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Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand the inclusion process at a Project Rainbow affiliated camp. Project Rainbow is a non-profit organization which promotes inclusion into children’s camps in Ontario. This study was completed in order to provide stakeholders of the camping industry insight on how inclusive techniques can be implemented in residential camps. The researcher observed one camp’s inclusion techniques for six days. The researcher observed three campers with disabilities and the camp staff and campers that interacted with them on a daily basis. While the researcher was at the camp, she interviewed nine staff members. The staff members consisted of the camp director, the inclusion coordinator, four camp counsellors, and three inclusion counsellors. An additional interview was conducted after arriving home from camp with the manager from Project Rainbow. The qualitative analysis program NVivo was used to help organize the analyzed data. The researcher found that in attempting to build a culture of inclusion, two important concepts are necessary. First, mutual leadership involved the camp director and Project Rainbow working together as a team to facilitate the inclusion process. Second, power of supportive relationships focused on inclusion being the responsibility of everyone, teamwork, and creating a welcoming environment. Hints at some potentially serious problems related to staff training, teamwork, and attitudes of non-disabled campers pointed to future research and policies which focus on the Ontario and Canadian Camping Associations’ role in inclusion, in addition to camp in this study and Project Rainbow.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Summer camp has been a favorite childhood experience for children for countless years. During the summer of 2001 approximately 800,000 children participated in camping within Ontario (Ontario Camping Association, personal communication, April 11, 2002). Residential camping for children across Canada has evolved tremendously over the past fifteen to twenty years. One indication of this change has been the shift from mostly segregated camping for people with disabilities, to more inclusive camping. Recently, hundreds of children with disabilities have been accepted into inclusive camp programs across Canada (Blake, 1996).

When camping for children with disabilities began in the 1930s, segregated camping was the only choice for children with disabilities to experience summer camp (Blake, 1996). Segregated camping refers to the practice of placing campers with a disability into separate camps where there are no non-disabled campers (Hutchison & McGill, 1998). Different camps specialized in specific disabilities (i.e., developmental disability, physical disability, etc.) and catered only to the children who had those specific disabilities (Blake, 1996). During the 1970s, integration in camping began. Integration is a process whereby people who have been devalued are provided with the necessary supports to participate with ordinary members of the community (Blake, 1996; Hutchison & McGill, 1998). For example, children with disabilities were participating in the same camps as children without disabilities, however do not necessarily create friendships.
null
While camping with all children together was the ideal, in reality many children with disabilities were physically integrated, but not always socially integrated. Physical integration refers to people with disabilities participating in a community setting with other people with disabilities, such as a day camp for children with disabilities held at a Y.M.C.A. It was believed that this type of integration had the potential to be a stepping stone to social integration because people without disabilities were nearby (Wolfensberger, 1972). The potential for children without disabilities to create friendships with children with disabilities is there, but may not actually happen. Social integration refers to a person with a disability participating in a regular setting or program with people without disabilities, that is, a person with a disability joining a regular camp (Wolfensberger, 1972). This situation has greater likelihood of social relationships developing however, this may never happen without adequate supports. In response to this criticism, about physical and social integration, the inclusive community movement began to lay down its roots in the late 1980s and early 1990s (McGill, 2000). Inclusion is the process of involving people with disabilities in communities that are fully welcoming, integrated, engaging, participatory, and accessible (Hutchison & Lord, 2001). Parents, children, and providers of inclusive camps began to see the numerous qualities of inclusive camping (Blake & Waters, 1995). Camps began to let all children attend camps, regardless of ability. Staff and volunteers were trained on inclusive practices (Blake & Waters, 1995). Each child was seen and respected as an individual with strengths and abilities. Tailored supports were available for children with disabilities to ensure that they had equitable opportunities for involvement (Blake & Waters, 1995). Finally, friendships were encouraged and supported between children with and without disabilities (Hornibrook, 1997; Schleien & Green, 1992).
In reality, we know very little about how the process of inclusion is actually being implemented in a camp setting. There is very little literature written about the approaches used to include children with disabilities into camps (Blake, 1996). The literature that is available on camp integration mainly focuses on the benefits of camp integration for children with and without disabilities (Bogle, 1996; Hornibrook, 1997; Schleien & Green, 1992; Schleien, Hornfeldt, & McAvoy, 1994), the parents of the campers (Hornibrook, 1997), and the camp staff (Blake & Waters, 1996; Hornibrook, 1997). The literature concerning camp inclusion focuses on partnerships (Hutchison, 1998), suitability of camps for integration (Allison & Schneider, 2000), and staff training (Bogle, 1996; Bullock, Mahon, & Welch, 1992; Doornink, 1990; Hutchison & McGill, 1998; Orchard, 1996; Sable, 1992; Schleien, Ray, & Green, 1997).

One potentially useful source of information regarding inclusion process was a Canadian article by Blake (1996). Blake (1996) identified five different possible staffing arrangements for camp integration; however this information was based on his own personal experience rather than research. First, staff are hired specifically to work one-on-one with the children who have disabilities. Second, a specially trained counsellor works as a team with a regular counsellor. Third, all staff are hired with the expectation that they may be working with the children with disabilities. Fourth, parents provide their own worker to accompany their child to camp. Fifth, volunteers are recruited to assist as additional staff members when required. While these ideas were useful, the amount of information provided on each option was sparse.

An extremely useful source for inclusive camp learnings was an American study that was just published that was conducted by Brannan, Fullerton, Arick, Robb, and Bender (2003). This was a national study focusing on best practices identified in inclusive camping. The results of this study just became available in the form of a book. Results of the study focused on the
benefits of inclusion for the campers with and without disabilities and implications for camp administrators and staff training. This appears to address some of the gaps in the literature and will most certainly be welcomed by everyone interested in inclusive camping. The study focused on specific approaches to developing and implementing inclusive outdoor programs.

The Brannan et al. (2003) study provided an American perspective and contributed to the sparse literature regarding camp inclusion. While this American study was considered to be most useful, a Canadian study on inclusive camping was also considered to be needed. A Canadian perspective is needed not only because of the different social values that Canada and the United States possess but, because of three fundamental differences between the two countries, which may in turn affect inclusive camping. First, in the United States, the American With Disabilities Act (ADA) provides the mandate for inclusion in all aspects of life, including recreation settings. Canada does have a human rights act, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), which has Section 15(2) which relates to people with disabilities. However, Canada does not currently have federal legislation like the ADA that pertains only to disabilities. In Ontario, where the research occurred, legislation was passed; however, the legislation is considered weak because of its voluntary nature. The Ontario with Disabilities Act 2001 provides just guidelines for people to follow, the act may not end up in regulation (Ontario with Disabilities Act, 2001).

Second, the guidelines published for camp inclusion by the American Camping Association are not exactly the same as the Canadian Camping Association guidelines; however, both are extensive (American Camping Association, 2001; Ontario Camping Association, 2002). The American Camping Association offers 300 standards for camps to follow, while the Canadian Camping Association provides over 400 separate standards dealing with camp
operations. For example, the Canadian standards association highlights categories such as leadership and equipment, whereas the American standards association does not. A Canadian study was needed to reveal the extent to which these guidelines were used to facilitate camp inclusion within a Canadian context. The camp used in this particular study was a member of the Ontario Camping Association and did follow the guidelines set out by the Canadian standards association. After reading the results of this study it became evident that the camp used in this study brought into play leadership, programming, and transportation, for example, to facilitate the inclusion process.

Third, integration in the recreation field has had a longer history in Canada than the United States. In the United States, the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) was established in 1991 and provided a major impetus for inclusion in all aspects of society, including recreation settings (Reynolds, 1993). In Canada, recreation integration began to be examined in the early 1970s when the Journal of Leisurability began to be published (McGill, 2000). While an exact date is not known regarding the first time integration in camping occurred, as mentioned earlier, Blake (1996) suggested that integration has been available informally since camps started operating. The Ontario Camping Association, during the 1980s, began to publish a journal, held forums, and led workshops. At the same time, an organization with a specific mandate to promote inclusive camping, REACH for the Rainbow, was initiated in Ontario (Project Rainbow, 2001). REACH for the Rainbow, which is located in Toronto, was started in 1983. The organization supported the inclusion of people with disabilities in regular recreation and summer camps (Project Rainbow, 2001).

In summary, there was a need for research on the topic of inclusive camping specific to the Canadian context. Throughout the past 50 years, recreation in general, and more specifically
camping for children, has developed from segregated to more inclusive programs. Very little information regarding camp inclusion processes has been developed or researched. At the time of developing the present study, it was known that an extensive American study was being conducted on inclusive camp processes. Thus, this Canadian study will compliment and add to the finished comprehensive American study.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this case study was to understand the inclusion process at a Project Rainbow affiliated camp in Ontario. The grand research question for this study was: How does a Project Rainbow affiliated camp create an inclusive environment? In order to generate explanations rich in detail that answers the above question, the following sub questions were proposed:

Sub Questions

1. How did the camp (administration, structure, and policies) facilitate the inclusion process?

2. How did staff members facilitate the inclusion process?

3. How was inclusion impeded at the camp (administration, structure, policies, and staffing)?

Scope of the Study

This study was confined to one residential camp that was affiliated with Project Rainbow. Before camp began, background documents from both the camp and Project Rainbow were examined. As well, informal discussions were held between the researcher and the camp director and manager from Project Rainbow. The majority of the data were
collected between August 4 and August 9, 2002, a week during which the selected camp operated. A formal interview was conducted with the manager from Project Rainbow after the camp ended. All camp staff and campers were possible participants during the observational phase. All camp staff were possible participants for the interview process. The study addressed the inclusive process which occurred in a camp setting.

**Significance of Study**

First, this study contributed to the literature on inclusion research. There was limited research done on the topic of inclusive camping (Bogle, 1996; Bullock, Mahon, & Welch, 1992; Canadian Camping Association, 1992). Therefore, this study hopefully will complement and reinforce the findings of the large American study that was recently completed. This study will also fill a gap in the inclusive camp literature which currently focuses more on benefits of inclusion rather than the process. Lastly, a unique Canadian perspective on the topic of inclusive camping will be provided.

This study will also improve inclusion practice. This study is of interest to a plethora of different stakeholder groups: camp directors, parents of children with disabilities, parents of children without disabilities, campers with and without disabilities, and the staff members. Camp directors will be able to compare their inclusive processes to this study and decide if some of their approaches need to be improved or completely changed. Children and parents will be able to match their needs and wants with the most appropriate available option. Camp staff will be interested in the study because of potential insights into different training and other inclusion processes that can be used to provide quality inclusive experiences. The study will also allow the camp staff to
determine if specific inclusive processes they are currently using are beneficial for all of their campers.

This study will also contribute to inclusion policy development. National and provincial camping associations (e.g., Canadian Camping Association & Ontario Camping Association) are most likely to benefit from this study. Currently, every camp that is affiliated with the Ontario Camping Association must follow policies and regulations in order to maintain membership with the Ontario Camping Association. The Ontario Camping Association regularly reviews and revises standards when appropriate (Ontario Camping Association, 2002). Hopefully, these organizations will be able to consider the findings of this study as they refine their own policies and guidelines for inclusive camping.

I intend to share the results of this study with the Canadian Camping Association, the Ontario Camping Association, Project Rainbow, and the camp involved with the study. Hopefully, this work will filter down to the hundreds of camps which fall under their membership. Because so many stakeholders are affected, all of the above mentioned groups will be encouraged to incorporate the findings into their camp programs to better meet the needs of all interested individuals. Furthermore, hopefully schools, workplaces, and other recreation setting such as sports leagues, will be able to apply the findings to their contexts.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Inclusive Recreation

Camp integration is part of a broader inclusion movement. Over the past 25 years, many changes have occurred in the disability field in Canada. From complete segregation to social integration, the involvement of people with disabilities into the community has developed immensely. This section will discuss the evolution of inclusive recreation, from the 1970s through to the 1990s.

The 1970s were an era when integration, for the very first time, began to be seen as an important recreation issue. During the 1970s, institutions began to phase out and alternative communities for people with disabilities began to be established because of an increased emphasis on rights and quality of life (McGill, 2000). Independent leisure participation, both segregated and integrated, that was age appropriate and easily accessible started to emerge (McGill, 2000). It was not until the 1970s, when the first and only journal on leisure, integration, and disabilities, the Journal of Leisurability began to be published. In a research study comparing the Journal of Leisurability with the American Therapeutic Recreation Journal, the status of recreation integration research was explored. The study demonstrated that the Journal of Leisurability published a far greater number of articles with a focus on integration (23.2% of total articles) compared to the Therapeutic Recreation Journal (8.1% of total articles) (Hutchison, 1983). Later that decade, the first Canadian book on leisure and integration, Recreation Integration, was published (Hutchison & Lord, 1979). This material provided in-depth research and practice articles on integration. Furthermore, in the 1970s, the United Nations signed an International Declaration of the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons, and shortly after, a declaration of Rights of Disabled Persons. Both acts were very important to the disability field
because they demonstrated that people with disabilities deserved respect, dignity, rights, and access to community based human services (McGill, 2000).

During this period, two continuum models guided the field in terms of the transition from segregation to integration recreation services. A continuum is a range of services from the most restrictive environment (MRE) to the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Wieck & Strully, 1991). Both models built on Wolfensberger’s (1972) work, where three phases were identified. First, segregation was the most restrictive and referred to the isolation of people with disabilities from society, often in an institution, or in the case of camping, a specialized camp only for people with disabilities. Second, physical integration referred to people with disabilities participating in a community setting with other people with disabilities such as a group home or a camp for children with disabilities run out of a Y.M.C.A. Third, social integration referred to a person with a disability participating in a regular setting or program with people without disabilities i.e., a person with a disability joining a regular camp.

The Leisurability Model (Gunn & Peterson, 1978) (see Figure 1) was based on the assumption that people with disabilities needed to have leisure opportunities ranging from segregated to integrated. Figure 1 demonstrated the three different types of services that needed to be made available for people with disabilities. Segregated rehabilitation programs offered participants the opportunity to work on health issues. The leisure education program focused on people acquiring leisure and social skills, gaining knowledge of resources, and improving self-awareness. Finally, integrated services provided opportunities for people with disabilities to be involved in regular community programming.
Figure 1

The Leisurability Model

Gunn & Peterson, 1978
Figure 2
Developmental Continuum of Experiences

Hutchison & Lord, 1979
The Developmental Continuum of Experiences, a second model (see Figure 2), was developed by Hutchison and Lord (1979). This model was based on the assumption that a continuum of services was necessary so people can progress at their own rate, move from dependent to independent experiences, and have choices. The model built on Wolfensberger’s (1972) phases: segregation, physical integration, social integration, and described seven distinct steps along this continuum. The seven steps included: 1. Upgrading experiences in institutions; 2. Segregated upgrading experiences in advocate associations; 3. Segregated upgrading experiences in community settings; 4. Homebound and individualized upgrading experiences in the community; 5. Integrated experiences in the community with advocacy and support; 6. Integrated experiences in the community with little or no advocacy; and 7. Ongoing community involvement.

Upgrading of skills occurred mostly in the segregated and physically integrated options (first 4 steps) whereas participation with support occurred in the socially integrated portions (last 3 steps) (Hutchison & Lord, 1979).

In summary, the 1970’s was a period where the concept of the continuum was developed, refined, and implemented. This is evident in Gunn and Peterson’s (1978) Leisurability Model and Hutchison and Lord’s (1979) Developmental Continuum of Experiences. Both models provided the framework for recreation services for people with disabilities in the United States and Canada respectively.

Concern about the concept of the continuum of services as a framework for supporting the integration process began during the 1980s (Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 1991). One concern was that if readiness was a prerequisite for progressing then many people with severe disabilities would never have a chance to progress. Second, there was a realization that intensive supports could be provided in community settings. Finally it was believed that
individuals with disabilities and families should have the right to choose an integrated lifestyle (Wieck & Strully, 1991). As a result, the 1980s were an era of continued refinement of the integration concept and realization of the need for stronger advocacy strategies and policies to ensure the full participation of people with disabilities. For example, volunteer leisure buddy programs and the Canadian Federation of Sports for the Disabled were established in order for people with disabilities to become involved in recreation programs to break their isolation and provide an alternative to options that were more segregated or physically integrated (Hutchison & McGill, 1998; McGill, 2000). Municipal recreation departments developed policies which insured that all persons had access to regular programs, including people with complex disabilities (McGill, 2000). The 1980s were also a time of growing awareness for the need of advocates to support people with disabilities and hence a proliferation of advocacy organizations. Advocates were able to support people with disabilities, lobby for, and receive greater financial resources for services and supports (McGill, 2000). In 1986, a national forum, the “Jasper Talks,” took place and its follow-up: “blueprint for action.” These talks generated strategies for change regarding adapting physical activity in Canada and provided an impetus for integrated programs being adapted to suit the unique needs and abilities of participants with disabilities (Hutchison & McGill, 1998).

Many changes continued to occur in the 1990s. Most significantly, there was a growing recognition that caring relationships and friends, not just integrated programs, helped people with disabilities though crisis and vulnerable moments and reduced isolation (McGill, 2000). Critique of the earlier continuum models further reinforced the inadequacy of an approach based on settings and programs rather than social support and relationships, hence, the paradigm was shifting from integration to inclusion and new and different models were needed to guide this
evolving practice. However, today much of what happens in the lives of people with disabilities can still not be considered inclusive (McGill, 2000).

**History of Inclusive Camping**

The majority of the literature relevant to camp inclusion falls into three categories: history, benefits, and strategies. Each of these topics will be discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

The movement towards integrated camping has been slow but steady over the years. Organized camping has been available for children without disabilities since 1889 (Blake, 1996). Camping for children with disabilities was not established until 1937 by the Ontario Society for Crippled Children, which is now called The Easter Seal Society (Blake, 1996). The Ontario Society for Crippled Children catered only to children with disabilities, and each of the camps specialized in specific disabilities such as developmental or physical disabilities (Blake, 1996). Presently, segregated camps for people with disabilities continue to operate, however integrated camps are also an option for children with disabilities. Current literature does present a strong defense against segregated camping and other settings, however, there are still some organizations, such as Easter Seals, that still promote and practice segregated camping across the country (Blake, 1996). Believers in segregated camps feel that specialized camps are able to cater to individual needs. Segregated camps range from a focus on weight control, cancer, and diabetes to autism. Organizations that operate segregated camps present a plethora of reasons for providing segregated camping such as:

- specialized care or medical attention that is required by the children; lack of opportunity in 'regular' camp settings; mandate of the founding organization; education of children about self-care and developing independence; higher ratio of staff to campers; specialized
training required by staff; creating an opportunity for children to meet other children who are coping with similar challenges; accessible facilities; and child and parental choice.

(Blake, 1996, p. 4)

An exact date is not recorded for when integrated camping began, yet the best estimate is approximately 1940 (Blake, 1996). Most integrated camps started out as camps for children without disabilities and then eventually let children with disabilities into their camp programs (Blake, 1996).

Organizational support for inclusive camping was needed because of the overwhelming response of children with disabilities, parents, and camp staff wanting to be a part of integrated camping (Blake, 1996). The Ontario Camping Association (OCA) has been promoting and encouraging children’s camping in Ontario for over 60 years. It is a non-profit voluntary organization that provides training and conferences for accredited camps across Ontario. One of the OCA’s roles is to ensure that affiliated camps follow the 400 standards that are set out by the OCA. Every four years camps receive a visit from OCA staff to ensure that they are following the 400 standards. The standards range from health and transportation to leadership and administration. Unfortunately, of those 400 standards none of them apply to inclusive camping (Ontario Camping Association, 2002). On the other side of the boarder, the American Camping Association (ACA) only has 200 standards, yet a few of the standards apply to accessibility issues. For segregated camps, 20% of the staff needs 24 weeks experience working with that population; the director needs 24 weeks experience; and sufficient medical staff must be provided in camps with campers with medical needs. For inclusive camps, dining, sleeping, bathroom, and program areas must be accessible; there must be a procedure for informing staff about disabilities (e.g., how to work wheelchairs and special devices); and a registered nurse
must be on site if a camper has special medical needs (American Camping Association, 2001). The ACA follows the Americans with Disabilities Act regarding accessibility issues as part of their standards (American Camping Association, 2001). These standards are evaluated on a period basis, that is, every five or six years, unless something arises, like new legislation such as the ADA in the 1990's (American Camping Association receptionist, personal communication, August 29, 2003).

The OCA began taking a minor role in integrated camping during the mid 1980s (Blake, 1996). During the 1980’s an integration committee was formed to help camps integrate campers with disabilities. However, in the last twenty years many changes have been made to this committee. The OCA believed that the committee was too proactive and did not give camps a choice to be inclusive or segregated, many camps were scared away regarding becoming inclusive. Therefore, today the committee is called the Special Needs Resource Committee. The OCA does provide a newsletter every month which includes one section from the Special Needs Resource Committee. Although most information regarding the Special Needs Committee is not visible on the OCA web site, it is responsible for providing resources to families, camps, and counsellors. The OCA website provides families a list of camps that may be best suited for their child’s specific disability. Also parents may read articles on accessing money to pay camp fees and the transition to adulthood for children with disabilities. All camps are invited to the Special Needs Resource Committee conference which happens once a year and to off-camp season monthly meetings. Finally, the Special Needs Resource Committee does offer camps suggestion for pre-camp training. The committee provides suggestions for how to get staff to think about how to adapt activities so everyone can be included and recognize that all kids have strengths and weaknesses (S. Grosenger, personal communication, August 22, 2003).
Looking at the broader picture, the OCA is a member of the Canadian Camping Association (CCA). The CCA provides regular meetings and networking for the different associations across Canada and presents a national promotion of camping. The mission of the CCA is to be a national federation dedicated to the growth, development, and promotion of organized camping for all populations in Canada. The CCA was created in 1950 to formulate a national voice. The different associations that comprise the CCA meet twice a year to report current issues in the camping industry. The CCA website does not suggest that information about disabilities is discussed during these meetings.

REACH for the Rainbow in Toronto, initiated by a parent of a child with a disability in 1983, supports people with disabilities to be integrated in regular recreation and summer camps, either as campers or as camp staff and provide regular training opportunities for camp staff (Project Rainbow, 2001)

In 1994, the Canadian Camping Association (CCA) sponsored a national symposium on inclusion in Canada. Development, production, and distribution of the *CCA/ACC Inclusion Training and Resource Manual*, developed as a result of the forum (Blake, 1996).

According to Blake (1996), it is difficult to decipher how many camps presently are integrated. A survey was conducted in Canada in 1994 that revealed 190 out of 337 camps were working towards integration or were completely integrated (Canadian Camping Association, 1992). The 337 camps were a result of the 515 member camps of the Canadian Camping Association in 1992 that may have completed a 1992 survey about being integrated or not and then completed the 1994 study. Many camps are just beginning to become integrated, and many other camps feel that their environment is not suitable for children with disabilities (Blake,
Recognition, knowledge, curiosity, and action is growing, however there is still a long
way to go before all camps will be fully integrated (Blake, 1996).

Strategies/Processes for Camp Inclusion

Over time, many different strategies have been used to facilitate the camp inclusion
process. Strategies for camp inclusion involve: partnerships (Doornink, 1990; Hutchison, 1998;
Orchard, 1996), camp policies (Pontone, 1996), leadership (Bogle, 1996; Brannan, Fullerton,
Arick, Robb, & Bender, 2003; Hornibrook, 1997; Orchard, 1996; Pontone, 1996), staffing
structure (Blake, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003), staff training (Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003;
McGill, 1984; McTavish, Chatterton, & Schmidt, 1996), communicating with parents (Brannan
et al., 2003), and inclusive practices (Brannan et al., 2003). Each strategy will be discussed in the
following section.

Partnerships

Many camps depend on partnerships with local organizations, such as the Catholic Youth
Organization and REACH for the Rainbow, to help facilitate their integrated camping programs
(Bullock et al., 1992; Orchard, 1996; Sable, 1992). Partnerships provide a context for: finding
potential participants with disabilities as well as integrated settings; deciding, in a mutual or
collaborative way on polices, models, and strategies that are most suitable for inclusion; enabling
both parties to learn the expertise from the other group; and ensuring adequate leadership is
provided (Hutchison, 1998).

According to Brannan and his associates (2003), partnerships can take three different
forms. The first type involves asking an agency to help provide staff training about the needs of
children with disabilities. The second type involves obtaining help with both training and
referrals. This second type describes the partnership between the chosen camp for this study and
Project Rainbow, which provides training and referrals to the camp. Many of the other duties that Project Rainbow performs will be mentioned in the following section. Last, the third type of partnership is the most intensive and involves co-creating and co-staffing an inclusive program with an agency that serves people with disabilities.

**Standards and Camp Policies**

Since the Ontario Camping Association’s founding in 1937, Ontario Camping Association Standards have offered camps in Ontario a benchmark for sound camp operation and administration (Ontario Camping Association, 2002). Over 275 camps are presently affiliated with the Ontario Camping Association (Ontario Camping Association, 2002). To become a member of the Ontario Camping Association, a camp must meet over 400 separate standards that have been set by the Ontario Camping Association. Examples of some categories in the Ontario Camping Association Guidelines manual include: health, campsite, facilities and equipments, leadership, programs, and transportation (Ontario Camping Association, 2002). Furthermore, by being an Ontario Camping Association member, camp professionals can exchange information and ideas during Ontario Camping Association visits. Unfortunately, there has been no research on the Ontario Camping Association’s policies and standards. However, evaluations are performed on the standards when they feel it is necessary; for example, when they feel something about inclusion should be added, they will do so (Ontario Camping Association, personal communication, August 29, 2003).

All of the camps Project Rainbow was affiliated with were accountable to the Ontario Camping Association. Because this research focused on a camp that was associated with Project Rainbow (which was a branch from REACH for the Rainbow),
Project Rainbow and REACH for the Rainbow’s policies will also be mentioned. Project Rainbow supports the inclusion of children with disabilities into regular camps. Reach for the Rainbow’s mission statement says, “Reach for the Rainbow develops integrated opportunities that enrich the lives of children and young adults with disabilities, their families and the communities in which they belong” (Project Rainbow, 2001). The goal of the program is to provide children with disabilities access to the same opportunities that their peers without disabilities receive (Pontone, 1996).

According to Pontone (1996), Project Rainbow provides several policies that the affiliated camps agree to follow when in partnership with Project Rainbow. First, the camp must agree to reserve a specific number of spaces per session throughout the summer for the children with disabilities, not just at the beginning or the end of the summer when the camp may not be as full. Second, when a child with a disability is enrolled in a camp, the camp must agree to do all that is possible to have the child included at the camp. Third, the camp must hire additional trained staff to support each child with a disability and his or her camp group. Next, only one child with a disability can be placed within a cabin group. Fifth, once the children with disabilities are familiar with the camp and staff, they may be able to attend camp without additional support, such as an inclusion counsellor, if Rainbow staff and parents agree. Sixth, participants are placed in age specific groups. Next, inclusion must be a camp-wide commitment, not just a commitment by the specially trained support staff. Therefore Project Rainbow trains the entire camp staff regarding the needs of children with disabilities. Last, the camps must communicate with Project Rainbow and problem-solve with staff as needed through telephone calls and planned visits by Project Rainbow.
Leadership

Leadership philosophy, policies, and implementation strategies for camp inclusion can come from different sources. For example, in the case of non-profit camps, the board of directors of most camps are responsible for policy development, hiring of the camp director, and overseeing facility management.

Camp directors are responsible for the overall implementation of the camp program (Brannan et al., 2003). They must incorporate the policies and procedures laid down by the board regarding inclusion and other aspects of camp life. When planning, the director's goal is to offer a wide range of themes and activity levels so that the camp program will cater to differing interest and abilities of campers (Brannan et al., 2003). Directors are responsible for hiring appropriate camp staff to ensure a strong inclusion philosophy is implemented. This not only includes counsellors, but program staff, maintenance staff, and kitchen staff as well. All members of the community must be willing to work in and strive for an inclusive environment.

