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INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem

On the morning of September 11th, the world was witness to a tragedy that represented the very worst and the very best of what human beings are capable. Marked by heroic deeds with life-saving consequences, caring acts performed by complete strangers, and charitable giving carried out by a shocked but generous country, the events of September are prime exemplars of America's philanthropic tradition. For some, these humanitarian acts were instinctive, for others more purposeful and conscious, and for still others perhaps an appeal to duty.

The response to the immediate and longer-term needs of the victims, their families and communities affected by the events of September is but one example of what it means to be a caring and compassionate society. De Tocqueville recognized this over 150 years ago when he wrote, "If some great and sudden calamity befalls a family, the purses of a thousand strangers are at once willingly opened and small but numerous donations pour in to relieve their distress" (Mayer & Lerner, 1966).

Yet, the notion of people helping people is as old as human nature itself. Social researchers have offered valuable theories to help explain how prosocial behavior is developed and nurtured in humans, and how it cuts cleanly across class, cultural, gender, and religious distinctions. Other groups have meanwhile joined researchers, including non-profit agencies, religious organizations, professional societies, and charitable foundations in the desire to better understand prosocial behavior in order to help strengthen the philanthropic tradition.
Girl Scouts of the USA (GSUSA) is one example of a group that is directing efforts toward strengthening the philanthropic tradition. GSUSA is a youth organization for girls with a mission to “inspire girls with the highest ideals of character, conduct, patriotism, and service that they may become happy and resourceful citizens” (Girl Scouts of the USA, 2000). Through a new program initiative designed for its female youth members called, *Strength in Sharing: Philanthropy in Girl Scouting*, the organization is attempting to enhance and develop certain attributes that are believed to be associated with the attitudes necessary to develop a philanthropic tradition.

**Purpose of the study**

This study examined the outcomes of girls who participated in a program designed to enhance attributes related to philanthropic behavior. It studied the attributes of connection to the community, civic awareness and attitudes, civic action and efficacy, identification of community needs, philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving, and ability to work collaboratively, in order to determine how they might be different from a similar group of girls who did not take part in the philanthropy enhancement program.

**Need for the study**

Some observers have concluded that the American philanthropic tradition is in danger, and that Americans must do more to pass along philanthropic attitudes to their children. Based on these observations and other information, the need for the present study is seen in assessing whether the *Strength in Sharing* program can serve as a facilitator of philanthropic attitudes, and, if so, to what extent. The researcher hopes to
add to the literature on developing and enhancing philanthropic attitudes and beliefs among youth.

Background

In early-2000, GSUSA rolled-out the *Strength in Sharing* program with the long-term objective of building “a generation of young women who support women and children’s causes through giving money and time, and who commit to lifelong philanthropy” (Girl Scouts of the USA, 2000b). The program seeks to add to the development of philanthropic attitudes by involving its girl members 5-17 years of age in activities that are focused on learning philanthropic concepts.

After GSUSA introduced *Strength in Sharing* to its 317 chartered Girl Scout councils across the U.S., Reno, Nev.-based Girl Scouts of the Sierra Nevada and Las Vegas, Nev.-based Girl Scouts of Frontier Council entered into a collaborative partnership to pilot test the new program. With the backing of a three-year $10,000 grant from the E. L. Wiegand Foundation to be used for program supplies, resource materials, and training, the two Girl Scout councils embarked on a five-month pilot study of *Strength in Sharing* within their respective jurisdictions. Frontier Council offered the new program activity to its registered girl members from January-May 2001.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Several themes were selected for their relationship to this paper. Among these are the tradition of philanthropy, an overview of current trend data on giving and serving as well as theories and research on prosocial behavior. The influence of service learning on youth, and the relationship between giving and serving behavior are also presented.

The tradition of philanthropy

When the first colonists arrived on North American soil, the needs of one another were a matter of physical necessity (Wuthnow, 1991). Two hundred years later, during the early 1830s, de Tocqueville delivered his account of how Americans were still meeting the needs of others. His description of the mutual helpfulness and cooperation of Americans together in daily life is an indicator of what might be described as one of this society’s predominant national characteristics. The traits of helping, caring, and giving are not unique to the United States, but that has not hindered Americans from developing a lengthy and strong philanthropic tradition that has grown to include the support of the sick, the needy, the arts, education, and research (Curti, 1957; Wuthnow 1991). So ingrained is the spirit of philanthropy in Americans, that a report on the 1999 White House Conference of Philanthropy refers to it as “a core value of our nation as freedom of speech or freedom of worship” (White House, 1999).

