the shelter and near the picnic table.

Swimming or wading was a very frequent activity for both adults and children, in contrast to the highly developed campground where adults rarely indulged in any water activity, except fishing. Air mattresses, rubber rafts, or inner tubes were used during swimming and wading time. In the case of a river or creek, inner tubes would be used to travel the rapids.

Another activity of some frequency was walking through the campground and picking up beer bottles and pop cans. This seemed to consume a great deal of time for the children. Riding bikes was also observed at this time.

Because there was no supplied wood at the less developed campground, if a unit desired a fire then wood gathering was a must. Sticks and branches, or sometimes whole trees would be collected and chopped up during this time for the coming evening's fire.

It has been mentioned that in the highly developed campground, units would still be leaving and new units would be pouring in. On a much smaller scale this was also true at the less developed campground with a few units leaving and a few units arriving. The only

significant change in the inflow and outflow of units was on Friday, when the inflow would be greater than the outflow and on Sunday when the outflow would be greater than the inflow. Another phenomena in which this report was interested as a side issue and as a hopeful partial explanation for Hendee's theme that campgrounds are places to be social, was that of stranger encounters among children, particularly young children. The only observed occurrences of this phenomena took place in the less developed campground between several children. It was thought that as the children got together, the parents might get together as was reported in some studies dealing with life in suburbia and the campground. But among young children, in one case, it was the parents who got the children together after which no further contact between the parents was observed. This is not to say that children encounters did not take place but that between strangers, social interaction was at a minimum, which refutes the Hendee and Campbell argument.

Still another activity observed at the less developed campground was an almost daily visit to the air conditioned "Mama and Papa" general store at Union Creek. This may very well have been the pattern at the highly developed campgrounds also, but at the less developed campground, it was easier to observe. With only a small creek and little breeze, the air conditioned store provided not only an established place to buy food, but also a sanctuary from the continual heat.

It should be mentioned here that at the less developed campground, frisbee, football, baseball, lawn darts, horseshoes, car cruising, and mass bicycling were not observed. With the exception of occasional bicycle riding, none of the above activities occurred at the less developed campground while these kinds of activities were frequently observed in the highly developed campground. Therefore, it can be stated that the differences in the two campgrounds were not only in regard to the physical layout of the campgrounds and the interaction patterns but also the kinds of activity patterns engaged in.

1600-1759 Highly Developed Campground

In the highly developed campground, the arrival and setting up of camp was the most frequently observable activity in the campground. For those units who were already set up, and in their campsites, sitting in lawn chairs or at the picnic table talking, playing games, reading, or watching the activity of other units seemed to be the major activities at this time.

Units were also beginning to return from a day's journey, in their vehicles. Some of these units had been sightseeing (in Astoria), hiking (in Wallowa Mountains), beach combing (at the Pacific Ocean), swimming (in Wallowa Lake), fishing (by ocean charter), going to and participating in baseball tournaments (in Enterprise and Seaside), and going to and participating in a rodeo (in Enterprise). In response

to some of the activities engaged in, e. g., baseball, hiking, and rodeo, an activity commonly observed in the campground at this time period was people going to the utility buildings for showers.

Along with the arrival of new units and the arrival of units who had been away from their site and in most cases away from the campground, units were also beginning to prepare for the evening by chopping wood and beginning to prepare for dinner by "setting" the picnic table or the table inside their shelters.

1600-1759 Less Developed Campground

In the less developed campground, the single noticeable difference from the highly developed campground was the lack of rushing around by the campers. In the highly developed campground with so many people around, it appeared that most people were doing things "by the numbers." For example, in the highly developed campground it was easy to look around and see campers doing somewhat similar things and therefore develop activity patterns which could be used in descriptions like the present one. However, in the less developed campground, the patterns of activities described almost became individual activity patterns instead of aggregate patterns because there were fewer people doing them. Part of this rushing atmosphere may be in part due to the tremendous turn-over rate of camping units each day in the highly developed campground and the frequency with which

vehicles were used, causing, at times, minor traffic congestion at intersections. A related explanation may be that because of distance between campsites and the natural barriers between campsites at the less developed campground, campers felt less inclined to follow any strict pattern of how to camp, which may be exhibited if "neighbors" were more available for observation as was the case in the highly developed campground. It should be emphasized that this "rushing" difference being suggested was not restricted to the 1600 to 1759 hours time period but it was at this time period and after several weeks in the field that we began to observe this difference repeatedly.

As in the highly developed campground, sitting continued to be a major activity in the less developed campground. Sitting was being done mostly in lawn chairs, with sitting also being observed at picnic tables and inside shelters. Sitting was generally accompanied with drinking, smoking, talking, or reading. Fishing, which was rare from 1200 to 1559, was now being revitalized with campers fishing from rubber rafts and from the bank.

The campfire played an important part in camping. In the highly developed campground with wood available, every unit observed had a fire at least once, with some units having one long continuous fire. With the woodbins not available and the task of preparing and starting a fire slightly more difficult, as in the case of the less developed campgrounds, fires were still a vital part of camping. Every unit observed

in the less developed campground also had a fire at least once. The difference between the two campgrounds was that the fires at the less developed campground were on the whole shorter in length of time and were generally observed at two distinct times; once in the early morning (for breakfast and general heating) and again in the evening (for dinner and evening conversation). There seemed to be either a sense of conservation or an appreciation for having to collect and chop one's own wood in the less developed campground, so as not to use the wood needlessly. Of course, there were a few cases observed at the less developed campground, where the lack of woodbins and supplied wood was seen as no problem at all. In these cases, power saws were used to either saw fallen trees, or to fell a living tree, thus collecting a substantial wood supply. But even in these cases, the fires did not burn as long as some at the highly developed campground.

Another activity engaged in at this time was walking. Walking can be associated with collecting wood, collecting beer bottles and pop cans, walking throughout the campground with no apparent purpose, and walking within the campground with a purpose, i.e., going fishing, going to the pit toilet, going swimming, or going to the store.

1800-1959 Highly Developed Campground

At this time period, in the highly developed campground, there were only a few sites which had camping equipment present but no

people present. This was a time of more activity in and around the campsite than the previous time period. Most of the activities engaged in during this time period can be described as revolving around mealtime. It was during this time period that most of the unit members consumed dinner. Most of the preparation of the meals was done either inside the shelter (in cases of camper trucks, trailers, and motor homes) or outside on Coleman stoves. If it was done inside the shelter, females were most likely preparing the meal, but if it was outside, on Coleman stoves, males could be observed doing the cooking.

In eating the meal, several different arrangements were observed. For those units with family and/or friends within the campground and who were camped next to each other, eating outside on two picnic tables which had been pulled together was quite common. Rarely did this type of unit eat inside their shelter. On the other hand, units without family and/or friends within the campground were more inclined to eat inside their shelters (trailer and motor homes particularly) than eat outside at the picnic table.

After finishing the meal, washing dishes and cleaning up the table was generally a task for females. It was interesting to note that in the units using tents as the main shelter, the tasks of meal preparation and cleaning up was more of a shared experience between males and females than in those units using camper trucks, trailers, or motor homes. The obvious answer to this situation was that the preparing of

meals and the cleaning up of meals is traditionally a female task. But this answer doesn't get at the difference between the two phenomena. A more likely answer which extends and clarifies the sex role differentiation notion was that in the more technological , sophisticated shelter there were kitchens with stoves, refrigerators, and cupboards. These kinds of technological aids simulated an environment not too dissimilar to that "at home" wherein the traditional role of females as meal preparer and dish washer are established. In coming to the campground for whatever reason, in a "home like" shelter which reenforces past activity patterns, it can be expected that the male and female will act in some respects as they act "at home". In this case, when the cooking and dish washing was done inside the shelter, females were almost always involved.

If units lacked the sophisticated equipment as in the case of tenters, the past environment which reenforces activity patterns was missing and alternative activity patterns were observed, that is, more involvement by males in the preparation and cleaning up of meals.

A phenomenon which was constant throughout the day and which involved several kinds of activities was that of the fire. The activity involving the fire can be broken down into three areas. The first area was the gathering of wood. Most of the units had plenty of wood, but in order to get a fresh supply or keep a fast diminishing wood stack in "good" shape, frequent trips to the woodbin were necessary. In a

few cases, units would gather an entire pick-up truck load, haul it to their site, and chop wood to their heart's content. The second area, was the chopping of wood. After gathering the wood, many units would chop and stack the wood in a very orderly manner. Most of the units observed had stacks of wood, with some close to a half a cord. The stack of wood itself was, in some cases, divided up into large pieces of wood, medium sized pieces of wood, and small pieces of wood. An important note here was that as cooking and washing dishes were mainly female tasks, the gathering and chopping of wood was mainly a male task. Females were only seen chopping wood under one or both of two conditions: 1) When a tent was the main shelter; and 2) among young females in the units. The third area of the campfire activity was the building and maintaining of the fire. If a fire was not going just before this time period, the chances of observing a fire being built were very good. More than likely the fire had already been built and maintenance of this fire was the activity to be readily observable. Maintenance of the fire entailed the continual stoking and feeding of wood into the fire. This activity was engaged in by more and more people as dinner was concluded and people gathered around the fire for the evening.

After dinner, there were several activities which were frequently engaged in. The most common was sitting in lawn chairs, at the picnic table, or in the shelter. While sitting, the people might be

reading a book, newspaper, or magazine; roasting marshmallows over the fire; talking; smoking; or watching the activity in their site or another site. Play was also engaged in after dinner within the site. Such things as lawn darts, cards, hide and seek, tag, or simply playing with a bucket and shovel in the dirt were commonly observed. Other kinds of activities observed at this time included hanging clothes on a clothes line (a rope strung between trees), cleaning and washing bikes, blowing up a rubber raft, listening to a cassette or radio, or the setting up of camp. In mentioning that units were still setting up camp, it should be mentioned that most of these cases were those units who had reservations and didn't have to compete for a site.

There were also several different activities engaged in outside of the site at this time. Most common was walking through the campground. It was at this time also, that activities such as go-carting, roller skating, phone calling, frisbee, baseball (fly-up), horseshoes, and lawn darts were engaged in with increasing frequency. Two activities which were fairly restricted to the highly developed campground in comparison to the less developed campground and which could be observed with the increasing frequency of walking were the numerous bikes on the street, coupled with the growing numbers of vehicles cruising the streets. It would be reasonable to think that the nature trails would be used by pedestrians for getting from one place to another, leaving the streets to the vehicles and bicycles but by our

observations the streets and nature trails served two different functions. The nature trails were generally located behind campsites or around the perimeter of the campground, where observing campsites would be difficult. Their purpose, as one park manager put it, was to "give the camper the illusion of being in a fairly secluded forest or campground."

The nature trails, if used at all, were generally not used as viable transportation routes but, as implied above, they were used as a mechanism of illusion, to give to the camper the impression of being out in the wilds. At this time period, the nature trails received a minimum of use. Most of the entire campground were either in their campsites (near the streets) or on the streets walking, riding, or driving. To get an idea of the confusion and competition for street space, it should first be noted that, in general, the main streets of the campground were just wide enough for two vehicles coming in opposite directions to navigate past each other and possibly have a foot or so to spare. Added to this was the passing of vehicles in fairly large numbers (most were cruising the streets as is done by young people on Friday and Saturday nights in certain areas of most cities), and groups of bicyclers (in some instances we referred to them as bicycle gangs because of the speed and carelessness in which they rode) weaving their way around the vehicles and people headed in no particular direction but rather just "out to see what's happening."

To top this off, sprinkle a few hundred people walking in several different directions dodging both bicycles and vehicles. If this scene can be imagined, what we have is a highly developed campground from about 1900 to 2100 hours. This illustration is not true of the entire campground at this time, but rather is limited to the main arterials (what we referred to in our notes as the Autobahns of the campground).

In wrapping up this time period for the highly developed campground, one further comment should be made about walking on the street. This was not the only time period noted for walking on the streets. Walking on the streets was a continuous activity engaged in all day long. What was significant about this time period was that most of those who were staying the night had their camps set up and from listening to street conversation, the main purpose for walking the campground for both new units and "old timers" (those who had been in camp more than one day) was both to feel out the campground and to see what other campers have in the way of equipment. This seems more than reasonable when translating this into city life. Many times a person who has moved from one city to another, or even within a particular city, doesn't have time to "feel out" the neighborhood. This is done after the move if it is done at all.

1800-1959 Less Developed Campground

As in the highly developed campground, the main activities in

the less developed campground at this time can be categorized as revolving around mealtime. The same cooking and cleaning up relationship held for units in the less developed campground who cook and clean up within the shelter (that is, the female does it). The difference between the two campgrounds though was that proportionately more units were in tents at the less developed campground than at the highly developed campground and besides this, more meals were prepared and cleaned up outside of the shelter. This means, and was confirmed by observation, that males engaged in some aspect of preparing and cleaning up from meals more, in the less developed campground, than in the highly developed campground. This indicated that there was more of a sharing of mealtime experience and responsibility in the less developed campground. It was commonly observed that males would get water for heating, engage in cooking (particularly breakfast and dinner), and even at times wash dishes.

Sitting was again another major activity. Campers would continue to sit in lawn chairs most often, followed by sitting at the picnic table or inside the shelter. While sitting, any of a number of activities might be engaged in - for example, feeding the fire; reading; talking; writing; comforting a baby; listening to the radio (very subjective interpretation); and (a main difference from the highly developed campground) playing the guitar, banjo, or fiddle and singing. This latter sitting activity was (also a standing activity) observed

several times in the less developed campground and was never observed in the highly developed campground.

Fire starting and maintaining were also activities engaged in frequently at this time. Females, in the less developed campground while receiving help in the mealtime tasks from males, also shared some of the wood gathering, fire building, and fire maintaining tasks with males, more so than observed in the highly developed campground. It was not uncommon to see females gathering sticks, fallen branches, or even chopping branches and trees with an axe and then hauling them back to their sites.

Thus, in at least two activities, mealtime and wood gathering and chopping, there appeared to be noticeable sex role differences between tenters and more sophisticated shelters. And, also, there appeared to be some sex role differences between campground types.

A few other activities engaged in at this time included shooting sling shots, flying a wooden airplane, trapping and chasing chipmunks, and washing cars. These activities are mentioned here not only because they occurred at this time, but more specifically these activities were not observed at the highly developed campground. With the exception of washing cars, a fairly reasonable case can be made to suggest that the kinds of activities engaged in at the less developed campground required more imagination and less technology than those at the highly developed campground. Put very briefly, at the highly

developed campground, potential activities and activity areas were, to a great extent, premade, scheduled, and categorized. One can go-cart at a go-cart track, baseball is played in a fairly open area, as well as frisbee. Lawn darts has rules and the roller skating rink, as well as the marina, only open during certain hours. These kinds of activities and activity areas, when made available, offered options but also in many ways restricted imagination and for all intents and purposes they could be engaged in at home as well, and in some cases more often than in the campground. In the less developed campground in comparison to the highly developed campground, there was a general lack of specified activity areas and a general lack of structured activities to be engaged in. While some may argue this cuts down on possible alternatives, we would argue that this kind of atmosphere allowed for and, in some respects, demanded that campers use their imagination and skills in developing techniques and strategies for passing time. Thus we had beer can and pop bottle pick-ups, guitar playing, singing, chasing chipmunks, flying wooden planes, shooting sling shots, and helgramite catching along with tree frog catching, in contrast to the kinds of activity patterns displayed in the highly developed campground.

2000-2159 Highly Developed Campground

During this time period the sun set and a previously busy camp-

ground began to slow down. With the sun setting, lanterns and fluorescent lights began to light up the campsites. In the highly developed campground, at this time, the campfire was the major focus around which most activity revolved. During this period, chopping wood and feeding the fire were the mainstays of camping. Following campfire maintenance and very much related to it was sitting. Lawn chairs again won as the place most frequented by sitters, followed by the picnic table. While sitting around the fire, such activities as reading, talking, roasting marshmallows or hot dogs, playing cards or yatzee, and staring into the fire were the most common events to occur.

An activity which was basically concluded by now, but, in a few cases, still was being engaged in was cooking, eating, and washing dishes. This was particularly true of those units who had recently set up camp.

Radios and cassette recorders now were heard on occasion as the campground quieted down. In a rare instance, the volume was such that the sounds of Buck Owens and His Buckaroos were heard 1/3 of a mile away (this happened on the 4th of July).

If the unit was inside their shelter, more than likely they were at the table (in cases of camper trucks, trailers, and motor homes) reading, talking, playing cards or staring out the windows.

Before it got too dark, games, such as lawn darts, fly-up, badminton, frisbee, and horseshoes, were commonly played. On the 4th

of July fireworks, which had been going off sporadically all day, were at this time going off at much higher frequencies. This continued until approximately 0230 in the morning.