In some camps, the director actually hires an inclusion coordinator to oversee the inclusion process (Brannan et al., 2003). All of the camps mentioned in Brannan's (2003) study noted that they had an inclusion coordinator, or an individual with possibly a different title, who performed the same duties. The inclusion coordinator's responsibilities begin before the camp's season. The coordinator reviews incoming applicants and contacts the parents of the applicants. During the first contact between the coordinator and the parents, the coordinator establishes a working relationship and serves as the principle liaison with the parents and the camp. When camp begins the coordinator is usually present when the child arrives at camp to introduce their self to the parents and prearranges with parents to have the parents contact him/her during the week to be given a report on their child. The inclusion coordinator is also responsible for the training of staff regarding the needs of campers with disabilities and strategies for facilitating
their inclusion into the camp. Furthermore, the inclusion coordinator is responsible for providing ongoing support and consultation to the staff members that are including campers with disabilities. Lastly, the inclusion coordinator, keeps an ongoing record of inclusive practices for individual campers and the program for use in future years (Brannan et al., 2003).

Some directors encourage the inclusion coordinator, or an alternative staff member, to conduct home visits before camp begins. This provides the opportunity to get to know each camper with a disability and compile a detailed profile on the campers with disabilities. The detailed profiles provide personal information on each camper with a disability. These profiles, in turn, provide the camp staff with suggestions and implications for responding to individual needs of each camper with a disability (Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003; Hornibrook, 1997).

Staffing Structures for Inclusion

Surprisingly very little has been reported regarding staffing structures for inclusion and models for implementation. In the past, all of the models that have been used regarding integration have focused on the broad meaning of integration and how it is related to segregation, for example, the continuum and Leisurability models. There have not been any models developed that depict how to socially include people with disabilities into camp activities, until Brannan and his associates (2003) developed their book on inclusive practices. However, before this book was completed, Blake (1996) discussed a few different staffing approaches.

Blake (1996) hinted about the importance of this issue by outlining five different staffing approaches that may be utilized in any camp where inclusion occurs. The first approach focuses on staff that are hired specifically to work with the children with disabilities. The staff that are hired are the only staff members that are responsible for the children being integrated. The second approach concentrates on specially trained counsellors who become regular counsellors.
These counsellors are partnered up with a counsellor who is not specifically trained, and the two counsellors team counsel the group together. The third approach discussed occurs when all staff are hired with the expectation that they will be working with the children with disabilities. Hence, every staff member is capable of working with every camper. Fourth is when the parents provide their own worker to accompany their children to camp. The worker is not a usual staff member of the camp and is only at the camp when the child they are working with is at the camp. The fifth approach is when the camp provides additional staff when needed. This approach revolves around recruiting volunteers to assist as additional staff members when required. Each camp's specific agenda regarding its inclusion program will probably influence which model is decided upon for choosing what type of staff will be hired for the summer.

Brannan and his associates (2003) discussed two different models for staff roles and responsibilities for inclusion. The first model is called the Cabin Model. The second model is called the Unit Model. The cabin model involves one or two counsellors being responsible for six or eight campers. Some camps using the cabin model have created specific coordinator and counsellor position that support the inclusive aspect of the program. The inclusion coordinator's role was discussed in the leadership section above. The inclusion counsellor is trained and supported by the inclusion coordinator. The inclusion coordinator assigns the inclusion counsellor to a specific camper with a disability and her/his cabin group. The inclusion counsellor meets the parents of children with disabilities and learns information that would be helpful in supporting the camper. The inclusion counsellor provides assistance to the camper with disabilities as needed, and at the same time, serves as a second counsellor in the cabin for all of the campers in the cabin. The inclusion counsellor supports the campers with disabilities to adjust to their peers and the program, and learn the routine. The inclusion counsellor assesses
what level of support is needed for activities of daily living and then determines how assistance can maximize independence in these tasks. The inclusion counsellor utilizes every opportunity to facilitate the inclusion process, either setting up experiences for the whole group to get to know each other, or by supporting the camper with disabilities in an activity by standing back and watching, or providing extra motivation. If a camper with a disability needs assistance, the inclusion coordinator strives to provide it without interfering with the child’s social interaction with the peer group.

In the unit model, 15-24 campers and four unit leaders and assistant leaders live and participate in activities together. Unit leaders supervise and support all campers in the unit. Some of the campers may have individual needs that the group addresses as a whole. The inclusion coordinator may assign additional staff to help the units to support individual campers. The inclusion coordinator also provides supports, problem solving, and resources to unit leaders for individual needs of campers.

*Qualities and capabilities required for staff members.* Camp directors require staff members who can help enforce the mission statement and goals of the camp. If a camp hires an inclusion coordinator, directors would like to hire an individual with expertise in meeting the needs of campers with disabilities. However, directors did not want to hire a person with knowledge and experience limited to specialized settings, as this could lead to a camper being unnecessarily segregated from their group. Therefore, directors like to hire an individual with experience in the inclusion for youth with disabilities (Brannan et al., 2003).

With regard to hiring inclusion counsellors, a number of camps have found that high-school aged older teens, with prior experience in working with children with disabilities, were often ideal for being inclusion counsellors, presumably because of their youthfulness and ability
to relate to campers close to their age. Other camps prefer college-aged students that may be preparing for careers in special education or other similar fields to serve as inclusion counsellors (Brannan et al., 2003).

**Staff Training For Inclusion**

No matter what model or approach for implementation a camp chooses to follow, the literature has highlighted several key points. Staff must be well trained to provide the best opportunity for every camper who goes to camp (Bogle, 1996; McGill, 1984; McTavish et al., 1996). Pre camp training, where the staff have the opportunity to learn as much information as possible before working hands on with the campers, needs to be made available. Pre camp training activities can include sessions on how to provide inclusive programming (McGill, 1984; McTavish et al. 1996). Sometimes full day sessions with professionals who work in the disability field are included in the training (Bogle, 1996). Typically, inclusion training for all staff members is comprised of two hours to half of a day of a staff training week (Brannan et al., 2003). It is important that staff learn at the pre camp training sessions that running an inclusive camp requires a cooperative effort (Bogle, 1996; Orchard, 1996). Pre camp staff training obviously is a time where group cohesion is developed (Sable, 1992). Finally, during training, camp staff recognize that the camp director is available throughout the summer for support and encouragement. Planned informal support opportunities are quite useful where staff can talk with each other, problem solve, and share information (Bogle, 1996).

**Successful training approaches.** Camp programs found that simulations, which give counsellors a sense of what living with a certain disability might be like, increased staff’s abilities to see the situation from the perspective of the campers with disabilities. An additional training approach is to have staff role-play different situations that could occur, and then let them
discuss and decide what they would do in that situation. Moreover, the training leaders may describe the accommodations and support strategies that have been used in the past for youth with disabilities. The message revealed through this type of training is that flexibility, collaboration, and creative problem solving are the keys to successful inclusion (Brannan et al., 2003).

Inclusion counsellor training. As Blake (1996) mentioned, some camps hire specific staff members to play the role of inclusion counsellors for the entire summer. Thus, these staff members may receive specific training. One camp, mentioned by Brannan and his associates (2003), sent its inclusion counsellors to a specialized camp for children with disabilities to learn first hand personal care, communication methods, and ways to redirect and support youth. Another camp mentioned in the study provided their inclusion counsellors with practical information to help support the children at camp. Most camps taught ways to promote the social inclusion of young children into their peer group. Often taught was the process of developing a counsellor relationship with the individual camper, but not letting the relationship interfere with the development of the camper’s peer relationships (Brannan et al., 2003).

Staff training does not end the first day of camp. On going staff training should emphasize that a respectful and nurturing environment is necessary so campers can gain the many benefits from their camp experience (Bogle, 1996; Sable, 1995). An emphasis on each camper’s strengths, not weaknesses, is very important to each camper’s time at camp, especially those with disabilities (McGill, 1984). Every day may be a new learning experience for every staff member. Each camper is distinct and probably requires different types of adaptations for activities and encouragement in separate areas of development (Brannan, 2000). According to McTavish et al. (1996), staff must remember to respect their campers and to put their campers’
needs before their own. Staff should remember that camp is for the kids. Also, staff are role models for the campers (McTavish et al, 1996). Because children look up to people who are older than them, staff members have to remember that they are always being watched.

Lastly, an environment that is conducive to inclusion should always be a goal that is strived for throughout the summer camping months. By the staff avoiding labelling of campers with disabilities and encouraging and facilitating group cohesion amongst the campers, inclusion can happen (Rogers & Robb, 1992; Sable, 1992). A close circle of friends between the campers may be the end result from a summer of camping in an inclusion camp setting (Schleien et al., 1994). How staff training is approached may differ depending on the inclusion model being used.

*Communication with Parents*

Information sharing with the parents of campers with disabilities is very important. Often, a child’s first trip to camp may be more stressful for the parents than for the camper. Establishing a relationship with the parents is very helpful for both the program and the parents (Brannan et al., 2003).

Parents need to understand how the program is structured, the key activities that occur, the nature of the facility, and group living arrangements. Information about the child from the parents is also necessary. Parents and the staff need to determine if the program is appropriate for the child. If so, information sharing continues as the staff and parents plan what kind of assistance or adaptations the child may need (Brannan et al., 2003). Parents have an important role in the planning process and should be considered as an important partner (Rynders, 1995).

Sometimes camp provide the parents with a check-in call while the child is at camp around the second day of the session. The parents are informed about how the child is doing and
if any concerns have emerged. Thus, the parents and the staff member (usually the inclusion coordinator) can discuss problem-solving techniques (Brannan et al., 2003).

Finally, the parents and the child can evaluate the camper’s experience after the camper has arrived home from camp. The camper and parent may reflect on what went well and what could be improved for future seasons of camping. The parents may communicate their responses to the camp staff so the camp staff can build upon the given answers (Brannan et al., 2003).

Inclusive Practices

Many different situations arise during camp for inclusion to occur. First, practices that promote program-wide inclusion will be discussed, followed by a guide which demonstrates how to provide an inclusive activity. Inclusive practices that facilitate social cohesion in groups and during activities of daily living and personal care will also be discussed. Finally, inclusive practices used on the first day will be discussed.

Practices that promote program-wide inclusion. Brannan and his associates (2003) identified two inclusive practices that are important factors in the success of inclusion and involve the entire program community. The first practice involves sharing information about individual needs with all staff members. For example, counsellors and inclusion counsellors meet regularly to discuss strategies and to problem-solve situations. Brief meetings to ensure ongoing communication before, during, and after each session are important for inclusion. Some programs also conduct end-of-season meetings to collect and summarize effective practices used with individual campers, which are placed into a file for the following year.

The second practice involves programming activities across the whole camp that puts the inclusive philosophy into action. For example, a camp mentioned in Brannan and his associates (2003) study conduct a flag ceremony for the whole camp on the second day of each session. A
flag ceremony is when the camp comes together and raises a flag. This is the first time when all of the staff let the campers conduct the ceremony on their own. This allows peers to step forward, and include and assist campers with disabilities to participate in the ceremony.

*Inclusive practices used for program activities.* When conducting an inclusive camp activity, instructors need to keep a few things in mind. For example, when designing the program, the facilitator needs to consider the different needs of the campers who will be participating in the program. Adaptations or alternative ways to do an activity that recognizes the different physical, cognitive, or communicative ability levels, need to be available. The facilitator also needs to be aware of the individuals in the group before they arrive so individual needs can be kept in mind when choosing the activity. Individual needs also have to be thought of when preparing the site and equipment. Furthermore, if needed, the facilitator should pair campers with disabilities with program assistants or a counsellor for safety (Brannan et al., 2003).

In terms of instructing the activity, the instructor needs to instruct away from the action, so the campers focus on the instructor and not the equipment. The instructor should demonstrate what he or she is talking about and could use visuals such as drawing, photos, or finished product samples. The activity should be broken into steps, then teach and practice each step, and finally, put the sequence together. Additionally, make sure the campers understand the activity, and if not, repeat the instructions. During the activity, the facilitator should instruct the counsellors to supervise and instruct the camper with disabilities. Also, the facilitator should provide peer assistance or peer models for the camper with a disability (Brannan et al., 2003).

*Inclusive practices that encourage and preserve inclusion in groups.* Many camps use certain activities to build group cohesion and identity. These group activities also facilitate the
social inclusion of participants with disabilities into the peer group. Challenge/adventure course initiatives is one such activity. These programs typically involve icebreakers and trust building which are followed by group initiatives. Group initiatives are selected that require members to problem solve how they will incorporate or accommodate each member’s physical and other abilities in order to achieve a goal (Brannan et al., 2003).

Cabin or unit talks are also used to facilitate inclusion in groups. A cabin or unit talk is a group discussion led by staff which is used to prevent or solve misunderstandings within the group. Talks also provide information to the group at the beginning of the session about the needs and behaviours of the camper with a disability. The purpose of the talk is to provide campers the opportunity to ask questions beforehand about the needs or behaviours of the camper with a disability, so the other campers could be prepared to help facilitate the inclusion of the camper with a disability into the group (Brannan et al., 2003). Other recreation and educational settings have noted the important role that peers play in the inclusion process, from physical supports, to making friends (Grenot-Scheyer, Staub, Schwartz, & Peck, 1998; Heyne et al., 1993).

_Inclusive practices in daily living and personal care._ The campers are typically responsible for keeping their cabins clean. Campers with disabilities are also responsible for chores, as are the other campers in each cabin. Counsellors must consider the strengths of each camper and find a chore that she/he could perform well. Sometimes two campers may pair together to complete a chore (Brannan et al., 2003).

During mealtime, some campers with disabilities need additional support or structure. Some camps use mealtimes as an opportunity to give counsellors a break and another staff member will sit with the camper who needs extra help. Campers with disabilities are expected to
complete the same mealtime chores as other campers, however a counsellor may need to assist and supervise the camper with a disability (Brannan et al., 2003).

Daily morning and evening routines may require extra time for campers with disabilities. Since counsellors and campers are all living together in a group, and are a cohesive team, the fact that some members may take a bit longer is simply part of the group’s daily life. In inclusive camping, counsellors create a group context where everybody helps each other, waits for each other, and watches out for each other. It is imperative that personal care routines are carried out with privacy, but it is essential that the individual remains connected to the group (Brannan et al., 2003).

_Inclusive practices used on the first day of camp._ Different camps have different ways of facilitating the first day of camp. According to Brannan and his associates (2003), no matter what camp a camper may be at, no group changes its routine because a camper with a disability is in the group. For example, at a Girl Scout camp, the day begins with arrival and registration. The community life coordinator (CLC) reviews pre-established accommodations with the camper’s parents and asks for any updated information. The CLC introduces herself to the camper and lets the camper know that she is available. The camper leader is then brought to her group where she meets the unit leader and fellow campers and rules are described. The rest of the day continues with the camper with a disability receiving extra support only when absolutely necessary (Brannan et al., 2003).

Also, at Camp El Tesoro, Brannan and his associates (2003) found that the first day begins with the inclusion counsellor, also known as a buddy, assisting the camper with a disability introducing her or him self to the cabin group. The buddy assists the
camper all day and makes sure the camper knows where everything is located, such as beds, night stands, and luggage. At Camp Rancho Framasa, the first day begins with the parents and the camper being greeted and walked to the camper’s cabin. The camper is assisted in choosing a bunk. The camper is also provided with a copy of the camp daily/weekly schedule. The camper with a disability is introduced to the rest of the campers and sometimes the camper’s disabilities are discussed. Interaction among group members is encouraged. The camper is assisted throughout the day and is provided information about an activity before it begins so the camper knows what to expect and is prepared for what is coming next (Brannan et al., 2003).

*Inclusive Practices that Provide Individualized Support to Campers*

Brannan and his associates (2003) described ten ways that counsellors provide additional support on an individual basis to group members. Each practice will be discussed.

*Provide encouragement and motivation.* During new or challenging activities, staff provides campers with encouragement and express confidence in each camper’s ability to accomplish the activity. The verbal support motivates campers to succeed in an activity. Furthermore, the camper with a disability’s peers see the staff providing encouragement, so in turn, the peers also provide encouragement.

*Model how to complete activities.* When a staff member models an activity, a camper may see how it is done and learn by both seeing and hearing what to do. Counsellors may describe what they want the camper to do and then point out the actions of a staff member and other campers as an example of what they mean. Visual input, combined with audio input, can enhance learning.
**Provide more time to complete an activity.** Some campers need more time to complete an activity. Counselors need to provide flexible time frames so campers can participate in an activity at their own pace. If activities are provided in this way, counsellors can easily adapt the activity for individual campers.

**Arrange for peers to provide assistance.** Counsellors may have a camper without a disability provide assistance to a camper with a disability. Staff members determine which activities are safe for a peer to assist another camper. If campers are paired together, staff makes sure that the assisting camper is mature and interested in helping out. Brannan and his associates (2003) found that campers with a disability, who were helped by a camper without a disability, learn faster than if they were being helped by an adult model.

**Provide campers with assistance.** “Physical assistance involves any physical contact used to direct, guide, lift, or in other ways support an individual to perform an activity” (Brannan et al., 2003, p.103). Sometimes being physically guided can help a camper learn how to perform an activity. Campers with physical disabilities who use a wheelchair or other equipment for getting around may need physical help to travel, transfer, and to engage in small and large aspects of daily living and personal care.

**Break a task into smaller steps.** Once initial instructions have been given, and a camper still does not understand, counsellors may re-instruct by breaking the task into smaller steps that can be learned and practiced one at a time. Counsellors often use this approach to teach chores, personal care, games, and skills.

**Provide alternative ways to do an activity.** In light of the fact that some campers need to perform tasks in different ways than others, counsellors have preplanned more
than one way campers could perform activities. Staff should have these alternative options ready ahead of time in case they are needed. Staff can also provide alternative ways to do activities right on the spot. For example, counsellors might adjust or reduce the number of jobs involved in completing a task.

*Provide extra practice.* Some campers could use a little extra practice to develop a skill. The opportunity to provide campers with additional practice depends on the program schedule and the group needs. Many counsellors feel that they do not have enough time to provide additional time for practice because of tight program schedules. However, during free time, or less structured time periods, counsellors could help campers engage in extra practice.

*Provide alternative ways to communicate.* Usually alternative ways to communicate means finding an alternative to verbal communication. Sign language, pictures, or the written word, are used to help communicate, besides using the spoken word. Some campers, who can not speak, use augmentative communication systems mounted to a table, or placed across the armrest of a wheelchair, if the camper has a wheelchair. Some campers, such as campers with autism, may use pictures, or drawings to help them communicate.

*Provide special equipment.* Some campers with physical disabilities bring their own adaptive equipment such as customized eating utensils. Camps also use adapted equipment, when necessary, such as floats for swimming, adapted fishing poles, and mounted archery bows. The adaptive equipment allows all of the campers to participate in every activity.
Determining Suitability for Camp Inclusion

In accordance with the philosophy of inclusion, all community recreation settings and camps should be including persons with disabilities. However, some settings are more suitable for inclusion than others due to its physical environment. As discussed earlier, many camps have decided themselves they are not suitable, which in and of itself may need to be questioned. Campers need to feel comfortable and welcomed at camp for inclusion to succeed. Two recreation inventories are available to assist in this assessment process. While not specifically designed for camp inclusion, they might be useful.

The recreation inventory for inclusive participation (see Figure 3), developed by Schleien et al. (1997), is a model that demonstrates how to ensure that people with disabilities will be able to physically participate in recreation programs (Allison & Schneider, 2000; Schleien et al., 1997). In the first stage, program and participant information is gathered to determine if the specific activity and setting is appropriate for the participant. The program is deemed appropriate for the participant if the participant and the professional feel that the participant is of the same chronological age as the other participants and if the individual demonstrates a preference for the particular activity. If the activity and setting are not appropriate for the participant, then the programmer chooses an alternative activity or setting. The second stage involves the activity discrepancy analysis. Here the programmer and participant determine the skills and ability levels of the participant and the specific activity requirements. A leisure skills inventory is used for the participant and specific activity requirements are determined. If the skills and ability level of the participant match up with the activity, then the individual participates in the program. If the participant’s ability and skills do not match the activity, then further activity considerations are required. Further considerations include the physical,
Figure 3

The Recreation Inventory for Inclusive Participation

Part I. (A) Appropriateness of Recreation Activity/Setting for Participant
(B) General Program and Participant Information

IF YES GO

IF NO YIELD

Alternative Activity or Setting for Investigation and Potential Participation

Part II: Activity/Discrepancy Analysis

Leisure Skills Inventory GO Inventory for Participant With Disability

Part III: Specific Activity Requirements

IF YES GO

IF NO YIELD

Part IV: Further Activity Considerations
(A) Physical
(B) Cognitive/Academic
(C) Social/Emotional

IF YES GO

IF NO YIELD

PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAM

Alternate Activity or Setting for Investigation and Potential Participation
Return to Part I to Analyze New Activity

Schleien, Ray, & Green, 1997
cognitive, social, and emotional requirements that are involved with the activity. If the skill and ability level still cannot match the activity, or cannot be increased, an alternative setting or activity must be considered. (Allison & Schneider, 2000). A person with a disability needs to be placed into an activity that has been considered highly appropriate for him or her. If the participant and the activity do not match in terms of ability and skill, the participant will not gain any benefits from participation in that activity or setting.

Figure 4, which provides general considerations for facilitation of leisure experiences for people with disabilities, was developed by Allison and Schneider (2000). Once again, this model addresses physical integration, however it does not ensure inclusion for the person with the disability. The first step in the model includes an organization placing importance on the person with the disability first when making any accommodations. This involves focusing on the persons’ abilities, matching the person’s skills with the activity’s challenges, and adapting any part of the activity to match the participant’s abilities. Step two includes encouraging participant autonomy and choice when making decisions. Facilitating independence in participation, determining any necessary adaptations, and viewing any adaptations as transitional takes place in this step. The third step entails the participants with disabilities being involved in any adaptation process by discussing any adaptations, determining the adaptation feasibility, and ensuring that safety is maintained. The participants with disabilities become quite involved in the adaptation process. They have the opportunity to make their own suggestions regarding their participation in the activity and determine how safe they will be when participating in the activity. Evaluation of adaptations occurs in the last step. Evaluation transpires through observations. Adjustments are then made if necessary and the original activity is reconsidered.
General Considerations for Facilitation of Leisure Experiences

- Place emphasis on person first when making accommodations
- Encourage participant autonomy when making decisions
- Involve participant in adaptation process
- Evaluate adaptations

Allison & Schneider, 2002, p. 59
If the participant appears to be content then no adjustments will have to be made to the activity (Allison & Schneider, 2000).

Hutchison and McGill (1998) (see Figure 5) have proposed many questions for determining the factors that are inhibiting or enhancing to the process of integration, which allows a participant to determine if the program is suitable for him or her. This model addresses inclusion strategies that are used in inclusive settings. The main categories are: support, cooperation, appropriate expectations, individualization, facilitation of social integration between participants, flexible setting, and non stigmatizing supports for integration.

There has been one model created that states that all recreation services are capable of providing recreation services for people with disabilities. Crilley (1994) has prepared a model of integrated community recreation services that includes many essential planning principles to help facilitate integration opportunities for people with disabilities (see Figure 6). Crilley's (1994) model states that each community has the capability of creating an inclusive environment for recreation services. According to Crilley (1994), community recreation program characteristics promoting quality integrative experiences should include but are not limited to the following:

1. There is real access to information and resources, openly communicated to all participants. This is to ensure the exercise of informed choice by individuals.

2. Program rules or operational changes to the program are not applied arbitrarily or in an ad hoc manner. They are incorporated into regular structures and practices to sustain active involvement of existing and potential participants.
Figure 5

Questions for Determining those Factors that are Inhibiting or Enhancing to the Process of Integration

Does the setting promote ways for participants to support each other and get to know one another?

Yes  No

☐ ☐ Can you see evidence of people supporting each other in the setting? Is the leadership of the setting shared amongst formal leaders and participants?

Cues: · children learning from other children.
       · adults showing each other how to do a certain skill or encouraging their peers to try another way.
       · participants having a voice when it comes to making decisions about what they want to do and how they want to do it.
       · participants sharing some of the responsibility for ensuring everyone is involved as much as possible.

☐ ☐ Is the focus of the setting co-operative?

Cues: · focused on working together rather than competing against one another.
       · focused on shared goals and mutual respect for other participants.
       · participants are encouraged when they show cooperative behaviour and begin to encourage it amongst themselves.

☐ ☐ Are there high expectations for all involved?

Cues: · challenges are set that are stimulating and rewarding for each person
       · expectations are appropriate considering the ages of the participants.

☐ ☐ Is there evidence of individualization in the setting?
Cues: • wherever needed, the program goals or physical setting has been changed in order to meet a participant’s need.
  • participants enjoy the ways in which each person expresses his or her unique talents and gifts and are helped to recognize and celebrate them.
  • participants do not feel that they must be at exactly the same skill level in all areas and that it is alright for each person to be learning something slightly different.

Yes   No

☐ ☐ Does the setting find ways to facilitate social interaction between participants?

Cues: • participants know each other on a first name basis.
  • participants are grouped with different people for various activities.
  • there is some “free” time where the goal is spending time to get to know each other.
  • relationship development is considered an important aspect of the program

☐ ☐ Is the setting flexible?

Cues: • participants and formal leaders have a stake in making the setting inclusive and remain open to new ideas and suggestions.
  • participants are all active in the problem-solving process.

☐ ☐ Are the supports for integration provided in a way that does not necessarily stigmatize the participant?

Cues: • participants in programs provide natural supports to each other as much as possible without recruiting outside volunteers and paid staff.
  • leadership supports this by modeling ways that participants can provide support and suggesting ways that participants can become involved in the process.
  • the leadership encourages the person who needs the support to communicate his or her needs openly.
  • when additional staff or volunteers are used, care is taken to ensure that this person does not take away the responsibility for integration from the rest of the group but is there for the experience of the whole group.

Figure 6

Essential Planning Principles to Help Facilitate Integration Opportunities

Figure 1: Integrated Community Recreation

Crilley, 1994, p. 11
3. All participants accepted as members of a program have available to them full rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

4. Social and secondary activities associated with the central recreational activity are deliberately structured and implemented to optimise involvement by all group members. (Crilley, 1994, p. 7)

This model applies to public recreation services and may not be as applicable to private services where there is little obligation to provide inclusive services. As well, as stated at the beginning of this section, these models were not created for camp inclusion specifically, but rather community recreation. However, each model may be useful to camps in helping to provide inclusive settings.

Benefits of Camp Inclusion

Including people with disabilities will enhance your camp’s existing structure and programs. Inclusion is a process that encourages growth and learning throughout the whole camp. When you undertake the process of becoming inclusive, you become involved in a process that helps you develop a better understanding of who makes up your immediate community, the areas of your program that need review, and the leadership development and new learning that need to take place within the camp’s staff team and client base. Inclusion will help you develop your camp so that it is more responsive to everyone’s needs. (Blake & Waters, 1995, pp. Int-5-6)

Over the past few years, the literature has demonstrated that camp inclusion can benefit key stakeholders in integrated camping experiences. Not only do the children with disabilities benefit, but also campers without disabilities, camping staff, and parents of children with
disabilities (Anderson, Schleien, McAvoy, Lais, & Seligmann, 1997; Bogle, 1996; Hornibrook, 1997; Schleien & Green, 1992; Schleien, Hornfeldt, & McAvoy, 1994).