Trend data on giving and serving

Since de Tocqueville’s writing, Americans have continued to be the source of a steadily growing philanthropic tradition as measured by increasing levels of charitable
donations and volunteer time; activities, which are twice as common among Americans as among citizens of other countries (Ladd, 1999). Expressed in quantitative terms for the year 2000, total giving in the United States reached over 200 billion; a figure representing 2 percent of gross domestic product (American Association of Fundraising Counsel, 2001). A willingness to help is seen in the 83.9 million adults in the U.S. who volunteered approximately 15.5 billion hours. Fifty-nine percent of American teenagers support the philanthropic tradition by volunteering an average of 3.5 hours per week totaling 2.4 billion hours annually (Independent Sector, 2001).

But while quantitative data consistently celebrate new plateaus in the philanthropic tradition, some scholarly research points to the decline in social capital and civic engagement; characteristics that once allowed American society to cohere, and are now in a state of disintegration (Putnam, 2000). According to the Prudential Spirit of Community Youth Survey, more kids say that conditions in their communities are getting worse (30 percent) than are getting better (25 percent) (The Wirthlin Group, 1995). In addition, an Indiana University Center on Philanthropy publication reports that the philanthropic tradition is in jeopardy and that, “based on current trends...giving and serving will decline among young people and therefore among tomorrow’s adults” (Bentley & Nissan, 1996). Bennett (1988) writes that the next generation of children may be at risk, and Spaide (1999) cautions that “we are in danger of producing a whole generation of children with philanthropic retardation.”

Parents seem concerned. Findings from the Raising Charitable Children Survey show that Americans strongly believe that children should participate in charities in order to
become better citizens (94 percent), yet almost three out of four (70 percent) admit their children are not involved in any philanthropy (Cone/Roper, 2000).

Definitions

Curti (1958) dates the appearance of the word “philanthropy” in the English language to 1628. Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary defines it as “goodwill to fellowmen” and “a philanthropic act or gift.” However, scholars in the field of sociology prefer to distinguish philanthropy by its prosocial or altruistic intent.

Prosocial and altruistic behaviors are age-old qualities in humans, yet the formal study of these traits appears only to have begun around the mid- to late-1960s. This development is associated with the stabbing death of Kitty Genovese in 1964 (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Kohn, 1990). Despite the presence of 38 witnesses, no one came to her aid, or even called the police until she had expired. The event and the resulting, now well understood and nearly proverbial “bystander effect” became a source of interest to social psychologists who wanted to learn more about why people help or refrain from helping.

Prosocial behavior is characterized as “voluntary actions that are intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals” (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989). Genuine caring or concern can explain why some people choose to help others. However, by contrast, helping behavior can also be motivated by one’s own benefit, personal gain, the need for social approval, or some other ulterior purpose. Along these lines, Harbaugh (1998) has developed a mathematical model, which shows how donor’s taste for prestige can influence the amount they give to charity.
Altruistic behavior on the other hand is a specific type of prosocial behavior. Bar-Tal (1976) has developed three criteria for evaluating altruistic behavior. First, it must be carried out voluntarily, then it must aim to benefit another, and finally it must be carried out without expectation of a reward. Eisenberg (1982) lists seven definitions of altruism from leading scholars in the field of sociology all of which in some way emphasize the notion of sacrifice on the part of the doer for the undeniable benefit of the receiver.

Theories of behavior

Researchers have embraced various theories to help them explain the development of prosocial behavior and altruism in humans. One popular model, referred to as “social learning theory,” posits that these behaviors are learned through the influence of environmental factors, or more specifically through the observation of “models” (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Bandura, 1977 Bandura & Walters, 1963). Young children are gradually assimilated and accepted into society by modeling behavior that societal, cultural or familial norms deem appropriate. Familial antecedents have an important function in shaping children’s behavior, especially parents and the type of relationship that children have with their parents (Bar-Tal, 1976).

In the world of business, fund development professionals have recognized the practical implications of social learning theory by modeling a heritage of philanthropy to their publics. These professionals also recognize that philanthropic education of students in grades K-8 is important in getting this group involved in financial support later on in life (Falco, Fopma, Maxwell, Stoller & Turell, 1998).
The importance of modeling in influencing the development of giving and serving behavior has been examined in the Independent Sector publication, *Giving and Serving in the United States*; a biennial national survey of adults conducted by the Gallup Organization (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). Based on responses given by a representative sample of 2,719 adults, researchers found that rates of giving and volunteering can be increased by assuring that young people have positive adult role models, such as a parent who volunteers. Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1996) also studied the habits of teenagers 12-17 years of age, and concluded that “a commitment to lifelong philanthropy” among adults begins when these behaviors are learned in the early years of one’s life.

Controlled studies have shown the ability of positive reinforcement, prompting, and praising to successfully modify the behavior of children. Staub (1971) showed how modeling significantly increased attempts by children to help other children when signs of distress were heard. Dumand and Adelberg (1967) showed how reinforcement positively affects the sharing behavior of nursery school children from a favored environment as well as children from a welfare center. Gelfand, Hartmann, Cromer, Smith and Page (1975) found that children who were originally disinclined to contribute pennies for a game of skill to another child will do so following instructional prompts. Lastly, White and Burnam (1975) demonstrated that particular levels of modeling among fourth and fifth graders depended upon the instructional set and age.