At 2045, in the highly developed campground, country and Western music came over loud speakers announcing that it was time to go to the theater to watch slides, mainly about Oregon State Parks. We observed between 250 and 550 people, each evening, drift to the theater to be entertained for 30 to 45 minutes.

Another activity which was similar in frequency as that noted in the morning was the trips to the rest stations and utility buildings during this time period. Campers went there to shave, shower, brush teeth, and set hair - not to mention the biological reasons for the trip. Still another activity which, by the end of this time period, was beginning to be observed more frequently was the increasing number of units who had gone to bed.

Before discussing the less developed campground, it should be noted here, there were four experiences of camping that occurred approximately at this time period and which represented some distinct differences between the less developed campground and the highly developed campground.

First, earlier an instance of a boy on a bike getting lost was discussed. During the 2000 to 2159 time period, still another lost camper came to our attention. This was a young male (probably 6) who was

crying, at the side of the street, when we happened by. After taking him to the registration booth, we asked him how he got lost and why he could not find his campsite? His reply was "Everything is so big and looks so different." This was a recurrent theme in the highly developed campground. The campground was laid out so that each section is not too dissimilar and yet campers cram themselves into the campsites side by side, each with slightly different equipment, making the recognition of a particular campsite quite difficult. This difficulty was comparable to a young child being lost in the city or suburbs and yet being only a few blocks away - riding around on his bicycle; or an adult trying to find a particular house (having been there only once) but not having the address. The buildings might be similar, but yet each was slightly different, making recognition of the right block or section sometimes difficult.

Although we have no proof of the number of people getting lost in the large city in comparison to the smaller city, we did have proof that people did get lost in the highly developed campground, while we came into contact with no lost persons in the less developed campground. This suggested that differences in size of campground and differences in population size, density, and heterogeneity might very well effect people in different ways.

Second, one kind of person the highly developed campground attracted was represented by "Grandpa", an elderly man who claimed

not to be a camper. He and his wife (elderly female) camped in a 17 foot trailer. While at Wallowa Lake, Grandpa told us that they had had twelve trailers in twenty years but didn't consider themselves campers, or trailer people, because they had their friends and family in the city (Portland). Interestingly enough, two weeks later we saw Grandpa and his wife in Fort Stevens, camping. Since we were not observing them in Ft. Stevens, we asked them about what they thought of the crowding and smog in some campgrounds like Wallowa Lake and Fort Stevens. Grandpa's response was, "I'd rather die of carbon monoxide than be alone in one of those National Forest campgrounds."

Grandpa, as was noted in personal field notes, was the type of person Hendee must have been referring to as being social, because he was definitely "social". Being a car salesman for 45 years, he had learned how to talk to strangers under most circumstances and took any available opportunity to do so. But Hendee and others imply that it is the campground, or campground life, that lends itself to being social. This we cannot accept. Grandpa confessed to being social everywhere, not only in the campground.

Grandpa's attitude toward the highly developed campground was countered by campers in the less developed campground who responded in different ways to the question, "Why do you camp here?" Some of their responses were: "Those other campgrounds are like the city", "Too city-like", "I come here to get away from that kind

of atmosphere", "It's free", "Ya don't need reservations here", "Less crowded", "I've come here for 18 years", and "Not so many rules."

On the one hand, we have the "Grandpa's" who enjoyed crowds, structure and compactness; on the other hand were people who liked fewer people around, freedom of choice, less structure, and more elbow room. These differences being discussed did not claim to be the prime differences for campground selection or prime movers in camper attitude; but, nonetheless in the units observed, these kinds of differences did seem to fit for some of them.

Third, another incident that occurred in the highly developed campground that did not occur in the less developed campground was the phenomena of being asked to buy beer for minors. The campers who asked for the beer were 14 to 16 years of age (males and females) and when asked why they would possibly want to drink in a campground with so many things to do, two different responses followed: 1) "My parents have gone to town to drink," and 2) "Are you kidding, there ain't a damn thing to do around here." A somewhat related phenomena occurring at the highly developed campground and not at the less developed campground was the constant presence of police. At this time period, we observed five different police cars pass us. As they passed, their intercom could be heard from as much as 20 - 30 feet away (approximately the distance from a campsite

picnic table to the street). It was felt that study on the need for, and presence of, the police in campgrounds would be highly illuminating.

Fourth, this last incident concerns the campfire and points to still another difference between the two types of campgrounds. Observing the consequences of campfires did not emerge as an interesting phenomena until, while observing in a highly developed campground, we noticed what the thick flowing smoke of between 200 to 600 campfires was doing. The smoke was clinging around tree-top level and being funneled off in the direction the wind blew. In the case of Wallowa Lake, the smoke (which, if seen from a vantage point looked as thick as some of the smoggier days in Portland) was carried out onto the lake, where it eventually dissipated. In the less developed campground with fewer sites, the smoke from the campfires was not nearly as thick as that of the highly developed campground. The difference between the two types of campgrounds was not only that in one there was thicker smoke; but also in the potential problems that might arise from the thick hanging smoke. Burning eyes and occasional coughing were observed as a result of smoke, in a few instances, so the fact remained that campers were disturbed by the thick smoke.

2000-2159 Less Developed Campground

In the less developed campground, the campfire was the main

event around which most activity revolved, similar to the highly developed campground. Sitting around or near the campfire in lawn chairs, at the picnic table, or on stumps, was the major activity. While sitting, reading, talking watching people or the fire, roasting marshmallows, feeding the baby, looking at maps, or playing the guitar, banjo, or fiddle and singing was observed. If, at this time, the unit was not outside by the campfire, then most likely it was inside the shelter sitting at the table talking among themselves, reading, or playing cards.

There were a few people at this time, particularly from 2000 to 2059, who were outside of the campsite but still within the campground. Some of the activities they may be engaged in included picking berries, walking, fishing, bike riding, washing dishes by the water hydrant, playing tag, or sitting along the bank of the creek or lake.

From 2100 to 2159 hours, lanterns and flashlights replaced the sun light. There were frequent trips to the pit toilet and an increasing number of units retired to their shelters letting the campfire die out slowly as they prepared for bed and eventually extinguished their light.

2200 - Highly Developed Campground

At this time, in the highly developed campground, there were only a few units in the entire campground who were still up (most had

gone to bed). Of those remaining up, most were inside their shelters, sitting at the table reading, talking, or playing cards. There were only a few campers outside. Those outside were sitting near their campfires talking and maybe listening to a radio. There were trips still being made to the oft visited rest station or utility buildings; but even this activity was tapering off rapidly.

As 2300 hours rolled around, the campfires, lanterns, and shelter lights that had replaced the sunshine were mostly all out. The campground was fairly quiet, at rest, waiting for tomorrow.

2200 - Less Developed Campground

In the less developed campground, after 2200 hours, a similar pattern to that exhibited in the highly developed campground existed. Only a few campers remained up, either inside their shelter or near the campfire. Those that remained up were talking, drinking, and/or reading. Soon the entire campground was quiet.

There was a difference in the two campgrounds that has not been mentioned as yet, and that was interesting in itself. In the highly developed campground, when all the campers put out their lights, there were still lights on. The campground itself had lights burning all night long. In many cases these were only the lights in the rest stations and utility buildings; but in some cases this meant street lights as we have in the city and suburbs. When the campers in the less developed campground put out their lights, the only light available

came from the moon and the stars.

II CONCLUSION

It has been shown that in both campground types there were at least three major activities around which the camping day revolved. These activities included eating (preparing, eating, and cleaning up), sitting, and, the various activities that were involved in the campfire.

Differences have been shown to exist in regards to all three of the main activities. For example, in the highly developed campground firewood was provided in woodbins; whereas this was not done in the less developed campground. In the less developed campground, females were more apt to be involved in the campfire activities, than they were in the highly developed campground, i.e., gathering and chopping wood.

It has been demonstrated that such things as ethnic groups, getting lost, the constant presence of police, and "autobahns" were unique to the highly developed campground and if at all present in the less developed campground, they were not as noticeable. Other kinds of differences found included the tremendous turn-over rate of campers in the highly developed campground as compared to the less developed campground, the use of the reservation system and the registration lines at the highly developed campground as compared to the less developed campground, and lastly, the activities engaged in

at the highly developed campground, i.e., go-carting, cruising in cars, roller skating, phone calling, frisbee, baseball, football, horseshoes, and lawn darts, were found to be different from the activities engaged in at the less developed campground, i.e., mini bike riding, model plane flying, shooting sling shots, hiking, fishing, inner-tubing, tag, collecting beer bottles, and playing guitars and singing.

These similarities and differences just discussed are not a complete summary of the preceding dialogue concerning a day in the campground but are indicators of "what is going on in the campground." It is hoped that by reading the description of the campground followed by this brief ethnography that the reader has by now picked up, not only a visual image of the physical layout of the campgrounds as described in the preceding chapter, but also developed a feeling of what is going on in the two campground types, as described in this temporal patterning of activities and behavior. With this accomplished we are prepared to discuss patterns of inter-unit interaction.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS

In the two preceding chapters an attempt has been made to allow the reader to "get acquainted" with the two campground types. This chapter seeks more specifically to examine inter-unit interaction by answering four general questions: 1) In general, who was interacting? What was the age and sex of those interacting? 2) How was urban-ness related to interaction generally? Do the findings support or refute the literature? 3) When acquaintanceship to other campers is taken into account, what is the relationship between urban-ness and interaction? 4) Were the conclusions reached, conveying the relation between urban-ness, acquaintanceship, and interaction born out when even finer distinction or finer dimensions of interaction are examined?

In aiding the discussion tables are presented. Because of the nature of the questions being asked, the tables will vary as to the kind of measurement procedure used, although the two procedures most frequently used will involve the proportion of units engaged in interaction and the rates by which units engaged in interaction. Any deviation from these two procedures will be preceded by a brief explanation.

I MEASUREMENT OF THE PARTICIPATION IN INTERACTION

Participation was designed to measure the extent to which camping units did or did not engage in interaction, where interaction could be either social contact or social interaction. Each selected unit focal site and its adjacent occupied units were observed for N 1/2 hour time intervals. Some sites were observed for, say, 4 different 1/2 hour intervals while other sites were observed for, say, 5 different 1/2 hour intervals. (See Appendix A) Of concern here was the question, which of the three possible levels of interaction occurred during the 1/2 hour periods in which a site was observed? Each given 1/2 hour time interval of observation of a given site was scored as exhibiting one of three mutually exclusive possibilities: no interaction, social contact, or social interaction. Since a unit could theoretically engage in more than one social interaction during any 1/2 hour of observation since the unit could engage in some social interaction and some social contact, a priority system was established which gave social interaction the highest priority, followed by social contact and then by no interaction. Thus, a unit which engaged in two social contacts and one social interaction during the 1/2 hour of observation was scored as exhibiting social interaction; a unit which engaged in only one social interaction was scored as exhibiting social interaction; a unit which engaged in any number of social contacts during the 1/2 hour

was scored as exhibiting social contact; and a unit which engaged in neither social contact nor social interaction was scored as exhibiting no interaction.

Thus, if a unit was observed for N different $1/2$ hour time intervals and engaged in social interaction in p of those time periods, its participation proportion in social interaction would be p/N . If the same unit engaged in social contact, but no social interaction during q of those time periods, its participation proportion would be q/N . If no interaction was observed during r of the time periods, the unit's participation proportion in no interaction would be r/N . Note, social interaction, social contact, and no interaction were scored so as to be mutually exclusive, ($p/N + q/N + r/N = N/N = 1.0$). The residual interactions and/or contacts which may have occurred during any $1/2$ hour of observation were considered when scoring the rates of interaction.

The participation proportions for classes of camping units was derived by simply adding the participation proportion for all units comprising that class and dividing that number by the number of $1/2$ hour observation periods. For example, the participation proportion for social interaction of all observed units in highly developed campgrounds was .22, which indicated that 22% of all the $1/2$ hour-unit observations in highly developed campgrounds exhibited at least one social interaction. The participation proportion in social contact for

the same class of camping units was .05, which indicated that 5% of all the 1/2 hour-unit observations in highly developed campgrounds exhibited at least one social contact and no social interaction. The participation proportion for no interaction in the same class of units was .73, which indicated that 73% of all the 1/2 hour-unit observations in highly developed campgrounds exhibited no interaction. Note that the sum of the three proportions totals one.

II MEASUREMENT OF THE RATE OF INTERACTION

In contrast to the participation measure, the rate measure takes into account the total number of events (social interactions and social contacts) in a given time period. The total number of time periods in which a given site could possibly be observed interacting was N , where N was the number of 1/2 hour time intervals that the site was observed. Of concern here is the question, how many of the two possible levels of interaction occurred during the 1/2 hour period in which a site was observed? During each given 1/2 hour observation period a site was scored as exhibiting the actual number of social interactions and social contacts observed.

Note that in this procedure each unit being observed for 1/2 hour time periods constitutes the base for interaction. The events being counted are not the number of unit-to-unit interactions in the total campground but rather the number of inter-unit interactions engaged

in by the units under observation.

This distinction is necessary to understand for two reasons:

1) Since units under observation were adjacent to one another, interaction occurred frequently between units under observation as well as between a unit being observed and a unit outside the field of observation. Since interaction could occur with units located outside the observational field, and since there was no way to monitor the total campground, (that is, no way to include outside units in the exposure to risk denominator of the ratio) the events must be considered as occurring only to units within the observational field. So, if an observed unit interacted with a unit located outside the field of observation, this counted as one event, since it occurred to a unit being observed. 2) When an interaction occurred between two units which were being observed, this counted as two events, not one. This emphasizes the fact that each unit was being considered as a unit of analysis.¹

¹This problem is very similar to the calculation of nuptiality rates. The total marriage rate is calculated by dividing the number of marriages which occur (comparable to the number of interactions) by the single population aged 15 and over (comparable to the total unit hours spent in the campground). The total marriage rate is less desirable in reflecting nuptiality processes than are the sex specific marriage rates, however, since the sex composition of the unmarried 15 year olds and over population influences the occurrence of marriages but is not reflected in the total marriage rate. Similarly, in the campground, interaction process, the ratio of observed to un-observed units would influence the number of interactions observed, so we turn to an observed unit specific interaction rate just as demographers turn

If inter-unit interactions were to be considered the basis of events, rather than 1/2 hours of exposure to risk, the exposure to risk would have to include the number of combinations of all units in the campground taken two at a time, times the length of observation time. Since the number of units in the campground changes throughout the day and since there was no way to monitor the entire campground, this type of approach would have required constant alternations in the risk of exposure and supernatural observational powers. Lacking the resources for both requirements, we have turned to observed unit specific interaction rates as the next best procedure.

Thus, if a unit was observed for N different 1/2 hour time intervals and engaged in p social interactions in those N time periods, its rate of social interaction would be p/N . If the same unit also engaged in q social contacts during those N time periods, its rate of social contact would be q/N . Note, while social interaction and social contacts can be scored as mutually exclusive, they can occur within the same time period and thus theoretically can exceed 1.0, as was not

to sex specific nuptuality rates. The additional problem in measuring interaction, however, is that "males can marry males," that is, units being observed can interact with other units being observed. If homosexual marriages were to occur, these would be counted as two events in the sex specific nuptuality rates because each was exposed to risk and each was married. This comparison illustrates that it is the events of interaction which are of interest, not the objects that are interacting, and furthermore, these events occur to individual units (even though other units are involved) and not to unit dyads.

possible in the measurement of participation proportions.

The rate of social interaction or social contact for classes of units was derived by adding the total number of social interactions or social contacts of all units comprising that class and dividing by the number of 1/2 hour observation periods. For example, the rate of social interaction for highly developed campgrounds was .26, which indicated that 26 social interactions occurred for every 100 1/2 hour-unit observation periods. The rate of social contact for the same class of camping units was .06, which indicated that 6 social contacts occurred for every 100 1/2 hour-unit observation periods.

Before beginning the analysis, it should be made clear that no tests of significance were made on the data and thus in some cases (especially when the N was small) sampling errors could account for the percentage differences. The strength of the percentages discussed here is that the resultant directions are fairly consistent and show several distinct patterns of interaction behavior.

III CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERACTANTS

Having described the ecological properties of the campgrounds and having oriented the reader to the general kinds of behavior observed in the two campground types, it would be advantageous to begin the analysis of interaction patterns by asking: Who is interacting?

Who is Involved in Interaction

It is important that while the major part of this analysis is concerned with inter-unit interaction, the tables in this section of the analysis also depict the elements (people) within the unit and their contributions to interaction. This investigation of the age and sex characteristics of the units observed will provide further support for the rest of the analysis which will stress in finer detail, the influence of ecological properties and acquaintanceships upon interaction.