Benefits of Inclusion for Campers with Disabilities

Most of the literature on benefits of camp inclusion pertains to campers with disabilities. Children with disabilities were first included in mainstream camping so attitudinal barriers could be broken between campers with disabilities and campers without disabilities (Sable, 1992). However, many other benefits arose from integrated camping. Friendships and relationships were formed between campers with and without disabilities (Brannan et al., 2003; Bullock, Mahon, & Welch, 1992; Hornibrook, 1997; Lord, 1996; Sable, 1995) because of the positive social interaction that occurred with the children with disabilities (Brannan, Arick, Fullerton, & Harris, 2000; Hornibrook, 1997; Sable, 1995). Hornibrook (1997) stated that friendships were created at camp between people with disabilities and people without disabilities. Some friendships created at camp often continued right through the school year. These lasting friendships prevented isolation and loneliness for the children with disabilities (Hornibrook, 1995). Once camp was finished, the children with disabilities still had their camp friends to play with and keep them involved in other recreation activities.

Positive social interaction included an increase in appropriate play behavior (Schleien et al., 1997) and improvements in communication (Brannan et al., 2000; Schleien et al., 1994). According to Brannan et al., (2000), Brannan et al., (2003) and Schleien et al., (1994), inclusion helped children with disabilities learn to cooperate and share their toys with the other children. During camp, the children with disabilities began to speak more clearly about what they wanted to play with and what activities they had no interest in participating. Furthermore, the children
with disabilities were surrounded by other talkative children, and thus had the opportunity to enhance their listening skills and work on their own talking skills (Schleien et al., 1994).

Youth with disabilities not only developed socially from integrated camp settings, but also emotionally, developmentally, and independently (Anderson et al., 1997; Blake & Waters, 1995; Brannan & Fullerton, 1999; Brannan et al., 2000; Brannan et al., 2003; Fullerton, Brannan, & Arick, 2000; Lord, 1996). For example, being away from home for a child with a disability fostered independence from the child’s family (Brannan et al., 2000; Lord, 1996). Children with a disability learned responsibility at camp (Brannan et al., 2000; Lord, 1996). For example, getting up on time and being ready for the morning activities, or having to prepare a meal for their cabin mates, were some responsibilities at camp. Children with disabilities also acquired new skills that helped them do certain tasks on their own (Blake & Waters, 1995; Brannan et al., 2000; Lord, 1996). Some examples included taking turns, brushing their own teeth, or roasting marshmallows, all of which eventually lead to performing activities of daily living on their own.

Through integrated camping, children with disabilities increased self-esteem, self-acceptance, and self-confidence (Brannan et al., 2000; Brannan et al., 2003; Hornibrook, 1997; Sable, 1995). According to Sable’s (1992) research, children who participated in integrated camps had enhanced confidence in participating in integrated opportunities in their home communities. Once children realized that they had the capabilities to participate in recreation and leisure activities, they did not hesitate to join in on other community events (Sable, 1995). Through participation in recreation activities, children with disabilities began to believe more in their own abilities and appreciate their capabilities, accept who they are, and thus increase their self esteem.
Benefits of Inclusion for Campers Without Disabilities

The next strongest literature base of benefits of camp inclusion pertains to fellow campers, or campers without disabilities. One of the articles from the literature is based upon a research study (Sable, 1992). Sable (1992) performed a qualitative study that focused on unique aspects of a Boy Scout camp that integrated children with disabilities. Sable discovered that integrated camping provides a setting where children with and without disabilities got to know and feel comfortable each other. Mainstream campers gained respect and appreciation for the accomplishments of their peers with disabilities when they participate together in camp activities (Sable, 1992). There appeared to be mutual respect for one another because they each struggled through the same experience. Often, the gifts of the child with a disability shone through in the camp setting because the setting values co-operation and fun. Children’s capacities and contributions are acknowledged and focused upon, rather than the disabilities and limitations (Sable, 1992). At the beginning of Sable’s study, the Boy Scouts believed that the Boy Scouts with the disabilities were not as developed intellectually, emotionally, personally, and socially. However, at the end of Sable’s study, the Boy Scout campers without the disabilities revealed that the Boy Scouts with the disabilities were just the same as the rest of them in all respects.

Other literature revealed that when children got to know one another at school or in the community, many myths and misconceptions were dispelled and awareness took place (Blake & Waters, 1995; Brannan et al., 2003; Bunch, & Valeo, 1997; Dyson, 1994). Once children were placed in an integrated setting, fears of people with disabilities were diminished (Brannan et al., 2003; Hornibrook, 1997; Lau, Keung, & DeGraaf, 1999). Due to the increased social interaction between campers with disabilities and campers without disabilities (Brannan et al., 2000; Brannan et al., 2003),
mainstream campers acquired a better understanding of what it meant to have a disability. Hence, their tolerance and compassion increased (Brannan et al., 2003; Hornibrook, 1997). As they participated together, non-disabled campers learned that they had more in common with their peers who have disabilities (Blake & Waters, 1995).

Benefits of Inclusion for Camp Staff

The literature based on benefits for camp staff is mostly based on recommendations, not research. Camp staff benefit from inclusive camping. For example, staff develop awareness about disabilities issues (Hornibrook, 1997). Many staff members, when they first begin working with campers with disabilities may not realize the many hardships that people with disabilities face on a daily basis. However, after working with the campers with disabilities, staff members begin to realize and become aware of the many issues campers with disabilities face. Staff also learn that every camper is a unique person and that knowledge of a child’s disability tells you very little about the camper’s gifts and interests. The staff also gain skills at adapting activities (Blake & Waters, 1995; Hornibrook, 1997). Not all of the participants may be able to perform an activity the exact same way, so it is the staff’s responsibility to adapt the activity, so that every camper can participate (Blake & Water, 1995).

Recently, Brannan and his associates (2003) discovered that camp staff often develop relationships among themselves and with campers that last a lifetime. Staff have been found sharing nostalgic moments about inclusive experiences that have happened at camp over the years. Staff too benefit from working and playing with campers with disabilities in an inclusive environment.
Benefits of Inclusion for Families of Children with Disabilities

We are well aware that families who have a child with a disability are impacted in terms of their leisure, as well other aspects (Mactavish, Schleien, & Tabourne, 1997). There is a small body of literature on the benefits for families of children with disabilities. Most of the literature is based on recommendations, not research studies. Integrated camping, just like most recreation programs, has allowed families of campers with disabilities more time for themselves (Hornibrook, 1997). Blake and Waters (1995) stated that rejuvenation is beneficial to the overall family relationships. McCormick, White, and McGuire (1992) conducted a study exploring the parents’ perception of the benefits of summer camp for campers with a disability. The study found that respite time was vital for parents or guardians because of the additional responsibilities in caring for youth who have a disability (McCormick et al., 1992). McCormick et al. (1992) also found that when youth are involved in recreation and leisure programs outside of the home, the parents are temporarily relieved of their care giving duties, allowing them to rest and engage in their own recreation and leisure activities. In addition, while the children with disabilities were away at summer camp, parents were able to spend more time with their other children (McCormick et al., 1992). All of these respite concerns may play out in terms of the length of time parents decide to send a child a camp, the type of camp selected, or the supports requested while the child is at camp. Whether or not camp staff has the maturity to provide adequate respite for children with disabilities is a different issue to be explored later.

In summary, the literature on inclusive camp strategies provides information about the history of recreation and camping; partnerships and camp policies; leadership; staffing structures for inclusion; staff training for inclusion; determining suitability for camp inclusion; and benefits of inclusion for campers with disabilities, without disabilities, camp staff, and parents and family
members of children with disabilities. Unfortunately, most of the literature, with the exception of Brannan et al. (2003), is based on authors' analysis or descriptions, not research studies.
CHAPTER 3: QUALITATIVE PROCEDURE

The Qualitative Research Paradigm

The purpose of this case study was to understand the inclusion process at a Project Rainbow affiliated camp in Ontario. The study examined how the camp administration, structure, policies, and staff facilitate the inclusion process, as well as how inclusion was impeded at the camp.

A qualitative approach was taken for this study. This approach was considered most appropriate for studying inclusion because relatively little is known about the inclusion process in a camp environment. Hence, an approach was needed that could provide flexibility around the design, purposeful sampling, personal engagement by the researcher, and inductive investigation, all characteristics or themes related to qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2002).

For example, qualitative inquiry and this particular research study emphasize and build on themes such as naturalistic inquiry, holistic perspective, dynamic systems, and unique case orientation (Patton, 2002). Naturalistic inquiry, unlike certain other types of research, implies that the researcher does not attempt to change the research setting. This ensures that the researcher can make sense of and interpret an issue through the participants' own meaning attached to the setting. While at the camp, to ensure invisibility (Stoddart, 1986), which means that the researcher did not get in the way of the program or make herself standout from the other staff members, the setting was not manipulated. The researcher simply observed the campers and staff during their regular camp routine and interviewed a few staff members, thus obtaining the staff members' interpretation of the phenomena. Unfortunately, other participants were not interviewed.
because of their age and ethical reasons. A holistic perspective means that the whole phenomenon under study is understood as a complex system. This means that a description and interpretation of a person’s social environment or an organization’s external context, is necessary for the overall comprehension of the observations and interviews (Patton, 2002). Thus, I strived to understand the inclusion process as a part of the entire camp experience that relates to the camp’s philosophies and teachings. This understanding was through interviews, observations, and document analysis. Through each specific piece of data collection, I treated each unique entity and then compared it to the other pieces to determine how all of the pieces fit together. Dynamic systems occur when the researcher pays attention to process and assumes that change is constant and ongoing (Patton, 2002). Naturalistic inquirers expect change, anticipate that change will occur, and prepare to accept the change and go with the flow. While at the camp, I described the changes that I saw occurring and tried to understand what kind of effect the changes had on the participants. In this context, I, the qualitative researcher, was the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Patton, 2002). Triangulation enables the researcher to have different perspectives on the nature of inclusion in order for the dynamic nature of inclusion to be illuminated. Interviews allow the researcher to gain the staffs’ perspectives on the process of camp inclusion and to offer their view on how inclusion has changed over time at the camp. Observations provide the opportunity for the researcher to share their perspective and say what is really happening at the setting, and document any changes that occurred during the stay. Document analysis enables the researcher to analyze what the camp’s intentions are regarding inclusion, and to see how the intentions are carried out, if they stay the same or are changed to meet their inclusion
objectives. Last, unique case orientation involves the researcher assuming that each case is special. Each observation and participant offers richness, depth, meaning, which comes out during the first level of analysis and thereby contributes later to the entire cross-case analysis (Patton, 2002).

Furthermore, qualitative research is concerned mainly with process rather than outcomes or products. How people make sense of their lives and how things occur is of interest to qualitative researchers (Creswell, 1994). Most qualitative researchers gain their information through fieldwork. In qualitative research, the data is presented in words and attention is paid to detail through data collection strategies such as observations or interviews (Creswell, 1994; Patton, 2002). As Patton (2002) explains, "In-depth and detailed fieldwork that is unrestrained by predetermined categories is the approach that qualitative researchers take, whereas quantitative researchers require standardized measures so people can be fit into predetermined categories" (p. 14).

Aside from the literature, no categories about the processes taking place in the camp were predetermined, consistent with the notion of the emergent research design. "The qualitative researcher needs considerable flexibility and openness" (Patton, 2002, 44). Therefore, I went into the camp with an open mind regarding the different interpretations of inclusion and the strategies they may be using to implement inclusion. My understanding of the concept of camp inclusion and its particular strategies is in the early stages due to lack of previous research, and therefore there was a need to explore and describe this phenomena in detail (Creswell, 1994; Patton, 2002).
The Qualitative Case Study Research Design

The case study is when the researcher explores a single entity or phenomena bounded by time and activity and collects detailed information by using a variety of data collection procedures during a sustained period of time (Creswell, 1994). The epistemological question that drives the case study is: What can be learned from the single case, rather than generalization beyond the case (Stake, 2000)? When using the case study approach, the researcher can learn to understand the situation in great depth and identify cases rich in information (Patton, 2002). Patton (2002) explains that a great deal can be learned about how to improve a program by studying failures or successes. This particular research project studied one camp’s program success and failures with the inclusion process. The case study also aims to capture individual differences and unique variations from one person or program to another (Patton, 2002). This current study attempted to understand the different inclusion processes used by this particular camp because this camp was seen as being a ‘best practice’ inclusive camping example. By ‘best practice,’ it is understood that the best possible example of camp inclusion was identified for purposes of this study.

This case study was an instrumental design. Stake (2000) explains that the purpose of an instrumental case study is to provide insight into a particular issue. The case is actually of secondary interest. The case plays a supportive role, helping us to understand more about a concept. The concept for this study was the inclusion process. The camp provided an arena to conduct the research and determine how the inclusion process is facilitated and impeded.
Data collection processes for case study designs include: observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials (Creswell, 1994, 1998). The primary focus of data collection was concerned around what was happening to people in a setting and how individuals were affected by the setting (Patton, 2000). This study incorporated the use of observations and interviews and documents to illuminate the essential aspects of the inclusion process.

*Researcher’s Role*

One of the key concepts of qualitative research is reflexivity. Reflexivity implies that the researcher should share his/her own perspective of the phenomenon in order for the reader to understand the researcher’s role in the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The researcher’s past experience in the camping field aided in the research process. For eight years I worked at an inclusive summer camp. Of the 250 children a week who attended the camp at which I worked, approximately 25 children had a disability. For the first five years, I was a counsellor-in-training and a group counsellor. The last three years were spent working one–on–one with children with disabilities as a counsellor and assistant director of the inclusion program. During the eight years I worked at camp, I saw the integration process change from physical integration, where campers with disabilities were at the regular camp but in their own group, to social integration, where they were part of an age-appropriate integrated group. The strategies used to integrate the children with disabilities into the camp program also transformed over the years to the point where it may be considered an inclusive setting for some campers. I bring knowledge of these past experiences dealing with camp integration for children with disabilities to this
present study. From my past experience, I have found that inclusive camping provides many excellent opportunities for children with and without disabilities to meet one another, learn from each other, and have fun while participating together in a camp environment. Stating these feelings reveals the fact that I am a strong supporter for inclusive camping, reflects ownership for my perspective, and explains why there was little criticism of inclusive approaches.

Bounding the Study

Site Selection

In consultation with the Project Rainbow Program Manager, and Co-ordinator of Evaluation, the 43 residential camps currently involved with Project Rainbow were considered as possible sites. In order to explore and describe the inclusion process, one camp was selected (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Stake, 2000). Consistent with Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998), recommendation, as a first time qualitative researcher, I felt a single camp was an appropriate choice. Single setting case studies are characteristically easier to accomplish than multi-site studies because they are less time consuming and may involved less data to collect, manage, and interpret. It is also possible to have more than depth than is possible with multiple sites. It was felt that the camp that was selected needed to be the highest caliber according to Project Rainbow and most of the camps that they were involved with were considered to be less suitable than the camp selected.

Initial contact with Project Rainbow, a division of REACH for the Rainbow, was made through the Head of Evaluation at Project Rainbow Head Office in Toronto in January 2002. The researcher’s advisor informed Project Rainbow that a study was being planned, and that we hoped they would consider being involved at a later date. The
advisor indicated that she would contact them when specifics about the design were worked out. Permission to conduct the research came from two sources: the Project Rainbow Program Manager, as well as the director of the camp involved.

REACH for the Rainbow is a unique non-profit, registered charity that promotes integrated recreational opportunities for children and young adults with developmental and physical disabilities across Ontario. REACH for the Rainbow is a partner to 50 other agencies.

In 1987, REACH for the Rainbow offered integration supports to summer camps in Ontario, under the auspices of Project Rainbow. Project Rainbow worked to establish and modify the existing frameworks of established camps to provide opportunities for inclusive camping. Project Rainbow helps plan a coordinated, purposeful approach to inclusion through annual conferences, staff training, program development, and liaison work between camps and families. Project Rainbow helps to identify an appropriate camp setting for each child interested in going to camp. This might include accessibility needs or adapted equipment for campers (www.reach.on.ca/p_camp.htm). At present, Project Rainbow is involved in the inclusion of approximately 550 children with disabilities into approximately 43 camps around the province (www.reach.on.ca/p_camp.htm).

Purposeful sampling was used in the selection of the camp that served as the site for the study. Purposeful sampling relies on selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases provide a great deal of information about the issues of central importance to the purpose of inquiry. Studying information-rich cases yields insights and in-depth understanding of the "different perspectives on the problem, process, or event" (Creswell, 1998, p. 62) rather than empirical understandings (Patton, 2002). More specifically, the study used extreme case sampling. Extreme case sampling involves the intended users (i.e., Project
Rainbow) involved in the study choosing the case (i.e., the camp) that will reveal the most information about the achievement of success in the inclusion process (Patton, 2002). The Project Rainbow affiliated camp that was chosen for the study met the following criteria:

- affiliation with Project Rainbow, and a member of the Ontario Camping Association, to ensure that the camp was accredited
- high ratings on the previous evaluations conducted by Project Rainbow to ensure overall quality of the inclusion process
- chosen site in operation for more than seven years to ensure that it had the opportunity to become established
- camp director and inclusion co-ordinator had previous experience at the camp e.g., director was assistant director and the inclusion co-ordinator was a counsellor
- relatively high degree of accessibility (few camps are totally accessible because of the outdoor terrain); cabins (at least those where a camper with a physical disability lives), bathrooms, and dining hall able to accommodate all campers
- camp hires the best trained staff capable of dealing with inclusion issues.

The Participants

Interviews were conducted with staff from both Camp Crystal Sands and Project Rainbow. One Project Rainbow manager, the camp director, the inclusion coordinator, and seven staff members, comprised the interview participants. Observations also occurred with approximately 20 camp staff who came in contact with the children with disabilities, three children with disabilities, and able bodied campers who came in contact with the three children with disabilities during the observation period.
Guidelines were followed in order for the participants to be selected for this study. Dan, the Program Manager from Project Rainbow’s Head Office in Toronto was interviewed. He was selected because he oversaw the implementation of inclusion at all Project Rainbow-affiliated camps. He supervised Project Rainbow staff who provided input into camp training.

The camp director, Kim, was also a participant in the study. The camp director was ultimately responsible for overseeing the entire inclusion process. She supported all staff, including the inclusion co-ordination, program staff, and counsellors. As well, the director acted as a liaison with Project Rainbow.

The inclusion coordinator, Mandy was a participant. This was the person the camp director hired to co-ordinate the inclusion process. In general, this staff member was a person who was contacted when support was needed around an inclusion issue.

A variety of camp staff, who had given permission to be in the study, who worked directly or indirectly with campers with disabilities were participants. This included: cabin counsellors, counsellors-in-training, and senior program staff. These were the people who implemented the camp program, and also got involved with the inclusion process. There were approximately 20 staff members who were observed. Of these 20 staff members, only seven who were more directly involved as the campers with disabilities’ cabin counsellors or support counsellors were interviewed.

Three children with disabilities attended the camp during the week the study was conducted. These study participants had parental permission and were observed. Approximately 80 other campers without disabilities attended camp that same week. Of these 80 campers, those who were in close contact with the campers with disabilities
were also considered to be participants and were observed. Most of the campers were aware that I was observing them because the staff members introduced me to the campers as a researcher from Brock University.

Data Collection Procedures

Triangulation was used to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation. Triangulation conveys the idea that multiple sources of data and perceptions clarify meaning, verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation, and bring credibility to the findings (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2000). Data collection took the form of documents analysis of Project Rainbow and the camp’s written materials, participant observations of selected campers and staff, and interviews of key staff members.

Data was collected at the camp once during the summer. An audit trail, described later under verification steps, was used to ensure that all details of the procedure were carefully recorded (Yin, 1989). The site visit occurred during the middle of the summer (August 4-9). This date was chosen because it gave the camp staff ample time to adjust to the summer routine, yet the staff members were not yet worn out from their busy summer. The researcher arrived at camp the morning before the campers. It was not possible to arrive earlier because the staff was on a two day break in between sessions. Arriving before the campers made it possible for the researcher to become familiar with the camp staff and routine and to feel part of the camp atmosphere. Part of the researcher becoming familiar with the camp involved her participating in staff meetings to meet staff members and learn camp policies and routines before the campers arrived. Relevant documents were also examined.
Document Analysis

Documents were seen as an important source for constructing an understanding of a process (Patton, 2000). Documents were used to supplement information received from observations and interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Training manuals, newsletters, articles, and brochures belonging to both Project Rainbow and the camp were examined. The documents were analyzed along with the interviews and observations to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the camp and counsellors facilitate the inclusion process and how inclusion may be impeded at the camp.

Observations

Observations have been considered fundamental to all research methods (Patton, 2002). "Observations in natural settings can be rendered as descriptions either through open-ended narrative or through the use of public checklists or field guides (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p. 137). By being on site and observing, the researcher is able to understand and capture the context of the inclusion process. The researcher may also see things that may routinely escape awareness among the people who are in the setting (Patton, 2002).

The participants for this study were observed during their regular camp routine and interactions with each other. During these observations, the campers and staff was introduced to me as an outsider; however, I attempted to be as non-imposing as possible (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002), by learning the camp routine on my own and helping out when asked. In order to prevent the participants from changing their behavior, a number of strategies were used by the researcher (Berg, 2001). I stayed at the camp for the entire six day camp session so the participants became familiar with my presence and therefore became desensitized. I participated in everyday routines such as cabin clean-up and
canoeing so I appeared to be an active staff member rather than just a researcher. I became known as a nice person, because of the time given to walking around the camp at a similar pace to others and stopping to talk to people as if I were a regular participant. However, other times I was not quite as involved, such as during swim time when I became an observer on the sidelines.

Each time I became part of one of the three camper’s groups, I was introduced to the campers as a researcher and helper to the group. I carried a notepad with me to take brief notes throughout the day as nonchalantly as possible. Twice throughout the day, during swimming and before bed, I excused myself so I could retreat to my tent or office to write some detailed field notes, using the observation protocol.

The observations sessions allowed me to see how inclusion was happening at the camp. The observations clarified what was found in the literature and what was said in the interviews (Denzin & Lincoln 1994). Therefore, I watched how the counsellors interacted with the campers with disabilities. I watched what adaptations were being made so all campers could participate in the activities. I also examined how the staff worked together to achieve inclusion for all campers. Furthermore, I observed how the campers without disabilities interacted with the campers with disabilities.

When I first arrived at camp on Sunday morning, I was given some information about each of the three campers with disabilities that were going to be at camp that week. I took a few minutes to read the information sheets over and to get to know the campers on paper. Also, before the campers arrived, a staff meeting took place under the shelter. I partook in this meeting and was introduced to the staff members as a researcher from Brock University. I also was able to get to know who the staff members were and what
their role was going to be this week at camp. Once the staff meeting was over, I set up my home for the next week, my tent for sleeping and the office for working, and waited for the campers to arrive.

During my visit, I spent approximately two days observing each camper with a disability in a variety of settings (e.g., in the cabin group, at meals, during activities), as well as the staff who were involved with the campers (see Table 1). I first began to observe camper #1 and the people with whom he associated. I followed this camper around until the end of the next day. The day started at 7:00 a.m., with the campers getting into their bathing suites for morning dip, which is where I first began my observations. While they went back and changed, I sat, waited, and prepared for my next observation. Breakfast was at 8:00 and I sat with the group and observed their interactions until 8:45. During cabin clean-up, I sat and observed the group in action. At 9:30, the entire camp plays an all camp game, during which I was a participant observer. At 10:00, the entire camp had a spiritual session involving songs, skits, and prayers. I observed and participated in the songs and prayers. At 10:30, the group reflected on the spiritual time, wherever they felt like hanging out, and I was observing. At 11:00 until 12:30, there were two group activities (e.g., ropes, hiking), so I followed Camper #1 and his group to the activity they had chosen. I sat with the group at lunch from 12:30 until 1:00, then tagged along to the cabin for rest hour from 1:00 until 2:00. Again, I hung out and observed the campers as they played quietly read comics or listened to the counsellors playing the guitar. From 2:00 to 4:30, there were two more group activities that I attended, observed, and participated by helping campers shoot arrows, make a craft, or get to the next session. At 4:30 there was an all camp swim where I went to my office.
Table 1
Observation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Morning dip</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Morning dip</td>
<td>Morning dip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Cabin clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Camp game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Spiritual session</td>
<td>Spiritual session</td>
<td>Spiritual session</td>
<td>Spiritual session</td>
<td>Spiritual session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Group reflection</td>
<td>Group reflection</td>
<td>Group reflection</td>
<td>Group reflection</td>
<td>Group reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Arrive at camp</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Staff meeting</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Campers arrive</td>
<td>Rest hour</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Rest hour</td>
<td>Pack for home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Get to know each other</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
<td>Group activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Camp swim</td>
<td>Camp swim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camp swim</td>
<td>Camp swim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Home time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Camp game</td>
<td>Camp game</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camp game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Tuck time</td>
<td>Tuck time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuck time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>Camp fire</td>
<td>Camp Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camp fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:30</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to fill out an observation protocol. At 5:30, dinner was served and I sat with the group again. From 6:30 to 7:00, there was free time, so I played with Camper #1 and his counsellor. An all camp game happened between 7:00 and 8:00, so I hung out with Camper #1 and his support counsellor. During tuck at 8:00, I sat with the group as they ate their purchases. At 8:30, campfire began, so I sat with camper #1, sang songs with the camp, and watched the skits. At 9:00 was vespers, another spiritual time of singing and prayer and winding down for the evening. At 9:30, when the campers went to their cabin group to get dressed for bed, I returned to my office to prepare for evening interviews.

Days three and four I spent my time with camper #2 in a similar way, in that I participated in all the activities with the camper. It was different however in that camper #2 was part of the wilderness tenting camp where there was no set schedule except for morning spiritual session at 10:00 a.m., swimming at 1:00 p.m., and vespers at 9:00 p.m. During unorganized times like meal preparation, informal games, or sitting around talking, I participated if it seemed suitable, and observed. Basically, the counsellors made the decisions about what activities the campers would participate in throughout the day. For example, the staff decided on a day trip to a nearby conservation area. I went with them on the bus, hiked and played games, cooked our meals, and slept under the stars, all the while, being attentive to the need for observing and recording.

For the remaining two days, I observed camper #3, which followed the same schedule as camper #1. The reason for this schedule of observing each child for two consecutive days was that I could observe each camper at different times throughout the day over the two days, and at different activities, both planned and unscheduled. This enabled me to appreciate any differences in behavior or participation levels that may have
arisen due to fatigue, hunger, type of food, type of activity, weather, and time of the day. I figured that this would be the best observation schedule so I could see how inclusion occurred during regular camp routine and also during unscheduled activity time. According to Patton (2002), during periods of unplanned activity, participants sometimes exchange views and act differently than they would during planned activities. I only took time off from these observations when the children were swimming and once they were in bed.

An observation protocol was developed and used for recording notes in the field (see Appendix A). The observation protocol had a place to record descriptive and reflective notes. The descriptive notes presented the information in detail, with “rich data” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 123). Particular aspects of the informants, the physical setting, activities, and events were carefully recorded. Upon arrival at camp, photos were taken of many different settings (e.g., dining hall, pool, cabins, activity areas). The reflective notes illustrated my personal thoughts on what I was observing. My feelings, problems, ideas, hunches, impressions, and prejudices were all noted. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), the purpose of reflective notes is to improve the descriptive notes. By being aware of my own relationship to the setting, I was able to be more aware of the design and analysis during the study (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998).

Interviews

Interviews are used to gather descriptive data in the participants’ own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some part of the world (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Researchers interview people to find out from them things the researcher cannot directly observe (Patton, 2002). Qualitative interviews range from
structured to unstructured. For example, structured interviews are focused around particular topics and are guided by some general questions. An interview guide may be used, which offers the interviewer considerable latitude to ask about a range of topics. Open-ended or unstructured interviews enable the researcher to ask the participant to talk about the area of interest and probe more deeply for specific content (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

Unstructured face-to-face interviews were conducted on an individual level (see Table 2). The researcher had practiced these questions on friends who had worked previously in camp situations, as a way to build interview skills and re-evaluate the appropriateness of each question. No changes were made as a result of the pilot. Staff members were interviewed on a one-to-one basis to encourage each participant to share honestly about the inclusion process and to obtain unique voices from the different participants (Patton, 2002). The decision was made not to conduct a focus group because of the inexperience of the researcher in terms of group process skills, the fact that the researcher was alone at the site, and the time constraints on staff due to pressure to be with campers most of the time during waking hours. Staff was interviewed when there was a time suitable to both the interviewee and the interviewer. People interviewed included the program manager from Project Rainbow, the camp director, the inclusion coordinator, inclusion counsellors and counsellors.