In addition to social learning theory, scholars recognize the “cognitive-developmental” approach to a child’s socialization into society and the learning of prosocial behavior. Building on theories developed originally by child psychologist Jean
Piaget, Kohlberg (1969) posited that transformations of cognitive structure are responsible for the development of ways of thinking about physical and social objects. As a child advances through the six stages of the Kohlbergian model of moral development, its understanding of giving and serving also develops over time (Bentley & Nissan, 1996).

**Religion**

The power and influence of organized religion is a significant socializing mechanism in the development of prosocial behavior, particularly with respect to the giving and serving habits of followers. Of the $203 billion in charitable donations for the year 2000, 36.5 percent went to the area of religion (American Association of Fundraising Council, 2001). One explanation for this generosity can be traced to religious teachings that prescribe an ethic of care for fellow believers and non-believers. Dictums and teachings reflecting concern and care can be found in narratives such as The Golden Rule, the Beatitudes, and the parable of the Good Samaritan (Wuthnow & Hodgkinson, 1990). Religious charity, almsgiving, and good works are also core parts of the three dominant religions in America—Christianity, Judaism, and Islam (Bentley & Nissan). The duty to give is an important function in the Judeo-Christian religious heritage as expressed in the act of tithing as well as in Tzedakah, a Jewish term meaning righteousness as applied to deed of charity and philanthropy. As a socializing mechanism, it is in houses of worship that children first learn giving and serving behaviors as a formal group activity.

Interestingly, however, some research has questioned the connection between God and good. Kohn (1990) conducted a survey of quantitative and qualitative research
studies that showed no statistically significant difference between believers and non-believers in the willingness to volunteer, or to perform charitable or altruistic acts. Wuthnow (1995) also presents evidence that religious or spiritual concerns are an important reason for volunteering in only about one-third of American teenagers.

Other socializing influences

Other socializing influences have been advanced to explain how people acquire philanthropic habits. Bentley & Nissan (1996) suggest six of them, some of which have already been mentioned above:

1) Caregivers of familial relationships—Parents are important influences on personality, ego development, moral development, and humanitarian concern.

2) Peers—Interaction with peers influences children’s cognitive, social and moral development.

3) Teachers and schools—Historically schools have played an important role in socializing students including the teaching of values and morals.

4) Religious organizations—Religion and the philanthropic tradition of giving and service are closely intertwined, even inseparable.

5) Youth service organizations—The guidance of mentoring adults and wholesome activities of youth organizations give young people a framework for prosocial learning experiences.

6) Mass Media—Media-rich environments are having a huge impact in our society. As an example, fifty-nine million viewers raised more than
$100 million to benefit September 11 relief efforts after the unprecedented simultaneous airing of the two-hour television fundraiser "America: A Tribute to Heroes" over 35 broadcast and cable networks on September 21, 2001 (Levin, 2001).

Service learning

Service learning is included in this literature review because of its ability to nurture developmental assets associated with prosocial behavior. The researcher is hypothesizing that the interpersonal and civic outcomes that are the result of service learning programs have immediate implications for participants of Strength in Sharing due to its volunteer and community service components.

Researchers, scholars, and service learning authors do not offer a single definition of service learning. The U.S. Department of Education classifies it as "an educational activity, program, or curriculum that seeks to promote student’s learning through experiences associated with volunteerism or community service" (Kleiner, 1999). In this context, several activities listed among the requirements for Strength in Sharing can be considered service learning experiences. For example, one activity requires Senior Girl Scouts to "Pick a local organization that serves women and girls. Volunteer for at least six hours with that organization, learning about their services, how they are funded and what their needs are." Cadette Girl Scouts are required to "Decide on a council or community project that benefits the needs of women and girls…" More strict definitions of service learning emphasize school-based curricula (Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Markus; Raskoff & Sundeen, 2000).
Quantitative research on community service suggests it has a positive effect on the intellectual and social/psychological development of participants. This includes a heightened sense of personal and social responsibility, more positive attitudes toward adults and others, active career exploration, and enhanced self-esteem (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). Other outcomes include a greater sense of responsibility, more willingness to help others, increases in self-esteem, and more tolerance for persons different from themselves (Conrad & Hedin, 1982). Carver (1997) found that participants in community service gain in developing social skills, becoming effective change agents, finding creative solutions to everyday problems, as well as the development and maintenance of a community in which students share a belonging. The South Carolina State Department of Education showed that outcomes from a year-long community service program included learning new career opportunities, meeting new people, better understanding the community and how it functions, and how to work better in a team (Miller & Neese, 1997).

Kahne and Westheimer (1996) categorize K-12 service learning programs into those that promote charity and a sense of altruism, and those that promote change and methods of social reform. "A program based on a charity rationale would focus on giving, civic duty, and the educational experience, while a change-oriented program would emphasize caring, social reconstruction, and a transformative educational experience that combines learning with action."