Table I documents the age and sex of all individuals observed in social interaction with units being observed both within and around the campsite area. Three trends emerge: 1) Males were more involved in interaction (males 55% and females 45%). 2) Middle-aged people were more involved in interaction (total of 32%) 3) Young children were least involved in interaction (total of 9%). Further breakdown of the data is necessary because the distribution of interaction (Table I) is very similar to the age and sex distribution of the campers (Appendix E), suggesting that there may be only minimal age and sex differences in interaction.

If the data are broken down, controlling for campground type, Table II is the result. Notice, here, that the same overall relationships as existed in Table I are also exhibited in Table II, with a few interesting campground distinctions. First, notice that the difference between males and females is greatest in the less developed camp-

TABLE I

PEOPLE INVOLVED IN INTERACTION

Percentage of observed people involved in interaction by sex, by age, and by age-sex.

	Elderly	Middle-Age	Young Adult	Teen-Age	Child	Young Child	
Female	7%	14%	7%	8%	6%	3%	45%
Male	8%	18%	7%	7%	9%	6%	55%
	15%	32%	14%	15%	15%	9%	100% (604)*

* Total number of people observed.

TABLE II

PEOPLE INVOLVED IN INTERACTION BY CAMPGROUND

Percentage of observed people involved in interaction by campground, by sex, by age, and by age-sex.

Highly Developed

	Elderly	Middle-Age	Young Adult	Teen-Age	Child	Young Child	
Female	8%	13%	6%	8%	8%	3%	46%
Male	9%	19%	5%	7%	9%	3%	52%
	17%	32%	11%	15%	17%	6%	98% (367)

Less Developed

Female	5%	16%	10%	7%	3%	2%	43%
Male	7%	16%	10%	5%	9%	10%	57%
	12%	32%	20%	12%	12%	12%	100% (237)

ground (14% as compared to 8% in the highly developed campground). Second, in further support of the differences between males and females, notice the fairly large difference in the "middle-aged" category of the highly developed campground (males 19%, females 13%) and the "young child" category of the less developed campground (males 10% and females 2%). Third, contrasting the two types of campgrounds by age, notice the different percentage patterns. In the less developed campground the middle-aged category (32%) is followed by the young-adult category (20%) with the other categories all exhibiting the same level of involvement (12% each). In the highly developed campground, the middle-aged category again has the highest involvement (32%) but is followed by the elderly and child categories (17%) which is followed by the teen-age (15%), the young-adult (11%), and the young-child (6%) categories.

With this type of distribution of interaction involvement, it appears that not only were the campgrounds different in respect to demographic and non-demographic factors, but the campgrounds were also different as far as age and sex involvement in interaction was concerned.

Initiator of Interaction

In order to demonstrate this difference even more distinctly in answering the question of who was interacting, we turn to Table III and

examine the initiations of interactions and contacts. Hendee and Campbell report that new arrivals exchange names and children form play groups; but there is no mention of who, in terms of age and sex, initiates the interaction. (17, p. 21) A limitation of the results in the present report is that only a total of 86 initiations were observed. In most cases, the interaction was already in progress, making it difficult to determine who initiated the interaction. Table III supports the general age and sex results found in Table I by illustrating even more dramatically the dominance of males (66%) over females (33%) in initiating interaction, the dominance of middle-aged initiators (45%) over any other age category, and the relatively few initiations made by young children (4%). The important difference between this Table and Table I is the sharp increase in the percentage of young-adults initiating interaction followed by a decrease in the elderly, teen-age, child, and young-child categories. It was frequently observed that once the initiation had taken place and the interaction continued over time, more people would become included.

A partial explanation for the difference in male-female initiations could be that in both types of campgrounds females, more than males, were preparing and cleaning up meals and were cleaning up campsites. While the females were busy at maintenance tasks, the males could be doing one of a hundred different things, many of which provided opportunities for interaction. For example, checking under

TABLE III

INITIATOR OF INTERACTION

Percentage of observed initiations of interaction or contact by sex, by age, and by age-sex.

	Elderly	Middle Aged	Young Adult	Teen-Age	Child	Young Child	
Female	0	17%	9%	5%	0	2%	33%
Male	8%	28%	15%	7%	6%	2%	<u>66%</u>
	8%	45%	24%	12%	6%	4%	99% (86)

the hood of a vehicle was a perfect opportunity for one male to initiate an interaction with any other male who might be near by. Another example was going to the woodbin or gathering wood. While the female in general, was restricted to the campsite and in many cases to the inside of the shelter (particularly at meal time) the male was free to engage in a variety of different activities.

One reason initiation by children was not higher is that many of the campsites had more than a nuclear family in them. In one instance, there were 18 people in one campsite, most of them children. Thus, in many cases, units occupying campsites were self-sufficient in that the children were supplied with playmates in their own units, not needing to initiate interaction with other units.

Initiation by Campground Type

Looking at initiations and separating for campground differences, Table IV points to some interesting patterns of behavior. First, among the elderly, only the males were observed initiating interaction (highly developed 7%, and less developed 10%), although females were involved (Table II) after initiation. Second, the middle-aged group in the highly developed campground has a much higher percentage of initiations (52%) than the same age group in the less developed campground (37.5%). Third, teen-agers in the highly developed campground were observed initiating interaction more often (17%)

TABLE IV

INITIATOR OF INTERACTION BY CAMPGROUND

Percentage of observed initiations of interaction or contact by sex, by age, by age-sex, and by campground type.

Highly Developed

	Elderly	Middle-Age	Young Adult	Teen-Age	Child	Young Child	
Female	0	17%	9%	4%	0	2%	32%
Male	7%	35%	13%	13%	0	0	68%
Total	7%	52%	22%	17%	0	2%	100% (46)

Less Developed

Female	0	17.5%	10%	5%	0	2.5%	35%
Male	10%	20%	17.5%	0	12.5%	5%	65%
Total	10%	37.5%	27.5%	5%	12.5%	7.5%	100% (40)

than the same age group in the less developed campground (5%).

Fourth, the children and young children in the less developed campground were observed initiating interaction much more (20%) than the same age groups in the highly developed campground (2%).

Initiating interaction seemed to be part of a selective process that included consideration of the setting or ecological field as having an impact on interactional behavior. For example, teen-agers in the highly developed campground were observed to verbalize more and make themselves known by talking loudly, playing cassettes loudly, cruising in cars, and running through the campground (sometimes from the police). In contrast, teen-agers in less developed campgrounds were with their own unit most of the time, and if not, were involved in activities such as walking around the campground, fishing, swimming, gathering wood, reading, boating, collecting beer bottles, or doing nothing in particular. The major difference observed was that the teen-agers in the less developed campground seemed to want to commune with nature more so than teen-agers in the highly developed campground, who expressed the desire to be back home "where there were things to do. "

Children in the less developed campground were allowed more freedom to roam than those in the highly developed campground and would, in a few cases, wander into another site and form play groups with other children. In the highly developed campground (where some

children even were lost) some parents seemed lax in watching their children but on the whole they kept them under guard far more than at the less developed campground.

Initiator By Familiarity

Controlling previously existing acquaintanceships, Table V illustrates the patterns of interaction initiation that were observed (not concerned with whether the initiator knew the person with whom interaction occurred). This Table reveals several illuminating behavior patterns. First, there was a greater difference between male and female initiations when observing units who did not know any other campers (74% males, 26% females) than between male and female initiators when observing units with previously existing acquaintances within the campground (males 59%, females 41%). Second, all of the initiations in the elderly group were initiated in units with no prior social relationship with other campers (17.5%). They were also elderly males. Third, for units who knew other campers, 84% of the interactions were initiated by the middle-aged and young-adults. For units who did not know other campers, only 54.5% of the initiations involved middle-aged and young-adults. Fourth, in units without previous acquaintances in the campground, 28% of the initiations were by teen-agers, children, and young children; while only 16% were initiated by the same age groups when observing units who knew other

TABLE V

INITIATOR OF INTERACTION: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS

Percentage of observed initiations of interaction (combining campground type) by sex, by age, by sex-age, and by previously existing acquaintance with other campers.

With Family and/or Friends

	Elderly	Middle-Age	Young Adult	Teen-Age	Child	Young Child	
Female	0	23%	16%	0	0	2%	41%
Male	0	27%	18%	9%	0	5%	59%
Total	0	50%	34%	9%	0	7%	100% (44)

Without Family and/or Friends

Female	0	12%	2%	10%	0	2%	26%
Male	17.5%	28.5%	12%	4%	12%	0	74%
Total	17.5%	40.5%	14%	14%	12%	2%	100% (42)

campers within the campground.

Thus, while behavior patterns expressed here seem to follow a particular trend in each of the tables, the control factor is shown to have a definite impact as to the strength or shift of the trend. For example, Table IV displayed male dominance in initiating interaction - controlling for campground type. Table V, while also demonstrating this phenomena, illustrates an interesting relationship between initiating interaction and previously existing acquaintances. If previously existing acquaintances were within the campground, male dominance in initiating interaction waned and females were observed initiating interaction.

Another example of the influence of having family and/or friends within the campground was the initiation pattern displayed by the elderly. While the elderly were shown to be involved in interaction, only the males were observed as initiating interaction. And of the elderly males initiating interaction, only those who did not know other campers initiated interaction. A partial explanation for this is that most of the interaction observed involving elderly campers was initiated by other members of their unit. The elderly camper could become involved in the interaction but rarely initiated interaction, particularly if family and/or friends were within the campground. Those elderly who knew no other campers were mostly in small units made up of only two to four people (in one case an elderly male was the

entire unit).

When exploring interaction initiations for all those not considered adults, the units who had no other acquaintances within the campground demonstrated higher percentages of initiation. A partial reason is that if the unit itself did not supply similar age peers and if no other campers were known, in order to gain peer group contact the teen-ager or child was forced to make contact outside his or her unit. This contact could be made by engaging in a common activity (e. g., fishing, inner-tubing, or swimming), by accidentally meeting, or by being brought together by adults.

Even though these results indicate that involvement in interaction was fairly consistent with age and sex proportions observed in the campgrounds, differences in involvement patterns begin to emerge, suggesting that interaction patterns may be different under different settings or ecological fields. Correspondingly, differences in involvement patterns also have been shown to vary when a specific aspect of interaction is examined, for example, initiation. The resulting interaction patterns not only vary generally by age and sex, but age and sex differences also show up when investigating initiation controlling for campground type and acquaintanceship with other campers. The tendency for any particular age or sex to initiate an interaction has been shown to be, to some degree, influenced by at least two factors:

- 1) The ecological properties of campground; and 2) previously

existing acquaintance with other campers. The forthcoming sections will attempt to investigate the phenomenon of inter-unit interaction as related to both the ecological properties of the campground and to familiarity with other campers.

Interaction Variability

Before going further, one other aspect of who was interacting must be investigated. This concerns the variability of the units involved in interaction. In other words, of all of the interaction observed, how were they distributed among the units? The reason for illustrating unit variability is to demonstrate whether or not any particular unit was overly active in interaction. For example, in the case of the less developed campground where only 54 units were observed, if one or two units were overly active, accumulating most of the interaction scores, discussion of interaction patterns as a campground phenomena would be seriously hindered because of sampling "error" (i.e., having selected overly active units). For this reason Table VI was constructed to illustrate the unit variability.

In checking for variability, notice that for both campgrounds the highest percentage of units involved in at least one interaction occurred in the "1-2" interaction category (highly developed campground 18%, less developed campground 15%). The other units were spread thinly over the other interaction categories with only 3% of the units in the highly developed campground engaging in "9-10" interactions. Thus,

TABLE VI

UNIT INTERACTION VARIABILITY

Percentage of units by interactions observed, examining the variability (extent) of units involved in interaction by camp-ground type, and by number of interactions units were involved in.

<u>Number of Interactions</u>	<u>Highly Developed</u>	<u>Less Developed</u>
0	71%	70%
1-2	18%	15%
3-4	4%	7%
5-6	2%	6%
7-8	2%	2%
9-10	3%	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%
	(N= 107)	(N= 54)

the interactions observed and the inter-unit interaction patterns to be discussed in the remainder of the analysis can be said to have been distributed fairly evenly among the observed units.

IV ECOLOGICAL PROPERTIES - AS AN INFLUENCE IN INTERACTION BEHAVIOR

Increases in population size, and density, the main variables posited in the introduction of this report, have been shown in numerous studies to have various effects upon social relationships. Some reports indicate that as population size, density, and heterogeneity increase social relationships may be face to face but tend to be impersonal, superficial, and segmental. This implies that as populations increase in size and density, what this report has identified as social interactions would decrease. Along with this notion, as population size and density increase what this report has identified as social contacts and no interactions would decrease.

Contrary to this, recent campground literature has implied that camping is being perceived as a social event wherein interacting with other campers is an important part of camping. While most of these reports do not discuss the population issue, several of the previous campgrounds which, under this report's definition, should have displayed high population size and density and therefore should have displayed interaction patterns similar to those in the highly developed campgrounds in this report.

If the two campground types are examined as exhibiting two contrasting population sizes and densities, where the highly developed campground represents high population size and density and the less developed campground represents low population size and density, we should then expect to find higher proportions and rates of social interaction in the less developed campground.

Table VII, which displays the total participation and rates in the different levels of interaction illustrates (contrary to our expectation) that in the highly developed campground, with higher degrees of population size, and density, there was more frequent engagement in both participation (.22) and rate (.26) of social interaction than in the less developed campground (.17 and .18 respectively). It is interesting to note the increase (particularly in the highly developed campground) when comparing social interaction in participation form and rate form (from .22 to .26). Not only was there a higher proportion of units participating in social interaction, in the highly developed campground compared to the less developed campground, but some of the units in the highly developed campground were engaged in more than one social interaction per period of observation. This is quite contrary to our hypothesis which posits that as populations increase there is a corresponding decrease in social interaction.

While these results tend to suggest that sheer population size and density will not necessarily decrease the proportion or rate of

TABLE VII

TOTAL PARTICIPATION AND RATES

Observed proportions of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by campground type (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

Highly Developed	Less Developed
.22	.17
.05	.02
.73	.81

100%
(340)

100%
(265)

Participation in social interaction

Participation in social contact

Participation in no interaction

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

.26
.06

(340)

.18
.02

(265)

Rate of social interaction

Rate of social contact

social interaction, there are other ecological properties that may help explain the results illustrated in Table I. In the highly developed campground, the campsite density was much higher than in the less developed campground. This means that campsites, in the highly developed campground, were closer together than in the less developed campground. If the population densities of the highly developed campground are then added, two things result: 1) Almost every campsite was occupied; and, 2) camping units were camping quite close together. In contrast, campsites in the less developed campground were sometimes 100 feet apart. When the population density is added, two things result which are dissimilar to the highly developed campground: 1) There are proportionally more campsites unoccupied in the less developed campground than in the highly developed campground; and, 2) the camping units are at times even further away than 100 feet from other units. Thus the units in the highly developed campground, by sheer spatial distance from other units, had greater opportunities and at time "obligations" to become involved in social interaction. The units in the less developed campground, by demonstrating and maintaining greater spatial distance from other units, than could be the case in the highly developed campground, had less opportunity to become involved in social interaction than units in the highly developed campground.

For example, in Table VII, the proportion and rate of social

contacts is at least twice as great in the highly developed campground (participation .05, rate .06) as in the less developed campground (participation .02, rate .02). This tends to support our hypothesis in that as populations increased so did social contacts, that were impersonal and transitory. Because of the physical distance between units in the less developed campground, we can suggest that if either social interaction or social contact were to occur at all, it would have almost assuredly been a deliberate social interaction.

Another set of ecological properties which can partially explain the results in Table VII, are the actual physical barriers within the campground and between the units. Aside from the spatial distribution of the units, physical barriers will be treated here with specific reference to natural and man-made barriers. Physical barriers would then include such features as trees, bushes, tarps, shelters, and vehicles that blocked visual entrance into a unit's site. Also included are such things as nearness to campground and local vicinity facilities, such as the distance from the campground's public road to the unit's site or the distance from the unit's campsite to the lake, river, trails, or activity areas.

As previously mentioned in Chapter Three, the highly developed campground exhibited fewer natural barriers than the less developed campground. Not only did a bountiful supply of trees and bushes hinder observation of units in less developed campgrounds, but the

"lay of the land" and placement of campsites also hindered viewing many of the units in the less developed campground. While the land was fairly flat in the highly developed campground, the land was hilly in the less developed campground. Another important difference between the two campgrounds was the distance from the main road running through particular sections of the campground and the campsites. Whereas the campsites in the highly developed campground were quite close to the road, many campsites in the less developed campground were 20 to 50 feet from the road. Furthermore, while the land in the highly developed campground was flat (making all of the campsites easily visible from the road), there were many campsites in the less developed campground which were either above the road or below the road, making the campsites difficult for passers-by to look into.