Program Manager from Project Rainbow. This interview provided background to the study, rather than specifics about the camp, the staff, and the children who attended
Table 2

Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts Shed</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:30pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Inclusion Counsellor</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts Shed</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Camp Director</td>
<td>Camp Office</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:15pm</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Inclusion Coordinator</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts Shed</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:30pm</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:30pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Inclusion Counsellor</td>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00pm</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:30pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kala</td>
<td>Inclusion Counsellor</td>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Senior Staff Member</td>
<td>Outside Dining Hall</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:30pm</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Project Rainbow Manager</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>After Camp Visit</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the camp. The interview focused on Project Rainbow’s role in the inclusion process.
The interview also helped clarify some of the questions I had regarding my observations
from camp and helped discover what Project Rainbow’s thoughts were on the inclusion
process. An interview protocol was used during the interview (see Appendix B). The
protocol consisted of questions that guided the interview. Questions focused on Project
Rainbow’s affiliation with the camp and the manager’s opinion of the inclusion process
and the way it is facilitated at the camp. For example: “What is Project Rainbow’s
affiliation with the camp?” “What does Project Rainbow do to facilitate the inclusion
process?” “What unique challenges/problems have you been faced with when
implementing inclusion at the camp?” As discussed above, an unstructured approach was
used so the protocol was a starting point for discussion rather than an end in itself. A
number of probes, both planned and unplanned, enabled the researcher to gain rich
information from this participant.

Camp Director. An interview protocol (see Appendix C) provided a framework
for questions that were asked during the interview. Interview questions focused on the
director’s role in the inclusion process and her role at camp. For example, “What do you
do, as camp director, to make sure all campers are included into the camp program?” This
question, with its probes, allowed the participant to discuss camp philosophy, policies,
and structure, as well as the nature of the relationship between the camp and Project
Rainbow. “How can the inclusion program be improved?” was another question which
enabled the director to respond from a broad camp perspective. This unstructured
interview took place on the second day that I was at the camp. I would have preferred the
interview to take place on the first day, however, due to time restrictions and busy
schedules, the interview occurred on the second evening. Fortunately, on the first day, during informal conversation, the director was able to inform me about camp routines and rules, and we were able to work out any details about the research that still needed to be addressed.

_Inclusion Coordinator._ The interview occurred on the second night to ensure that the inclusion coordinator was able to act as a liaison for me. This meant that the coordinator became an informant and helped me out when needed with regards to getting around camp and getting to know the staff members. The interview protocol (see Appendix C) provided a framework for questions that were asked during the interview. Questions for this interview focused on the inclusion coordinator's role at camp. For example: “What is your position at this camp?” “What can you tell me about the inclusion program?” What do you do to make sure all campers are included into the camp program?” These questions and their probes enabled the researcher to understand the chain of command relative to addressing issues arising with campers with disabilities or with staff; and the unique perspective on the role of the inclusion co-ordinator.

_Inclusion Counsellors and Counsellors._ Individual interviews (see appendix D) were conducted with the cabin counsellor of each child with a disability (n=3) and the child with a disability’s inclusion counsellor (n=3). One extra counsellor was interviewed because she spent a majority of her time helping the campers with disabilities and their counsellors throughout the week. These interviews were scheduled with staff members in a way that respected the camp schedule. On the first evening, I interviewed the cabin counsellor and the inclusion counsellor of the camper who I was observing for the first two days. The fourth evening I interviewed the wilderness counsellor and the inclusion
counsellor of the second child that was being observed. During the fifth evening, I interviewed the group counsellor and the inclusion counsellor of the third child. The last interview took place during lunch, outside of the dining hall, on the last day with a senior staff member. She was chosen because she has worked with two of the three campers that I was observing in the camp setting. The staff was asked questions about their participation in the inclusion process at camp, how the inclusion program worked, and what they thought could be changed with regards to the inclusion program. For example: “How did you become aware of the inclusion program at this camp?” “What do you do to make sure all campers are included in the camp program?” “How can the inclusion program be improved?” These questions and their probes enabled the voice of regular counselling staff to be understood, not just the inclusion staff. The counsellors are the ones who were implementing the inclusion program, but asking questions which probed their role in-depth was done throughout the week. No children were interviewed for this study because the focus of the study was on the inclusion process and the children were not seen as having control over the implementation of inclusion process. Furthermore, it was possible ethical issues would arise if there was an attempt to interview campers.

All scheduled interviews were audio taped, with the permission of participants (see Appendixes E, F, and G for letters of introduction, consent, and appreciation). This ensured that the researcher did not miss any information from the interview (Creswell, 1994). The interviews were transcribed and were mailed to the interviewees to verify the accuracy of the transcription. Participants were asked to contact the researcher if there were any concerns with the transcription, but no replies were received by the researcher.
Data Analysis Procedure

According to Patton (2002), data analysis is performed so a framework may be constructed for communicating the essence of what the data reveals. Massive amounts of data are reduced so significant patterns may be identified. Ideally, the data analysis will be conducted as an activity simultaneously with data collection, data interpretation, and narrative reporting writing (Creswell, 1994). Therefore, collecting information from the camp, sorting the information into categories, formatting the information into a story, and actually writing the qualitative text, occurred consecutively, following the site visit. The process of qualitative analysis was based on data reduction and interpretation. "The patterns, themes, and categories of the analysis come out of the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis" (Patton, 1990, p. 390).

To begin, following Taylor's and Bogdan's (1984) approach to data analysis which divides data analysis into three steps, the ongoing discovery phase, coding the data, and discounting the findings considers whether the data from a transcription should be divided into more manageable portions of information before beginning coding. However, it was decided that the participants' responses were short enough that there was not a need to create any divisions in the data. Also, the field notes were divided into time frames and therefore the researcher did not have to divide any of the data. The researcher read all the interviews and field notes over to have a more holistic picture and to begin to get a feeling for the data in terms of indigenous concepts, versus sensitizing concepts that the researcher brought to the analysis from the literature. Indigenous concepts are terms that emerge or are created by participants that capture the essence of the experience,
whereas sensitizing concepts are terms or ideas that the researcher brings to the data (Patton 2002).

The case study approach allowed the researcher to understand the inclusion process. As the researcher began to think about a framework for organizing the data, it appeared as though both people and the camp needed to be considered. People's interactions with each other, their experiences, and their perspectives provided a framework for analysis. Also, the elements in the camp such as structure, processes, and policies influenced the framework for organizing the data.

In order to commence to classify and segment the data into categories of information, the researcher went through each interview and observation session one sentence at a time and coded or labelled in the margins. This process of open coding is the first step in data analysis. Codes were developed by grouping together phrases that were similar in terms of ideas, events, or themes (Kirby & McKenna, 1989). Every time a new code was developed, the researcher added the new code to the code book, which made it easier to remember the codes that had been used. A good code book will have detailed descriptions of the codes and exemplars of real text (Patton, 2002). Different colored highlighters were used when multiple codes were evident in the same section. Double or multiple coding is used because most passages have more than one theme or pattern (Patton, 2002). The researcher had to review the interviews and observations multiple times before finalizing the open codes. While the researcher was coding the data, she also made memos which reflected any hunches of particular relationships or theories that might have come out of the data, and to assist in sharpening her analysis
skills. The researcher's supervisor also checked all codes, and where there were discrepancies, the researcher and supervisor negotiated an agreed upon label.

At this stage, the researcher input the transcripts from the interviews and the observations into the computer data management program called NVivo (2002). In computer programs, the codebook supports the researcher in coding within the framework of themes (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The manual codes were inputted into NVivo (2002) by first highlighting the passage and then labelling the passage. Next, NVivo (2002) grouped together all of the passages that had been given the same code.

Once the passages were grouped together, the researcher was able to begin the process of comparing and contrasting each passage to ensure that all of the passages belonged to the appropriate category (Patton, 2002). Strauss' (1987) method of constant comparison was used by the analyst as she worked back and forth between the data and the emerging classification system to verify meaningfulness and accuracy of the categories and the placement of data in those categories (Patton, 2002, p. 466); this also means the analyst finding specific examples in the data to verify the category. This resulted in the elimination of approximately sixty codes from the original ninety codes. The data from eliminated codes were moved to more appropriate categories. The data was rearranged until some measure of coherence became evident (Kirby & McKenna, 1989). When it was decided that each quote was under the appropriate code, the researcher was ready to go onto the next level of analysis.

The finalized categories were then placed into patterns using constant comparisons. A pattern is a descriptive finding that is common across people or sites; Patton (2002) gives an example, "almost all participants reported feeling fear when they
went down the mountain” (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Researchers look for convergence or recurring regularities (common patterns); these regularities reveal patterns that can be used later for clarification of themes.

A theme is more representative of the pattern and is usually more topical, such as the theme of fear itself, or “dealing with fear” as a major theme in wilderness education. So themes are more like a generic heading that describes several patterns in a way that has broad applicability. At this point, the findings of this study are compared to the literature as a way of verifying the findings and contributing to thoughts about the implications of the major findings (Patton, 2002).

*Verification Steps*

*Trustworthiness*

For qualitative researchers, addressing issues pertaining to trustworthiness and authenticity are paramount during the early stages of research design. Lincoln and Guba (1985) discuss the issues of credibility, applicability, dependability, and confirmability, as being constructed to parallel conventional criteria of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and neutrality respectively.

*Credibility*

The study addresses the issue of credibility by data triangulation (Patton, 2002). Credibility ensures that the analysis is believable given the nature of the phenomenon concerned and the circumstances of the research (Patton, 2002). Observations, interviews, documents, researcher’s notes, and logs were used to ensure that the results were consistent. Different types of data may yield different results, therefore the observation results and the interview results were compared to each other to verify the results. Also,
inconsistencies between the two different types of data can offer opportunities for deeper insight into the study (Patton, 2002). Concerns about credibility are addressed through triangulation.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability ensures that there was an audit trail, such as memos, written field notes, personal notes, and/or a reflexive journal, used for the analysis (Patton, 2002). An audit trail was created as a way of tracing and verifying key decisions made during the research process to connect the conclusions to the original data. Yin (1989) suggested reporting a detailed protocol for data collection in the case study, which might increase the opportunities for replication in another setting. In terms of a methods trail, I kept a detailed protocol throughout my research process. This protocol allowed me to see the process that I had followed throughout my research. In terms of data trail, in order to arrive at my final conclusions, I made memos about major decisions pertinent to the analysis. In terms of dependability of the findings, the intent of qualitative research is not to generalize findings, but to form a unique interpretation of the results. In other words, the findings are not based on past research or assumptions. In terms of confirmability or replicating the study, statements about my assumptions, selection of informants, and researcher biases all enhance the chances of this study of inclusion being replicated in another setting (Creswell, 1994). As well, use of the NVivo program, which has a built in mechanism for an audit trail, allowed for an audit trail.

The same patterns or events did not happen in all of the camp’s settings, so to ensure the confirmability issue, the researcher provided a detailed account of the focus of the study, the researcher’s role, the informants’ positions and basis for selection, and the
context in which data was collected. Data collection and analysis strategies were provided in detail in order to provide a clear and accurate picture of the methods used in this study. Last, all phases of this study were scrutinized by an advisor who has experience in qualitative research methods (Creswell, 1994).

Transferability

Thick descriptions of the findings, both interviews and observations, were reported. This enabled the readers to determine whether the findings could be transferred to other settings because of shared characteristics between this study and other studies (Patton, 2002). During the analysis phase, categories were saturated with information until the researcher was confident that no longer did new information reveal a new understanding about relationships within the category (Lincoln & Denzin, 1994). I have also included data about the observation settings, participant selections, my own feelings, and any other data that I felt would be helpful with the transferability of this study.

Dependability

Throughout the analysis the results were subject to change and instability. The rigor of the study was dependent on allowing the data to emerge and be interpreted in a logical and progressive manner (Streubert & Carpenter, 1995). Therefore, during the analysis process the researcher continuously analyzed her findings, and made sure each category was saturated before moving on to the next category.

Authenticity

According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), authenticity occurs “when written accounts contain a high degree of internal coherence, plausibility, and correspondence, to
what readers recognize from their own experiences and from other realistic and factual texts" (p. 381). The researcher's past experience in the camping industry and her knowledge of the literature combined together to give the researcher an authentic understanding of the study and the data collected. The researcher used her past experience and literature knowledge to sort out the data and make the most sense of what the data was trying to portray to create a fair and balanced outcome to the study.

Furthermore, the researcher not only included a voice from the camp that was studied, but also incorporated the voice of Project Rainbow. This ensured that all voices that were involved with the research process were heard, to make certain that all aspects of the inclusion process were studied.

Member checks were also performed. Member checks involved cross checking the researcher's work with the participants of the study. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), researchers must have their participants review the research material. After I had the interviews transcribed, I mailed out a copy of each interview to the corresponding participants. This allowed the participants to review the interviews and ask questions or make changes to the interviews if they felt it was necessary. None of the interview participants replied to the member checks and additional follow-up was done.

The Qualitative Narrative

The results of this case study are presented in a descriptive narrative form. Quotations are intertwined with the researcher's interpretations of the findings, varying the use of long, short, and text-embedded quotes (Creswell, 1994). The final project is a construction of the different interpretations and processes of inclusion that are used in a residential camp setting. This allows the reader to experience and understand the
different strategies that are employed (Creswell, 1994) in an inclusive camp setting. The different themes that were found from observations and interviews during the study were compared and contrasted to provide new insight into the different inclusive strategies that are being used in Canadian camps. Because of the lack of research on this particular topic, the contribution of this study was to add to the general literature on inclusive camping.

Ethical Issues

Several steps were taken to secure permission to study the informants and situation. The Brock University Ethics Review Board reviewed and approved my study proposal to ensure that the rights of participants were protected. In this study, I observed both children and adults who attended the chosen camp, but interviewed only the adults at the camp. An information letter was given to all of the campers and staff members when they arrived at camp. The letter explained that I would be conducting research at their camp and observations and interviews (only for staff members) would be occurring periodically throughout my stay at camp. The letter introduced: who I am; the purpose and procedure of my research; the expected benefits from the research; how their rights, needs, and values would be respected; any foreseeable risks; how confidentiality would be maintained by using pseudonyms; and how the participants would be informed of the results from the study. Parents were asked to sign the consent form and return the form to me before the parents left their children at camp for the week.

Furthermore, the staff members were sent a letter prior to camp that explained that some of the staff members would have the opportunity to be interviewed. If the staff members wished to participate in the interviews, if chosen to do so, then the staff


The text on the page is not clearly visible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a continuous block of text, possibly discussing a topic in detail. The content is not legible enough to transcribe accurately.
members would identify their participation by signing in the 'agree' box in the letter. If the staff member chose not to participate, then they would have signed in the 'disagree' box (staff under the age of 18 must have parent sign form). Staff was asked to bring the consent form to camp. All participants who were interviewed received feedback at the end of my study. Feedback included a letter of appreciation. Also, the camp director, the Director of Project Rainbow, and every participant who wished to receive a copy of the executive summary were sent one.

No physical risks to the participants occurred during my research. Also, no psychological or emotional risks that were greater than what the participants would encounter in everyday life resulted from my study. Confidentiality was maintained by using pseudonyms while at camp and in the research report. A master list was kept with the participants' given names, pseudonyms, and contact numbers. This list, the observation sheets, and interviews were placed in the researcher's advisor's office in a locked file and my study at home, in a locked drawer, while I was not using them. At the end of the study, the data was shredded. The results from this study were only used for the intended research purpose of this study (Creswell, 1994).
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The results of this study on camp integration will be organized in two sections. The first section will be a description of the camp, so readers can get a feel for Camp Crystal Sands. The last section will focus on the results from the researcher’s journey with Camp Crystal Sands.

Camp Crystal Sands

The residential camp for children that was chosen for this study sat on 20 acres of land. Surrounding the camp was an escarpment on one side and a vineyard and orchards on the other. The camp included many different focal points including a tenting area, an archery range, a dining hall, the main office, cabins, a shelter, a pool, a fire circle, half a basketball court, a volleyball court, a high ropes course, an arts and crafts shed, and a stream with a forest behind.

Camp Crystal Sands, the camp which was the focus of this study, was a United Church camp. The camp had been in existence since 1951. The camp was co-ed and included children between the age of 6 and 15. Camp Crystal Sands accommodated approximately 100 campers a week. This camp was affiliated with two other camps which served children outside Camp Crystal Sands region. Most campers reside near the camp, both those with and without disabilities.

The philosophy of Camp Crystal Sands was based on the belief that church camping is an integral part of the church’s ministry. Camp gave children the opportunity to worship God in new ways in a different setting and to experience new relationships with others. Camp was a place to have fun, share joys, make discoveries, and overcome anxieties (Camp Crystal Sands Brochure, 2002).
null
Campers arrived on Sundays, and so a regular camp routine went from Sunday to Friday, when they left. There was a shorter option for younger campers. When the campers woke up, they all had to go for a quick swim in the pool, followed by breakfast. After breakfast there was cabin clean up followed by an all-camp game. Immediately after the game, the campers headed to the dining hall for a spiritual session. Before lunch the first of three program sessions took place. After lunch there was a hour rest period, proceeded by two 45 minute program sessions. Before dinner, there was a one hour of mandatory swim time. An hour of free time followed dinner. The night concluded with an all-camp game, spiritual session, and camp fire.

Also part of Camp Crystal Sands was a separate smaller camp which was referred to as tent camp. The tent camp hosted approximately 20 of the 100 same age campers per week and operated separately from the main camp. The tents were set up on camp property and the tent campers and staff used the camp’s program areas when the main camp was not using them. The two camps joined together for two spiritual sessions that occurred at the beginning and end of the day. Tent camp did not follow the same daily routine as the camp. The staff planned the day’s activities as the day went by, with the exception of the spiritual sessions. Furthermore, tent campers left camp property for an overnight trip to a nearby conservation area on Tuesday afternoons and returned back to camp Wednesday afternoon. Four staff members were responsible for the tent campers, plus an inclusion counsellor joined the foursome when a camper from Project Rainbow attended tent camp.

Camp Crystal Sands not only provided a meaningful camping experience for children, but also for the staff members. During the study, it became obvious that staff
members chose to work at Crystal Sands because they enjoyed the setting, the religious nature of the camp, as well as an affiliation the camp had with a leadership camp. Kim, the camp director stated, “I really enjoyed this setting, and I am from nearby, so it has been a good location. I like the area.” Marissa, a camp counsellor, also liked the camp’s setting, especially the fact that she could go canoeing on the lake, “I liked that it was a wide open space. We could go canoeing on the lake cause I’d never gone canoeing on the lake before.”

A few of the staff members, such as Mandy, came to work at Crystal Sands because of its welcoming environment. Mandy noticed this when she first joined the Crystal Sands staff in previous years, “I found it very welcoming. That was my initial impression as somebody who didn’t know anybody on staff when they come, felt very welcome and included. I felt very at home here.” An inclusion counsellor named Bill enjoyed the fact that he was helping people and doing something good, like making campers feel welcome:

I think the experience I get from being able, to see yourself helping other kids who have special needs and just knowing that I am doing something good. I don’t have any special needs so I think it’s great that I just help other kids and make them feel welcome, even though they may not feel welcome at home, whatever, make sure that they have a good experience at camp.

Other staff members liked Camp Crystal Sands because of the religious affiliation it had to their church and God. Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, reported that, “Mostly because I prayed and I said, ‘God, where should I go?’ God said, ‘Go to Camp Crystal Sands’.”
Many staff became familiar with Camp Crystal Sands through its affiliation the camp had with the leadership camp (Leaders in Development Camp [L.I.D.]) they attended before working at Crystal Sands. Mandy, the inclusion coordinator, starting working at Crystal Sands as part of a placement for leadership camp a year before, “I participated in a leadership development camp so I attended a portion of our camp for a couple of days and then the following summer I came back and I volunteered here for a week.” Maggie, a camp counsellor, also discovered Camp Crystal Sands through this leadership camp. She volunteered, as part of the leadership training, for seven weeks at Camp Crystal Sands, “I did L.I.D. and then I did another program called F.I.T. and I ended up being at this camp for seven weeks.”

Camp Crystal Sands became affiliated with Project Rainbow in 1999. Before this time, there was not an inclusion program at the camp. The 1999, directors of Camp Crystal Sands, Steve and Kim, had heard about Project Rainbow through their sister camps. Steve and Kim became interested in a partnership and approached Project Rainbow. Project Rainbow made a presentation for Camp Crystal Sands’ board of directors. The board of directors liked what Project Rainbow proposed and the partnership began. According to Dan, the manager from Project Rainbow, it is mostly through networking and positive working models and relationships that a camp becomes involved. The director/ board would have been thinking of inclusion first on their own, however, word of mouth is another way camps have heard about Project Rainbow.

Every session the camp accepts three to four campers from Project Rainbow. In a cabin where there is a camper from Project Rainbow, there will also be approximately ten other campers. Two counsellors and an inclusion counsellor, the staff member mainly
responsible for the camper from Project Rainbow, are in charge of an eleven camper cabin.

Attempting to Build a Culture of Inclusion

The remaining section of chapter four will discuss the findings from the interviews and observations found at Camp Crystal Sands. In order to answer the three research questions, how does a camp facilitate the inclusion process, how does staff facilitate the inclusion process, and how does a camp impede the inclusion process, the concept of building a culture of inclusion will be elaborated in this section. According to Maggie, a counsellor at Camp Crystal Sands, a culture of inclusion, or an inclusive camp, was a place where all campers felt welcome, were supported, and “where kids can just be a kid.”

Figure 7 below helps to capture how a culture of inclusion can be built at a residential summer camp. Figure 7 shows that with mutual leadership from both the director and the affiliated partner and staff members and campers supporting each other through unique staff roles, an inclusive work strategy, and a welcoming environment, a culture of inclusion may be built. However, as in any segment of society, there are impediments at the camp that do not help foster the inclusion process. Not enough preparation, lack of communication, and campers not being supportive, are the three components that impede building a culture of inclusion.

Mutual Leadership

Camp Crystal Sands had been operating since 1951. Not until recently did Crystal Sands decide to partner with Project Rainbow to become an inclusive camp.
1. Director Oversaw Inclusion Process
2. Preparation was a Mutual Process
3. Inclusion is Everyone's Responsibility
4. Teamwork and Supportive Relationships
5. Welcoming Environment Reflects Supportive Relationships
6. Not Enough Preparation
7. Lack of Teamwork
8. Campers are not Supportive
Project Rainbow has been involved with Camp Crystal Sands for only four years. When one thinks about this, it is not so many years for a camp to become such a symbol or “best practice” of inclusion, according to Project Rainbow. When Crystal Sands decided to become a partner with Project Rainbow, Crystal Sands required guidance to lead them in the direction of inclusive camping. From the beginning of Crystal Sands inclusive journey, Project Rainbow had provided maps in the form of vision, training, and support. For example, Project Rainbow helped Crystal Sands to understand the importance of having a policy on ratio on campers without disabilities to campers with disabilities. Project Rainbow’s long history down the inclusive camping road had taught them many lessons to be shared with camps less experienced. And now Camp Crystal Sands was becoming a more experienced traveller who could share insights from its journey, as it has in this study.

It is very difficult for good ideas to be implemented without good leadership. When we think of leadership, we usually think about persons who are inspiring, visionary, strong, clear, and motivated. In this study, the idea of mutual leadership began to emerge as a theme because it was evident that no one leader or source was fully responsible for the culture of inclusion. While leadership was essential, leadership that developed philosophy, policies, and implementation strategies came from two different sources, the camp director and Project Rainbow. Staff members had their own jobs that they were responsible for, however, the camp director and Project Rainbow worked together to ensure that a culture of inclusion could be built.
**Director Oversaw Inclusion Process**

Camp directors of inclusive camps are responsible for the overall implementation of any camp program (Brannan et al., 2003), including applying the policies and procedures generated by a board of directors pertaining to inclusion. Bogle (1996) and Hornibrook (1997) affirmed that the director was responsible for the overall implementation of the camp program. The camp director was responsible for hiring appropriate camp staff. Kim, the camp director, was in charge of hiring the staff, which included looking at their past experience, matching counsellors’ strengths to campers’ strengths, allowing the counsellors to float, assisting counsellors, and acting as the coordinator. These were the jobs that the director of the camp was responsible for, and together with Project Rainbow, mutual leadership emerged as an important theme.

At times in this discussion about the director overseeing the inclusion process, you may get a sense that this theme extends beyond the director to a collective, “whole camp” support/sharing in responsibility and information. This is understandable, and later, under the theme of ‘power of supportive relationships,’ there will also be an opportunity to reflect on areas of common patterns.

**Staff experience.** “Due to economic and value changes regarding volunteerism, outdoor-based programs also have found the recruitment and retention of qualified and appropriately motivated staff to be one of the most significant challenges” (Brannan et al., 2003, p. 40). Kim, the camp director in this study, managed to find staff that were capable of carrying out the inclusion process and who would contribute to an overall positive summer camp experience. The director at Camp Crystal Sands hired staff members that had a range of camping experience. The director herself was in her first
year as camp director but was in her seventh summer of working at Camp Crystal Sands. Previously she had been the assistant director for three years, lifeguard for a year, and head lifeguard and canoe instructor for a year. Kim’s own leadership skills developed through her past experience as the assistant director and head lifeguard. Furthermore, while observing at camp, as part of the study, I watched as staff relied on Kim for her expertise in keeping campers from Project Rainbow with their appropriate groups, a constant challenge which is discussed at length later.

The inclusion coordinator, Mandy, was working on her fifth summer at Camp Crystal Sands. Previously Mandy had been a counsellor, arts and crafts programmer, and kitchen staff. As for the rest of the staff, there was a range of experience. Many of the counsellors that I interviewed were working for their first or second summer at Camp Crystal Sands. However, all of the counsellors had been to a leadership training program or volunteered at the camp the year before. Kala, an inclusion counsellor, had attended a leadership training camp for two summers and also did a summer somewhere else in a program called LID (Leaders in Development). Marissa worked at Camp Crystal Sands for the first time this summer and so did Bill. Maggie, a camp counsellor, worked at Camp Crystal Sands for her second summer, however, she had volunteered for two weeks at Camp Crystal Sands the summer before.

*Director allowed counsellors to float.* Different camps have different models for determining how staff will work with campers and programs. At Camp Crystal Sands, the director gave every counsellor the opportunity to choose to work with the campers referred by Project Rainbow, if the counsellor chose to do so. Blake (1996) alluded to this model of different staffing structures. He stated that camps who used this approach hired
their staff with the expectation that they would all be working with the campers with disabilities. At Camp Crystal Sands, staff floated in the sense of being a counsellor one week, maintenance another week, and inclusion counsellor the next week. All staff members that were interviewed for this study made reference to the fact that they could choose to be an inclusion staff member. Marissa, a camp counsellor, stated that she liked the fact that all staff members had the opportunity to be an inclusion counsellor, “I like that here we give everyone an opportunity to do it [be an inclusion counsellor]. We ask all the counsellors to do it, and so everyone has a chance.” According to Bob, a camp counsellor, “We’re all regular counsellors and will be asked the week before if we would like to do Rainbow the next week.” Kim, the camp director, said floating promotes a team atmosphere and counsellors have the opportunity to work with the campers with disabilities:

Personally, I think staff floating is much more effective. It promotes a team atmosphere. It doesn’t promote ‘these are the inclusion counsellors, and all they do is one-to-one, because they don’t get to know the other staff as well.’ Often, the inclusion counsellors do have to the leave the group for a few minutes if their camper has to go for an extra washroom break or go and get changed or something like that. So they’re the ones that are usually least with the group, if you want to put it that way. So you don’t want them to not be nobody on the staff. Since everybody co counsels together, everybody knows each other really well and everyone has time to do one-to-one they remember the support they needed, so they are more willing to give the inclusion counsellors support.
Although Doug from Project Rainbow did not tell Kim how to arrange her staffing structure, he agreed with Kim and believed this approach was valuable because it gave staff a chance to learn, hands on, about integration, "In a sense, everyone comes to understand the integration process, inclusion process, and they are that much better of a support themselves when they are helping someone else in that role." This kind of mutual understanding between the camp and Project Rainbow was evident throughout the study.