Volunteering and giving

In studies conducted on teenagers and adults, Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1996a, 1996b) discovered an important relationship between volunteering and giving. Adult volunteers gave more than nonvolunteers did, and households with a volunteer
contributed a higher percentage of their household income than those without a volunteer. A similar situation holds true for teenagers: volunteers who contribute money gave more hours per week than those who volunteered but did not contribute.

One of the important conclusions in the Hodgkinson and Weitzman studies reveal, “Volunteering is more likely to become a lifetime habit when children are exposed to concepts of caring, sharing, and community at an early age.”

**Summary**

This literature review approached the philanthropic tradition in the U.S. from several perspectives. While scholars and professionals have recognized the American penchant for giving and serving, many believe there are signs these traits may be in jeopardy, particularly among youth. The teaching of important developmental assets is seen as one way to counteract this trend. Research shows that humans assimilate desired societal, cultural, and familial norms through modeling as well as through the development of one’s own moral judgment. Service learning and volunteer work were shown to be instrumental in the acquisition of developmental assets. Most importantly, the researcher has presented this information against the background of children and young adults.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey research design in order to gather data from participants six months after their participation in the *Strength in Sharing* pilot program at Girl Scouts of Frontier Council. Administrators conducted the program between January and May of 2001, while the researcher gathered data for the present study from late-November 2001 until mid-January 2002. The study focuses on the association between involvement in the program and the development of positive attributes such as caring, compassion, and civic mindedness among participants. As mentioned earlier, researchers believe these positive attributes are responsible for the formation of philanthropic behavior among youth and adults.

Population and sample size

The subjects assigned to take part in the study were drawn from a population consisting of Cadette Girl Scouts (grade 6-9 or 11-14 years old) and Senior Girl Scouts (grade 9-12 or 14-17 years old). From this population, the researcher identified two sampling strata based on participation or non-participation in *Strength in Sharing*.

The experimental group was composed of 100 percent, or all of the 75 Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts who participated in the pilot program. These test subjects were exposed to the program over a five-month period. The treatment consisted of a variety of age-appropriate activities, which required participants to learn about and address philanthropic issues in a wide range of settings, and to identify, serve, and support causes involving girls and women. Some activities directed participants to gain familiarity with
community services provided to girls and women, to interview funding professionals, or
to learn how funds are distributed to meet a community need (see Tables 8 and 9 in
Appendix II for a complete list of activities). Other activities contain a volunteering or
community service component. Experimental group test subjects decided on their own
which five of the eight required activities they would complete. Participants experienced
these activities working together as a group ranging in size from five to fifteen girls under
the guidance of at least one trained adult leader. Groups worked on the activities at their
own pace. Adult leaders were given basic training on how to administer the program and
use its book resources, including the *Strength in Sharing* program monograph.

The control group was composed of Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts who did not take
part in *Strength in Sharing*. From this population the researcher conducted a systematic
random sample that produced 209 test subjects, or 50 percent of the sampling strata.\footnote{2}
The control group maintained its involvement in routine Girl Scout activities, which may have
included completion of badgework, or involvement in program activities and community
service projects, but did not include participation in *Strength in Sharing*.

A questionnaire was mailed to all members of the sample. Four follow-up waves were
sent to non-respondents over a ten-week period.\footnote{3,4} Additionally, 340 reminder phone
calls were conducted between the second and third mailing. Of the 284 test subjects
surveyed, 147 surveys were returned for a response rate of 52 percent\footnote{5} (see Table 1,
overall response rate). Experimental group subjects registered a 52 percent rate of return,
while control group subjects registered a 51 percent rate of return (see Table 1, response
rate by study group). Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts showed a rate of return of 22 percent
and 85 percent respectively (see Table 1, response rate by age level). Furthermore, of the
surveys that were returned, a breakdown by age level and control group is offered in Table 2. Finally, demographic characteristics of the study sample for which surveys were returned are available in Table 3.

**Survey instrument**

The Cadette and Senior Girl Scout Philanthropy Survey is a self-administered instrument composed of 61 items arranged in three different sections (see Table 10, Appendix II). Responses to each item are measured using one of two five-option Likert scales. Likert scale “A” ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, while Likert scale “B” ranged from 1 = not at all to 5 = a lot. Item 38 utilizes a dichotomous response scale.

Basic demographic information inquires into age, race, school grade, Girl Scout age-level, total membership years in Girl Scouting, and the possession of earned Girl Scout leadership awards. Approximately 50 percent of the survey items were based upon the Civic Responsibility Survey #1 (Furco, Muller & Ammon, 1997), which measures student perceptions of civic responsibility. Many of these items were adapted to meet the needs of the present study. The remaining survey items were developed by the researcher based on a review of the literature.