Thus, the physical barriers of the two types of campgrounds were different. At the highly developed campground, the units camped close together, had few trees or bushes to block neighbors from viewing their campsite, and were camped near the road allowing passers-by not only an opportunity to view the campsite, but making it almost impossible not to view the campsite. At the less developed campground, the units were camped anywhere from 50 to 150 feet away from the next unit, the campground had an abundance of trees and bushes blocking clear visual entrance into a site, even by neigh-

bors, and the campsites were between 20 to 50 feet from the road making it difficult for passers-by to view the campsite without actually going into the campsite's "territory".

The physical barriers of the two campground types have implications for interaction patterns: 1) The higher the level of physical barriers, or the more physical barriers that exist in a setting, the greater the chances are that interaction will be low; and the fewer numbers of physical barriers in a setting, the greater the chances are that interaction will be high. 2) The more physical barriers that are present in a setting, the easier "escape" or "privacy" will be to attain, allowing units the option to interact. As the number of physical barriers decrease, "escape" or "privacy" will be harder to attain and maintain, making interaction not just an option but, at times, an obligation.

While Table VII illustrates the highly developed campground as featuring higher proportions of social interaction and social contact, the less developed campground is shown as opting for no interaction at higher proportions than the highly developed campground (less developed .81, highly developed .73). In translating this to the physical barriers exhibited in the two campground types, it was the less developed campground which had more physical barriers within the campground and thus higher potential for privacy. It is this potential for privacy that allowed the units in the less developed campground

the option to interact or not to interact. In the highly developed campground this option was also present, but not to the degree of that found in the less developed campground.

In referring these results to the literature dealing with population, size, and density and the literature dealing with the interaction behavior of campers, it is suggested that population size and density alone cannot account for the interaction pattern observed in Table VII. Other aspects, such as campsite density and the physical barriers of the campground, also play a part in influencing interaction patterns. The highly developed campground has higher rates of interaction than the less developed campground; but if the proportion of no interaction in either campground is compared to the other levels of interaction, notions that the campground is being defined as a "social event" where sociability is becoming mandatory are hardly called for.

V FAMILIARITY OF UNITS - AS AN INFLUENCE IN INTERACTION BEHAVIOR

Another variable which may influence interaction patterns, and which has frequently been ignored in previous studies is the familiarity of camping units. If on the one hand, the campground is being defined as a social event, then we would expect units to be interacting with each other regardless of the social relationship units have with one another. If on the other hand, the campground is not being de-

defined as a social event, wherein exchanges between units are frequent, then we would postulate that most of the social interaction would take place between units who knew each other from outside the campground and that it is previously existing relationships among units and not the campground that may influence researchers to define the campground as a social event. While it was demonstrated in the preceding section that the ecological properties of the campground did influence interaction patterns, this section will demonstrate that familiarity among campers had even a stronger influence on interaction than did the ecological properties.

In order to investigate the familiarity phenomena, the camping units were not only controlled for campground type but were also controlled for previously existing acquaintances with other camping units. Because no systematic effort was made to contact the units, the decision as to whether a unit did or did not have family and/or friends in the campground was basically subjective, although through eavesdropping, informal conversations, etc., it was felt that the judgments were reasonably accurate. This is a definite limitation to the validity of the results and is thus brought to the reader's immediate attention.

Table VIII (a, b, c, & d) represents the total participation and rate of the different interaction levels. Notice in Table VIII that in both campgrounds the proportion of social interactions engaged in by units who knew other units in the campground, far exceeded the pro-

TABLE VIII

TOTAL PARTICIPATION AND RATES: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by campground type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed	Less Developed
a. With family and/or friends		
Participation in social interaction	.60	.53
Participation in social contact	.07	.02
Participation in no interaction	.33	.45
	100% (107)	100% (56)
b. Without family and/or friends		
Participation in social interaction	.04	.07
Participation in social contact	.04	.02
Participation in no interaction	.92	.91
	100% (233)	100% (209)

TABLE VIII

TOTAL PARTICIPATION AND RATES: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS, con't.

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

c. With family and/or friends	Highly Developed	Less Developed
Rate of social interaction	.76	.59
Rate of social contact	.08	.05
	(107)	(56)

d. Without family and/or friends	Highly Developed	Less Developed
Rate of social interaction	.04	.08
Rate of social contact	.06	.02
	(233)	(209)

portion of social interactions engaged in by units with no acquaintances within the campground (e.g., less developed campground with friends .53 and without friends .07). This same relationship holds when looking at the rates of interaction in Table VIII (c & d) (e.g., highly developed campground with friends .76 and without friends .04). These results strongly indicate that those units which engaged in social interaction and engaged in repeated social interaction were units with previously existing relationships within the campground.

An important distinction is that Table VIII does not necessarily demonstrate that units with friends or family within the campground are interacting with the friends or family; but simply that there is a very strong relationship between units with previously existing acquaintances in the campground and social interaction.

Another interesting inter-campground phenomena is illustrated if parts of "b" and "d" of Table VIII are compared. In both participation (.07) and rate (.08) of social interaction, units in the less developed campground who know no one in the campground exhibit almost twice as many social interactions as the same type of units in the highly developed campground (participation .04, rate .04). In reflecting back on the preceding section, the influence of ecological properties, particularly population size and density, was shown to exhibit an increase in social interactions as population size and density increased. This finding was the inverse of what we had hypothesized.

When examining the dimension of familiarity among campers, particularly parts of "b" and "d" of Table VIII, we find the expected result. That is, for units without previously existing acquaintances within the campground, social interactions did, in fact, decrease as population size and density increased.

Still another way to show the importance of controlling for familiarity in campground research is to ask: "Is there more social interaction in the highly developed campground because any given unit is more likely to have a 'familiar' unit within the campground to interact with?" The answer is negative. In investigating the observed units by familiarity, 78% (83) of the units in the highly developed campground were perceived as units who knew no other units, compared to 83% (45) of the same type of units in the less developed campground. Correspondingly, 22% (24) of the units in the highly developed campground did know other units in the campground compared to 17% (9) of the same type units in the less developed campground. Not only were the units with previously existing acquaintances engaging in most of the social interaction in both campground types, but they also made up a rather small proportion of the total units observed.

Realizing, then, that only a small proportion of the units account for the social interactions and examining the high proportion of "no interaction" in part "b" of Table VIII (highly developed 92%, less

developed 91%) this report's hypothesis that the campground is not, as yet, a place demanding sociability from all the campers is supported. Most campers did not prefer, or at least did not overtly desire or seek social interaction.

While the ecological properties of the campground can and do influence interaction patterns, this section of the analysis has investigated the dimension of familiarity and has shown the importance of controlling for previously existing acquaintances. The familiarity variable was shown to have strong influence on the proportion and rate of social interaction. For units who knew other units in the campground, the ecological properties of the campground had influences as exhibited in the previous section: as population size and density increased, social interactions and social contacts increased. For units who knew no other unit in the campground, social interactions decreased and social contacts increased as population size and density increased.

So, we find the interaction patterns reported here can be seen as being influenced not only by ecological properties but also by familiarity. The remainder of the analysis looks at both of these variables on more specific dimensions of interaction.

VI FINER DIMENSIONS OF INTERACTION

This section is designed to investigate interaction patterns when

four finer dimensions of interaction are examined. First, heterogeneity will be explored, demonstrating that interaction patterns among different types of units convey some unique patterns in reference to both the ecological field of the campground and the familiarity dimension. Second, the temporal dimension will be investigated in terms of periods of the week in which interactions occurred. Third, the dimension of familiarity will be investigated, considering units interacting with strangers and non-strangers. And fourth, the spatial dimension will be examined, including a) the spatial relationship of the interactants, b) where the action took place, and c) the activity which was conducive to interaction.

Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity is that characteristic wherein people making up a "population" are different from each other. It is this difference, (whether the characteristic being examined is the division of labor, competing goals and values, or the type of shelter being used in a campground) that increases in complexity as the population size and density increase. In describing the two campground types, it has already been mentioned that the highly developed campground was more heterogeneous than the less developed campground in that it exhibited license plates from a greater variety of different states. The form of heterogeneity of interest in this report is the degree to which

different camper types engaged in the various levels of interaction. Just as the interaction level would be expected to decrease as population size and density increased, so might the interaction level be expected to decrease as the level of shelter technology increased. That is, we would expect higher proportions and rates of interaction to be engaged in by units using tents as the main shelter followed by camper truck and trailers. As shown in Table IX, the less developed campground fits the pattern perfectly for both proportions and rates of social interaction. Tent units socially interacted the most (.23) followed by camper truck units (.16) and finally trailer units (.11).

When expanding the postulate to include both density and heterogeneity, we would then expect the shelters in the lower density regimes (the less developed campground) to exhibit higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the same type of shelter in the higher density regimes (highly developed campground). A quick examination of Table IX shows that in the less developed campground, social interaction occurred at higher proportions and rates only in the case of tents (less developed - participation .23, rate .25; highly developed - .19, rate .22), while in the highly developed campground higher proportions and rates of social interaction occurred in the case of trailers.

While this may seem confusing, a partial explanation can be given which refers to the ecological properties of the campground.

TABLE IX
CAMPER TYPE

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by campground type, by camper type (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

Highly Developed

Less Developed

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Tent	Trailer	Trailer	Camper Truck
Participation in social interaction	.19	.26	.11	.16
Participation in social contact	.04	.05	.02	.03
Participation in no interaction	.77	.69	.87	.82
	100% (143)	100% (149)	100% (113)	101% (38)

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type, camper type (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Tent	Trailer	Trailer	Camper Truck
Rate of social interaction	.22	.32	.11	.21
Rate of social contact	.06	.07	.02	.03
	(143)	(149)	(113)	(38)

Besides higher campsite density and fewer physical barriers, the highly developed campground had rules that helped place certain shelters in particular sections of the campground. In the highly developed campground units were not free to choose their campsites. Unless the unit had reserved a particular campsite, it was at the mercy of the registration booth attendant. In addition to this, the highly developed campground was structured as to the type of shelter permitted in certain sections of the campground. There were sections constructed to serve only complex shelters such as trailers, and there were sections for general camping to include: tents, camper trucks, and trailers. This contrasts sharply with the less developed campgrounds where campsite choice was given to the unit. The result of these different environmental arrangements was that whereas in the less developed campground no particular arrangement was attempted (campsite selection was fairly random), in the highly developed campground entire sections had only trailers with a few camper trucks and no tents. Therefore, the highly developed campground, which was characterized generally as being more heterogeneous than the less developed campground, did have sections within the campground that were far more homogeneous than in the less developed campground. Thus, the trailer units in the highly developed campground, as a result of a forced ecological spatial (and a possible subcultural normative pattern) arrangement, demonstrated higher proportions and rates of

social interaction than the tent units who were located in a more heterogeneous area.

If the familiarity dimension is added as another control variable, Table X is the result. Four interesting patterns of interaction can be seen. First, in focusing on parts "a" and "c", a relationship similar to that in Table IX is also present for units with previous acquaintances within the campground with the following exceptions: tent units in the highly developed campground had higher proportions and slightly higher rates of social interaction over camper trucks; and there was a stronger difference between tents and trailer units in the less developed campground. Second, regardless of campground and population density, units with previously existing acquaintances continued to have much higher proportions and rates of interaction (Part "a" & "c") compared to units who did not know other units in the campground (Part "b" & "d"). Third, when examining within campground differences, and units without other units known in the campground (Part "b" & "d"), complexity of the shelter is shown to have had little influence in selecting which units would interact, with the exception of the camper trucks who were observed in no social interaction. Within both campgrounds the extent of social interaction was nearly the same. And, fourth, it is by investigating the between campground differences of parts "b" & "d" of Table X that our postulate is supported. Looking at units with no previous acquaintances within the campground, the

TABLE X

CAMPER TYPE: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by campground type, by camper type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed			Less Developed		
	Tent	Trailer	Camper Truck	Tent	Trailer	Camper Truck
a. With family and/or friends						
Participation in social interaction	.58	.62	.56	.72	.25	.55
Participation in social contact	.05	.09	.00	.00	.05	.00
Participation in no interaction	.37	.28	.44	.28	.70	.45
	100% (38)	99% (53)	100% (16)*	100% (25)	100% (20)	100% (11)*
b. Without family and/or friends						
Participation in social interaction	.05	.05	.00	.09	.09	.00
Participation in social contact	.04	.03	.06	.01	.01	.04
Participation in no interaction	.91	.92	.94	.90	.90	.96
	100% (105)	100% (96)	100% (32)	100% (88)	100% (94)	100% (27)

*Notice the N is low, severely limiting interpretations of results.

TABLE X

CAMPER TYPE: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS con't.

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type, by camper type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

	Highly Developed			Less Developed		
	Tent	Trailer	Camper Truck	Tent	Trailer	Camper Truck
c. With family and/or friends						
Rate of social interaction	.68	.81	.63	.76	.25	.64
Rate of social contact	.08	.13	.00	.08	.05	.00
	(38)	(53)	(16)*	(25)	(20)	(11)*
d. Without family and/or friends						
Rate of social interaction	.06	.05	.00	.10	.09	.00
Rate of social contact	.06	.04	.06	.00	.01	.04
	(105)	(96)	(32)	(88)	(94)	(27)

*Notice the N is low, severely limiting interpretations of results.

shelters in the lower density regime (the less developed campground) exhibited higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the same type of shelters in the higher density regimes (the highly developed campground). This suggests that factors like an increase in population size and density may or may not decrease social interaction, and that other variables such as knowing or not knowing other units in a setting have a strong influence on the direction the population increase will effect social interactions.

So, the potential for randomization of campsite selection (being able to choose one's own campsite) the various ecological properties of the campground, i. e., population density, and either having or not having friends or relatives in other units within the campground have been shown to be influences in the level of interaction engaged in by various types of units.

Temporal - the period of the week

In an attempt to shed further light on the direction and level of interaction in the campground, the relationships between the ecological properties of the campground, familiarity, and participation and rate of interaction by different periods of the week have been analyzed.

This dimension of interaction is illustrated in Table XI which shows interaction patterns broken down by campground type and by week-day interactions and week-end interaction. It should be remem-

bered that in all cases the week-end population size and density was greater than during the week, allowing us to compare interaction patterns within a particular campground when the population size and density varied (See Appendix D). If the proposed population hypothesis is correct then higher proportions and rates of interaction should be engaged in during the week-day and in the less developed campground. From inspection of Table XI, the between campground interaction patterns were similar to previous examinations of campground differences. That is, the highly developed campground exhibiting higher population size and density also exhibited higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the less developed campground. It is when investigating within campground differences that some support is given to our hypothesis that as population size and density increase, social interaction will decrease. This is particularly true in the less developed campground. During the week the density was lowest and social interaction was highest (.19). During the week-end the population density was high and social interactions decreased accordingly (.13). The highly developed campground illustrates a rather different pattern. During the week, when density was lowest, the proportion of social interaction was little different (.21) than on the week-end when population size and density was highest (.23). To support the notion of little difference in social interaction in the highly developed campground notice the difference between the proportions

TABLE XI

WEEK-DAY, WEEK-END

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels, by period of the week, by campground type (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Week-day	Week-end	Week-day	Week-end
Participation in social interaction	.21	.23	.19	.13
Participation in social contact	.03	.06	.01	.02
Participation in no interaction	.76	.71	.80	.85
	100% (179)	100% (161)	100% (151)	100% (114)

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type, by period of week (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

Rate of social interaction	.27	.25	.23	.13
Rate of social contact	.05	.08	.02	.02
	(179)	(161)	(151)	(114)

and rates of social interaction. The proportions show higher participation during the week-end (.23) while the rates show higher involvement during the week-day (.27). It may be that in the highly developed campground with its high densities during the week and on the week-end, the campground exhibited saturation density. Having a saturation density during the entire week, the highly developed campground would be expected to demonstrate minimal change in either increasing or decreasing social interaction.

Of further interest is that the proportion and rates of social contacts supported the population hypothesis between and within campgrounds. That is, as population size and density increased so did the proportion and rates of brief encounters. Between campgrounds this relationship was demonstrated more strongly in the highly developed campground (social contact - week-day .03, week-end .06) than in the less developed campground (social contact - week-day .01, week-end .02). Thus, within each campground the proportion of contacts was highest on the week-end.

To further explicate the relationship between social interaction and the population hypothesis, the campgrounds were controlled for units who knew or did not know other units within the campground (Table XII).

Familiarity is again shown to be an important influence, not only between campground densities but also within campground densities.