There was one counsellor at Crystal Sands whose full time job at camp was an inclusion counsellor. All of the camps that were surveyed in Brannan et al.'s (2003) study used the model of full time inclusion counsellors. This had never occurred at Crystal Sands before. Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, approached Kim at the beginning of the summer and asked if she could work with the campers with disabilities all summer long, because she felt most comfortable with this specific job. All interviewed staff was aware of Natasha’s full time job while at camp and Natasha appeared to work well with the other staff members. Kim, the camp director, explained why she was willing to make an exception:

The reason we hired one person this year is, because she begged for it. She really wanted one-to-one. She really finds counselling one-to-one more exciting. She doesn’t want to feel uncomfortable counselling more groups and she is absolutely amazing and is really conscientious about how to take care of one kid. As a whole I wouldn’t hire four counsellors to do one-to-one all summer.

Obviously, Natasha really excelled at being an inclusion counsellor. Therefore, Kim believed, that because of Natasha’s feelings of being a regular group counsellor, Kim made an exception for Natasha to be a full time inclusion counsellor.
Director matched counsellor and camper strengths as basis for hanging out together. At a Girl Scout Camp in the United States, staff are assigned to groups on a weekly basis so that skills and preferences of individual staff members are considered and matched with the needs of the different campers attending that week (Brannan et al., 2003). Camp Crystal Sands also strategically matched the inclusion counsellors and campers together. The campers from Project Rainbow were not just matched up with any counsellor from camp. The director, assistant director, and inclusion coordinator all worked together using Project Rainbow profiles of the campers to ensure that the inclusion counsellor who was selected to work with a particular camper was a good match; in other words, they needed to get along and work well together. Basically, the three administrative staff tried to match the campers’ strengths with the counsellors’ strengths. The administrative staff did this by looking at all of the counsellors at camp and determined which counsellor would work best with the campers from Project Rainbow. For example, while I was at camp, I noticed that both Mike, a camper from Project Rainbow, and Bill, his inclusion counsellor, were both very outgoing people and liked to talk to everyone around them. According to Mandy, the inclusion coordinator:

Kim, Jim, and myself, kind of all meet together and we look at the kids that we have coming for that week and we look at kids that are coming in the future weeks and we try and match counsellors with the campers and try and pick people who are going to be able to handle certain situations... if we can foresee that, we try and match people up that way. So it’s kind of a group effort.
Also, there were some counsellors that could have been an inclusion counsellor, however needed a few weeks to become more comfortable with inclusion because they have never seen inclusion demonstrated before. Kim, the camp director, explained:

There are obviously counsellors that are stronger at being one-to-one than others and there are others who could wait to mid to late summer because they could be new staff who have never seen integration. They’ve never seen how things work, so we give them time before we throw them right into that and so we can look through the profiles and say O.K. this kid looks like he could work with this staff.

Director assisted staff. One important role of the camp director is to assist staff in a variety of ways. The camp director, Kim, helped staff members at camp when she was needed. When Kim, the camp director, had time, she walked around camp and was available for helping any staff member who she perceived needed extra assistance. Different times during my stay at camp, I noticed Kim providing a helping hand. For example, while I was hanging out with Berry, a camper with a disability, and his inclusion counsellor, Kala, I noticed Berry was having a difficult time staying with his group while his group played a game. His counsellors were having no luck at convincing him to stay with his group. They were simply saying comments like “Berry, stay here with us.” Kim, the camp director, showed up and convinced Berry to stay with his group. Kim did this by telling Berry, in a firm, authoritative director’s voice, that he had to stay with the group because that was where he belonged. Bogle (1996) affirmed that the camp director should be available for support and encouragement. Planned informal opportunities are also quite useful for the staff members to help each other out, problem solve, and share information. According to the director:
I typically find myself checking in with all the counsellors who are doing one-to-one at some point in a day. Definitely, at least a check in, how are you doing, how’s your camper doing? And if I notice that somebody is struggling, trying to come up with some suggestions that are practical or something they can try. Also, like I said before, it’s often relaying their needs to some of the senior staff, who can help them out. I often will go out, and I absolutely love playing with kids, so I’ll go out and join in an activity. If they’re swimming, I’ll go down and play in the pool, give the counsellors a chance to get some of the other kids in the group, and spend 10-15 minutes and just get to know the kids a little bit and spend some time with them.

Other times, staff searched around camp or the office for the director to assist them and requested assistance in problem solving or brainstorming around a particular issue. Bill, a camp counsellor, mentioned that if the counsellors can not solve the problem, then they go find Kim to provide help. Kim, the director, stated:

Counsellors often use me as trouble shooting, kind of looking for ideas. You know, say one of the kids wants to go on a hike, she’ll say, ‘do you think you can hike there?’ They’ll double check if they want a second opinion. ‘If we can’t get back, what will we do?’ ‘Or what do you think if we had a child who doesn’t hike very well, because they lose their attention after a few minutes.’ Talking about what we can do in order to make it work, or can we have an extra staff to make it work? On staff, I am the person who has the most experience working with children with disabilities, and so if there’s a child who does become very difficult, I often will go and spend a fair amount of time with them. So on a week when
there's not anybody who really needs extra help, the amount of time I spend is a lot less.

The camp director, Kim, also supported her staff, specifically the inclusion staff, by giving them extra breaks, as Kim knew from past experience that extra breaks were essential for inclusion counsellors. “Staff can get tired more quickly and need more break time when working with children who need additional support or have behavioral challenges” (Brannan et al., 2003, p.165). Kim justified why the inclusion counsellors at Crystal Sands received extra breaks:

Just knowing that it is harder than counselling a regular group of kids and so they are given a 45 minute of extra time where they just maybe have shower time because they can’t shower when their kid showers and they can’t do those types of things when their child’s doing that, so um they get that extra 45 minutes where the program staff takes over for 45 minutes, and during games the co counsellors have to work together to support the child with a disability.

Doug, the Project Rainbow program manager, realized the importance of having a strong director who assisted inclusion counsellors when they were in need of support, “Kim supports her staff, she is on top of the participant’s individual needs, so she is ensuring that they are in good safe care and responding to anything that is needed. She is just a strong coordinator.” Furthermore, a staff member from Project Rainbow came up at least once a session to be sure everything was running smoothly, and to support the director in working with the inclusion counsellors.

*Director kept in contact with parents.* Camp directors often have the responsibility of keeping in contact with parents of campers with disabilities to ensure
that the camper is safe and having a good time while at camp. Brannan and his associates (2003) mentioned that the role of the inclusion coordinator was to talk to the parents and keep them informed. For example, Kim, the director, kept in contact with the parents of the campers from Project Rainbow while the campers were at camp. Parental contact provided an update on the camper, eased the parents’ concerns, and enabled the director to problem solve with the parents about any issues or concerns that had emerged. Kim, the Camp Crystal Sands director, stated:

I’m usually the one to communicate with their parents. I would say about 80% of the kids who come to camp through Project Rainbow, their parents call at least two or three times during the week to make sure they’re O.K. and to make sure things are going well. And so I like to keep in close contact with the counsellors, obviously to know what’s going on, but also so when their parents call, I can tell them, ‘Here’s what they’ve done, here’s some of the things they’re doing’.

Preparation was a Mutual Process

Many camps also depend on partnerships with local organizations throughout the year to help prepare for inclusion (Bullock et al., 1992; Orchard, 1996; Sable, 1992). Camps’ partners identify and refer campers with disabilities to the camps, decide on policies and strategies, and ensure adequate leadership to enable inclusion (Hutchison, 1998).

The interview responses suggested three ways Project Rainbow worked with Camp Crystal Sands to prepare for an inclusive camp culture: planning, ensuring that there was a policy on ratio concerning how many campers without disabilities to how
many campers there were from Project Rainbow each week, and training before and throughout the summer.

**Planning.** Before campers arrive, camps use planning as a tool for preparing themselves for inclusion. Different camps have different styles for receiving information about their campers with disabilities. Brannan et al. (2003) discovered through their research that some camps send out camper information forms before the campers arrive at camp, and other camps speak to the campers’ parents before camp begins; information pertaining to the camper revealed the campers’ health history, daily care, interests, communication, vision, hearing, self-care, sleeping and eating habits, behaviour, and goals for home, school, and camp.

At Camp Crystal Sands, each camper from Project Rainbow had a personal profile compiled by Project Rainbow before camp began. The profiles included the camper’s name, abilities, support needs, and hints for communication and social activity. For example, Berry’s profile suggested that the counsellors have Berry repeat back to them the instructions for an activity to make sure Berry understood. Each inclusion counsellor who was working with a camper referred by Project Rainbow received a camper profile approximately a week before the campers arrived at camp. The profiles helped the one-to-one counsellor become a bit familiar with their campers before the campers arrived at camp and before the inclusion counsellors called their campers’ parents.

According to the director, she went through the profiles with the inclusion coordinator and the inclusion counsellors:
We encourage them. We go through the profile. Mandy, our integration coordinator and I, we go through the profile with them and ask what are some questions you might like to ask the parents. She gets them to write the questions down so when they call them, they are ready to ask them.

Brannan and his associates (2003) discovered, at one camp, that the inclusion counsellor and the cabin counsellor met to discuss support strategies and how best to include the camper with a disability into the group. This is unlike Crystal Sands, where the inclusion counsellor and the inclusion coordinator met to discuss such strategies. Mandy, the inclusion coordinator, mentioned that her job was to work with the inclusion counsellors to make sure they were ready for the campers’ arrival at camp:

I meet with the counsellors and approach them about working with that child and give them time to read over the profile and then I meet with them a day or two later and go over any questions they have and concerns. We try to brainstorm ways that we can solve problems or try to plan all that out as much as possible before the child comes.

The inclusion coordinator told me what she did about planning, even before the campers arrived at camp:

I do some troubleshooting and stuff like that, different things that may encounter, how to go about aiding the child and making it so that they can participate, so that they are not being drawn away from the kids, and things like that, and that’s all prior to the child coming.

The Project Rainbow staff put the profile together, however sometimes the camp staff had to make some adjustments to the profiles, if it appeared that Project Rainbow
had not kept a particular file current. A few staff members did notice that some of the profiles needed to be updated. According to Kim, the director:

Generally the profiles are fairly detailed. The only time we have a problem with profiles is when they, I mean kids with disabilities, could change so much in a year and so they obviously become outdated fairly quickly and Reach For The Rainbow is good about getting current updates for us, because they have so many kids that it is really difficult to keep up with all of the updates. I actually wrote the updates for our camp this year because I worked with Project Rainbow for a good chunk of the year. So I wrote all the updates depending on how the kid did at camp last summer and the information their parents gave us throughout the year. And sometimes you read a profile and it says a sixteen year old is coming and it says so and so is a great 11 year old child. So you say, 'O.K., how much have they changed in five years?' And so the updating definitely helps, but is it hard when you’re trying to get all the things together and the information they give you is generally very good. I love hearing the counsellors say, ‘well I read this in a profile that they are suppose to wear lifejackets, but they should be able to swim fine in the shallow end. Is it O.k if I don’t put a lifejacket on them?’ You can tell the counsellors really take to heart what the profiles say. So they’re definitely a good asset.

Policy on ratio of campers with a disability to campers without a disability.

According to Wolfensberger (1972), if too many people with a disability are together in a community setting, then it will be difficult for them to be assimilated. Project Rainbow was conscious of the importance of having a ratio which ensured that there were only a
certain amount of campers from Project Rainbow at camp per week. Pontone (1996) stated that, according to one of Project Rainbow’s policies, a camp must agree to reserve a specific number of spaces per session throughout the summer for children with disabilities. Due to Camp Crystal Sands number of campers registered on a weekly basis, Project Rainbow decided how many campers from Project Rainbow should have been referred each week. Essentially, each week there were approximately three to five campers from Project Rainbow, because Camp Crystal Sands had approximately 100 campers at camp per week. Many of the staff members were aware of the policy on ratio. According to the camp director, “Project Rainbow, they set the format for us at the beginning of the summer. There are four campers most weeks. We have five a couple weeks.”

The policy on ratio was not only the responsibility of Project Rainbow. Camp Crystal Sands ensured that there were additional staff in each group where there was a camper referred by Project Rainbow. Project Rainbow did state that the camp must hire additional trained staff to support each child with a disability and his or her cabin group (Pontone, 1996). This was one way the camp tried to ensure that there was enough support for the campers. The camp director clearly explained this in her quote:

So in a group with the child there will be three counsellors instead of two and therefore there will always be one of two co counsellors with that child during the day, during campfire, and vespers so the child will have a lot of support.

Training. Staff must be well trained to provide the best opportunity for every camper who goes to camp (Bogle, 1996; McGill, 1984; McTavish et al., 1996). As part of the partnership between Project Rainbow and camps, another important role that Project
Rainbow played related to staff training. Pontone (1996) stated that one of Project Rainbow's policies was to train the entire camp staff regarding the needs of children with disabilities. Project Rainbow staff members provided training for all camp staff members at Camp Crystal Sands. Not only did Project Rainbow provide training on inclusion, but so did Crystal Sands' director, Kim. During pre-camp, training for inclusion was done for a couple hours on one day. As it will be shown later, a couple of hours of pre-camp training was not enough time for the staff to completely learn and understand how inclusion can work in a camp environment.

McGill (1984) and McTavish et al. (1996) state that pre camp training activities include sessions on how to provide inclusive programming. Many different concepts about inclusion are discussed. It is important that staff have the opportunity to learn as much as possible before working hands on with the campers (McGill, 1984; McTavish et al, 1996). Brannan and his associates (2003) composed a list of staff training topics for inclusion. The list included: history and philosophy of inclusive programming, people first language, disability awareness activities, program-relevant information about different disabling conditions, confidentiality and privacy, strategies for counselling youth, planning processes used to meet youth with disabilities, individual and group situations that can occur, accommodations used for youth with particular disabilities, and supporting youth in daily living activities.

Between the two training sessions on inclusion, one by Project Rainbow and the other by the director, camp staff learned a plethora of ways to help a camper be included into camp life. According to the director, she tried not to focus the session on different disabilities, but more on how to make all campers feel a part of the group:
We also do training during staff training week on integration training, not training on different disabilities. There is minor training on what to expect from a child with disabilities, but the majority of it is training on how to make them part of the group and how to make things work out. So a counsellor being assigned to a camper and beyond that the staff have all been trained in what it is to work as a team, to be a support to make integration work.

Also, the staff was trained that each camper was unique and thus, the staff may have encountered specific situations with different campers. As a result, staff had to address this uniqueness by setting small goals so they would not get down on themselves and their campers. Kim, the camp director, said:

A lot of the time it’s just talking to a lot of the staff, before the summer started, what does integration look like, what is it, what specific situations look like. At the pool what integration looks like, one kind of integration may be different than integration with another child. Kind of stressing the whole idea each kid needs to be comfortable with camp, and once they’re comfortable with camp, they’re much more comfortable with integration. Doing a lot of training on that so they’re not down on themselves right away if they can’t get their camper to be with their group all of the time. Try to help them to understand that there is small integration goals to set for themselves and so they need to see that there are some kids that you easily want to be with, some kids that want to be with the other kids. There are other kids who come to camp who never want to be with other kids. Trying to explain to the staff the difference, and talking about different children and to find different integration activities and working that into being included all the time.
For example, according to Bob, a camp counsellor, training included inclusion tactics and keeping all campers happy:

They kind of go over some of the problems you will encounter, some neat tricks that work. Just basic, like how to keep Rainbow interested and how to keep them part of the group. We get a profile along with the Rainbow kid that gives us hints on how to include them and how they can be included.

As you will see from the next quote, the Camp Crystal Sands director mentioned a wide range of topics and issues pertaining to training, some just mentioned, but presented them in a way which illustrated the complexity of the training and inclusion process:

Especially if you’re working with a child who isn’t able to verbalize on their own, how can you communicate with them and how can you help them to communicate with the other children. Talking about different attention spans, how you can work with children with short attention spans and how you can make it so they can be part of the group too. And a lot of the reasons that they have an inclusion counsellor is they cannot initiate those friendships on their own. So helping them to meet this child and introducing them to the group and making sure they’re always part of things that are going on, and a talent for getting them up there with the other kids and doing something with the other kids with them. In one sense how do you explain them to the other children, and two, how do you deal with them. But also helping the other kids see the similarities between the child who has disabilities in themselves and just kind of pulling out similarities.

Most of the staff training, as seen in the last example, focused on the social aspect
of inclusion. Kim focused little on the physical aspect, such as training inclusion
counsellors to keep their camper with the group and adapting equipment, because “it is a
lot easier to physically integrate a child than to socially integrate a child.” Kim did spend
a few minutes explaining, “things such as getting them from one place to another, how to
do a proper lift and things like that, so that kids are not going to be in danger
whatsoever.”

Furthermore, all staff was invited to go to the yearly Project Rainbow’s counsellor
conference before camp began. The program manager from Project Rainbow stated:

We have a major conference in June at Humber College. Specifically, Crystal Sands would send about ten of their staff, which is a very strong commitment, and they pay for their staff to come to the conference. They are able to hear sessions. For example, the Geneva Center on Autism would offer level one and level two on autism. So you can come in at your own level of learning. There are always sessions on seizure disorders, program adaptations, about 25 different sessions.

The Project Rainbow training did not end for the camp staff members once camp
began. Project Rainbow staff visited the camp at least once a session to ensure that the staff was having a good week and also to see if the staff needed any help or support.

During the fourth day of my visit at Crystal Sands, I was informed that a staff member from Project Rainbow was at camp. Unfortunately, I was not able to meet this person, but later, Doug from Project Rainbow stated:

On the camp visits, that is a time to do observations and speak with the counsellors and give the tips. They get to know us after a while because we have been there for the summer, so they are getting to know us, or they do know us. Of
course, anything that requires planning on a higher level is taken to the camp director. We do a de-brief with the camp director, or a designate. You know when it comes to integration its not just a wish you really have to get support, plan support, and we do that piece so we wouldn’t just make the transfer and referral.

We were visiting those camps. Our coordinators not only are doing the intake, but they are also the person training the camp also following through with resource visits and planning, though in a sense it’s a small wrap around program in all those facets in the camp communities.

The staff may have been apprehensive at the beginning of the summer in terms of inclusion. However, because of the mutual leadership between Project Rainbow and camp which led to effective training sessions, staff was able to work through their apprehensions. Over time, camp and their partners will “increasingly intertwine their respective expertise and continue to develop an inclusive program together” (Brannan et al., 2003, p. 72).

*Power of Supportive Relationships*

Mutual leadership has been shown to be one important element in building a culture of inclusion. But that is not enough. Supportive relationships, in the broadest possible sense, are also very important. To build a culture of inclusion, the analogy of the African proverb “it takes a village to raise a child” is helpful because it shows that the support of many people is needed to make inclusion work (Clinton, 1996). Supportive relationships have also been shown to be important during research on camp inclusion (Brannan et al., 2003). There are three main ideas related to the power of supportive relationships that evolved from the present study: unique staff strategies contributed to
supportive relationships; inclusive work strategies involved supportive relationships; and a welcoming environment reflected supportive relationships.

*Inclusion is Everyone’s Responsibility*

In a camp environment, each particular staff position plays a crucial part to the overall operation of the camp (Brannan et al., 2003). As these staff positions were observed and discussed at Camp Crystal Sands during this study, it was possible to see the power of these supportive relationships. The different types of staff positions at Camp Crystal Sands are explored in this section and include: inclusion coordinator, inclusion counsellor, counsellor, volunteers, and program staff.

*Inclusion coordinator responsibility.* According to Bogle (1996) and Hornibrook (1997), some camps actually hire an inclusion coordinator to oversee the inclusion process. Inclusion coordinators are responsible for communicating with parents before campers arrival, pre-plan individual supports and accommodations, develop inclusive strategies, train staff in inclusive practices, inform staff about individual needs, assign inclusion counsellors to cabins, implement individual accommodations with staff, supervise and support (daily check-ins, provide breaks) inclusion counsellors, assist instructors to adapt activities, lead staff in problem solving, and finally, communicate and problem solve with parents as required (Brannan et al., 2003). At Camp Crystal Sands, an inclusion coordinator was hired to help assist in overseeing the inclusion process. The inclusion coordinator, Mandy, at Crystal Sands performed such duties as reading over camper profiles. When Mandy wasn’t out supporting her inclusion staff, she was in the office preparing for new campers from Project Rainbow to arrive:
My main role that sets me apart from everybody else is that I do some of the paper work prior to the child’s coming, like I photocopy the profiles and kind of make connections between the child and the inclusion counsellor.

A lot of her duties were shared with the director because of the director’s experience in working with children with disabilities and also because the inclusion coordinator was also the program coordinator.

The inclusion coordinator had the responsibility for helping the inclusion counsellors by providing relief and helping when the inclusion counsellor needed it. As the director mentioned earlier, program staff and the inclusion counsellor were responsible for providing relief to inclusion counsellors. During my stay at Crystal Sands, I watched Mandy once a day relieve an inclusion counsellor of his or her duties for approximately 45 minutes. Mandy, the inclusion coordinator, clarified:

I’m kind of the resource person. Like, I do a lot of support for the counsellors who have only one camper a week. Every day I do like 45 minutes of relief for somebody and I do extra relief if somebody needs it just because it’s my job. I float around and do what has to be done. If they need help lifting or changing or anything like that, or showering, I go in and support them and help them out with that, kind of spare hands that float around. I try to check in with those counsellors every day and see how things are going and see if anything has come up or try and see if they’re keeping things going or the child’s having difficulty with the group, and I try to see if somebody needs extra relief that day.

Inclusion counsellor responsibility. “The inclusion counsellor provides assistance to the camper/student with disabilities as needed, and at the same time serves as a second
counsellor in the cabin for all of the campers/students in the cabin” (Brannan et al., 2003, p. 65). Brannan et al.'s (2003) definition of an inclusion counsellor reflects the model that Camp Crystal Sands’ staff tried to follow. Not only were the inclusion counsellors responsible for acting as a support and second counsellor to all of the campers in their cabin, but they were also responsible for promoting the inclusion of campers with disabilities. When this strategy was broken down into its component parts, it seemed there were three aspects: communicating with their campers’ parents, helping the campers get involved with their groups, and monitoring their campers’ behaviour.

Establishing contact and a rapport with the parents is vital to camp staff being able to obtain important information (Brannan et al., 2003). Before the camper with a disability arrived at camp, the inclusion counsellors called the campers’ parents to introduce themselves and get to know the camper a little bit more than what their profile said. Many staff members mentioned that the inclusion counsellors called their campers’ parents. The camp director explained why the inclusion counsellors called the parents of the campers from Project Rainbow:

They [inclusion counsellor] make a phone call home on the Thursday or Friday before the child comes, and introduces themselves to the family, let the family know who it is going to be, just so the family can prepare the child, ‘so and so is going to be your counsellor when they get to camp, we’re going to see so and so.’ Also, if they [the inclusion counsellors] have any questions after reading the profile, they can ask. They also ask the parents if they have any questions. If they are first time campers, they tell them about the different activities they’ll be doing while they are at camp and talk a little bit about their schedule and what to do and
kind of how registration goes, and then from there, they basically say see you at camp.

Inclusion counsellors also communicated with the parents by sending home a journal at the end of the week with the camper. Feedback from one year at camp can be used by the camp and parents to facilitate inclusion of campers the following year. The journal discussed the week’s events, including any positive or negative occurrences. Each inclusion counsellor was responsible for providing a journal. Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, spoke about her extra effort that she put forth with the journal for campers from Project Rainbow every week:

You’re supposed to do a journal. Just a brief outline of, ‘Hey, this is what goes on at camp.’ I’ve decorated my journals and went out and like – the camp will supply them, but I went and bought my own and made all my own journals because I knew I was doing it every week and I wanted every journal to be different for everyone.

Another strategy of the inclusion counsellor was to make sure that the camper with a disability stayed with the group and was involved with the group. If the campers are not with their group, then inclusion will not happen. Thus, once the inclusion counsellor supports and encourages the camper to stay with their group, inclusion has a greater chance of happening. One of the main ways this seemed to happen was by staff members staying positive, trying to really focus on the bright side, remaining enthusiastic in order to have campers get the most out of each day. Another way of explaining this was to say campers sometimes needed an extra psychological push in order for them to stay with their group, to join an activity, and sometimes just to feel better about
themselves. Inclusion counsellors tried to think of all the good reasons why the campers should remain with their group, as opposed to getting distracted and running off to another area of camp. While at camp, I noticed one inclusion counsellor, Sharon, who was constantly trying to get her camper, Berry, to stay with his group, but was able to remain positive throughout. At one point, Berry sat down, so Sharon pulled him up and told him how much fun it would be to see Adam, a counsellor, in a tree, so Berry went with the group. Another example of counsellors trying to keep their campers with their group was when Kala, an inclusion counsellor, tried to convince Berry to go to his group. It took about ten minutes, but he finally went. She used a lot of sayings such as, ‘Come on Berry, your sword is in the bunk, let’s go get it!’ This following comment from Bill, an inclusion counsellor, reflects the importance of a supportive relationship with the camper:

I guess we’re encouraging campers to stay with the group. We’re always pushing him and telling him about the great things that are going to happen and all the friends you’re going to meet if you go with the group, keeping it positive and pushing him, not forcing him, but pushing him to the point where he makes the decision.

Another example occurred when Berry was told by his inclusion counsellor to stay with his group; he still decided to leave. Berry lasted about twenty minutes of group time before he decided to go for a walk. Kala told him to just stay for a few minutes, but he decided to run. Berry, at times, would make it to where he was supposed to be, but then quickly decided he wanted to go somewhere else. Berry walked in his cabin and checked the place out then left shortly. Berry then decided to go back to Bill’s cabin and
he played some guitar with Bill. Apparently, Berry did not like staying with his group and the staff had a difficult time convincing Berry that in order for him to make friends, he would have to stay with his group. A strategy of the inclusion counsellor was to help the campers from Project Rainbow, include them in group activities, and help them make friends. However, as seen in the above example, campers are not always willing to cooperate.

Inclusion counsellors also want to make sure that the campers are enjoying their stay at camp. Few campers from project Rainbow would rather hang out with staff or do an activity on their own. Pam, a camp counsellor, explained that sometimes Berry just did not want to be with his group and so the staff let him do an activity that would make him happy:

Well, sometimes there’s just like, there’s certain activities that, for example, Berry just doesn’t like to do and it’s hard because you really want for him to be in it with the kids because you want him to be happy too.

Another related issue was that half the battle of staying with the group was related to the time factor. Often, campers with disabilities moved slower than other campers, so it took a bit longer to get to the activity areas. Because they were moving more slowly, it seemed it was easier to get distracted. Consequently, Crystal Sands’ inclusion counsellors worked their hardest to encourage their campers to catch up to fellow campers.

Yet another strategy of the inclusion counsellor involved assuring that the campers with disabilities and without disabilities were safe. I observed Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, watching Sheana to make sure she was safe: Natasha kept a careful watch a few feet behind Sheana just to make sure Sheana would not fall into the pond.
Kim, the camp director, explained that the inclusion staff encouraged appropriate behaviour by reminding the campers to stop participating in any unsuitable behavior. By the inclusion staff members encouraging suitable behaviour, the staff members are supporting the campers and leading them in the right direction of making friends:

We had a little boy who would put his hands down his pants this summer and had attention seeking behaviour. That was what he always did, and he would ask people to touch him when he pulled down his pants, and at 12 that’s not appropriate. It can’t happen. But Sasha was really good about reminding him to keep her hands out of her pants.