**Pre-test**

The researcher pre-tested the survey utilizing ten Girl Scouts who were drawn from the sampling frame but who were not involved in the study. An evaluation form asked the pre-test group to assess the survey based on length, comprehension of instructions, clarity
of questions, and reading level. Follow-up telephone calls produced feedback that resulted in a reduction of the total number of survey items as well as a rewording of items. Survey instructions were also revised for greater understanding.

Validity study

A validity panel of experts reviewed the instrument for face and content validity. Members of the panel included the executive director of a social service agency, the founder and editor of a citywide monthly newspaper for high school teenagers, two survey research company associates, the principal of a private school, and a development consultant of a national youth organization.

Feedback was obtained by telephone and through an evaluation form. Suggestions resulted in, among others, the elimination of double-barreled questions, a repositioning of items within the survey, and the inclusion of definitions for terms used in the survey instrument. Skip patterns were also reformulated, and a six-option Likert scale was shrunk to a five-option scale.

Measurement of variables and research questions

The dependent variables in this study consisted of six scales measuring attitudes believed to be related to philanthropy. Answers to individual questions were grouped to form six subscales measuring connection to the community, civic awareness and attitudes, civic action and efficacy, identification of needs, philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving, and ability to work collaboratively. The individual survey items were reviewed to ensure that expected responses moved in the same direction as the response
scale. Items that were reversed in meaning were recoded (see Table 8, Appendix II for a list of items in the six subscales).

For each respondent, the individual responses to each item comprising the subscale were summed for each subscale. Then, the sum for each subscale was divided by the number of items in the scale. This resulted in a score between 1 and 5 which represents the average of the subject's responses to the items in that subscale.

This study utilized four research questions to help determine whether involvement in Strength in Sharing (the independent variable) caused variation in certain attributes that are believed to be related to the development of philanthropic attitudes (the dependent variables). These research questions are:

**Research question 1:** Does participation lead to an increase in attitudes concerning caring, compassion, and civic-mindedness?

**Subscale 1 – connection to the community:** The first three subscales utilized questions that were adapted from the Civic Responsibility Survey. The four items from Subscale 1 probe a respondent's sense of belonging in the community, and the function participants might have in making it a better place. Is there a sense of ownership or buy-in to the goals of the community? Does the respondent receive a sense of satisfaction from giving or serving the community? Is the respondent “close to” or “distant from” what goes on in the city, town, or village she lives in?
**Subscale 2 - civic awareness and attitudes:** This subscale contains 10 items. While some citizens give government leaders and civic constituencies complete responsibility for maintaining and enhancing quality of life in their community, other citizens prefer to get involved in helping to determine these matters. What do survey respondents do as young citizens? Are they motivated to advance community causes, or do they let others do this for them? In order to make this determination, survey items have been designed to focus on the respondent's attentiveness and alertness to community challenges. Is she sensitive to community issues, and is she motivated to help address them? Does she see herself as a change agent? Does she view herself as contributing to the greater good of the community, or will others exercise important civic functions for her? Some of the items probe a respondent's understanding of local and national issues, while others attempt to assess her level of civic empowerment.

**Subscale 3 - civic action and efficacy:** Of the six items in this subscale, three have been developed to assess the respondent's level of volunteer action, and whether she considers such action a "regular occurrence." Is her volunteer commitment of a level so high that she seeks to get others involved? In contrast, two items attempt to identify whether the respondent feels she has the wherewithal to make a difference.

**Research question 2:** Does participation increase the ability to identify community needs involving women and girls?
Subscale 4 – identification of needs: This subscale contains seven researcher-designed items. Of interest is how well-informed test subjects are about local concerns that may affect them as women. Are they conscious of gender-specific issues? Do they know if community agencies are doing anything to address these issues? Does the respondent have an idea of the role that charitable organizations play in this scenario? Item 34 gives the respondent an opportunity to call upon her knowledge of specific community resources that are available to women, girls, and families.

Finally, as a measure of recognizing and acting upon need, the researcher asks whether the respondent has discovered some unique role for herself in helping to improve the well-being of people outside her immediate family.

Research question 3: Does participation positively influence philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving?

Subscale 5 – philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving: This subscale contains six researcher-designed items. Four of the six items focus on the act of giving money to charitable and worthy causes, not including religious organizations. Item 33 is an attempt to determine if the giving of money by the respondent is an act that is perhaps connected to a real or perceived material loss, or if it is an altruistically based act as defined by Bar-Tal (1976) above by asking:

If I were asked to donate money to a charity right now, I would first have to think if there is anything I would like to buy for myself, before I just
give my money away. (Do not include money you would give to a religious organization, such as a church, synagogue or mosque.)

When answering the above item, respondents are directed not to include money given to a religious organization. This was done in order to avoid the enormous influence of faith-based organizations as a socializing influence: the researcher wanted to exclude monies given as a result of tithing or almsgiving.