Parts "a" and "c" of Table XII demonstrate a complete reverse of the expected interaction patterns when population densities are increased. While we hypothesized that as campgrounds exhibit increases in population density, social interaction would decrease, units with previously existing acquaintances (Parts "a" and "c") socially interacted at increasing proportions and rates as population density increased. A partial explanation for the increase is that on the week-end as the population size and density increased the proportion of units who knew other units also increased. At the highly developed campground, campsites would be more often reserved for the week-end than during the week. At the less developed campground the week-end provided the locals an escape from the heat. All in all, there were higher proportions of units who knew other units camping on the week-end than during the week.

While social contacts increased when between campground density is investigated (e.g., participation week-day - less developed .03, highly developed .07); the inverse is demonstrated when within campground density is explored. For example, in the highly developed campground the rate of social contact was .06 on the week-end and .08 during the week. Thus, when previously existing relationships are examined, the direction of social interaction and social contact for the most part was the opposite of the predicted overall interaction pattern.

By inspecting Parts "b" and "d" of Table XII, the results begin

TABLE XII

WEEK-DAY, WEEK-END: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by campground type, by period of week, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Week-day	Week-end	Week-day	Week-end
a. With family and/or friends				
Participation in social interaction	.56	.69	.51	.63
Participation in social contact	.07	.06	.03	.00
Participation in no interaction	.37	.25	.46	.37
	100% (59)	100% (48)	100% (37)	100% (19)*
b. Without family and/or friends				
Participation in social interaction	.03	.04	.10	.06
Participation in social contact	.02	.05	.01	.02
Participation in no interaction	.95	.91	.89	.91
	100% (120)	100% (113)	100% (112)	99% (97)

*The low N makes interpreting the results very hazardous.

TABLE XII

WEEK-DAY, WEEK-END: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS con't.

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by campground type, by period of week, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Week-day	Week-end	Week-day	Week-end
c. With family and/or friends				
Rate of social interaction	.73	.75	.54	.63
Rate of social contact	.08	.06	.05	.00
	(59)	(48)	(37)	(19)*
d. Without family and/or friends				
Rate of social interaction	.04	.05	.10	.06
Rate of social contact	.03	.09	.01	.02
	(120)	(113)	(112)	(97)

* The low N makes interpreting the results very hazardous.

to demonstrate the predicted direction. When exploring the units without family and/or friends within the campground both the social interactions and the social contacts were engaged at proportions and rates that correspond to the hypothesized direction with one minor exception. The exception is that within the highly developed campground the week-day and week-end social interactions were quite similar, again demonstrating the possible effects of saturation density. For the rest of Parts "b" and "d", the less developed campground engaged in higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the highly developed campground. The highly developed campground engaged in higher proportions and rates of brief encounters than the less developed campground. With the exception of the social interactions in the highly developed campground, the within campground social interactions and social contacts demonstrated that as population size and density increased, social interaction was either similar to previous levels of social interaction or decreased and social contacts increased.

The importance of this part of the analysis is that the within campground interaction patterns could be explored. When the familiarity variable was controlled, it was discovered that having acquaintances in other units within the campground had the effect of increasing social interactions as density increased; whereas not knowing other units had the predicted effect of decreasing social interaction as density increased. The importance of prior acquaintances within the

campground setting has been shown to have considerable influence in determining the outcome of interaction patterns.

Familiarity - stranger and non-stranger

One of the major issues in this study, indirectly illustrated in previous tables, concerns the participation and rates of interaction when investigating stranger and non-stranger interactions. The image that as camping units arrive at the campground they exchange greetings and pleasantries with their neighbors, the children quickly form play groups, and, on the whole, camping is viewed by the units as a social event, would seem to imply that both stranger and non-stranger social interactions are occurring and possibly at the same proportions and rates. This supposition is highly suspect if our data concerning stranger encounters is reviewed. It is the stranger encounter that lends itself to the shallow and indifferent response towards others, the contact that is segmentalized. When adding to this characterization the fluctuations in population size and density that help distinguish the two campground types, several propositions concerning stranger and non-stranger type social interactions can be made; 1) The higher the population size and density of the campground the less the proportion and rate of social interaction between strangers; 2) the higher the population size and density of the campground the higher the proportion and rate of social interaction between units who know each other;

and, 3) within each campground, non-stranger social interactions will exhibit higher proportions and rates than social interactions between strangers.²

From the data accumulated in this report and from the high proportions of 1/2 hour periods where no interaction was observed in Table XIII at both campground types, it does not appear to be the case that all or even a majority of the units observed expressed an overt desire to engage in social interaction with other units (e.g., no interaction, highly developed campground - stranger .92, non-stranger .81). This strongly indicates that previous statements and postulates suggesting that the campground is a place to be social with other units can, should, and is being questioned. Along with this, the proportion and rates of social interaction between strangers showed little change when examining between campground densities (e.g., highly developed participation .04, rate .06; less developed participation .05, rate .05) indicating that between strangers a decrease in proportion and rate of interaction may not necessarily accompany an increase in population

²When exploring Table XIII, notice that the base of both stranger and non-stranger is the same (e.g., highly developed campground = 340). When observing a particular unit and scoring it in only one of the three levels of interaction it was discovered that during a 1/2 hour period the unit could engage in social interaction with both a stranger and a non-stranger. Finding it perplexing and difficult to assign a higher priority to either category, both the stranger and non-stranger interactions were scored separately; thus, the two categories are unconnected and should be viewed as separate items.

TABLE XIII

STRANGER - NON-STRANGER

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by type of personal relationship, by campground type (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	Stranger	Non-Stranger	Stranger	Non-Stranger
Participation in social interaction	.04	.18	.05	.10
Participation in social contact	.04	.01	.01	.01
Participation in no interaction	.92	.81	.94	.89
	100% (340)	100% (340)	100% (265)	100% (265)

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by type of personal relationship, by campground type.

Rate of social interaction	.06	.20	.13
Rate of social contact	.04	.02	.01
	(340)	(340)	(265)

density, especially when the overall involvement in social interaction was extremely low in the first place.

When shifting the discussion to non-stranger social interaction, differences between the two campgrounds begin to emerge. As the population size and density increased (going from the less developed campground to the highly developed campground) higher proportions and rates of social interaction were observed between non-strangers (e.g., participation less developed .10; highly developed .18). Not only did the social interactions increase as population size and density increased, but within each campground social interaction was participated and engaged in more by non-strangers (e.g., highly developed - participation .18, rate .20) than by strangers (e.g., highly developed - participation .04, rate .06). While these results are similar to the discussion of Table VIII (p. 149) there is an important difference between the two tables. Whereas Table VIII illustrates the total participation and rates of social interaction engaged in by units who did or did not have previously existing acquaintances; Table XIII examines more specifically the type of social interaction that took place, that is, either a stranger social interaction or non-stranger social interaction.

To get the advantages of both Table VIII and Table XIII, to investigate both the type of unit engaging in interaction, and the type of interaction engaged in, Table XIV was constructed to relate both the

ecological properties of the campground and the familiarity of units to the observed interaction patterns.

By separating stranger and non-stranger interaction types, we imply that both categories are mutually exclusive of each other. For example, when scoring stranger interactions, the level of no interaction not only included the proportions of 1/2 hour periods where no interaction occurred but it also included the proportion of 1/2 hour periods where non-stranger social interactions occurred.

Table XIV, illustrates several important points. First, under stranger social interactions (Part "a" & "c" of Table XIV) units in the highly developed campground that had previously existing acquaintances within the campground engaged in social interaction, while the same type of unit in the less developed campground did not. In contrast to this finding, it was the case that among stranger type social interactions, and units who did not know other units within the campground, the less developed campground participated more and had higher rates of social interaction than did those in the highly developed campground. A distinction to be made here (deserving further research) is, it might be possible that units with previously existing acquaintances in a campground which displays high population densities and few physical barriers, find it easier to engage in social interaction with stranger type units because of the social support received from knowing other camping units. As the number of known campers and camping units

TABLE XIV

STRANGER - NON-STRANGER: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS

Observed proportion of unit 1/2 hour participation at different interaction levels by type of personal relationship, by campground type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (each unit 1/2 hour scored by highest degree of interaction taking precedence).

	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	W/ Family &/or Friends	W/O Family &/or Friends	W/Family &/or Friends	W/O Family &/or Friends
a. Stranger				
Participation in social interaction	.07	.04	.00	.07
Participation in social contact	.04	.04	.02	.02
Participation in no interaction	.89	.92	.98	.91
	100% (107)	100% (233)	100% (56)	100% (209)
b. Non-Stranger				
Participation in social interaction	.56	NA*	.44	NA*
Participation in social contact	.04	NA	.02	NA
Participation in no interaction	.39	NA	.54	NA
	99% (107)		100% (56)	

* It should be mentioned that non-stranger type interactions among units without family and/or friends would not be expected to occur; but in the less developed campground, it was observed that a unit interacted with friends who came from outside the campground to visit.

TABLE XIV

STRANGER - NON-STRANGER: WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILY AND/OR FRIENDS con't.

Observed rate of unit 1/2 hour interaction at different levels by type of personal relationship, by campground type, by previously existing acquaintance with other campers (number of interactions or contacts per unit 1/2 hour of observation).

c. Stranger	Highly Developed		Less Developed	
	W/Family &/or Friends	W/O Family &/or Friends	W/Family &/or Friends	W/O Family &/or Friends
Rate of social interaction	.07	.04	.00	.08
Rate of social contact	.05	.06	.04	.01
	(107)	(233)	(56)	(209)
d. Non-Stranger				
Rate of social interaction	.68	NA*	.59	NA*
Rate of social contact	.04	NA	.02	NA
	(107)		(56)	

* See previous page.

increased the cohesion and strength of knowing other campers allowed units with family and/or friends in the campground to socially interact even with strangers.

Second, in support of the discussion of Table XIII, Parts "b" and "d" of Table XIV illustrate that as the population size and density increased so did the proportions and rates of social interactions among non-strangers (e.g., participation - less developed .44, highly developed .56). Not only did non-stranger social interaction increase between campgrounds, but within each campground type interacting with family and/or friends was engaged in at much higher proportions and rates than interacting with strangers (e.g., highly developed - stranger .56, non-stranger .07). This means that the largest portion of the social interactions engaged in were the densely populated campground and between units who knew each other from outside the campground. This finding, in conjunction with the proportion and rates of stranger social interactions, further lends support to the notion that campgrounds were not, overtly, places to be social. Socialability between units in the campgrounds seemed to come largely as a consequence of knowing another unit in the campground and not from camping "per se".

Another explanation for the differences mentioned in this discussion, particularly in stranger social interactions, involves the various ecological properties of the campground as partial explaining

variables. In previous sections of this report, statements regarding interactions between strangers supported the hypothesis that as population density increases, social interactions will decrease. But in the light of several glaring exceptions, like that displayed in Parts "a" and "c" of Table XIV, among "stranger" social interactions (for example, participation - highly developed .07, less developed .00) a further explication of certain ecological variables is required. Although more social interactions did take place in the highly developed campground in comparison to the less developed campground, we are discussing a rather small portion in comparison to the total exposure to risk.

If the two types of campground are inspected (See Appendix C), it becomes apparent that in the less developed campground the campsites were not spaced in as concentrated a fashion as they were at the highly developed campground. In the highly developed campground the campsites were close together and were mostly filled, providing high population densities. Not only were the densities high but seeing into other campsites was almost impossible to avoid. The potential for privacy from other units was fairly minimal except where barriers were constructed, where withdrawal into the shelter took place, or where frequent trips in a vehicle provided periods of escape, not only from stranger type units but from family and/or friends as well.

The point is that in having the pressure of constantly being "on

stage" for other known units, talking together, sightseeing together, eating together, sometimes sleeping together -- the stranger, because of his availability, may have been looked upon as a means of escape. For example, one incident observed at the highly developed campground was a family disagreement in progress. The two known units were next to each other and separating them was a woodbin. As an elderly male (a stranger) walked to the woodbin and picked up a piece of wood, the elderly male from one of the family units left his lawn chair, grabbed his axe, went to the woodbin and engaged the stranger in conversation for fifteen minutes. The conversation ranged from the size of the chunks of wood to the new Travelall the elderly male (from the family unit) had. This is not to suggest that all of the "stranger" social interactions began in this way, but to point out that in the less developed campground, stranger type units were not generally as available as they were in the highly developed campground, thus demanding that the units at the less developed campground seek other avenues of escape - such as going fishing, hiking back into the hills, walking along the lake or river, or just walking. Units at the highly developed campground also had the above mentioned routes of escape, but, remember, such things as lakes, rivers, oceans, and other such attractions were, on the whole, further away at the highly developed campground than at the less developed campground, while strangers were abundant.

Another explanation is that units who camped and knew other units in the campground were high on "social interaction seeking". As the population density increased, these types of units with friends in the campground had more opportunities to exercise their sociability than units who knew no other units within the campground and who could be low on "social interaction seeking". For the latter group of units, as population density increased, retreating from the saturation of social stimuli may have been the case.

If this was the case for units with other known units in the campground, why did units who knew no other units in the less developed campground exhibit higher proportions and rates of stranger social interaction than the same type of units in the highly developed campground? In light of the previous explanations, we can suggest that in the less developed campground with the campsites further apart and the population density lower, the pressure for "escape" would be minimal and the potential for privacy would be maximum. Under these conditions it seems reasonable to suggest that a unit (or unit member) may seek a social interaction or make themselves available for social interaction. For example, walking was a major activity in both campgrounds but in the less developed campground there was not the traffic and confusion on the roads and trails that there was in the highly developed campground (i.e., bike gangs, cars cruising, and mass humanity walking). The "atmosphere" that surrounded walking was different in

the less developed campground. There were fewer people on the road or trail, making those on the road or trail unique and something worth observing as they passed. The "subjective" potential for social interaction among strangers who knew no one in the less developed campground was greater than the potential in the highly developed campground, in light of the differences in campground "atmosphere". The subjective potential would include both the potential for privacy and the potential for selective interactions. The unique mixture of these factors not only created empirical differences in social interactions but also subjective differences (atmospheres) which demand explanations this report can only suggest from experience and from informal conversations with and among the campers.

If "stranger" social interactions for units who knew other campers within the campground are looked at, an inverse relationship is exposed. That is, as population size and density increased so did social interactions (e.g., highly developed - participation .07; less developed - participation .00). If "stranger" social interactions for units who knew no one within the campground are looked at, the population hypothesis holds. That is, as population size and density increased, social interaction decreased (e.g., participation - less developed .07; highly developed .04).

So we found interaction patterns appear to fluctuate as the data are looked at in different ways. Whether a unit did or did not have

family and/or friends within the campground has been demonstrated to have dramatically influenced interaction patterns. Other factors influencing interaction were the physical barriers of the campground and campsite density. Yet another factor was the population density: the physical availability of strangers to act as means of escape.

Spatial Dimensions

The spatial aspects of interaction may have interesting influences upon patterns of interaction. In this part of the analysis, three aspects of the spatial dimension will be discussed in relation to the various levels of interaction observed: 1) Interaction patterns will be discussed as being influenced by the spatial relationship of the units; 2) interaction patterns will be discussed in relation to the location of interaction, and, 3) interaction patterns will be discussed in relation to the kinds of activity which occasioned interaction.

The tables that follow are set up on a different base than has been used in the previous discussions. Tables in this segment of the analysis are based on the actual number of locations or activities wherein interactions were observed, instead of the 1/2 hour periods exposed to risk. Thus, while still examining inter-unit interaction, we are concerned with the proportion of interactions engaged in, out of the total number of locations or activities wherein interactions were observed, instead of the proportion of interactions engaged in out of

the total number of 1/2 hour periods exposed to risk of interaction.

a. Spatial Relationship of Interacting Units

When examining this aspect of the spatial dimension, the question being addressed is: What was the distance between the campsite unit under observation and the campsite which the "outsider" was from? In previous campground literature there has been little concern for the spatial relationship of the interactant's campsites (as distinguished from the actual place of the interaction). Of concern is the phenomenon of neighborliness. Do campers interact with all units in the campground without concern for the "outsider's" campsite location or is there a selective process that limits who one interacts with (i.e., with one's neighbor)?

Table XV symbolically demonstrates the spatial relationships of all units which engaged in social interactions or social contacts (this is in proportional form combining all social interactions and social contacts). Displayed, is the relationship of the "outside" unit, with which the interaction was made, to the observed units. Table XV shows that in all cases the highest proportion of interaction took place with units who were next to each other. This is the case, both for units who knew no other units in the campground (highly developed .50, less developed .60), and for units with previously existing acquaintances in the campground (highly developed .79, less developed .79). Proportions shown in the table are fairly uniform across rows and

TABLE XV

SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS OF INTERACTING UNITS

Percentage of combined contacts and interactions observing the spatial relationship of interacting units by campground type, and by previously existing acquaintance with other campers.