Once the camper’s hands were out of his pants other campers could see that the boy was like them and able to participate with them as a group, which could possibly lead to friendships.

Often it was difficult to have a camper do what the rest of the group was doing if they were causing harm to themselves or could possibly harm another camper. Inclusion counsellors at Camp Crystal Sands tried to work with these campers so all campers remained safe. Kala, an inclusion counsellor, suggested a strategy that when her camper with a disability became aggressive, she removed him from the other campers and did something that she thought would make him happy. Therefore, Kala was supporting the camper by keeping him content and she was also supporting the other campers because they were safe from the camper who was being aggressive, however, inclusion probably will not occur for Berry at this particular moment:
I just try, like group time he [Berry] can also hang out with the staff. He doesn’t want to stay in group time. He’s disruptive and starts giggling and hits people and stuff so we hang out with the staff so it keeps him happy.

Both inclusion counsellors and counsellors work together to ensure that inclusion is happening. The responsibility of inclusion does not solely rest on the inclusion counsellor. Bill, an inclusion counsellor, talked about how he tried his hardest to make sure that one of his campers fit in. He noticed the camper from Project Rainbow wouldn’t listen to his regular counsellor:

When I was in my first year, I was perogying [volunteer leader in training], we had a kid named Connor. He wouldn’t listen to his Rainbow person that was set to him. I just kind of talked to him and took it upon myself to make sure he had a good time at camp, and I thought that was a challenge, and at the end, he did get out on the high ropes and whatever.

Many camps’ inclusion counsellors and counsellors work together to discuss strategies to ensure that all campers were involved in the camp’s program (Brannan et al., 2003). At Camp Crystal Sands, the inclusion counsellor and the counsellor worked together to ensure that the camper with a disability stayed with the group, an issue previously mentioned. Only Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, explained that communication between counsellors and inclusion counsellors was important, and if ongoing communication throughout the summer was missing, then campers from Project Rainbow would miss out on activities and not be supported during the inclusion process:

The one-on-one counsellor knows what the problem is and so if you don’t vocalize to your co-counsellor, if you don’t say --- nobody’s thinking that, so they
need to be told. But they really like swimming so we need to put swimming in for this child. If you don’t tell the counsellors or you don’t go ahead and do it and organize it, a lot of times one-on-one you don’t have time to organize all the organizational chunks, like they choose chunks for the rest of the group and you’re just kind of added in. But you have to make sure they know what your child is like and what they need and they can figure it out.

_Counsellor responsibility._ Counsellors typically use a variety of practices or strategies to promote and maintain inclusion (Brannan et al., 2003). The counsellor’s role at Camp Crystal Sands in the inclusion process was to parallel and support the work of the inclusion counsellor, by making sure all of the campers in the group got to know each other and by ensuring that the camper with a disability stayed with the group.

Counsellors have the important role of introducing campers to each other, which can be an important first step in fostering and maintaining friendships. When introducing a camper with a disability, counsellors may introduce the child in several different ways. The aim is to have all members feel comfortable and safe (Brannan et al., 2003). When campers first arrived and met each other for the first time at Camp Crystal Sands, many of them had questions about each other. Some campers actually vocalized what they were thinking, so it was the counsellor’s job to make sure that all the campers were comfortable and understood each other. The counsellors at camp focused on the positives to ensure that the inquisitive campers received their explanations in a positive manner. Some of these answers pointed to the fact that there were not only differences between themselves and a camper with a disability, but also similarities. This implies a mediator type of role for the counsellor. A few of the interviewed staff mentioned how they
explained to their campers about the campers with disabilities. Mandy, the inclusion coordinator, explained:

Trying to make other children aware, other children are going to ask questions, why so and so is not here today? Why is he doing that? Trying to explain that it’s just something that happens, it’s O.K. Just trying to relate it back to something they would do. I know, in particular we had a little girl earlier this summer who’s nonverbal. But she could communicate through her mouth. She does specific movements with her head for yes and no. And the children were asking, well you know, can she talk? Why doesn’t she talk? I’m like, no, she can but it’s a different way of talking and trying to teach them how to communicate with her so that it’s not a matter of, oh she can’t talk, it’s a matter of we can talk to her.

Camp counsellor, Marissa, discussed how she explained that a camper from Project Rainbow was not completely different to her campers:

We introduce the camper to the other campers and if the kids have questions, they normally come up to ask the question. Like for Donna, ‘Why can’t she talk?’ And we just try to answer them and not make them seem completely different, just try and help them understand better. We don’t say, like this is Sheana and she’s different than you guys.

The camp director explained about one camper who used mostly non-verbal communication and again how this was more similar than different to other campers:

We had a little girl last week. She always said ‘I ya, I ya, I ya’ and that’s the way she spoke. But she was excellent at taking your hand and showing you things. Her counsellor explaining to the girls, ‘Well, why does she talk like that?’ and she
explained that you and I talk with words but if you watch, she talks by taking your hand and taking us to where she wants to go and that's how she shows us what she needs, and just explaining about giving straight forwards answers. But also helping other kids to see similarities between children who have disabilities in themselves and just kind of pulling out some similarities.

Similar to the role of the inclusion counsellor, counsellors work together with inclusion counsellors to assure their group stayed together. During my observations, I witnessed a counsellor trying to keep the camper with a disability part of the group. The counsellors were trying to get Berry to sit in the circle with the rest of the group but he kept saying, 'no!' Even though Pam, a camp counsellor, tried to include Berry by handing him paper and crayon, Berry continued to lie on his bed. This counsellor explained that each camper needed a different type of persuasion; however the staff remained focused on the positive aspects in order to get their campers involved and staying with the group:

Individual staff, when we see someone, we kind of go over and say, 'hey what's going on? Why aren't you playing? We're having so much fun and it would be awesome if you could come in.' Sometimes different kids take different approaches.

According to Brannan et al. (2003) during challenging activities, counsellors work together to provide campers with encouragement and express confidence and support in each camper's ability to do the activity. By providing verbal support, the staff motivate the campers to succeed (Brannan et al., 2003). The counsellors at Crystal Sands encouraged campers to participate in activities. While I was at camp I watched the staff
encourage a camper from Project Rainbow as he competed in a swim competition. Camp counsellor Maggie explained:

There’s also a lot of encouragement just to be there. Sometimes you need to be right there beside a child. Sometimes you need to hold their hand and stuff like that, just endless amounts of encouragement. Also, repeating instructions and helping them to have the courage to do it, whether it be holding his hand, or whether it be you taking a step back; also, just really announcing the good things that they do.

Volunteer responsibility. Volunteers are a valuable resource in recreation settings (Parker, 2000/2001). Camp Crystal Sands used volunteers as yet another supportive relationship. When the volunteers first arrived at camp, they attended a short information meeting, and met other volunteers. As a guest at the camp, I was expected to attend this meeting. Rules for the camp were set and we had to sign waivers. This meeting was where I met the perogies, who were counsellors-in-training. This week, they were at Camp Crystal Sands as volunteer assistant counsellors.

Throughout my stay at camp, the one volunteer that I was most in contact with was Catherine. Catherine was a friend of a counsellor working at tent camp. Catherine became a counsellor at tent camp. For the majority of the time, I watched Catherine help Natasha, the inclusion counsellor with camper Sheana. Basically, every time Natasha was unavailable, Catherine stepped in and took her spot. Just like the rest of the staff members at Crystal Sands Camp, the volunteers were used as floaters, similar to the inclusion co-ordinator, to fill positions that became available during their stay at camp. Catherine performed inclusion duties just like Natasha. For example, Catherine sat with Sheana and
spoke with her on the bus to and from canoeing and helped her make a bracelet.

Catherine also kept a watchful eye on Sheana when she was off playing with the other campers to make sure that Sheana and the other campers were getting along.

While I was at camp, I noticed that there was a staff member who had a disability who was always hanging out with the same staff member who did not have a disability. Most of the week I found this pair sitting in front of the dining hall chatting and once in awhile they did a bit of camp cleanup. Curious about these circumstances, during my interview with Doug from Project Rainbow, I discovered that the staff member with a disability was actually only there for the week and was in a position called a supported volunteer. When Doug first started working for Project Rainbow, he “would let parents know, with difficulty that the camping experience was over for the campers over the age of 13. Now we haven’t had to do that.” This particular person was too old to come to camp as a camper, so Crystal Sands had him come back as a volunteer. Doug explained:

The wonderful thing about these particular individuals is that they have the opportunity to come back to camp, but they are also not paying a fee to go back to camp. There is still the support person selected by Camp Crystal Sands to assist them through the routines of the day and to help out with any judgment calls, such as what may be required, such as it is time to come in from the sun, it is time to-

just be on the look out for health and safety issues.

Supported volunteers have an opportunity to work with staff members their own age.

Supported volunteers are the staff members peers. Therefore there is a possibility that friendships could be made between the volunteers and staff members. Furthermore if younger campers see the staff members are hanging out with and making friends with
individuals from Project Rainbow, then campers may not be so afraid to make friends with the campers their age from Project Rainbow.

*Program staff responsibility.* In general program staff are in charge of running summer camp activities, for example, a canoe instructor, arts and crafts director, and a lifeguard. The program staff’s main role at Crystal Sands Camp was to work at the camp activities such as lifeguards, high ropes instructors, and canoe instructors. The program staff also helped relieve the inclusion counsellors. The program staff was able to help the inclusion staff because of their flexible work schedule. Interestingly, the program staff had to know the campers with disabilities and all the activities so they could jump into an activity at any time if required. Kim, the camp director, provided details:

I’m talking right now about the inclusion counsellors so if they’re doing poorly then sharing that with the program staff because they are the ones that do most of the supporting because their jobs are a little bit more flexible. So checking in with them and letting them know that they can help. They [program staff] are expected to look out for the counsellors. They are expected to provide small breaks, if that’s what is needed.

No matter what a staff member’s role may be at Camp Crystal Sands, each staff role is seen as an important piece of the inclusive camp puzzle.

*Teamwork and Supportive Relationships*

Often at any camp, staff are found working together, relying on each other to overcome a challenge, or receiving help to finish a task (Brannan et al., 2003), which are examples of inclusive work strategies. According to Brannan et al. (2003), teamwork, acceptance, and mutual respect set a positive tone among certain camp communities.
"Including campers with disabilities flows very naturally from this perspective" (Brannan et al., 2003, p. 164). At Camp Crystal Sands, three major concepts seem to be particularly important for an inclusive work strategy within a supportive framework: first, supportive staff; second, equipment adaptations, and third, individualization.

Supportive staff. Knowing that there was someone available to help at all times was important for working in a camp atmosphere. There were many times during the summer when staff members found themselves relying on the support of fellow staff members, and other incidences when staff members provided support for a staff member who looked like they needed the help. This finding is consistent with other literature on teamwork that shows that individual skills, mastery, and effort are critical to the functioning of the team (Senge, 1990). Bob, a camp counsellor at Camp Crystal Sands, spoke about how he provided support for his inclusion counsellor:

I would be the support and kind of give him ideas on how to include Mike into the activities or just be there to support him for inclusion and then help with the other campers to include Mike and cheer him on and to get him through stuff.

The camp director, Kim, and most staff members interviewed, explained that support was really important in creating a team atmosphere:

I think the biggest thing is supporting people. I think if you’re not going to do it as a team, it’s not going to be a team thing. If you have a child who is non verbal and a child who doesn’t want to do a lot of activities, and doesn’t really want to be with the group very often, it could be a really lonely week, if you’re left on your own with that kid, and there’s not people there trying to pick you up and encourage you, and help you to think of ways and think of things to do, and give
you the ten minutes to yourself, or ten minutes to go and be with the other kids.
Then you’re not going to make it. It’s going to be really hard.
Maggie, a camp counsellor, suggested that support is important because some weeks could be overwhelming, and support was greatly appreciated.
On wilderness, there’s always an inclusion counsellor for them, but we also share a lot of the responsibility with them just because sometimes it’s overwhelming to be out there and to be working with them all alone.
There were incidences at camp when a counsellor needed to leave their group or camper for an unscheduled minute or two. The staff at Camp Crystal Sands were very supportive in that they watched each other’s campers for a minute or two, or ten. A few times while I was at camp, I noticed staff looking out for other staff member’s campers while they left the area. While Bill, Mike’s inclusion counsellor, was performing a skit, Bob, a counsellor sat with Mike. Another time, I watched a few counsellors watch Sheana as Natasha, her inclusion counsellor, led a game.
The counsellors sometimes left their entire cabin group with the inclusion counsellor, if necessary. Kim, the camp director, often noticed this occurring with the groups of Natasha, the inclusion counsellor:
You often see her [Natasha] walking across site with six girls and her camper with a disability, or if the counsellor had to leave and go to the washroom or leave and get some tuck or something like that, they’ll leave her with the kids.
Extra coaxing was needed at times in order for campers from Project Rainbow to stay with their group. Sometimes the camper needed to hear a different voice, perhaps different motivation, or just a little physical help for staying with their group. My first
day at camp I watched as the staff worked together to pull Mike, a camper from Project Rainbow, out of the pool during a swim race when other campers were participating. Mike was sitting with his group along the side of the pool when he decided to jump in. Unfortunately, it was not his turn to go in the pool. Therefore, the staff worked together to get Mike out of the pool.

Although previously noted in the section ‘director oversaw the inclusion process,’ it is important to note once again because the quote demonstrates that the child was not only the responsibility of the director, but the counsellor and inclusion counsellor. Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, explained that the extra support and teamwork skills came into play when a camper started to ignore his or her counsellor:

If you’re with a child or an adult for a long time, they get sick of you, right? So you could ask them to do something and they’d ignore you and say no and then a minute later someone else could come up and they could ask them and they would do it.

*Equipment adaptations.* Research on camp inclusion indicates that, various times, individuals with disabilities will need extra physical support. Some youth with physical disabilities will bring adaptive equipment with them, such as customized eating utensils or tools to assist in dressing. Many outdoor programs also have adaptive equipment such as floats for swimming, adapted fishing poles, or full body harnesses (Brannan et al., 2003). Not all activities, games, and adventures at Camp Crystal Sands were fully accessible for all campers. Sometimes, for example, a camper needed extra help getting up a hill to continue on a hike. A comment from a camp counsellor, Bob, illustrated how teamwork was important for counsellors to conquer the physical environment:
So those are usually our biggest challenges, finding a way for them to do it. I had a great little camper in our group and we went on a big hike at Bats Falls. We came to a hill. It was a steep hill, and our biggest challenge was to get her up the hill, a very steep hill. Because everybody else climbed using the rope, but she just didn’t have the motor skills to grasp to understand what we were doing. So we had three staff members working to get her up the hill. She felt great when she got up the hill.

Similarly, Natasha explained that sometimes extra physical exertion was required by the staff members in order for the campers to stay with the group:

Like a lot of them don’t like to go hiking at the escarpment. But we go out the extra mile to put them through, like carry them through, pick them up, and put them through it or whatever if they can’t do it on their own.

A counsellor, Bob, explained that Crystal Sands staff worked together to adapt some of their equipment so all campers could be involved in canoeing:

Like sometimes it’s hard for somebody in a wheelchair to go canoeing, which we have come up a pretty cool solution for that. We kind of took one of the dining hall chairs and took its legs off and so it’s like a seat in the canoe and then the Rainbow counsellor will sit in the canoe with them. The camper will sit in the chair in the canoe and so it’s just simple things like that, but we have overcome most of the challenges we have faced here.

Maggie, a camp counsellor, suggested another physical adaptation that was made to the high ropes program so campers with physical disabilities could participate:
She can only really move a lot of her face and stuff like that. And as you know, she went up on high ropes last summer. We modified a harness for her and Jim went up with her and staff was so excited about it.

Pam, a camp counsellor, shared a story about another adaptation made; they bought a small pool for one of the campers to use who could not use the regular camp pool. In turn, the adaptation made the camper feel valued:

Like at the pool we got for one girl who couldn’t move anything above or anything below her neck. We filled up another pool, like one of the little ones. We put her in it and she loved that. Just sitting with us at the lifeguards made her feel really special because none of the other kids were asked. So that was a really special thing.

Project Rainbow provided additional equipment to the camps that would help cultivate the inclusion process. In an interview with Doug from Project Rainbow, he explained that:

We supply some equipment that will assist individuals with physical disabilities. All-terrain wheelchairs are an example. We don’t have enough for all 50 participating camps. So we hustle those between camps when required.

The director from Crystal Sands spoke about making some long awaited changes to the camp environment so it would be more wheelchair accessible in order for campers in wheelchairs to easily access all parts of camp.

We are looking at putting ramps on all of our cabins right now. We only have it on one girl’s cabin and one boy’s cabin. We’re looking at putting ramps on all of them. We’re looking at paving a path from cabin one and cabin six right through
to the dining hall and paving the road. Those are all plans for the future. Kids with physical disabilities, it would make it easier for them to participate in activities and get from point A to point B.

**Individualization.** The next finding that appeared to contribute to the inclusive strategy at Camp Crystal Sands was individualization in programs. In response to earlier concerns regarding campers’ attention span, getting distracted, and slow pace, adaptations to programs were made by the staff as a team to ensure inclusion. According to Marissa, a camp counsellor, and many other staff members, staff varied activities. Campers with disabilities’ endurance were not always the same as campers without disabilities:

Varying activities, and like going for a hike and shortening the hike or finding a good time for the hike for the camper, organizing activities around them, asking them if they really want to go in the pool. They know they like swimming, so not doing swimming right after the hike because they are tired.

Some campers, due to physical or mental abilities, need to do a task differently than others (Brannan et al., 2003). Staff at Camp Crystal Sands tried to adapt an activity if it was apparent that a camper was not feeling comfortable. For example, Sheana was afraid of male counsellors, so the staff made sure that Sheana did not have to come in contact with any of the male counsellors. The way they made this possible was by breaking the campers into two groups, with Sheana in the group with no male counsellors, and Mitch and Ted, the male counsellors, taking the other group.

Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, explained that various campers needed the same activities adapted a bit so they were less structured:
During singing, let him wander. It’s not going to hurt him wandering around at the back or even at the front. One time he went up and tried all the instruments and I helped play with him. Especially the morning time – they have to sit and then they have to go sit for singing. Except for the singing part, they’re there for singing and they’re there for drama. If you let him wander during singing he’ll be sure to sit through the drama, but if make him sit during singing, he’ll be shot for drama and drama is the part where he needs to sit down and listen.

Although this wandering camper did not exactly participate in the same activity as the rest of the campers, the camper remained with the other campers, which could eventually lead to inclusion, however I did not see evidence of inclusion.

According to Brannan and his associates (2003), staff develop ways of providing flexible time frames so that campers can participate in an activity at their own pace. Some campers just needed to have their day slowed down so they could enjoy their stay at camp. This requires the cooperation of all staff. Kim, the camp director explained:

I think sometimes often you expect O.K. well you know I’m scheduled to get up in the morning and do this, do this, do this. Some people who can’t handle that and I think a big part of integration is understanding what of the schedule can they handle and there are some kids who are overloaded if you give them it all to do. By giving them little by little, and having O.K., if we spend the first twenty minutes with the group then we can go and spend some alone time after giving them 20 minutes, and trying to increase that time everyday and not pushing them beyond their limits.
Despite every effort, there came a time when some campers did not want to participate in an activity, so the activity was altered. Staff at Camp Crystal Sands allowed their campers with disabilities to take some time away from their group, if taking a break would keep them happy. Although this meant that a camper was given special privileges, at least the camper was happy and was not going to possibly upset or hurt another camper, if the camper from Project Rainbow were to become aggressive. Camp is supposed to be a happy environment. Sometimes happiness was a tradeoff for inclusion.

One day, Berry happened to be in the dining hall when a group (not his own) was setting up for lunch. Kala allowed Berry to help the group: Berry helped set up for lunch by setting the tables. He put glasses on plates and the other campers followed (usually glasses are put in front of the plates). He also helped with the prayer before lunch. Kala, an inclusion counsellor, told me how she tried to keep her camper happy:

Sometimes I just help him with daily activities and sometimes he’ll come like swimming and stuff that he likes that they do. Sometimes we just don’t go because he likes to hang out with the kitchen. The morning stuff is easy because, well with Berry, he gets up, he likes morning dip. He’s happy in the morning. He likes breakfast. He likes to hang out with the kids for cabin cleanup for stuff like that. He doesn’t hang out with them so much but he likes to be in the cabin with them. He doesn’t like games, but he likes to play with other people and then he loves to come and he’ll sing and he likes to dance and stuff like that. So he’s really into that with the kids and he’ll do the actions and stuff like that. And then we’ve got chunks [an activity] and it depends what the chunk is whether or not he’ll do it.
Pam, a camp counsellor, spoke of the extra attention that was needed at times when the campers usually had extra parental assistance while at home. Such times included morning and bedtime:

Bedtime, the extra attention that’s needed to helping them get changed and maybe making sure they brush their teeth, and then going to bed. Sometimes, just reading an extra story to that personal camper, like after all the other stories have been read, you know sometimes they get homesick, but the best thing is to try to handle it as quiet as you can, fix the problem.

The inclusion counsellors at camp tried to bring extra materials and alternative ideas in case the campers with disabilities needed some extra or alternative activities to do during down time, or a lull in an activity. These extra ideas came in handy when the current activity was not working very well for a camper. Therefore, the campers from Project Rainbow remained with their group. As long as the inclusion counsellor and group counsellor worked together, all campers were able to stay together. An inclusion counsellor, Natasha, explained that she would bring extra colouring books so her camper would be included during craft time, if the activity was too difficult:

When I had Sheana, I would always try and keep her in group time and stuff, but I would bring other things for her to do so I would bring like a coloring something like that. That way she’s still being included. She didn’t have to leave the group but she has an alternative craft to do. So I mean, we try to provide those opportunities.

Along the same line, Kim, the camp director, said that the camp provided kits for their campers with disabilities as a support for keeping all of the campers together:
I think a couple of things that we have that I think work really well, we have kits for all the counsellors who have children with disabilities. Those are kits full of sensory toys and things like that which, often during sitting time, helps the child to be more part of the group because they are able to be there with the group as opposed to losing their attention and having to leave. And so we’ve got things like squishy balls and little rubber snakes that go back and forth and things that twist and turn, slinkies, and stuff like that. We encourage the counsellors to, especially counsellors who feel they need those things fairly frequently, to keep a backpack with them.

Alterations with food were also made at this camp. The staff was aware of what campers liked and didn’t like, or what they couldn’t have because of allergies or other restrictions, and ensured these restrictions were met. In order for restrictions to be met and campers to be included, accommodations had to be made. If one camper could not participate in an activity, because of a food allergy for example, then staff created alternatives so all campers could participate together. An inclusion counsellor Natasha explained:

Doing the extra things and giving the kids a smile, like at tuck, if they don’t have anything at tuck, we’ll go out and get that child something they can have at tuck. Like my camper couldn’t have anything; only thing that she could eat was like a Cheesy, or freezie. She couldn’t have any hard candy or anything like that, cause she can’t swallow. It needs to be soft so we can squish them up, so we went and bought her cheezies and that was her tuck and we put it on the tuck list.
A Welcoming Environment Reflected Supportive Relationships

In any environment, staff members lay the groundwork for inclusion, while the campers immerse themselves and become part of the culture of inclusion. Campers are the participants who are playing with each other, talking to each other, supporting each other, and hopefully making friends with each other. That is what inclusion is about, welcoming each other (Hornibrook, 1997; Hutchison & McGill, 1998; Schleien et al., 1997). Camp Crystal Sands had a welcoming environment. Maggie, a camp counsellor, explained that at Camp Crystal Sands, campers felt so welcomed that they could just be themselves and felt that their disability was de-emphasized:

I really like how at times we’re not afraid just to take a step back and let the kid just be a kid. My favourite part about a kid with special needs being able to come to camp is that they can just be a kid for a week. They don’t have to be ‘the kid with special needs’ or the ‘special needs’ kid. They can just be Berry or who ever. They sort of let loose and stuff like that.

In this sense, a welcoming environment is about deemphasizing the disability.

Staff believe in inclusion. Often throughout the summer, staff found that they forgot that there was an inclusion program, because all of the campers blended together. Campers, whether they had a disability or not, played together, got along, and had fun. Staff did not appear to have to put forth an effort to include all campers. All of the campers were included in every program, evidence that good structural supports were in place. The inclusion coordinator, Mandy, believed that the staff had a general attitude from the start that made the campers feel welcome and knew that they could fully
immerse themselves in the program. If the camper was having problems getting involved, the staff jumped in and facilitated the camper’s involvement:

I think it’s a general attitude from the start of it. When it was introduced that first summer, it was kind of a ‘we’re going to start this off, we’re going to have children with one-to-one support, they’re going to be involved as much as possible in programming and in different things’ and always someone in each area has been told to and encouraged to find different ways for that kid to stay with that group and every area of camp, trying to include this child.

Because the camp followed a Christian philosophy, the staff believed that they did work as one to ensure that all campers were respected as a person and every camper was involved in camp activities. According to Pam, a counsellor:

I like how we, how it’s really important to follow, like the group’s going somewhere, we always try really hard to have that person follow the group and I guess you’d kind of figure out, like how we’re one group and one body and we all travel together and we all work together. Those little things, getting used to each other and working, respect for the people.

Many staff members felt that all of the campers were treated the same. An inclusion counsellor, Kala, spoke about all of the campers being treated the same, as equals, at camp:

I like the way that they are included in everything. And they are treated as normal. And the kids should be with normal kids because they might never be with kids who are normal. I don’t know, it’s hard for them to fit in like everywhere else in the world, but here they are just the same as everybody.
All of the interviewed staff ensured that campers with disabilities were welcomed into their programs by making sure that all campers were involved as much as possible.

While I was hanging out with Berry and his group for two days, I realized that Berry was given an opportunity to participate in every activity that the rest of his group participated. Although Berry did not always partake in all of the activities, Berry did go on the high ropes course and canoeing. Bob, a camp counsellor, explained in his interview that all campers were given an opportunity to participate in all of the camp’s activities:

We try our hardest just to make sure the campers are part of much as possible. That’s our biggest goal, that they do as much as everything or try everything. We go canoeing, we go on high ropes, we play archery, and stuff like that. We try to make sure they do everything. That’s one of the biggest things. I like that no one gets left out, it kind of feels like a big family, where your going to be able to try something and nobody’s going to put you down for it.

Kim, the camp director, furthered Bob’s comments by explaining, that because the staff was welcoming, the campers who attended Camp Crystal Sands felt more comfortable with inclusion:

As a staff, people really want to welcome those kids. It’s not just the inclusion counsellors who are welcoming those kids. It’s the staff as a whole that work to welcome those kids and I think we only accepting Rainbow four years ago and in that time we have been working with them I have seen our campers in general become a lot more comfortable with the idea of integration.

Campers Without Disabilities were Supportive. Maintaining a camp community that values inclusion is best accomplished through the example set by the camp
administration and staff. The modeling of camp staff is critical if campers are expected to adopt inclusive techniques (Brannan et al., 2003). Children are very good at watching what others do and repeating the same action. A favourite saying by many children and adults is, 'monkey see, monkey do.' This statement can be related to campers at Camp Crystal Sands. When children see counsellors or staff members performing a specific task, many times the campers will do the same thing. At Camp Crystal Sands, various times the campers were found repeating what staff members had done. The camp director, along with many other staff members, explained that campers did not necessarily start following what the staff members were doing right away; often times, campers started repeating what the staff was doing at the end of the week, after they had time to understand and see how things worked. Kim stated:

One of my favourite things to watch is early in the week you often see the kid who is kind of with the group, but not as nearly social as you would like, and as the week goes on, a perfect example, last week we had a little boy who was in a wheelchair and the kids were all when it came to playing capture the flag or something it was the kids pushing him, whereas early in the week it was a counsellor pushing him and you can see the kids trying to make the step from not really knowing how to interact to interacting.