Two items focus on the act of serving by inquiring into the respondent’s overall perception of conducting volunteer work or becoming involved. In sum, the researcher is attempting to learn how significant the acts of giving and serving are to the respondent.

**Research question 4:** Does participation enhance the ability to work collaboratively?

**Subscale 6 - ability to work collaboratively:** This subscale contains four researcher-designed items. Three of the four items are designed to measure the extent to which involvement in the program influences the ability to work together with others, in particular with adults. Not only is this program outcome significant in light of Miller and Neese (1997), who determined that community service can result in meeting new people and how to work better in a team, but it is an indicator of important developmental assets related to philanthropic attributes.
Data analysis

In order to enable a more precise examination of program outcomes based on length of participation, the researcher subdivided the experimental group into completers, those who successfully finished all of the *Strength in Sharing* activities, and non-completers, those who stopped working on the required activities at some point during the course of the program.

The mean scores for completers, non-completes, and control group members across all six subscales were generated using a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 4).

Additionally, mean scores for completers (members of the experimental group who finished *Strength and Sharing*) and control group members across all six subscales was generated using a difference of means t-test (see Table 7).
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The findings of the study and their analysis according to the methodology explained in the previous chapter are presented here.

In general, the researcher found only the slightest of relationships between participation in *Strength in Sharing* and changes in beliefs or attitudes among participants. With respect to the guiding questions of this study, the researcher concludes that any positive association between *Strength in Sharing* and attitudes related to caring, compassion, and civic-mindedness are small at best. Furthermore, the data do not show a strong enough relationship to conclude that participation in the program leads to the development of positive attributes associated with philanthropic attitudes. Control group members consistently measured at or very close to the same levels of outcome as completers and non-completers on all subscales of the study. The results by subscale are discussed below.

Research question 1: Does participation in *Strength in Sharing* lead to an increase in attitudes concerning caring, compassion, and civic-mindedness?

Subscale 1 - Connection to the community: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .126 points (see Table 5). The mean score for completers is 4 while non-completers achieved a score of 3.84. Control group members realized a mean value of 3.81 (see Table 4).

The results show that the highest observed value in this subscale was achieved by completers, followed by non-completers, and finally control group members. This
successive ordering of outcomes appears to have a direct correlation to the length of time participants were exposed to Strength in Sharing. Completers who finished the program gained the maximum benefit from it, followed by non-completers who achieved some benefit from it before quitting. That control group members have the lowest value seems to be the logical result of their non-participation.

Influences resulting from the community service component of Strength in Sharing may have contributed to higher marks by completers. Nevertheless, the mean differences were very small.

Subscale 2 - Civic awareness and attitudes: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .073 points. Completers reached a mean score of 3.80 with non-completers achieving 3.68. The control group at 3.69 attained a median value that is an incremental .01 points higher than non-completers.

It is of some consequence to note that all scores on this subscale reach into the higher end of the 3.0 point range; a respectable level even though it may not reflect the strongest possible levels of civic awareness as measured by the 5-point upper limit of the scale. The slightly higher score by completers over control group members seems to indicate that some civic awareness can be acquired through involvement in Strength in Sharing. Yet, this does not fully explain why control group members have a slight, if insignificantly higher value than do non-completers, who should have registered a higher score even if they were only exposed to the treatment for a limited time. One reason for the discrepancy may be found in the need to complete all of the required program activities in order to achieve the full extent of benefits targeted by the program.
Subscale 3 - Civic action and efficacy: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .2 points, the highest such difference in the entire study. Completers achieved a score of 3.85 while non-completers scored 3.39 or nearly one-half a point less. The mean score for the control group is 3.55.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA test) conducted on all three study groups shows that the difference in scores for this subscale is significant at the .10 level (F = 2.6, p = .076) (see Table 4). In order to test whether this significant variation existed between the two key groups consisting of completers and control group members the researcher conducted a difference of means t-test (see Table 6) and found that with a level of .38 there was little if any significant variation resulting from involvement in the program. The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn here is that Strength in Sharing can have a somewhat positive effect (yet not significant) on levels of civic action and efficacy if participants continue the program through its completion.

What the results of significance testing do not explain is why non-completers who received at least some treatment through the program reached a score .16 points lower than members of the control group who underwent no treatment at all. Furthermore, as was the case in subscale 2, non-completers received a lower score than control group members. If non-completers are being exposed to Strength in Sharing even for only a limited time, one might intuitively conclude that variation will result in limited amounts, yet this does not appear to be the case.

Research question 2: Does participation in Strength in Sharing increase the ability to identify community needs involving women and/or girls?
Subscale 4 - Identification of community needs: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .073 points. Completers achieved a median score of 3.80, while the control group received a 3.69 median score. Non-completers produced a score of 3.52.