Spatial Relationship	TOTAL		Highly Developed			Less Developed		
	Contacts & Interactions	Total	Contacts & Interactions	W/Family &/or Friends Contacts & Interactions	W/O Family &/or Friends Contacts & Interactions	Total	W/Family &/or Friends Contacts & Interactions	W/O Family &/or Friends Contacts & Interactions
Next to each other	.74	.74	.79	.79	.50	.74	.79	.60
A few sites away	.20	.21	.16	.16	.45	.17	.13	.27
From somewhere in the campground	.02	.02	.01	.01	.05	.04	.03	.07
From outside the campground	.04	.03	.03	.03	.00	.06	.05	.07
	100% (166)	100% (112)	99% (92)	100% (20)*	100% (54)	100% (39)	101% (15)*	

*The low N makes discussing the results a dubious matter.

down columns, but there were a few variations that deserve mentioning. First, in examining the interaction patterns for units "a few sites away" (within a three site area), there are differences between campground types and between campground units with and without previously existing acquaintances. A possible explanation for the differences might include the fact that in the highly developed campground, units were assigned campsites, thus, the chances of being separated from family and/or friends was actually greater in the highly developed campground than in the less developed campground where the campers had the freedom to choose their sites. Another possibility, particularly for units who knew no other units in the campground, was that with campsites further apart in the less developed campground, the potential to watch other units and "get used to them" was less than in the highly developed campground where three to ten campsites may have been possible to observe. Thus, whereas units in the less developed campground engaged in interaction with their closest neighbor (50 - 100 feet away), they were less likely to interact with units a few sites away than the same type of units in the highly developed campground.

In both types of campground, a few units were visited by family and/or friends from outside the campground. In the highly developed campground, all the cases involved units who knew other campers within the campground, while in the less developed campground the only

case involved a unit who knew no one within the campground. An observed difference between the two campgrounds was that in the less developed campground, the unit was made up of locals. (A local being defined as a person residing in a town or city close to the campground). At Magone Lake, the locals were from John Day and were visited by locals. In the highly developed campground the units were not made up of locals, but the visitors were (e.g., at Wallowa Lake the camping unit was from Portland and the visitors from Enterprise). Another interesting difference was that some of the visitors remained overnight in the less developed campground, while all the visitors left after a few hours visit in the highly developed campground.

b. Where Interaction is Taking Place

Another important spatial aspect in describing interaction patterns concerns location of the interaction and the differences in interaction patterns demonstrated in different activity settings. Gump and Sutton-Smith proposed that the properties of the activity setting have effects upon a person's social behavior, particularly in the amount and kinds of interaction. (13, p. 759) If the campsite is examined as an activity setting, the question is whether or not there are certain places or areas within or near the campsite that yield higher proportions of social interaction than others; whether or not there are noticeable differences between campground types?

To aid in distinguishing between some of the locations, a brief

definition of the categories is given now. The categories "Inside shelter", "By Campfire", and "At Picnic Table" mean that the interaction took place at those areas. Interaction took place "Inside the site" indicates that the interaction was confined to the site, but changed its location within the site itself. "Around equipment" means that the interaction took place near vehicles, boats, or shelters. Interaction that took place "Near site" took place on the road, near the woodbin, by the water hydrant, or on a path. Interaction that took place "At game area" indicates an area where games were played either in the site or near the site.³ In discussing these categories, Table XVI displays the differences in interaction between location, campground type, and familiarity of units. As can be gathered from the base used in determining proportions, it became necessary to break the interactions down into more than one location at times. For example, an interaction that started near the site and then proceeded to the campfire was scored once for each location.

Table XVI, as Table XV, lends support to the notion that the ecological properties of the campground may very well influence

³It must be acknowledged, before discussing the results, that pin-pointing the location of an interaction can become a frustrating chore, as interactants tend to move around. Taking this into consideration, notice that one of the categories is simply, "Inside the site". The reason for this catch-all category was to be able to manage those interactions that moved quite often from one place to another within the campsite.

TABLE XVI

WHERE THE ACTION IS TAKING PLACE

Percentage of contacts and interactions observed at different locations, by campground type, by acquaintance (a given interaction) may move from one location to another).

Location of Observed Interaction or Contact	TOTAL		Highly Developed						Less Developed					
			Total			W/O Family &/or Friends			Total			W/O Family &/or Friends		
	Inter-action	Contact	Inter-action	Contact	Inter-action	Inter-action	Contact	Inter-action	Inter-action	Contact	Inter-action	Inter-action	Contact	Inter-action
Inside shelter	.07	.00	.09	.00	.11	.00	.00	.00	.03	.00	.02	.00	.05	.00
By Campfire	.15	.07	.16	.08	.165	.07	.07	.08	.14	.00	.16	.00	.05	.00
At picnic table	.22	.10	.23	.12	.25	.00	.07	.25	.19	.00	.16	.00	.26	.00
Inside the site	.26	.30	.25	.31	.25	.29	.27	.33	.27	.25	.27	.00	.26	.50
Around equipment	.08	.10	.09	.08	.08	.14	.13	.00	.07	.25	.07	.00	.05	.50
Near site	.21	.43	.16	.42	.14	.50	.40	.33	.31	.50	.31	1.00	.32	.00
At game area	.01	.00	.02	.00	.015	.00	.07	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	100% (222)	100% (30)	100% (148)	101% (26)	101% (133)	100% (14)	101% (15)*	99% (12)*	101% (74)	100% (4)*	99% (55)	100% (2)*	99% (19)*	100% (2)*

*Notice that in most cases fewer than 20 interactions or contacts were noted making any definite statement difficult.

interaction patterns. Notice that, in general, the highly developed campground had higher proportions of interaction in specific locations inside the campsite than the less developed campgrounds; and that the units in the less developed campground exhibited their interactions proportions near the campsite or inside the campsite generally.

This demonstrates the influence of having campsites fairly far apart from each other combined with natural physical barriers that have a tendency to isolate the campsite. In the case of the less developed campground, the highest proportions in social interaction occurred outside the campsite in such settings as the road, a path, near the water hydrant, or in several combined locations in the campsite. At the highly developed campground, with the campsites close together and the natural physical barriers fewer, privacy was almost impossible; while the availability of units observing other units and, in some cases, the potential for social interaction was actually greater than in the less developed campground. It should be emphasized that the distance a campsite was from the campground road was sometimes as much as 50 to 75 feet in the less developed campground, while the distance was only five to ten feet in most campsites in the highly developed campground. Thus, there existed not only a closeness between campsites at the highly developed campground, but also a very close distance to the road. So we find the units in the less developed campground enjoyed privacy and a means of escape from fellow campers,

while units in the highly developed campground were constantly "on stage" not only for their neighbors, but also for anyone who happened to come by their site on the road.

In some cases those places where proportions were highest in the highly developed campground (like the picnic table, the campfire, and around the equipment) were, at most, either 10 to 20 feet from the road or practically on the road. In this kind of setting (not too dissimilar from a marketplace of several years ago, where merchants would come to show their wares) campers were left with little choice but to survive social stimuli the best they could. Some observations were made of units barricading their campsites. This was not a common practice; but, what was a common practice in the highly developed campground was the turning of lawn chairs and the seating arrangements at picnic tables that provided the most privacy or the least possible chance for interaction. For example, instead of sitting in a lawn chair by the campfire facing the road and/or the neighbor's campsite, it was observed, repeatedly, that campers would sit facing the campfire turning their lawn chairs away from the road and toward their own shelter; thus, blocking out, visually, the road and the neighbor's campsite. This was also observed in the less developed campground but not nearly as often.

Of particular interest is the fact that this same relationship was found to be the case for units with previously existing acquaintances in

the campground; suggesting that, with the campsites far apart and dense physical barriers, the units in the less developed campground interacted at higher proportions near the site and "inside the site" even when family and/or friends in other units were within the campground. When examining units who knew no other units in the campground, the relationship that only existed for units in the less developed campground was extended to the units in the highly developed campground as well. That is, the highest proportions of interaction took place "inside the site" and near the site in both campground types; suggesting, if interaction is desired, units without other known units even in the highly developed campground will interact at high proportions near the site.

This segment of spatial dimension has demonstrated some of the differences in interaction that can be investigated when the physical setting is changed; that is, when different campgrounds are examined or when certain properties of a setting are looked at. The results displayed in Table XVI are indicative of ways that certain properties of a setting can and do influence the amount and kind of interaction.

c. Conducive Activity

To get a clearer idea of what was going on in the campground in reference to interaction patterns, it is necessary to gain insight into the activity which was conducive to interaction. (See Table XVII) Consideration of this aspect of interaction is very similar methodo-

logically to the previous spatial dimensions. The determination of the activity which was conducive to interaction is a combination of when the observer begins observing, who initiates or continues the interaction, where the interaction was taking place and finally what observable "main" activity was conducive to beginning or continuing an interaction. Unlike the initiation aspect, the conducive aspect involves both the activities that lead to interaction and the activities that allow the interaction to continue. Therefore, the word conducive is meant to imply the activity which contributed and advanced the interaction and is not limited to only that activity that begins an interaction. From a quick survey of the table, it should be noticed that the categories are quite broad, allowing us to score an interaction within the general framework of what was going on in or near the campsite.

Many of the activities obviously overlapped when we observed behavior but they allowed at least for an insightful exploratory discussion of interaction patterns. It would be advisable in future campground studies to either stay longer in the field or to employ many more observers in order to break down the categories even further and get more "in depth" data on a fewer number of units, rather than shallow data on many units.

Some of the interesting results in Table XVII, which shed further light on both previous discussion of the various dimensions of interaction and of what was generally going on in the campgrounds include:

TABLE XVII
CONDUCTIVE ACTIVITY

Percentage of contacts and interactions observing different activities, by campground type, and by acquaintance (a given interaction may shift activities from one activity to another).

Activity of Observed Interaction or Contact	TOTAL			Highly Developed						Less Developed					
	TOTAL			Total			W/O Family &/or Friends Inter-action			Total			W/O Family &/or Friends Inter-action		
	Inter-action	Contact	99%	Inter-action	Contact	100%	Inter-action	Contact	101%	Inter-action	Contact	100%	Inter-action	Contact	99%
Preparing a meal	.07	.00	100% (28)	.08	.00	100% (185)	.08	.00	100% (170)	.09	.00	100% (24)	.08	.00	100% (183)
Eating &/or drinking	.12	.07		.12	.04		.13	.00	101% (111)*	.13	.00	101% (115)*	.12	.00	102% (113)*
Cleaning up a meal	.08	.00		.08	.00		.09	.00	101% (170)	.09	.00	101% (115)*	.08	.00	100% (113)*
Walking by, in, or near site	.22	.64		.18	.67		.16	.82	100% (111)*	.29	.54	100% (115)*	.29	1.00	100% (113)*
Sitting or lying	.06	.00		.08	.00		.09	.00	100% (170)	.03	.00	100% (115)*	.03	.00	100% (113)*
Maintaining equipment	.10	.04		.12	.04		.11	.09	100% (111)*	.05	.00	100% (115)*	.05	.00	100% (113)*
Games or play	.11	.14		.12	.13		.11	.00	100% (170)	.09	.23	100% (115)*	.07	.00	100% (113)*
Sitting and talking	.12	.07		.17	.08		.18	.09	100% (170)	.18	.08	100% (115)*	.20	.00	100% (113)*
Getting water	.02	.04		.01	.04		.01	.00	100% (170)	.05	.08	100% (115)*	.07	.00	100% (113)*
Getting wood	.04	.00		.05	.00		.05	.00	100% (170)	.03	.00	100% (115)*	.03	.00	100% (113)*
	99% (283)	100% (28)		101% (185)	100% (24)		101% (170)	101% (111)*	101% (115)*	99% (98)	100% (4)*	100% (11)*	102% (76)	100% (11)*	99% (3)*

*The number of interactions or contacts is few not allowing for any high powered conclusions.

1) For the campground in general, the only activities which the less developed campground exhibited considerably higher proportions of social interaction were activities outside the campsite (e.g., walking or standing near the campsite - less developed .29, highly developed .18); whereas units in the highly developed campground exhibited either similar or higher proportions of social interaction in activities engaged in inside the site (e.g., maintaining equipment - highly developed .12, less developed .05). These results, again, point to the probable influence of ecological properties providing different amounts of available privacy and demanding that the units be "on stage" at different levels. 2) Notice, if all three mealtime activities (preparing, eating and cleaning-up of meals) were combined in the highly developed campground, mealtime would exhibit the highest proportion in social interaction (e.g., preparing .08, eating .12, and cleaning-up .08 = .28). If this had been done in the less developed campground, standing or walking near the site would still have the highest proportion of social interaction. This demonstrates that while there was little difference in proportions of social interactions between campground for mealtime activities, the units in the highly developed campground had their highest proportion of interaction during these activities while units in the less developed campground had their highest interaction proportion outside the site. 3) The relationship discussed above also was illustrated by units in both campgrounds who had previously

existing acquaintances in the campground. Thus, for these types of units, campsite density and physical barriers also played a role.

Now in most cases of interaction, a unit's neighbor was a familiar unit. This meant that the two units were no more than 30 feet from each other in the highly developed campground and between 50 to 100 feet from each other in the less developed campground. 4) When inspecting units without previously existing acquaintances in the campground, the highest proportion of interaction for both campgrounds occurred in standing or walking near the site (highly developed .47, less developed .27). In the less developed campground this phenomenon has been explained as almost a necessary condition for interaction to occur. In the highly developed campground, this event may partially be explained as a result of making oneself available for interaction. For example, in one case the unit being observed had locked themselves out of their Air-stream trailer. A member of the neighboring unit walked by and noticed this and went over to offer assistance. It is interesting to note that after getting the door opened, there was no further contact between these two neighboring units. In another case, the units being observed overheard a neighboring unit discussing the fish they had caught that day. Being curious of the method used, a member of the unit being observed asked what the other unit was using for bait and where they were fishing? These social interactions were rare and, in most cases, they were not repeated. Units who knew

other campers within the campground, in contrast, engaged in repeated interaction.

This discussion has investigated interaction patterns and activities which were conducive to interaction. While the discussion has tried to focus on the importance of ecological properties as factors influencing interactions, familiarity has been shown to be as important, or even more important, in influencing interaction than the ecological properties of the different types of campgrounds.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Recent camping literature has proposed that today's campground is being defined as a place to have a social experience rather than a "wilderness" experience. With this kind of statement being made in the camping literature, the idea of campgrounds exhibiting higher proportions and rates of social interaction than no interaction became theoretically puzzling for two reasons:

1. Most campers live in cities or have been influenced by cities to a great extent and have consequently developed "urban" type adaptations for dealing with strangers. Why are these adaptive patterns discarded when interacting with strangers in the campground setting, as suggested by camping research?
2. The number of people per unit of space in some campgrounds exhibits greater density than in most residential neighborhoods. If density is seen as an important contributor to the "urban" type interaction patterns in urban neighborhoods, why should we find different patterns of interaction under similar small space density regimes?

To build a case that would question the "sociability" that campground researchers were reporting, the works of Barker, Gump and Sutton-Smith, Raush, Dittmann and Taylor, Hall, Morris, Tucker and Friedman, Keyfitz, Hawley, Smith, Form and Stone, Simmel, Wirth, and Tisdale were cited and commented on in order to bring into clearer focus some of the factors and variables that have been found to bring about different kinds of behavior, particularly interaction behavior in the city. Some of these factors include: 1) The ecological properties of the campground; e.g., population size, density, and heterogeneity; campsite density; and, physical barriers; and 2) the relationship between interactants. In order to become more specific in leading to a hypothesis, Wirth and Tisdale's theories were explored in somewhat greater detail than the rest.

To challenge the "sociability" statements found in the camping literature, the following hypothesis was put forth:

The patterns of interactions and activities will tend to be "social contact" or "no interaction" in character when the campground exhibits urban characteristics of density and technology and that interactions will exhibit less "social contact" or "no interaction" characteristics under less urban regimes of density and technology.

In transferring Wirth's theory and this report's hypothesis to the campground setting, three questions were asked:

1. Do the patterns of interactions and activities among units in the campground situation reflect a high degree of carry-

over of urban or impersonal solutions to interaction?

2. Do the patterns of interactions among units in the campground situation reflect characteristics of personal "primary group" type interactions?
3. What degrees of each type are being displayed?

In explicating what was meant by urban characteristics of technology, Tisdale's argument was used. Heterogeneity and division of labor according to Tisdale are not the causes of urbanization but rather are the result of population and technology. The important point was the notion that the non-demographic aspects of a setting (the physical layout), or the location of the setting within an ecological field would remain constant regardless of whether the demographic aspects were present or absent. It was in this discussion of Tisdale's argument that two contrasting campgrounds were brought into the design. In the description of the campgrounds section of this report, a considerable discussion was made differentiating between the two types of campgrounds so that one of the basic theoretical issues involved was the degree to which the ecological properties within which behavior occurs, tended to place constraints upon different levels of interactions among camping units.