While I was at camp I watched as Mike, a camper from Project Rainbow, and his group members evolve. At the beginning of the week, Mike hung out with his inclusion counsellor, Bill. Together, the two guys walked around camp and rhymed off numbers. They stayed with the group, however they did not socialize with the group. As the week progressed, I noticed other campers from Mike’s group and other groups walking with
Mike repeating numbers. No longer was Bill needed to hang out with Mike all of the
time. The boys in the group had taken Bill’s position and were socializing with Mike.

A counsellor by the name of Pam also recognized that the fellow campers did
follow the staff’s lead, “Like if they [campers without disabilities] see us trying to
include them, then the kids just completely follow the example and they are so helpful.”

The majority of the campers at Camp Crystal Sands comprehended and
empathized for all of the campers. Brannan and his associates (2003) stated that, “the
most important groundwork that can be laid is respect for all” (p. 127). Campers at
Crystal Sand realized that all of the campers were not the same. Although campers had
similarities, they also had differences. For the most part, the campers without disabilities
respected and supported the fact that not all of the campers were the same. Thus, the
campers without disabilities were kind and compassionate towards the campers with
disabilities.

While I was sitting in Mike’s (a camper from Project Rainbow) cabin during rest
hour, I noticed Mike playing with a camper’s watch. Instead of the camper pulling his
watch away, the camper let Mike play with his watch. Instead of complaining to a
counsellor and asking for the watch back, I noticed during this time Mike wandered. At
one point he visited with a camper, Sonny. Mike looked at his watch. Sonny sat quietly
and let Mike look at his watch. Eventually Mike took Sonny’s watch off. Sonny let him
take the watch, probably knowing that eventually the watch would be returned to him.

The campers seemed to understand and appreciate when activities were altered,
because the campers realized that created an opportunity for everyone to participate.

Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, stated:
Sheana doesn’t quite get everything, and if you slow down, she’ll want to hang out with you. If you slow down, and you do your activities slower, the kids realized hey, she can take part in them.

The campers at Camp Crystal Sands aided in the inclusion process by helping when the staff did not seem to be around. For example, during dinner one night, when I was hanging out with Berry and his group, I watched as one of the campers gave Berry more food because Berry was looking pretty hungry and there were no staff at the table at the time to provide Berry the food.

During Maggie’s (a camp counsellor) interview, she told me that it was usually the girls who liked helping and trying to include the campers with disabilities, more so than the boys. Maggie explained:

And then I love just seeing kids, like when I worked with Harry and his friends, there were these two girls who were like, ‘oh can I bring him to play basketball?’ and I’d think, ‘absolutely’. I like how the kids, particularly the people around us, a lot of girls especially will see that you’re working with this child and then they want to help too. Especially girls because they have kind of a maternal instinct within in, but the girls step up and they’re just like, they encourage them [campers with disabilities] also. And I just love seeing kids just encourage each other and stuff like that and feel inclusion and stuff like that and just make them totally part of the group. That’s got to be the best part.

Throughout the summer, Camp Crystal Sands’ staff saw their campers playing with each other and having a great time. This was evident from listening to all of the staff interviews. Marissa, a camp counsellor, along with other staff members reflected:
But she [the camper from Project Rainbow] did all the activities with the kids and when we did crafts in the mornings, some of the kids would bring over beads and help her with the activities. Sort of like swimming in the pool, like the kids loved playing with her because she liked to dunk under water so the kids would grab hold of her hands and they’d jump in the water at the same time and it was really easy for the kids to see that she was like a normal kid in the pool. And she played with them in the cabins. She brought a whole bunch of toys, so for during rest hour, she would play and the kids liked playing with her toys and stuff.

The girl from Project Rainbow mentioned in the above quote was making friends while she was at camp. Inclusion appeared to be happening as shown in Figure 5, which explains Questions for Determining those Factors that are Inhibiting or Enhancing to the Process of Integration (Hutchison & McGill, 1998). Because the campers found a common interest, the girls were able to play together and have a great time at camp, which hopefully turned into a lifetime friendship.

All of the campers were accepting of each other most of the time. Sheana, a camper with a disability, fit in with her group so well that the other campers played with her just as if she were any camper. During my observations, I noticed:

Sheana went to lie down on the tarp to talk with Natasha after eating. One of the boys came over and started play fighting with Sheana (all of the other kids were doing the same). Sheana laughed and started playing with him. She appeared to be enjoying herself because she kept going back for more.
The campers without disabilities would also try to include the campers with disabilities into games by communicating with them in their own unique way. Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, explained:

He [camper from Project Rainbow] liked to hang out with them. He loves to wrestle so we’d play games like knock the socks off the running shoes, and they played with him. He can’t say the word but he can spell the letters out so he’ll, the kids love to be like, ‘spell my name Connor’ and he loves to do it and they learned how to communicate with him.

Impediments to Inclusion

There are challenges to inclusion in outdoor programs, including camps. For example, settings can be too competitive and training sessions may not fully prepare staff members for what may lie ahead of them. When these constraints are not addressed, the overall goal of building a culture of inclusion is impeded (Blake, 1996; Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003; McGill, 2000; Sable, 1992).

While building a culture of inclusion at Camp Crystal Sands, staff members and campers sometimes inhibited the building process. Before the staff members were even hired for the summer, certain obstacles to an inclusive summer at camp were apparent. For example, staff interviews lacked content about inclusion and camper profiles lacked important information. Once the summer began, some staff felt that they were not adequately trained for the inclusive adventure that lay ahead of them. Possibly because of the lack of training, certain staff members had trouble working together and communicating with each other. Possibly the failure the staff had with teamwork led to some of the campers’ decision to not play with each other or create friendships with one
another. Not enough preparation, lack of communication, and campers not being supportive sums up the three major findings which will be further explored.

*Not Enough Preparation*

Earlier, there was a discussion which revolved around profiles and training which implied that a fair amount of information regarding inclusion techniques and camper information was shared during pre-camp and on an on-going basis. Overall, most people interviewed in this study felt that they were adequately prepared when dealing with campers with disabilities. However, this did not mean that there were no concerns raised about preparation for camp.

During the interview process, to become a staff member at Camp Crystal Sands, the staff, whether they were experienced with the camping industry or not, were not asked about inclusion during their interviews. Thus, the staff members may not have been prepared for working with campers with disabilities. The camp director, Kim, was the only person who made reference to this potential problem:

In hiring our staff, we don’t ask them questions on how they would include, how to make kids from all different backgrounds and all different areas and all different situations and all different ability levels feel comfortable in a group. But we don’t specifically ask them how they would integrate a child with disabilities. So in hiring our counsellors, we’re not - it’s not like we’re going to ask questions you would ask in hiring an inclusion counsellor – you’re only going to do that for a week or two in the summer. But I guess if you include that in your interview, you may end up with people in general who are a little bit more comfortable in, who could make things easier right from the start.
Furthermore, a few staff members mentioned that even though staff received profiles about their campers before the campers arrived, sometimes they had difficulty getting to know their camper at first and did not feel prepared to help include campers with disabilities into groups. This may be because the profiles could not include every single detail about a camper. Every now and then, it took a little getting used to a camper and understanding a camper before the camper and counsellor could start to enjoy camp. Marissa, a camp counsellor, explained her experience as an inclusion counsellor and trying to understand her camper who could not speak. As the week went on, Marissa began to understand her camper:

The camper was awesome. She was a little girl. She was seven and she couldn’t talk at all so it was really difficult because I couldn’t understand her but as the week went on I totally got to understand what was going on and stuff.

The same incident occurred again with Marissa. Marissa could not understand what one of her campers was trying to tell her. The profiles did not have enough information about Donna. However, after a few minutes of getting to know her camper, Marissa was able to help her camper out:

The first day when Donna got here, she got out of the car and she started to cry and I did not know what she wanted. She just cried and cried and cried and I could not figure out what she wanted because she couldn’t tell me and I was very frustrated with her. Like the first ten minutes of meeting her I was like, ‘I don’t want to do this anymore, I quit.’ And but finally I figured out that she just wanted something to drink and after that it was just like, I kept looking at trying to find different ways of figuring out what she wanted.
Training was another area where staff members did not feel prepared for their inclusive camping experience. Different times during the interviews, staff at Camp Crystal Sands stated that they did not receive enough training and therefore were uncomfortable when they were first put into the position of inclusion counsellor. Also some staff stated that, in general, the camp staff needed more training. Even Kim, the camp director, stated that she felt, “More training is always a possibility. Staff training week is short and to try to fit in as much as we do.”

A camp counsellor, Marissa, discussed that inclusion was only talked about a little during staff training, and she felt scared and apprehensive, especially when she was approached the first week to be an inclusion counsellor:

They talked a little bit about inclusion and stuff and I was really apprehensive about it. I didn’t want to do it. I was really scared and so the first week we did some stuff on it but I never thought I’d actually do any one-to-one stuff. The very first week they asked me to do some one-on-one and I was terrified because I didn’t see anyone with any groups. It was just the first week so I didn’t know what to do.

Doug, the program manager from Project Rainbow, agreed that more training could always be exercised, however Doug thought training could also occur throughout the year, “I think, I don’t know if they could do much more besides become better trained throughout the year, but that is an individual option really.”

During the interviews and my observations, it became evident that staff was not taught during staff training how to properly address campers with disabilities. Rogers and Robb (1992) and Sable (1992) affirm that inclusion is facilitated when the staff avoid
labelling of campers with disabilities. Unfortunately, sometimes staff at Camp Crystal Sands were heard labelling the campers with disabilities. Perhaps this was because, during staff training, they were not adequately informed of the importance of language. Inappropriate language leads to labels that remain with the person, stigmatization, and ultimately segregation. Throughout the interviews, staff would identify campers with disabilities as Rainbow campers. For example, Bob, a camp counsellor, stated during an interview, “I actually got a Rainbow one week this summer.” Bob did not even say that the ‘Rainbow’ was a person. Also staff would say that they were doing ‘Rainbow’ this week or did ‘Rainbow’ last week. Bill told me in his interview that they even called the program, “Rainbow or one-to-one.” The implications of this practice would certainly warrant further discussion with the camp and Project Rainbow.

Lack of Communication

Previous discussions implied that teamwork was a strong element of Camp Crystal Sands. Occasionally, however, there were indications of lack of communication. Communication between staff was a major strategy that often appeared to be missing at Crystal Sands. From time to time, a lack of communication meant that a camper or staff member missed out on an upcoming activity. Sheana, a camper with a disability, almost missed out on a water event because Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, was on a break and forgot to tell the staff who was left in charge:

The group was heading over to the slip and slide so everyone had to put their bathing suits back on. Unfortunately none of the counsellors knew what to do with Sheana. Natasha was still on her break and they did not know where
Sheana’s bathing suit was. Luckily Sheana took the initiative, went and found her bathing suit and put it on herself.

An inclusion counsellor, Natasha, mentioned the importance of communication between counsellor and inclusion counsellor. She said that communication was important because a camper with a disability would miss out on activities if the counsellor and inclusion counsellor didn’t communicate about camper’s needs and abilities. For example, if a group is running around all afternoon, saving the camper with a disability’s favourite activity until the end of the day, may make the camper too tired to participate in that activity. If the counsellor and inclusion counsellor would have discussed all of the group’s likes, dislikes, and abilities at the beginning of the day, then campers from Project Rainbow would always be able to participate in her/his favourite activities.

Natasha, an inclusion counsellor, had been a victim of lack of communication and thus had missed out on staff meetings because of her camper’s bedtime schedule. Natasha explained:

Sometimes communication – If I have a camper who goes to bed at like 7:30 at night, we’ll miss all the events at night, and then they’ll have a big staff meeting or something, and then they’ll forget that I’m out there, just kind of remembering, you know, there’s this camper who goes to bed early.

*Campers were not Supportive*

Campers without disabilities, not unlike citizens in other aspects of society, sometimes displayed behaviours which could be interpreted as not being supportive of the inclusive setting (Brannan et al., 2003; McGill, 2000; Sable, 1995). While it will be
discussed briefly, it must be emphasized that overall campers were supportive of each other.

The literature states that there are times when issues arise within a group surrounding a camper with a disability and thus not all campers are supportive. Occasionally, peer campers perceive a camper with a disability as always getting special attention and/or slowing down the group. Campers without disabilities may also treat campers with a disability as a baby or feel uncomfortable around the camper with a disability. Therefore, the campers without disabilities exclude the campers with disabilities (Brannan et al., 2003). Campers without disabilities at Camp Crystal Sands were not always supportive of the campers with disabilities. Once or twice, the campers from Project Rainbow were ignored or were not pleasantly welcomed. For example, when Mike was introduced to his cabin mates, he was not pleasantly welcomed. When introduced, the boys looked at Mike, said hello, and continued on with what they were doing.

Another incident that I witnessed was Sheana wanting to hang out with a few campers. One of the campers was not supportive of Sheana hanging out with them. Sheana went and sat on another camper’s sleeping bag and started chatting. The other camper wanted her off her sleeping bag, so she moved over a bit and sat quietly. I noticed a second time when Sheana wanted to chat with a small amount of campers, yet they did not appear to be receptive. Sheana had had enough of us and got up and walked to another group of girls and sat with them. The girls continued to have their own conversation. On both occasions, staff members were busy attending to other duties and did not notice what was happening with Sheana.
At times during my stay at camp, I witnessed the campers from Project Rainbow and their inclusion counsellors apart from their group. The inclusion coordinator was one of the few people interviewed who explained that some inclusion counsellors were accustomed to taking their campers out of groups. She suggested that the inclusion counsellors needed to be made aware that they were inhibiting inclusion:

Some [inclusion ] counsellors sometimes get in the habit of pulling children out too often and so maybe trying to make people aware to push just that little bit to make it so they're not always giving an out, or pulling them away.

Perhaps the inclusion counsellor pulled the camper out of the group because they became too attached to the camper. Kim, the camp director, also pointed this out in her interview:

I think that a counsellor can become very attached to a camper, and I think sometimes this pulls them away from the other kids. It's something you have to be made aware of, and they're made aware of it frequently. But I think it could be enforced more.

This inhibiting of inclusion became evident as I watched Mike and his inclusion counsellor hang out without their group. No effort was made by the staff member to have Mike return to his group. While waiting in line for dinner outside of the dining hall, Mike and Bill hung out with counsellors writing on the erase board, while the rest of the group stood in line.

Halfway through my stay at camp I noticed another camper leaving her group, and her inclusion counsellor did not tell her to go back to the group. Instead, she read a book to her, away from the group. The camper, Sheana, did not like the activity the rest
of the group was playing. Natasha, her inclusion counsellor, tried to convince Sheana to stay with the group by telling her that what the group was doing was what she was supposed to be doing. Unfortunately, Sheana was adamant about leaving. Therefore, Natasha and Sheana read a book together in their tent for a short while until Sheana was ready to join the group again.

During an observation, I watched Mike and Bill, a camper and inclusion counsellor, play together in the pool, without Bill trying to include any other campers. I also watched as Mike volunteered himself for the woggle race. Conveniently, that was a partner race, so Bill responded that he and Mike would be partners. Bill did not give another camper or staff member the opportunity to play with Mike.

I also observed Kala and Berry, an inclusion counsellor and camper, hang out together reading a map while their group sat with them. No attempt was made by Kala to include the group in their conversation. Berry sat behind the group waiting with Kala to have their turn. While they waited, they looked at a map of camp that they found on their way to the archery range.

The discussion concerning campers with disabilities spending time away from their peers and their fellow campers not being supportive, raises issues pertaining to the potential for friendships to occur. However, the short duration of a typical camp session may limit the number of opportunities for friendships to develop. The literature indicates that friendships can be formed between campers with and without disabilities in inclusive settings (Bullock et al., 1992; Hornibrook, 1997; Lord, 1996; Sable, 1995) because of the positive social interaction that occurs while at camp (Brannan et al., 2000; Hornibrook, 1997; Sable, 1995). However, if there is not an awareness of the importance of
The text on this page is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page from a book or a document, but the content cannot be accurately transcribed.
friendships and the important role that the camp environment can play, it is easy for these opportunities to be missed. Many camps are now aware of the importance of the transition to adulthood for campers with disabilities. When campers are supported to take on adult roles, such as counsellor or counsellor’s assistant, then potential for friendships is greatly increased (McTavish et al., 1996).

A camp counsellor by the name of Pam recognized in her group some of the campers with and without disabilities getting close to each other:

And I love seeing, even this week, with Berry in my group. I can see how some of the kids are just taking on to him. They just take him on as a friend or as like a little brother and I love how they watch out for him and they always help include him.

It is possible that Pam and other counsellors did not realize that being like a friend is different than being a friend. Without a clear understanding of the definition of friendship and specific strategies that can be utilized in a camp situation to promote real friendship development, it is possible that expectations for closer relationships to develop will remain low. More opportunities for inclusion to happen will occur when staff take a step back and let the campers decide together with their fellow campers what activities will follow. For example, I noticed that a camper with a disability and his inclusion counsellor hung out together during most of the activities. However, one time when the inclusion counsellor was not around, the camper became more immersed with the other campers. The other campers welcomed the campers from Project Rainbow as a regular camper and played camp games with them. While I was hanging out with Berry, I
watched as Mandy stopped to chat with a friend. Berry kept running. An opponent caught Berry (they were playing capture the flag) and attempted to play 'rocks, paper, scissors.'

Summary

After a long process of reviewing the many patterns, themes, and categories that were systematically described in this chapter, it is evident that mutual leadership and supportive relationships are necessary components in building a culture of inclusion. As the director of Camp Crystal Sands and Project Rainbow worked together as mutual leaders striving to build an inclusive camp community, training and camper profiles helped aid staff members in providing an inclusive camp setting. The camp director provided her expert opinion on inclusion by making sure that staff was ready to work with the campers and each other. Project Rainbow staff members put camper profiles and training sessions together so staff members got to know their campers and how to positively include the campers with disabilities into the everyday camp routine. However, it also took supportive relationships for inclusion to thrive.

Through unique staff strategies, an inclusive work strategy, and a welcoming environment, staff and campers at Camp Crystal Sands worked to create an inclusive camp. Staff members each had their own role that they played in including campers with disabilities into the camp program. Because each staff member had the opportunity to play each other's role, staff at Camp Crystal Sands supported each other through every day good and bad situations. Furthermore, staff learned that through minor and major adaptations, all campers could participate and thrive at Camp Crystal Sands. Staff and campers also provided a welcoming environment for each other by being supportive of all campers. Regrettably, a few impediments to inclusion did occur at Camp Crystal
Sands. Staff members were not fully prepared and ready to include campers with disabilities into their camp program. Training and camper profiles needed to be enhanced so staff members could feel comfortable at their jobs. Also, teamwork amongst the staff members was not always perfect; communication lines needed to be kept open. Finally, not all campers were supportive of each other. There were occasions during this study that campers did not play together or get along. It was also apparent that the level of relationships between campers was more at the acquaintance level than friends. It is just as important to mention the barriers to inclusion as it is important to mention the qualities that make inclusion work. If camps do not realize that they are impeding inclusion from occurring, although they are providing many outlets for inclusion to occur, then a culture of inclusion may not be built.
CHAPTER 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Inclusion of children with disabilities within the residential camping industry is becoming more recognized over the past decade. Many camps across Canada and the United States are trying to provide inclusive settings for campers with and without disabilities (Blake, 1996; Brannan et al., 1997). As a result, there is growing literature on the many benefits of inclusive camping (Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2000; Hornfeldt & McAvoy, 1994; Hornibrook, 1997; Schleien & Green, 1992). While this material provides a strong rationale for inclusive camping, it fails to provide badly needed information on inclusive strategies. The literature that does exist briefly mentions building partnerships (Brannan et al., 2003; Doornink, 1990; Hutchison, 1998; Orchard, 1996), policies (Brannan et al., 2003; Pontone, 1996), leadership (Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003; Hornibrook, 1997; Orchard, 1996; Pontone, 1996), staffing structures (Blake, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003), and staff training (Bogle, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003; McGill, 1984; McTavish, et al., 1996). The large American study by Brannan et al. (2003) was recently released, unfortunately was not available when I began my study. Without this study, the remaining literature barely scratched the surface as to how to implement the above mentioned strategies, because it was so general and lacking in meaningful examples that would encourage and support practitioners to make a difference (Blake, 1996). Without the Brannan et al. (2003) study as a foundation, I decided to proceed by focusing on one exemplary camp, according to Project Rainbow, for a week to find out exactly how a camp provides an inclusive setting. Essentially, I looked at how the inclusion process was facilitated at both the camp level and the staff level. I also decided to look at how inclusion was impeded at the camp, because it was
inevitable that while studying the inclusion process, constraints would surface. This concluding chapter will discuss conclusions and recommendations for future practice and research.

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to understand the inclusion process for staff at a Project Rainbow affiliated camp in Ontario. The grand research question for this study was: How does a Project Rainbow affiliated camp create an inclusive environment? To discover the answer to this question, three sub questions were developed: How did the camp (administration, structure, and policies) facilitate the inclusion process? How did staff members facilitate the inclusion process? And how was inclusion impeded at the camp? Through examining each of these three research question, it will be possible to see how and why inclusion was facilitated or impeded at Camp Crystal Sands.

The overriding theme for this study is attempting to build a culture of inclusion (see Figure 7). Many segments of society are struggling to build a culture of inclusion, from leisure settings, to places of work, schools, and neighborhoods. Over the past thirty or so years, academics have proposed a number of models for integration or inclusion to provide a stimulus and framework for social change (Allison & Schnieder, 2000; Crilley, 1994; Hutchison & Lord, 1979; Schleien et al., 1997). At the same time, legislation and policy development has provided a mandate for change. This inclusive theory building and change in societal infrastructures is filtering down to camping. Not unlike many other camps, the camp in this study has struggled to create a unique and special place where children could go to escape the pressures and fast paced life of cities and school; find a place where teamwork and competition is not something to be feared; where all children
or adults, regardless of ability or disability, feel acceptance and a desire to participate (Fullerton, Brannan, & Arick, 2000; Lau, Keung, & DeGraaf, 1999; Sugerman, 1996).

Spending time in this “best practice” or exemplary camp provided the researcher with the opportunity to see that this camp, Camp Crystal Sands, as a microcosm of broader society. In society, we see isolated examples of individuals, services, and community organizations that are trying their best to make changes that will create a more welcoming environment and inclusive society for individuals with disabilities. Two main patterns which were discovered, mutual leadership and the power of supportive relationships, could certainly be interpreted as symbols of attempts at an inclusive environment (see Figure 7). At the same time that there was evidence of inclusive symbols, it was also possible to see that this camp was like broader society situated just outside its walls: a society which is given contradictory messages about how to treat people with disabilities, a society where a few innovative practices exists amid a cadre of more traditional human services that constrain people with disabilities, a tendency to look inward and get caught up in bureaucratic details and lose sight of a broader inclusive goal, and a society where expectations for people with disabilities and society are low (Hutchison & McGill, 1998; Wieck, & Strully, 1991). Because of these significant concerns about societal conditions, it is important that, as we begin to think about the question of how the camp and staff facilitate the inclusion process, that we also consider the impediments to inclusion.

Mutual leadership, in this study, focused mostly on the relationship between Project Rainbow and Camp Crystal Sands and the individual and collaborative roles each partner played towards building a culture of inclusion at the camp. There is no question
that partnerships are seen as an important vehicle in promoting inclusion. Partnerships that are grounded in the experiences of people with disabilities, sensitive to the needs of families, knowledgeable about inclusion strategies, and connected to the community, all contribute to more positive inclusive initiatives (Lord, 1998; Rynders, 1995; Schleien, Rynders, Heyne, & Tabourne, 1995; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1990). As part of the Camp Crystal Sands/Project Rainbow partnership, each partner had both individual and co-operative roles, albeit they were not necessarily always clearly defined. The director was the up front person representing the camp who played a pivotal role in overseeing the inclusion process. The director hired the highest quality staff that she was able to obtain, oversaw the training process, invited any staff member to work directly with a camper with a disability, especially if the staff member’s abilities matched the camper’s abilities, assisted staff and campers when needed, and supposedly monitored the inclusion process. Project Rainbow have the responsibility for finding campers with disabilities, completing initial profiles, and matching each camper with the most appropriate camp in consultation with the family.

The camp and Project Rainbow collaborated on sharing the profiles, planning and conducting training, and determining policies regarding inclusion. Project Rainbow was responsible for ensuring that profiles were kept up to date, however, not all profiles were up to date, which was confusing for staff. Therefore, the director read over the profiles and updated any changes, based on the previous year’s experience with the camper, that were necessary for staff members to get to know their camper before the camper arrived. Brannan et al. (2003) reiterated the importance of having update-to-date, thorough profiles so staff members can become aware of the campers’ abilities and disabilities and
accommodate accordingly. Clearly the collaboration between the camp and Project Rainbow has not necessarily ensured that the profiles are being developed and utilized in the best way. This raises the issue that perhaps families and the campers with disabilities are not seen as an equal partner. It is very important that families also are seen as a partner (Blake, 1996; Brannan et al., 2003; Schleien et al., 1995; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1990), not just organizations such as camps or Project Rainbow.

In terms of training, staff members at Camp Crystal Sands were taught how to encourage camp inclusion, which enabled the camp staff to focus on each camper’s abilities, not disabilities, through each activity and program. McGill (1994) noted that each camper’s strengths, not their weaknesses, should be emphasized. Staff should be made aware of this important factor during staff training. The training did not focus on specific disabilities, so McGill’s message seems to have got across to both partners. The importance of providing appropriate training was confirmed by most of the literature on camp inclusion (Bogle, 1996; Brennan et al., 2003; McGill, 1984; McTavish et al., 1996).

Despite this collaboration around training, a significant finding of the study was that, on occasion, the staff members appeared to be inadequately prepared to deal with inclusion dilemmas which confronted them. Some staff members even mentioned that, all along, they had not felt adequately trained to include campers with disabilities into groups and programs. Unfortunately, this lack of preparation was sometimes reflected in the inclusion process. Some staff persons had considerable anxiety when they found out that they would be working with a camper with a disability, despite having chosen to do so. Bogle (1996) found that many staff members began to question their own abilities, were not prepared to work with campers with disabilities, but were eager to take on a new
challenge. The Camp Crystal Sands policy of allowing any staff member to work with a camper from Project Rainbow, on the surface, may have appeared to be a good strategy. However, this might contradict an earlier policy where Pontone (1996) quotes Project Rainbow policy that states that the camp must hire additional trained staff to support each camper with a disability. In other words, just because a counsellor chooses to work with a camper with a disability does not ensure that the person is necessarily the best trained person for that position.

It is no surprise that young staff persons feel inadequately prepared to work with campers with disabilities. These staff members are hesitant to take on such an important role because they have so little previous experience, training, and support and live in a society where people with disabilities are portrayed in a negative light. The Canadian and Ontario Camping Association (CCA/OCA) are well aware that an increasing number of families are choosing to send their children with disabilities to regular camps (Blake, 1996). In addition to providing training at conferences, what policies and structures are they putting into place to be sure that their member camps are working towards inclusion? Are directors qualified to implement and monitor the inclusion process? Are they hiring young and unqualified staff in order to save money? A survey of the OCA guidelines indicated that there are no guidelines from camps about the why’s and how’s of inclusion. Fortunately, Project Rainbow has filled in some of the gaps left by the OCA, however, this is not a reasonable expectation of an organization which is independent of the OCA. While a partnership with Project Rainbow is an important starting point, a camp like Camp Crystal Sands and the OCA need to recognize that a broader interpretation of partnership is needed. Partnerships with organizations that understand
inclusion and innovation, which precludes many traditional disability service organizations, would be the most beneficial (Lord, 1998).