The difference of .11 points in the ability of completers over control group members to identify community need may be correlated to specific program requirements in Strength in Sharing. This difference, while relatively small, may have resulted from the direct opportunities that program participants have in examining real-world situations involving gender-specific community need (see Table 8, requirements 3 and 8 for Cadette Girl Scouts as well as Table 9, requirements 1, 2, 4, and 7 for Senior Girl Scouts). Completion of program requirements suggests that important gains in knowledge are achieved in the ability to identify need of girls and women.

Interestingly, the n-values for subscale 4 in Tables 6 and 7 reveal hidden variation among the three groups relative to item 34, which requires the listing of specific charitable organizations. Overall, a higher ratio of acceptable responses to the number of participants in the study group exists for completers (22 of 26) and non-completers (10 of 13) than for control group members (87 of 108). This higher number of acceptable responses suggests a higher level of knowledge, which may have been gained through participation in Strength in Sharing.

Research question 3: Does participation in the Strength in Sharing program positively influence philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving?
Subscale 5 - Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .126 points. Completers attained a median score of 3.96, while non-completers achieved a score of 3.77. The control group received a score of 3.86.

The average point difference of .126 is the second such result in the study and matches that of subscale 1 which also revealed a difference of .126 points. Several of the survey items in the present subscale investigate giving money to needy causes, and the importance of volunteering now and in the future. The relative closeness of the scores in this subscale suggests the presence of a baseline understanding or commonly held set of beliefs and attitudes among respondents with regard to giving and serving. This closeness of scores is even more apparent between completers and control group members who exhibit a mere .10 point difference on this subscale: the lowest such difference between these two groups in all of the six subscales of the study (see Table 7).

Research question 4: Does participation in the Strength in Sharing program enhance the ability to work collaboratively?

Subscale 6 - Ability to work collaboratively: A comparison of results among all three study groups shows an average difference of .073 points. Completers achieved a mean score of 4.00 while non-completers reached 4.06. The control group received a score of 4.11 points.

Interestingly, the average point difference of .073 in the present subscale replicates the average difference of .073 points in subscales 1 and 4. This exact mirroring of scores
across all three study groups again suggests the existence of commonly held beliefs and attitudes. More interestingly still is the existence of a similar response pattern between completers and control group members as shown in Table 7. Here, while the average difference increases slightly to .11 points, an exact mirroring of scores in subscales 1, 4 and 6 again takes place.

In marked contrast to subscale 1 where completers, non-completers and control group members were the expected outcome pattern, the results of the present subscale show a complete reversal of this ordering. Here, the “ability to work collaboratively” revealed that control group members turned in the highest average score, followed by non-completers then completers.

The results in this subscale mark the first “negative” relationship between completers and the control group, i.e., control group members outscored completers. This is surprising because control group members did not participate in the program, yet were found to have results superior to those of completers, who did finish it. More surprising still is the finding that non-completers also scored higher than completers, if only by the slim margin of .11 points. Based on the greater opportunities completers should have had to collaborate with adults in the community and work with peers in a team setting, this group should have attained higher scores.

Summary of analysis

Analysis shows that completers scored above non-completers and control group members in five of the six subscales, albeit by the slimmest of margins. In addition, control group members scored above non-completers in five of those same subscales.
These two findings suggest a slightly positive association in the development of philanthropic attitudes and beliefs for participants if they complete all program activities required by *Strength in Sharing*, and a slightly negative association if participants complete only some of them. When seen against the 1-5 point measurement scale used in the study, the low amount of significant variation resulting from program participation becomes clear. Despite involvement in *Strength in Sharing* over a five-month period, an average difference of only .087 points separate all three groups. These results demonstrate a virtually insignificant relationship between participation in the program and any attitudinal or belief changes among members of the three groups.

An analysis of the two key groups in the study further highlights the absence of significant variation. As Table 7 shows, the average difference between completers and control group members for all six subscales is just over one-tenth of one point or .116 points. Completers scored only minimally higher than the control group in five of the six subscales, although in one case they even reached a .30 point difference. In the remaining subscale, control group members achieved a higher score by .11 points. Differences of this magnitude do not provide sufficient empirical evidence to assert that exposure to *Strength in Sharing* markedly develops or enhances attributes related to philanthropic behavior.

The results of the ANOVA test conducted on all three groups in subscale 3 suggest significance at the .10 level (F=2.62, p=.076). However, this level of significance does not hold for the relationship between the study's two key groups as seen by the t-test results in Table 6.
Finally, while significant variation resulting from program participation cannot be demonstrated in this study, and point differences between the key study groups remain only slight, it is of importance to note that a clear tendency toward consistently higher scores by completers over control group members is noticeably indicated. As seen in Table 7, completers attained an average of 3.90 points over the six subscales while control group members reached an average of 3.78 points. This condition is very promising and offers some evidence to conclude that exposure to the *Strength in Sharing* program can lead to consistently measurable positive changes when seen against the results of a comparison group that was not exposed to the program.
DISCUSSION

The context of community service

The small gains made by completers in Subscale 2 (civic awareness and attitudes) and in Subscale 3 (civic action and efficacy) may have been the result of direct community interaction as required by the program (see Cadette requirements 1, 2, and 8 in Table 8 as well as Senior requirements 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 in Table 9). Some of the gains can possibly be correlated to findings from Miller and Neese (1997), who described above how community service improved participants' understanding of the community and how to work better in a team. Miller and Carver's (1977) finding that service learning can produce effective change agents may also have had some influence upon the higher scores by completers.