In order to add more insight to the patterns of interaction, the work of Smith, Form, and Stone was incorporated. Their research pointed to the importance of the kind of social relationship that the

interactants had; and they suggested that, in the city, intimate relationships are found both throughout the city and within certain areas of the city. From a discussion of the Smith, Form, and Stone article, a further question to be looked at in the campground setting was - what was the relationship of the interactants?

To study these questions, we used participant observation techniques and noted inter-unit interactions and activities in the campground, paying close attention to the actual behavior of individuals while they were interacting, so as to document by observation, as well as by some self-reporting, such items as the behavior of the interactants, the composition of interactants, the temporal characteristics of the interactions (e.g., the duration, period of week, etc.), the spatial characteristics of the interactants (e.g., family, friends, or strangers).

In each section of the analysis a particular aspect of observed interaction patterns was discussed. The data can be summarized by briefly recapitulating the results of the four questions asked in the introduction to the analysis.

I WHO IS INTERACTING

Involvement in interaction was fairly consistent with the age and sex breakdowns of the two campground types. It was when initiation of interaction was explored that the variables campground type,

age and sex, and familiarity began to show signs of influence. Males were shown to be fairly dominant in interactions and initiations. Young adults and middle-aged person were observed to be involved in, and initiate, the highest proportions of interactions. Children were shown to be relatively inactive in interactions and initiations when compared to other age groups. And only elderly males without previously existing acquaintances were observed initiating interactions, while both elderly males and females were involved in interaction.

II CAMPGROUND DEVELOPMENT AND THE ECOLOGICAL PROPERTIES

Two campground types were compared, demonstrating that the highly developed campground exhibited higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the less developed campground. This was contrary to our hypothesis which stated that as population size and density increase social interactions decrease. In search of an explanation, campsite density and physical barriers were incorporated into the analysis. While the highly developed campground exhibited higher population size and density than the less developed campground, it was demonstrated that the highly developed campground had a much higher campsite density than the less developed campground and also that the highly developed campground exhibited fewer physical barriers, more regulations, and more structure than the less developed camp-

ground. These factors were mentioned not only to stress the possible influence of more than just population size and density on interaction patterns but also to stress the possible influence of the entire setting on interaction patterns. This section of the analysis also made it quite clear that while the highly developed campground did exhibit greater proportions and rates of social interaction than the less developed campground, the level of "no interaction" observed in each campground was much higher than any other level of interaction; making it quite difficult to define the campground as a social event.

III FAMILIARITY OF UNITS

While the ecological properties of the campground could influence interaction patterns, familiarity was also shown to be an important variable influencing patterns of interaction. For units with previously existing acquaintances within the campground, the resultant patterns of interaction were shown to be similar to the results when only the ecological properties of the campgrounds were examined. That is, when shifting from the less developed campground to the highly developed campground, social interactions and social contacts increased. When inspecting units without previously existing acquaintances in the campground, it was shown that social interactions decreased and social contacts increased as we shifted focus from the less developed campground to the highly developed campground. Thus,

not only did the ecological properties of a campground influence interaction but more importantly, the familiarity of the units also played a prominent role in influencing the patterns of interaction.

IV FINER DIMENSIONS OF INTERACTION

The interest in this section was in investigating whether or not the general findings relating to the ecological properties and to the familiarity among units would be born out when controlling for various dimensions of interaction. The finer dimensions of interaction included: a) Heterogeneity of the camping shelters, b) periods of the week interaction occurred, c) the breakdown of stranger and non-stranger interactions, and, d) the combination of the spatial relationships of the interactants, where the action took place, and the activity which was conducive to interaction. While the finer dimensions of interaction did demonstrate and confirm the results discussed in the previous sections of the analysis, each of the dimensions displayed a unique interaction pattern.

When inspecting the patterns of interaction by camper type (heterogeneity) it was suggested that having the freedom to choose one's campsite from all the unoccupied campsites in the campground would lead to higher proportions and rates of social interaction being engaged in by the least sophisticated shelter (as illustrated by the less developed campground). It was also discovered (as illustrated

by the highly developed campground) that structure and rules provided for segregated camping (trailers and camper trucks in one section and tents, camper trucks, and trailers in another section) causing the trailer sections to display more homogeneity than the tent sections. This ecological arrangement was shown to influence the patterns of interaction with the trailer units engaged in higher proportions and rates of social interactions.

The discussion of the temporal dimension, which examined and compared week-day and week-end interaction patterns, allowed for an investigation of population density between and within the two campground types. Here, it was shown that with higher population densities on the week-end social interaction decreased for units in the less developed campground and varied little from week-day to week-end in the highly developed campground.

Units with previously existing acquaintances were demonstrated to exhibit higher proportions and rates of social interaction when the population density increased. When considering units without acquaintances in the campground the relationship between population density was illustrated to be similar to the relationship found within and between the campgrounds in general, except that the proportions and rates were much smaller than either the general results or the results for units with previously existing acquaintances. For units without previous acquaintances, as population density increased,

social contacts increased. It was only in units with other known units in the campground that social contacts showed an inverse or inconsistent pattern.

In the stranger and non-stranger interaction section, it was demonstrated that social interactions were predominantly between units who knew each other from outside the campground. It was also illustrated, when examining units with no previously existing acquaintances within the campground, that higher proportions and rates of social interaction took place in the less developed campground where population density was low; rather than in the highly developed campground where population density was high. Furthermore, for units who knew other units in the campground, the highly developed campground, while exhibiting fairly low proportions and rates, recorded higher proportions and rates of social interaction than the less developed campground. The discussion regarding the highly developed campground used the high campsite density, the low level of physical barriers, and the unit's possible feeling of being "on stage" as partial explanations for the increased interaction. This was found not to be the case in the less developed campground where campsite density was low, the level of physical barriers high, and privacy easily attained.

In the last segment of the analysis, the spatial dimension was explored. First, it was illustrated that most of the social interactions

and contacts were between units who were camped next to each other, regardless of familiarity. Second, the location interaction was examined. It was shown, as a response to the ecological properties of the campground and the familiarity between units, that:

1. In the highly developed campground, most of the interactions took place in specific areas within the campsite, with the exception of units who knew no other units in the campground.
2. Units in the less developed campground, with or without previously existing acquaintances in the campground, and units in the highly developed campground who knew no other units in the campground, engaged in interaction in fairly high proportions both inside the campsite and, more importantly, outside the campsite.

Third, activities that promoted or maintained interaction were studied.

It was shown that:

1. Campsite activities (such as sitting in lawn chairs, maintaining equipment, or playing games) were engaged in at higher proportions and rates by units (particular units with previously existing acquaintances within the campground) in the highly developed campground than units in the less developed campground.
2. Walking or standing near the campsite and getting water

were activities associated with higher proportions and rates of interaction in the less developed campground than in the highly developed campground.

V FUNCTIONS OF THE CAMPGROUNDS

Besides the different patterns of interaction observed, the two campground types provided different functions. In the highly developed campground, campers came for various reasons -- a cheap night's lodging, just travelling through, a rodeo or baseball tournament nearby, or a place to spend a vacation -- to name only a few. These reasons for camping contrasted to reasons campers camped at the less developed campground: to get away from the city, to fish, because, "I always come here", "It's free", and "There's no hassle."

VI OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CAMPGROUNDS

Along with the differences in function, there were also several other kinds of differences that we observed: 1) There was little freedom of choice of campsite in the highly developed campground (unless reserved) as opposed to maximum freedom of choice in the less developed campground; 2) being lost or getting lost appeared to be quite possible in the highly developed campground; but not so in the less developed campground; 3) non-Whites, while only a very small fraction of the total campground population, were observed in the

highly developed campground but not in the less developed campground; 4) games and activities such as horseshoes, badminton, baseball, lawn darts, frisbee, cards, and bike riding were commonly observed in the highly developed campground; while cards, bike riding, swimming, bottle and can pick-up, sling shots, guitar playing, and singing were the common activities occurring in the less developed campground; 5) the noise level, while fluctuating throughout the day, was almost always higher in the highly developed campground than in the less developed campground; 6) related and contributing to the noise level, at times, was the ever-present police protection at the highly developed campground as opposed to the two or three police visits per week in the less developed campground; 7) mealtimes, that is, the preparing, eating, and cleaning up of meals, was found to consume the greatest amount of time in both campgrounds; 8) sitting, particularly in lawn chairs, was another activity that consumed a lot of observed camping time. In the highly developed campground, sitting and talking within the site not only passed away a lot of time but was the single activity most conducive to social interactions; and, 9) the mystique campfires had, beyond heating and cooking purposes, was displayed in both campgrounds although differences did exist.

This report has attempted to investigate the conditions under which certain patterns of interaction occur. These patterns of interactions between camping units were observed under varying conditions

of: 1) attributes of the campground setting; and, 2) the population size, density, and heterogeneity of the campground. While the results indicate a clear questioning of previous campground research which defined the campground as a social event, the level of interaction has been demonstrated to be dependent upon such variables as the familiarity of potential interactants, and the ecological properties of the setting.

It is hoped that further research will be conducted in this area so that additional insight into human interaction can be made available, and that future inquiries will find this report one which has raised many questions and perhaps has pointed the way to avenues of further study.

CHAPTER VII

EPILOGUE

I UTILITY OF GROUP ANALYSIS

In reflecting for a moment on fairly recent research on outdoor activities, it appears that social aggregate variables like income, age, occupations, education, or place of residence have received most of the attention of social scientists, with little attention being given to the make-up or social relationships of the participants (campers). For a fairly concise review of these studies see Burdge and Field (6 p. 63-72). By only examining the social and demographic characteristics of the participants in reference to their activity patterns, a limited and restricted amount of information about the people and their patterns of behavior will be learned. This important fact was not only shown to be true in this report but has been the topic on several occasions in Journals dealing with outdoor recreation (5, p. 125-147; and 23, p. 53-68) Meyersohn probably has stated the dilemma most accurately:

Leisure research like much other social research has been based largely on random sample, in which the connectedness of humans is carefully sampled out little effort has been made to study groups

such as -- family groups, groups engaged in common leisure activities, or groups belonging to the same voluntary association.
(23, p. 55)

In the present report, social and demographic variables explained the basic differences between the two campground types; for example, the density differences between the campgrounds and the participation and rate differences in social interaction. But the results derived from examining the tables comparing the two campgrounds somehow did not get at what was observed while in the field. The social and demographic information, of which there was (and is) a considerable amount, appeared only to be the bones or skeleton of how interactions were distributed. Interesting and significant differences did not emerge until the social relationship among the units between which the interaction took place were examined. It was found that units who knew other units within the campground engaged in much higher rates of social interaction than units who did not know other units within the campground. It was also found that, in the less developed campground, units without previously existing acquaintances in the campground interacted socially at higher rates than similar kinds of units in the highly developed campground.

This kind of information would most likely never have been derived by simply comparing the social and demographic variables of the two types of campground. By examining what the social relation-

ship was between units, if any, "meat" was added to the "bones".

This is not meant to imply that social group types of analysis have been completely ignored in outdoor recreation research. On the contrary, researchers such as Field, Burch, Cheek, Lee, and Burdge have all stressed the importance of inspecting social groups in assessing activity patterns of participants. The thrust of the argument is that very few studies have incorporated social group analysis and have linked patterns of activities or interactions to social relationships which characterize a social group. Most of the research only scratches the surface.

A very recent study by Field and O'Leary is a notable exception. In their study, the main concern was assessing participation in selected water activities. They demonstrate that by examining traditional social aggregate variables; i.e., occupation, education, income, age, sex, marital status, etc., that very little is explained and none of the variables can account for significant differences in swimming and fishing in fresh water. On the other hand, when variables such as family groups or friendship groups are looked at, the explanation of differential frequencies of participation is explained by social group analysis. (11, p. 16-25)

It is felt that social group analysis combined with both aggregate variables and pertinent social relationship data could not only advance the knowledge of outdoor recreation research but could aid

the social sciences as a whole in developing better methodologies.

II REACTION TO OBSERVER

Another topic which is generally left out of most sociological research, particularly research which uses participant observation as the main tool of data collection, is the matter of reactions to the observer while in the field. There is a voluminous literature on the topic of participant observation but most (exception is Whyte's Street Corner Society) of it is nothing but cook book recipes generally extending only so far as to give the researcher a tag with which to label himself (herself); i. e., participant observer, observer, participant, etc. Most of the literature is so general, and probably rightfully so, that applying the recipes to the present study would have required not only 30 to 40 hours a day (time for typing, coding, reading, and discussing) but would have required us to be magicians if we were to have followed the rules and had done everything required of a participant observer or an observer. The point is, in order to survive under the conditions of residing in a tent, having temperatures range from 80° to 105° during the day, typing in our vehicle, observing six hours a day, faced with chore of preparing, eating, and cleaning up of meals two to three times per day, and participating in camping - we found that certain adaptations were necessary. For example, during the first three observation periods we observed the units from

our vehicle. This was found to be a hinderance because we couldn't see the units very well. For the remainder of the field work, we walked and sat near the units.

Another adaptation was the shifting of roles from observer to participant observer. During observation periods, it was difficult to be a participant or even be defined by others as a participant so that for definition purposes we were observers, only concerned with recording behavior. Between observation periods, while engaging in other activities throughout the campground, we defined ourselves and were probably defined by others as campers, thus changing our role to participant observer. There were only a few times when a clash between the two roles would occur. One particular type of clash occurred while recording behavior. The clash consisted of the choice of recording behavior from a distance as observer, or accepting an invitation to visit with a camper. This happened only a few times but the problem did exist.

Using this method for data collection made us available for other campers to observe us observing. Going through the field notes we received at least 47 verbal reactions as a direct result of our sitting near units with clip board, paper, and pen. In some cases, what was included as a reaction to the observer could almost be included as a social interaction because they were repeated interactions. A unit would know what we were doing and either invite us into their site or

walk to where we were and then engage in interaction. Although some were repeated, none of the reactions to the observer were classified as interactions.

The reactions varied in length from brief encounters like, "Hey, what are you guys up to?" for which the typical reply was, "observing campground behavior," to being invited into the site, staying three to four hours, talking, eating, and drinking. There was a campground difference also. In the highly developed campground, which did not have a lot of physical barriers, but did have high campsite density, we were sometimes only a few feet away from the campsites we were observing making it quite obvious that we were observing them. In the less developed campground, where in most cases only two or three units could be observed because of the lack of availability of another unit and people, we were again made obvious to the units because of our physical position outside their campsite and the repetitive nature of our observations.

Another campground difference was, in the highly developed campground it was the adults who asked us what we were doing. In the less developed campground the children (particularly males) would freely talk to us and could then be used as informants; giving us such information as where they were from, what their parents did for a living, had they been there before? etc. This was also a method of creating rapport with the entire unit as the children were able to

tell the parents that "they are only observing campers."

The most common response to our physical presence generally elicited an image of us as being artists, sketching the campground. After two or three observation periods a unit would get curious enough to ask if we were sketching. After hearing our reply (observing campground behavior) most of the campers were satisfied and went back to their campsite, spread the word, and continued camping.

There were a few reactions to our presence which elicited what has previously been referred to as almost social interactions. These were repeated interactions in which some of the more interesting data was collected. In one case a middle-aged man at Wallowa Lake, who lives in a small town in central Oregon, advised us to go to Magone Lake after several discussions of what kind of campground we were looking for. In another case a young adult male, who was a travelling salesman living near Lake Oswego, conveyed to us in several conversations his dislike of highly developed campground (although he camped at Wallowa) and his dislike of \$9,000.00 motor-homes which were used two weeks per year. During these repeated interactions with units, social characteristics and camping attitudes were exhibited. Creating rapport with campers was easy; determining the validity of the data they gave us was an entirely different problem.

All in all, out of 302.5 hours of unit observations there was

only one half-hour observation in which we were criticized. In most cases, those who interacted with us were also the units who were engaging in social interaction with other units. Those who interacted with us also comprised only 28 units out of 61 units observed, indicating that while the reaction to the observer was most favorable, the units reacting made up a relatively small percentage of the total units.