Finally, a policy on the ratio of campers with disabilities to campers without disabilities was decided on by Project Rainbow. The camp agreed that having only four campers with disabilities at camp was justified. If camps are trying to include too many campers with disabilities into their program at once then congregation will occur, which will interfere with normalization and assimilation potential (Wolfensberger, 1972). Thus, by only accepting four campers with disabilities at each session, there was a greater chance that the campers with disabilities would be accepted and assimilated into all aspects of the camp program.

There is a danger that by focusing on mutual leadership within the framework of the camp/Project Rainbow partnership, that we have neglected to recognize some broader understandings pertaining to leadership as a framework for analysis. Leadership has been shown to be a key element for sustaining innovation in the non-profit sector (Light, 1998). This study has begun to raise some concerns about the leadership being played by key organizations such as the OCA. If what Lance Secretan (1999) says is true, that a cause “connects us from our present reality to a richly imagined future” (p. 69), is it possible that key organizations such as the OCA lack a strong commitment to the cause of inclusion? It is clear from this study that it is time to examine our organizations that are supposed to be there to provide leadership to the camping movement--provincial camping associations such as the OCA and the national organization (CCA). To what degree do these organizations understand “The Web of Inclusion: A New Architecture for Building Great Organizations” (Helgesen, 1995)? The previous focus in camping
literature is what we call small "I" leadership (Bogle, 1996; Brannan, Fullerton, Arick, Robb, & Bender, 2003; Hornibrook, 1997; Orchard, 1996; Pontone, 1996), but needs to take on a much broader, capital "L" vision of leadership.

Near the beginning of this conclusion, we discussed how camps try to create a unique place where children could go to escape the pressures of home and school and where all children feel acceptance (Fullerton et al., 2000; Lau et al., 1999; Sugerman, 1996). The theme on the power of supportive relationships spoke to this important aspect of camp where staff members work together to support each other and campers to create a welcoming environment where inclusion could flourish. Teamwork was an important element of the power of supportive relationships at Camp Crystal Sands. Through constant support from fellow staff members, watching each other's campers when necessary, and keeping all of the campers with their appropriate groups, the staff worked together to make sure inclusion was happening. The staff made sure that all campers with disabilities were involved because they believed the campers had a right to be involved. Without teamwork, many of the staff members would have had a difficult summer. Bogle (1996) recognizes the importance of teamwork in her study. She states that all campers at camp are all staff's responsibility. Camp staff needs to work together. The role of support should be shared equally among staff members so no camp employee is left struggling without assistance. While there were many signs of teamwork at the camp, there were also many examples where the support staff assigned to the camper from Project Rainbow seemed to be left to deal with their camper who was acting out or simply choosing not to be part of the group. Instead of encouraging the camper to return to her/his group, there seemed to be an acceptance that it was OK for the camper with a
disability to choose to stay apart, even though there was not the same expectations for other campers. Staff, at times, also seemed to not be in close enough contact with each other, which led to some campers missing out on certain activities simply because the staff or camper was not aware something was going on. There have been plenty of flags raised in the literature about the danger of assigning staff to work with a person with a disability and the person becoming isolated (Bogle, 1996; Hornibrook, 1997; Hutchison & McGill, 1998). If camps are going to continue assigning one staff member to a camper with a disability, then staff must remember what it is like to be alone with a camper from Project Rainbow during ‘down times’ of the day.

Also related to the idea of supportive relationships was the nature of the relationships with campers without disabilities. The staff members played a very important role in laying the groundwork for inclusion by encouraging an environment where campers and staff were welcoming. Campers with and without disabilities often played with each other and talked to each other. Most of the time, campers with disabilities fit in with their peers and were considered equal. Many campers without disabilities realized that each camper had her or his own abilities and could participate in all programs, if not in the same way as the other campers, then a different way. Furthermore, the campers liked helping the campers with disabilities; they learned how to help by watching the staff members help the campers with disabilities every day. Other research and literature states that camps in general portray a welcoming environment for most campers. Year after year campers look forward to going to camp and seeing old faces and meeting new faces (Brannan et al., 2003; Bullock, Mahon, & Welch, 1992; Hornibrook, 1997; Lord, 1996; Sable, 1995; Turnbull, Pereira, & Blue-Banning, 1999).
At the same time, there was evidence that certain campers without disabilities often were not supportive. The most common example was campers without disabilities leaving campers with disabilities out of the action. Literature states that if campers are not informed about their peers with disabilities, or if they do not understand something about the disability, then the camper without a disability will not be supportive of the camper with a disability (Brannan et al., 2003; Sable, 1995).

A much more serious issue that emerged was, that while many campers were on very friendly terms with campers with disabilities, there was a lack of support for closer relationships to develop. Clearly, many children with disabilities and parents choose integrated options because of their potential for friendship development (Bennett, Lee, & Lueke, 1998; Guralnick, Connor, & Hammond, 1995; O'Brien & O'Brien, 1993; Mahon, & Mactavish, & Bockstael, 2000). Again, supports to understand the difference between integration and inclusion and the role of friendship needs to be provided by community partners, families, and camping associations. Low expectations, where people with disabilities are not seen as being capable of having real friendships with people without disabilities, are a common constraint in leisure settings.

In conclusion, it is very understandable why, on first notice, Camp Crystal Sands may have been considered an exemplary example of camp integration available to study because of its personal best efforts. However, it has become clear that this camp is only a symbol for many other camps that are limited in their ability to become inclusive settings because of the lack of support from key camping associations, government, and broader society. Their tolerance of the status quo, lack of real leadership, and values which
promote inclusion as a choice rather than as a fundamental right, all continue to make
camp inclusion across Canada little more than a dream.

*Recommendations for Future Research*

The following recommendations for future research can be made based upon this study:

1. A comprehensive study like Brannan and his associates (2003) would have
been very useful during the development stage for this study. Unfortunately, Brannan
and his associates’ (2003) book did not become available until a week before final
submission of my thesis to my committee members. Therefore, I recommend that future
researchers looking at camp inclusion make use of the Brannan et al. book during the
preparation of their study.

2. Like Brannan and his associates (2003), a large study in Canada would be
useful. The study would involve a wide range of different camps to examine inclusion
possibilities and processes. As mentioned in Chapter 1, The United States and Canada
have different laws and mandates regarding people with disabilities. Although Brannan
and his associates (2003) study is very useful, a large Canadian study is badly needed.
This would also make it possible to study inclusion without getting caught into the
problem of best practice used in this study, which may have provided some bias to the
analysis of the current study.

3. The current study focused on Project Rainbow and Camp Crystal Sands. The
next study should focus on the Ontario and Canadian Camping Associations and their
policy role in having greater impact on inclusive camping.
4. This study looked at the staff impressions of the inclusion process that occurred in one session at one residential summer camp. A future study on impact or effectiveness of inclusion in one or more camps is needed to complement this process study. Researchers and practitioners need to know if the inclusion process is working, not just how to include campers with disabilities. Perhaps certain aspects of the process needs to be changed so all campers can benefit from inclusion.

5. A comparison study between a camp that has a partnership (with a Project Rainbow type organization) with a camp that does not have a partner organization might reveal differences in their inclusion processes. Researchers may be interested in studying the two different types of camps to discover the different positives and negatives of working with a partner organization and not working with a partner organization.

6. Being a first time researcher, my interview skills were not very strong. I did not have enough probes ready upon entrance into the interviews and the questions appeared to sound more quantitative than qualitative. Patton (2002) states that, "the quality of the information obtained during an interview is largely dependent on the interviewer" (p. 341). Thus, I recommend for future research that more probes be developed for the interviews. More probes and more qualitative sounding questions would have provided greater depth to the interviews, thereby strengthening the quality of the interviews. A stronger pilot study will ensure the required depth that qualitative questions elicit.

7. Campers could be interviewed in future research on camp inclusion. The campers, both with and without disabilities, can provide a unique perspective about the inclusion process. Due to the small size of this study and ethical reasons, children were not interviewed. However, future researchers may want to include the campers' voice.
8. Another limitation to this study was that there was not enough time spent in the camp. Further studies would be strengthened by having more than one site visit throughout the summer to the camp to determine if or how a learning curve occurs from the beginning, middle, and end of the summer. The researcher is quite confident that the staff’s inclusion skills improved over the summer. Consequently, the researcher may have observed different inclusion techniques at the beginning of the summer compared to the end of the summer. For that matter, if the research is conducted in a camp where the sessions are longer than one week, it might also be possible to determine changes in campers themselves.

9. Future research should also look into day camps. This current study looked at one residential camp. Inclusion may be facilitated differently at day camps than residential camps. There may be a different culture in the two types of camps that warrants further exploration.

10. This study used a case study approach which allowed the researcher to gather detailed in-depth data through observations, interviews, and document analysis at one bounded camp. Perhaps another study on the same topic may be conducted using an approach other than a case study approach. This way, researchers may be able to look at the broader picture pertaining to camp inclusion and the issues that revolve around inclusive camping.

11. If another study is performed using a best practice approach, it is important to be aware of the assumptions underlying this approach and build in safeguards to ensure bias does not affect the study.
Recommendations for Future Practice

After careful review of Chapter 4, it has become obvious that recommendations can be made for the camping industry pertaining to camp inclusion. Recommendations for future practice are twofold: first, recommendations for residential camps; second, recommendations for partnership organizations who work with the camps in providing inclusive environments.

Recommendations for Residential Camps

The following recommendations for future practice can be made as a result of this study:

1. Camps may want to consider partnership with an inclusive organization, such as Project Rainbow, because this study indicated that there are so very many strengths to this partnership. For example, Project Rainbow refers campers and provides training and support to the partnering camp. It was the conclusion of this study that a partnership of this nature increases the likelihood of a 'culture of inclusion' being created.

2. Simply because we support the idea of partnership with a Project Rainbow like organization does not imply that we think all campers with disabilities should go through such an organization. The hope would be that the majority of campers with disabilities and their families feel comfortable approaching the same camp their other children attend and working towards an inclusive camp program.

3. Inclusive policies are absolutely essential to ensure that the inclusion process is implemented effectively. Project Rainbow-like organizations should support camps in developing their own policies that are relevant to their particular camp. The director and camp staff should be involved in developing an inclusive policy. When the camp is
directly involved in policy-making, instead of Project Rainbow-like organizations simply handing them a ready-made set of inclusion policies, the camp will take more ownership for building the process of inclusion.

4. The director must be a strong role model for the camp. The director is responsible for establishing clear expectations regarding a culture of inclusion, mutual leadership, and the power of supportive relationships. When the director has these high expectations, everyone from campers to parents will want to follow in her/his footsteps.

5. All staff should be made aware, during their interview, that the camp they are going to be working at is an inclusive camp. A question or comment pertaining to inclusion should be posed to the potential camp staff member to make sure that the candidate wants to work in an inclusive environment and is supportive of an inclusive philosophy.

6. Camps should train all of their staff members to be able to work with the campers with disabilities. At Camp Crystal Sands, all staff members were able to work in any of the camp jobs that were offered to them, from counsellor to inclusion counsellor. This provides so much more flexibility and increases the likelihood of a culture of inclusion being created.

7. Camps should not have a designated inclusion counsellor. Perhaps groups with campers with disabilities should just have an extra counsellor in the group. Therefore not only one staff member will be responsible for the camper with a disability. Thus, there will not be an inclusion counsellor always leaving the group with the camper from Project Rainbow.
8. During this training, the focus should be on the social aspect of inclusion. Directors can let their staff know what they can do to help campers communicate and play together and get to know each other for their abilities and gifts instead of disabilities. For example, directors should explain to the staff that they should initiate friendships between campers by introducing the campers to each other and making sure that the campers with disabilities are part of all activities.

9. If a camp partners with an organization such as Project Rainbow, the camp may want to make sure that the organization stays current with camper profiles. Camper profiles need to be kept up to date because the profiles will not be useful if they refer to a five year old boy who is actually now eleven years old. Camper profiles are an important resource to the inclusion process because they include information about each camper’s unique interests, strengths or gifts, needs, and parental suggestions or tips. If the camp does not seem particularly interested in the profiles, perhaps the structure and content of the profiles need to be reviewed.

10. Camps should be prepared beyond the training aspect. All children have different abilities, interests, and attention spans. Not all campers’ attention spans are long enough to wait for the next scheduled activity to begin. Counsellors need to be prepared to adapt activities or the schedule if needed. For example, counsellors could consider having small activities planned for such occasions. Back packs full of extra toys could be worn by staff just in case an extra activity is needed. However, this should only be used as an emergency, as the goal is to encourage participation in regular camp activities with their peers.
11. It is important for staff to learn the potential that a camp environments have for the development of lasting friendships. This must apply to campers with disabilities. It is not enough for campers with disabilities to attend camp and be on friendly terms with other campers and staff. Specific strategies for maximizing friendships are available in the literature and need to be shared during staff training (Gold, 1999; Heyne, Schleien, & McAvoy, 1993).

**Recommendations for Project Rainbow-Like Partnership Organizations**

1. Inclusive policies are essential for the inclusion process to be implemented effectively. Project Rainbow-like organizations have the experience and expertise that is needed to advise their camp partners about some of the important elements that must be included. These guidelines for developing policy should be written and part of a broader package of resources that Project Rainbow-like organizations offer their partner camps. Of course, the camp must be intimately involved to ensure that the policies that are written are relevant to the unique context of their particular camp and to ensure the camp takes ownership for the process of inclusion.

2. Partnering organizations like Project Rainbow refer campers with disabilities to the camps. The partnering organizations are in charge of providing profiles on the campers with disabilities that attend each camp. Partnering organizations need to make sure that these camper profiles are kept up to date. Camps staff need to be prepared to respond to the individual needs of each camper. Camper profiles are an important tool for making this happen. If the profiles are not kept current, then the staff will not be nearly as prepared as they could be for the campers arrival.
...
3. The profiles provided by partnering organizations should be fully detailed. Many staff members in this study had a hard time getting to know their camper. They felt that in addition to having out-of-date information, other important information was left out of the profile. For example, if we want camp staff to really focus on positives, a real sense of the camper’s gifts is needed in the profiles.

4. Training is an important aspect that the partnering organization provides. The partnering organization has diverse experience with so many camps and therefore should provide as much information as possible to the camps about the inclusion process. If more than half a day is required to get all of the important information taught, then more time should be taken. The camp in this study had only a couple of hours of training from Project Rainbow. However, this camp was lucky in that their director did work for Project Rainbow previously and could provide any extra information that the staff was unsure about. Project Rainbow-like organizations should be prepared to spend as much time as possible with each camp to ensure that each staff member will be ready to help build an inclusive camp. In addition to pre-camp training, the partner organization needs to think carefully about specific strategies which are more in the context of ongoing educational opportunities; for example, at a staff meeting, having a few staff share their experiences and how they have dealt with certain situations would be an example of an ongoing learning opportunity for staff.

5. During training, or even better, during the year before camp begins, partnering organizations should provide the camp with details about each unique staff strategy as they pertain to the inclusion process e.g., camp director, inclusion co-ordinator, inclusion counsellors, counsellor, volunteers, supported employee, or Project Rainbow staff. An
example of one strategy of the inclusion counsellor is the person should always be available to provide extra support to the counsellor and inclusion counsellor as they work together to build a culture of inclusion.

6. There is danger that the role of an inclusion counsellor can be misinterpreted from being a facilitator for inclusion to a one-to-one counsellor for a particular camper. Often times in so-called inclusive settings, the staff who are there to provide support do not fully understand the role. When this happens, the camper with the disability often becomes dependent on the inclusion staff. Other staff may consider the responsibility for support for a particular camper to be the responsibility of the inclusion counsellor, rather than something to be shared by everyone. In turn, both the camper with the disability and the inclusion counsellor become isolated from other campers and staff. Project Rainbow-like organizations need to identify policies and structures which are needed to safeguard this from happening. One thing that happened in this study was that all staff was considered as being capable of being either regular or inclusion counsellors. Project Rainbow should have clear written guidelines about the inclusion counsellors’ role (mentioned above in #4) which is shared with camps when they negotiate being partners, when they do pre-camp training, and when they monitor the role of the inclusion counsellor throughout the summer. Despite an earlier recommendation about staff having back-up activities, more importantly, both Project Rainbow-like organizations and camps should make sure that there is a clear expectation that all campers, including those who have disabilities, be full participants in the camp program by being encouraged and supported to stay with their group, whether it be a cabin group activity, a program activity, or a broader camp event. It is all too easy for campers with disabilities to be on
the sidelines, either observing or doing an alternate activity. Hanging out with a staff member in an alternate activity will not contribute towards the camper with a disability building real friendships.

7. Partnering organizations should be available to the camps all summer long, as alluded to in recommendation #3 on training. At least once a week, a worker from Project Rainbow’s head office in Toronto went to Camp Crystal Sands to see how the inclusion process was going. Staff members were able to ask any questions they had of the Project Rainbow staff during this short visit. In addition to these important camp visits once a week, phone communication should be encouraged between the camp and the partnering organization, just in case any emergencies or situations arise that the camp feels it would benefit from consultation with a Project Rainbow staff member.

8. Partnering organizations like Project Rainbow, because of their experience with inclusion, understand the importance of finding the best match and must play an important role in making sure this happens. This includes working with families to find the most appropriate inclusive camp, the best counsellors who will become inclusive counsellors, and the best counsellor and inclusive counsellor who will be matched with a particular camper with a disability. A strong partnership will ensure the camp setting is open and flexible enough to ensure all these things happen.

9. Both Project Rainbow-like organizations and the partnering camps need to continually remind themselves that the partnership is critical for the inclusion process to work to its maximum potential. This means both partners need to see themselves as leaders and advocates for the inclusion process. This partnership means both parties will
be supporting campers, staff, and each other as they work toward building a culture of inclusion, mutual leadership, and supportive relationships.

Recommendations for the Ontario and Canadian Camping Associations

1. The Canadian Camping Association (CCA) does very little on inclusion. They are more concerned with networking and the national promotion of camping. The CCA should use their status and resources to ensure inclusion is included on each province’s standards list.

2. The Ontario Camping Association (OCA) needs to play a greater role in the inclusion process. The OCA should include inclusion standards as part of their list of 400 standards for camps to follow. For example, an inclusion standard could include accessibility. If camps are working towards inclusion, they should make sure that cabins, shelters, dining halls, and washrooms (plus any other facilities at the camp) are wheelchair accessible. Another example would require all camps to hire staff qualified on inclusion issues.

3. The Special Needs Resource Committee, which is part of the OCA, needs to make itself more visible. It is very difficult finding information on the OCA website that deals with inclusive camping.
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Appendix A

Observation Protocol

1. **Program Setting** – a complete description of the physical elements of the area in which the observation is taking place will be recorded. Included will be a description of the surrounding area (cabin, woods, pool deck, etc)

   **Descriptive**

   **Reflective**

2. **The Social Environment** – for each observation session, the following will be documented:

   - The organization of the children and camp staff (size of the grouping, Was the group(s) formed spontaneously or where they planned? Who made up the group?)
   - Nature/content of interactions between campers with and without disabilities
   - Nature/content of interactions between campers and staff members

3. **Programming Information** – The content of each session will be explained in detail. Attention will be paid to the particular activity that the group is participating in.

   As a basic guide the following questions will be used:

   - Who is involved?
   - What is being done and said by staff and participants?
   - How are all members going about what they are doing?
   - Where do activities occur?
   - When do things happen?
- What are the variations in how participants engage in planned activities?
- What adoptions are staff members making so all children can participate?
- How do feelings and behaviors change over the course of the activity?

Taking of Field Notes

Field notes will be hand recoded immediately following the completion of each observation session. Emphasis will be placed on recording observations following the description previously.
Appendix B

Interview Guide – Project Rainbow Staff Member

Hi, Name. My name is Tricia. I am here today so I can get to know a bit about Camp _______ and the inclusion process that they follow. I hope not to take up too much of your time, so let us begin.

1. How long have you been working for Project Rainbow?

2. How long have you been affiliated with this camp?

3. What does your job entail in relation to this camp?
   Probe: How do you foster the inclusion process at this camp?

4. How do you see this camp implementing the inclusion process?
   Probe: What about the role of the director?
   What accommodations/actions do staff members provide so all campers can participate equally?

5. What does Project Rainbow do to facilitate the inclusion process?
   Probe: How does Project Rainbow use staff manuals and training as a tool for educating about inclusion?

6. In your opinion, what could the senior staff members do to enhance the inclusion process at this camp?
   Probe: Director?
   Inclusion Coordinator?

7. What do you like about the inclusion process at this camp?

8. What unique challenges/problems have you been faced with when implementing inclusion at this camp?
9. In your opinion, how can the overall inclusion process at this camp be improved?
Appendix C

Interview Guide – Camp Director and Inclusion Coordinator

Hi, Name. My name is Tricia. I am here today so I can get to know a bit about Camp _______ and the inclusion process that you and your staff follow. I hope not to take up too much of your time, so let us begin.

1. How long have you worked at this camp?
2. What is your position at this camp?
3. How did you find out about this camp?
   Probe: What about the camp appealed to you? (how the camp operates, the staff members, the mission statement)
4. What can you tell me about the inclusion program?
   Probe: What is done by the staff members to ensure that all campers are included?
   What do you do to make sure all campers are included into the camp program?
5. What do you like about the inclusion program?
6. What unique challenges/problems have you faced when trying to include all campers into a program?
   Probe: How was this challenge/problem resolved?
7. In your opinion, how can the inclusion program be improved?
Appendix D

Interview Guide – Inclusion Counsellor/Counsellor

Hi, Name. My name is Tricia. I am here today so I can get to know a bit about Camp _______ and the inclusion process that you follow. I hope not to take up too much of your time, so let us begin.

1. How long have you worked at this camp?
2. What is your position at this camp?
3. How did you find out about this camp?
   Probe: What about the camp appealed to you? (how the camp operates, the staff members, the mission statement)
4. How did you become aware of the inclusion program at this camp?
5. What can you tell me about the inclusion program?
   Probe: What is done by the staff members to ensure that all campers are included?
   What do you do to make sure all campers are included in the camp program?
6. What do you like about the inclusion program?
7. What unique challenges/problems have you faced when trying to include all campers into a program?
   Probe: How was this challenge/problem resolved?
8. In your opinion, how can the inclusion program be improved?
   Probe: Any change in policies needed?
   Any staffing changes?
   What about the role of director?
Appendix E

Letter of Introduction/Consent-Campers

July, 2002

Dear camper’s parent/guardian;

I am a graduate student in Applied Health Sciences at Brock University (specializing in Recreation and Leisure Studies). Under the supervision of Professor Peggy Hutchison, I will be conducting research at your camp titled, ‘A Qualitative Study of Inclusion at a Residential Summer Camp.’ The purpose of my research is to gain an understanding of the inclusion process that occurs in a camp setting. As you are aware, some children who attend this camp have a disability. I would like to observe how the children with disabilities are included into daily camp life. Your involvement will help to improve the program at this camp and other camps in the future. Any child or staff member who participates will not be expected to alter their camp routine. They will simply be observed. All participant identities will be kept confidential by the use of pseudonyms in any written material. Participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits, and the participant may discontinue participating in the study at any time.

The research process will consist of one trip to your camp. During this visit, I will observe the camp staff and campers, and interview the camp staff to discover how the inclusion process is occurring.

If you are willing to allow your child to be a participant in this study, please read the following and sign below.

Name of participant: (please print) __________________________________________

- I have been given and have read this Letter of Introduction provided to me by the interviewer conducting the research.

- I understand that this study in which I have agreed to let my child (if under 18) participate could possibly last one entire week while at camp. The purpose of this investigation is to gain an understanding of the inclusion process at Camp ________.

- I understand that my child’s participation in this study will not bring any risk or harm to my child.

- I understand that my child’s participation in this study is voluntary and that my child may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without a penalty.
- I understand that I or my child may ask questions of the researcher at any point during the research process.
- I understand that there will be no payment for my child’s participation.
- I understand that only the Principle Investigator and her supervisor named above will have access to the data.
- I understand that the results of this study will be made available to Project Rainbow, the camp, and participants in the study.

Parent/Guardian signature (if participant is under the age of 18)

__________________________

Please return the signed form with your child on his or her first day to camp.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Brock Research Ethics Board (File #______). If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact Tricia Mecke at (905)685-8957 or Peggy Hutchison at (905)688-5550, ext. 4269. Concerns about your involvement in the study may also be directed to Research Ethics Officer in the Office of Research Services at (905) 688-5550, ext. 3035.

Feedback about the use of the data collected will be available in January 2003, from Peggy Hutchison in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences at Brock University. A written explanation will be provided for you upon your request.

Thank you for your help!

Tricia Mecke
Appendix F

Letter of Introduction/Consent - Staff

July, 2002

Dear staff members/ parents of staff members;

I am a graduate student in Applied Health Sciences at Brock University (specializing in Recreation and Leisure Studies). Under the supervision of Professor Peggy Hutchison, I will be conducting research at your camp titled, ‘A Qualitative Study of Inclusion at a Residential Summer Camp.’ The purpose of my research is to gain an understanding of the inclusion process that occurs in a camp setting. As you are aware, some children who attend this camp have a disability. I would like to observe how the children with disabilities are included into daily camp life. Your involvement will help to improve the program at this camp and other camps in the future. I will only be at your camp during the middle of week of camp. Any child or staff member who participates will not be expected to alter their camp routine. They will simply be observed. All participant identities will be kept confidential by the use of pseudonyms in any written material. Participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits, and the participant may discontinue participating in the study at any time.

The research process will consist of one trip to your camp. During this visit, I will observe the camp staff and campers, and interview the camp staff to discover how the inclusion process is occurring.

Name of participant: (please print) _______________________________________________________

• I have been given and have read the Letter of Introduction provided to me by the interviewer conducting the research.

• I understand that this study in which I have agreed to let myself or my child (if under 18) participate could possibly last one entire week while at camp. The purpose of this investigation is to gain an understanding of the inclusion process at Camp _______

• I understand that all personal information will be kept strictly confidential and that all information will be coded so that the name of our camp and my (child’s) name is not associated with my (child’s) answers.

• I understand that there will be no obligation to answer any question that I feel is invasive, offensive or inappropriate.

• I understand that a tape recorder may be used to tape the interview to ensure that the researcher will not forget any important information.
• I understand that my (child's) participation in this study will not bring any risk or harm to myself (my child).

• I understand that my (child's) participation in this study is voluntary and that I (my child), may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without a penalty.

• I understand that I (my child), may ask questions of the researchers at any point during the research process.

• I understand that there will be no payment for my (child's) participation.

• I understand that only the Principle Investigator and her supervisor named above will have access to the data.

• I understand that the results of this study will be made available to Project Rainbow, the camp, and participants in the study.

Participant Signature

Parent/Guardian signature (if participant is under the age of 18)

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Brock Research Ethics Board (File #______). If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact Tricia Mecke at (905)688-1816 or Peggy Hutchison at (905)68805550, ext. 4269. Concerns about your involvement in the study may also be directed to Research Ethics Officer in the Office of Research Services at (905) 688-5550, ext. 3035.

Feedback about the use of the data collected will be available in January 2003, from Peggy Hutchison in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences at Brock University. A written explanation will be provided for you upon your request.

Thank you for your help!

Tricia Mecke
Appendix G
Letter of Appreciation

September 2002

Dear Camp Staff, Campers, Parent/Guardian of Campers;

Thank you for your participation in the research project, ‘A Qualitative Study of Inclusion at a Residential Camp.’ As you are aware, this research project is being conducted by Tricia Mecke in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences at Brock University. The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of the inclusion process at your camp.

Your participation has been essential to our understanding of the inclusion process that may occur in residential camps. We hope that the findings will help us to identify strategies for inclusion at summer camps.

Feedback about the use of the data collected will be available January 2003 from Peggy Hutchison in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences at Brock University. A written explanation will be provided for you upon your request (contact Peggy and leave your name and address). If you have any concerns or questions about this research project, please do not hesitate to call me at (905) 688-1816 or (905) 688-5550, ext 4269. Thank you again for your participation!

Sincerely

Tricia Mecke