Participant observation seems to be a very viable technique in campground research. The campground is a laboratory in which real people come together for short periods of time. Topics such as interaction patterns, socialization, role behavior, family roles, deviant behavior, and territoriality (personal space) are all potential research topics with which some adapted form of participant observation as the tool for data collection could be used to yield very valuable insights into human behavior.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, Durward "Too Many Strangers" National Parks Volume 43, August 1969.
2. Barker, Roger G. "Explorations in Ecological Psychology" American Psychology Volume 20, 1955.
3. Barker, Roger G. and Herbert F. Wright Midwest and Its Children: The Psychological Ecology of An American Town Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954.
4. Burch, William "The Play World of Camping: Research into the Social Meaning of Outdoor Recreation," American Journal of Sociology March, 1965.
5. Burch, William Jr. "The Social Circles of Leisure: Competing Explanations," Journal of Leisure Research, 1 (Spring) 1969.
6. Burdge, Rabel J. and Donald R. Field "Methodological Perspectives for the Study of Outdoor Recreation," Journal of Leisure Research, 4 (Winter) 1972.
7. Campbell, Donald and Julian Stanley Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1963.
8. Darling, Fraser and Noel Eickhorn Man and Nature in the National Parks: Reflections on Policy Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Foundation, 1967.
9. Dressler, David Sociology: The Study of Human Interaction New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1969.
10. Etzkorn, Peter "Leisure and Camping: The Social Meaning of a Form of Public Recreation," Sociology and Social Research Volume 49, 1964.
11. Field, Donald and Joseph T. O'Leary "Social Groups as a Basis for Assessing Participation in Selected Water Activities," Journal of Leisure Research, 5 (Spring), 1973.

12. Galle, Omer R., Walter R. Grove, and J. Miller McPherson
"Population Density and Pathology: What Are the Relations
for Man?" Science April, 1972.
13. Gump, Paul and Brian Sutton-Smith "Activity-Setting and Social
Interaction: A Field Study" American Journal of Ortho-
psychiatry, 1955.
14. Hall, E. T. "Transactional Space" American Institute of Archi-
tects Journal, Feb., 1961.
15. Hawley, Amos H. Human Ecology: The Theory of Community
Structure New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950.
16. Hawley, Amos H. "Population Density in the City," Demography
Volume 9, No. 4, November, 1972.
17. Hendee, John C. and Frederick L. Campbell "The Developed
Campground" Pacific Wilderness Journal April/May, 1973.
18. Johnson, Warren, "Over-Use of the National Parks" National
Parks Magazine October, 1967.
19. Kephart, William M. "Quantitative Analysis of Intragroup Re-
lationships," American Journal of Sociology 55 (May),
1950.
20. Keyfitz, Nathan, "Population Density and the Style of Social Life,"
Bioscience 16, 1966.
21. McKitterick, Nathaniel "Perking Up the Nation's Parks" New
Republic September 18, 1965.
22. McNulty, Faith Letter in the New Yorker, February 25, 1961.
23. Meyersohn, Rolf "The Sociology of Leisure in the United States:
Introduction and Bibliography, 1945-1965" Journal of Leisure
Research 1 (Winter) 1969.
24. Morris, Desmond The Naked Ape New York: McGraw-Hill,
1967.
25. Raush, H.L., A.T. Dittmann, and T.J. Taylor "Person, Setting,
and Change in Social Interaction" Human Relations Volume
12, 1959.

26. Reiss, Albert J. Louis Wirth: On Cities and Social Life Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
27. Simmel, Georg "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in Georg Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms ed. by Donald Levine, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
28. Smith, Joel, William Form, and Gregory Stone "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City" American Journal of Sociology Vol. LX, Nov., 1954.
29. "The Big City Syndrome," UNESCO Courier 23:20 August, 1970.
30. Tisdale, Hope "The Process of Urbanization" Social Forces Vol. 20, March, 1942.
31. Tucker, James and Thomas Friedman "Population Density and Group Size" American Journal of Sociology Vol. 77, January, 1972.
32. Whyte, William Street Corner Society Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
33. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1970 Census of Population Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office Vol. 1 part A (May) 1972.
34. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1970 Census of Population Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office Vol. 1 part 39 (for Oregon) 1973.
35. Wirth, Louis "Urbanism As a Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology Vol. XLIV, July, 1938.

APPENDIX A

TIME-UNIT ROTATION OBSERVATIONAL SCHEDULE

Monday 6:00 - 8:20 a.m.

6:00 - 6:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
6:35 - 7:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
7:10 - 7:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
7:45 - 8:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16

Monday 12:00 - 2:20 p.m.

12:00 - 12:35	units	5, 6, 7, 8
12:35 - 1:10	units	9, 10, 11, 12
1:10 - 1:45	units	13, 14, 15, 16
1:45 - 2:20	units	1, 2, 3, 4

Monday 6:00 - 8:20 p.m.

6:00 - 6:35	units	9, 10, 11, 12
6:35 - 7:10	units	13, 14, 15, 16
7:10 - 7:45	units	1, 2, 3, 4
7:45 - 8:20	units	5, 6, 7, 8

Tuesday 7:00 - 9:20 a.m.

7:00 - 7:35	units	13, 14, 15, 16
7:35 - 8:10	units	1, 2, 3, 4
8:10 - 8:45	units	5, 6, 7, 8
8:45 - 9:20	units	9, 10, 11, 12

Tuesday 1:00 - 3:20 p.m.

1:00 - 1:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
1:35 - 2:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
2:10 - 2:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
2:45 - 3:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16

Tuesday 7:00 - 9:20			
	7:00 - 7:35	units	5, 6, 7, 8
	7:35 - 8:10	units	9, 10, 11, 12
	8:10 - 8:45	units	13, 14, 15, 16
	8:45 - 9:20	units	1, 2, 3, 4
Wednesday 8:00 - 10:20 a.m.			
	8:00 - 8:35	units	9, 10, 11, 12
	8:35 - 9:10	units	13, 14, 15, 16
	9:10 - 9:45	units	1, 2, 3, 4
	9:45 - 10:20	units	5, 6, 7, 8
Wednesday 2:00 - 4:20 p.m.			
	2:00 - 2:35	units	13, 14, 15, 16
	2:35 - 3:10	units	1, 2, 3, 4
	3:10 - 3:45	units	5, 6, 7, 8
	3:45 - 4:20	units	9, 10, 11, 12
Wednesday 8:00 - 10:20 p.m.			
	8:00 - 8:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
	8:35 - 9:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
	9:10 - 9:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
	9:45 - 10:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16
Thursday 9:00 - 11:20 a.m.			
	9:00 - 9:35	units	5, 6, 7, 8
	9:35 - 10:10	units	9, 10, 11, 12
	10:10 - 10:45	units	13, 14, 15, 16
	10:45 - 11:20	units	1, 2, 3, 4
Thursday 3:00 - 5:20 p.m.			
	3:00 - 3:35	units	9, 10, 11, 12
	3:35 - 4:10	units	13, 14, 15, 16
	4:10 - 4:45	units	1, 2, 3, 4
	4:45 - 5:20	units	5, 6, 7, 8

Thursday 9:00 - 11:20 p. m.

9:00 - 9:35	units	13, 14, 15, 16
9:35 - 10:10	units	1, 2, 3, 4
10:10 - 10:45	units	5, 6, 7, 8
10:45 - 11:20	units	9, 10, 11, 12

Friday 6:00 - 8:20 a. m.

6:00 - 6:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
6:35 - 7:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
7:10 - 7:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
7:45 - 8:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16

Friday 12:00 - 2:20 p. m.

12:00 - 12:35	units	5, 6, 7, 8
12:35 - 1:10	units	9, 10, 11, 12
1:10 - 1:45	units	13, 14, 15, 16
1:45 - 2:20	units	1, 2, 3, 4

Friday 6:00 - 8:20 p. m.

6:00 - 6:35	units	9, 10, 11, 12
6:35 - 7:10	units	13, 14, 15, 16
7:10 - 7:45	units	1, 2, 3, 4
7:45 - 8:20	units	5, 6, 7, 8

Saturday 7:00 - 9:20 a. m.

7:00 - 7:35	units	13, 14, 15, 16
7:35 - 8:10	units	1, 2, 3, 4
8:10 - 8:45	units	5, 6, 7, 8
8:45 - 9:20	units	9, 10, 11, 12

Saturday 1:00 - 3:20

1:00 - 1:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
1:35 - 2:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
2:10 - 2:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
2:45 - 3:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16

Saturday 7:00 - 9:20 p. m.

7:00 - 7:35	units	5, 6, 7, 8
7:35 - 8:10	units	9, 10, 11, 12
8:10 - 8:45	units	13, 14, 15, 16
8:45 - 9:20	units	1, 2, 3, 4

Sunday 8:00 - 10:20 a. m.

8:00 - 8:35	units	9, 10, 11, 12
8:35 - 9:10	units	13, 14, 15, 16
9:10 - 9:45	units	1, 2, 3, 4
9:45 - 10:20	units	5, 6, 7, 8

Sunday 2:00 - 4:20 p. m.

2:00 - 2:35	units	13, 14, 15, 16
2:35 - 3:10	units	1, 2, 3, 4
3:10 - 3:45	units	5, 6, 7, 8
3:45 - 4:20	units	9, 10, 11, 12

Sunday 8:00 - 10:20 p. m.

8:00 - 8:35	units	1, 2, 3, 4
8:35 - 9:10	units	5, 6, 7, 8
9:10 - 9:45	units	9, 10, 11, 12
9:45 - 10:20	units	13, 14, 15, 16

APPENDIX B1

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

Tt _____	Wk-d _____	6-8	Unit #'s _____
		8-10	Tot. day's of
Tr _____	Wk-e _____	10-12	observation _____
		12-14	
Ct _____		14-16	Weather _____
		16-18	
		18-20	Campground _____
		20-22	
		22-24	Date & Time _____

Age & Sex breakdown by Unit

1. Numerical (how many involved by age & sex)
2. Behavioral (init., talk, gesture, kind of action, friendly, eye contact, allows people into site, invites, gregarious, loner, avoids, one-sided, evenly)
3. Spatial (where act. takes place, activity that was conducive to inter., phy. barr.)
4. Temporal (less 30, greater 30, approx. actual length, length of stay)
5. Familiarity (strangers, n/strangers, indicator of familiarity)
6. Additional Notes (where units are from, conversa. picked up, etc.)

APPENDIX B2

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	CAMPGROUND	_____
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	DATE	_____			
20	21	UNIT	_____									
WK-D	WK-E	TIME	_____									
		SECTION	_____									

APPENDIX B3

UNIT INVENTORY SCHEDULE

Campground _____ Tt Tr Ct

Unit Number _____

Dates of obser. _____

Length of Stay _____

I. Characteristics of Unit:

A. Type of Equipment

1. Car
2. Shelter
3. Camping equipment
4. City equip. (games, lawn chairs)
5. Additions to site made by the unit

B. No. & break-down of members in unit: note appearance,
language, etc.

Males

Females

C. History of unit: note unobtrusive measures

II. Characteristics of site

A. Physical layout: note reference points, i.e., restroom,
water, activity areas, etc.

B. Physical Barriers:

1. Natural

2. Man made

APPENDIX B4

UNIT INVENTORY

Campground _____ WK-D WK-E Tt Tr Ct

Date: _____

Unit: _____

UNIT CHARACTERISTICS

CAR

SHELTER

CAMPING EQUIP.

CITY EQUIP.

ADDITIONS

UNIT MAKE-UP:

Males

Females

Site Characteristics (Location Terr, Activity areas, Water, etc.)

Natural

Man Made

Additional Notes (Unob. Meas.)

APPENDIX B5

SECTION INVENTORY

Campground _____ Section Number _____

No. of sites avail. _____

No. of sites filled and breakdown by camper type:

	Tt	Tr	Ct		Tt	Tr	Ct		Tt	Tr	Ct
M	_____	_____	_____	T	_____	_____	_____	W	_____	_____	_____
	Tt	Tr	Ct		Tt	Tr	Ct		Tt	Tr	Ct
Th	_____	_____	_____	F	_____	_____	_____	Sat	_____	_____	_____
	Tt	Tr	Ct								
Sun	_____	_____	_____								

I. Characteristics of Section

A. Location in relation to other features of the campground: i. e.
theaters, play areas, activity areas, etc.

B. Density of Section	Week-day	Week-end
Ratio of No. of sites occ. to no. avail:	M____T____W____Th____	F____S____S____
Approx. # people	M____T____W____Th____	F____S____S____
Concentration of people per acre in section	M____T____W____Th____	F____S____S____

C. Additional Notes:

APPENDIX B6

CAMPGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Campground _____ Dates of Observation _____

I. Campground Characteristics:

A. What does the campground offer: Include map of campground showing features in and around the campground.

B. How is the campground controlled: i.e., rangers, police, park employees, etc.

C. Density (approx.)

Ratio of no. sites	Week-day				Week-end		
occ. to no. of sites							
available	M	T	W	Th	F	S	S

Approx. no. of people	M	T	W	Th	F	S	S
-----------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---

Concentration of people							
per acre in campground	M	T	W	Th	F	S	S

D. Additional Notes:

APPENDIX C-1

Wallowa Lake State Park

Fort Stevens State Park

LEGEND

- ① Utility Building
- ② Rest Station
- Trail
- Lake

-See Detail Maps

Fort Stevens State Park (South Section)

APPENDIX C-2 cont'd.

Fort Stevens State Park (North Section)

Magone Lake

LEGEND

- ⊗ Pit Toilet
- ⊙ Water Hydrant
- △ Trash Can
- Information Board
- Trail
- Driveway
- ⊕ Charred Site

Union Creek

APPENDIX D

POPULATION DENSITY

MAGONE LAKE .01 square miles

Total Campground: Average Nighttime Population: 44

Average for the week 6,043 per square mile

Average for the week-day 4,750 per square mile

Average for the week-end 7,767 per square mile

Section E:

Average for the week-day 5,667 per square mile

Average for the week-end 9,722 per square mile

Section W:

Average for the week-day 4,050 per square mile

Average for the week-end 3,466 per square mile

UNION CREEK .08 square mile

Total Campground: Average Nighttime Population: 127

Average for the week 1,667 per square mile

Average for the week-day 1,276 per square mile

Average for the week-end 2,188 per square mile

Section 1:

Average for the week-day 731 per square mile

Average for the week-end 2,103 per square mile

Section 2:

Average for the week-day 1,844 per square mile

Average for the week-end 3,111 per square mile

Section 3:

Average for the week-day 854 per square mile

Average for the week-end 1,058 per square mile

Section 4:

Average for the week-day 1,900 per square mile

Average for the week-end 3,367 per square mile

WALLOWA LAKE .03 square miles

Total Campground: Average Nighttime Population: 754

Average for the week 25,429 per square mile

Average for the week-day 24,750 per square mile

Average for the week-end 26,333 per square mile

Section A:

Average for the week-day 29,333 per square mile

Average for the week-end 30,944 per square mile

Section B:

Average for the week-day 23,000 per square mile

Average for the week-end 27,083 per square mile

Section C (1-31):

Average for the week-day 26,688 per square mile

Average for the week-end 28,583 per square mile

Section E:

Average for the week-day 24,541 per square mile

Average for the week-end 21,500 per square mile

FORT STEVENS

.11 square miles

Total Campground: Average Nighttime Population: 1,489

Average for the week 14,184 per square mile

Average for the week-day 13,314 per square mile

Average for the week-end 15,344 per square mile

Section A:

Average for the week-day 17,464 per square mile

Average for the week-end 16,190 per square mile

Section E:

Average for the week-day 16,125 per square mile

Average for the week-end 16,389 per square mile

Section H:

Average for the week-day 13,030 per square mile

Average for the week-end 16,167 per square mile

Section M:

Average for the week-day 15,775 per square mile

Average for the week-end 15,333 per square mile

APPENDIX E

AGE AND SEX BREAKDOWN FOR ALL CAMPGROUNDS

	<u>Highly Developed</u>	<u>Less Developed</u>
Elderly Male	17 (4%)	14 (5%)
Elderly Female	17 (4%)	12 (5%)
Middle-aged Male	70 (17%)	39 (15%)
Middle-aged Female	68 (17%)	39 (15%)
Young Adult Male	26 (6%)	32 (12%)
Young Adult Female	27 (7%)	23 (9%)
Teen-aged Male	29 (7%)	20 (8%)
Teen-aged Female	44 (11%)	18 (7%)
Child Male	42 (10%)	20 (8%)
Child Female	27 (7%)	12 (5%)
Young-child Male	22 (5%)	18 (7%)
Young-child Female	18 (4%)	10 (4%)
TOTAL	<u>407 (99%)</u>	<u>257 (100%)</u>

COMPOSITION OF CAMPSITES

Single Adult	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Couple (Male & Female Adult)	32 (30%)	15 (28%)
Adults with Adults	1 (1%)	1 (2%)
Adults with Children	54 (50%)	27 (50%)
Adults with Adults with Children	13 (12%)	7 (13%)
All Female	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
All Male	5 (5%)	3 (6%)
TOTAL	<u>107 (100%)</u>	<u>54 (101%)</u>