The context of modeling

Bandura (1977) and others have shown how environmental factors have an effect on behavior, while Falco et al (1998) suggests that modeling can be used as a way to promote philanthropy in K-8 schools. Against this background, the researcher suggests that perhaps the guidance provided by adult facilitators in tandem with Strength in Sharing's structured activities may have combined to produce the behavioral and attitudinal modeling mechanisms that social learning theorists claim are of importance in helping young people acquire prosocial behavior. Completers, who attained the highest scores on nearly every subscale, may have been influenced by this modeling effect.
The context of socializing influences

The responses to items 7, 27, and 33 of Subscale 5 (philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving), may have been influenced less by Strength in Sharing or the Girl Scout program, and more through the impact of the highly publicized, nationwide rescue, relief, and support activities following the September 11 tragedy. The researcher makes this observation based on the perceived high level of news coverage by the print and electronic media on the resulting humanitarian and philanthropic efforts. In addition, government and non-profit agencies conducted their good works in visible ways, while advertisers celebrated their involvement amidst much publicity. The researcher suggests that the philanthropic attitudes and behavior of members of all study group groups underwent changes as a result of post-September prosocial activity reported by the mass media. These reshaped opinions may have given rise to the lowest level of difference (.10) between the experimental group and the control group as measured by Subscale 5. Bentley and Nissan (1996) describe the mass media as one of the six socializing influences responsible for the development of giving and serving. (Note: The researcher mailed the Cadette and Senior Girl Scout Philanthropy Survey eight weeks after the September 11 tragedy.)

The context of Girl Scouting

Because participants of this study are all registered Girl Scouts, the scores in each of the six subscales must be seen against the background of their core learning experiences within the Girl Scout program. Girl Scout activities target outcomes for its participants that are in many respects parallel to those of Strength in Sharing. For example, guiding
many of the program activities are ideals related to giving and service as expressed in the
Girl Scout Promise and Law:

Girl Scout Promise: "On my honor, I will try:/To serve God and my country/To help people at all times/And to live by the Girl Scout Law."

Girl Scout Law: "I will do my best to be:/honest and fair/friendly and helpful/considerate and caring/courageous and strong, and/responsible for what I say and do/and to/respect myself and others/respect authority/use resources wisely/make the world a better place, and/be a sister to every Girl Scout."

Because of similarities between *Strength in Sharing* and the underlying philosophy of Girl Scout program, completers, non-completers, and control group members may have experienced a ceiling effect. This may help explain the absence of a large amount of variation in the scores across all six subscales.
CONCLUSION

Limitations

This study surveyed 147 Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts with respect to the presence of certain attributes. Using the methodology explained earlier, the results show no significantly measurable differences in the areas that were examined. However, before conclusions are drawn, it is important to point out some of the limitations to this study.

First, *Strength in Sharing* may have given rise to larger outcomes than this study suggests, however they may have been short lived. Because the study data was gathered six months after the completion of the program, any short-term effects that *Strength in Sharing* could have produced would not have been readily identifiable. Future studies should strive to begin data collection immediately after the conclusion of the program in order capture time sensitive, short-term outcomes.

Second, gains in philanthropic attitudes resulting from participation in *Strength in Sharing* may have been difficult to achieve due to a ceiling effect. Test subjects may already have reached their highest level of philanthropic beliefs and values through participation in routine Girl Scout activities: a situation that may have muted additional increases resulting from involvement in *Strength in Sharing* activities. As a result, marked changes may not have been possible. In order to test for the impact of the ceiling effect, the researcher recommends future studies incorporate pre- and post-tests. Such tests would also help identify the causal mechanism related to these increases.

Third, randomization was not used when assignments were made to the test groups. In the present study, members were automatically assigned to the experimental group as a result of their volunteer participation in the *Strength in Sharing* program. By
volunteering for the program, girls may already have shown a preference for the type of activities offered through *Strength in Sharing*, and were therefore motivated to take part. As a result, these participants may have exhibited bias in favor of the program. Future studies should incorporate random assignment in order to avoid bias.

Fourth, the various sizes of the study groups may have prevented meaningful and reliable comparisons. As Table 2 shows, the study groups varied widely in the number of subjects, e.g., completers consisted of 26 subjects, non-completers of 13 subjects, and the control group of 108 subjects. As a result, the data arising from these low numbers may not be truly representative of the wider population, e.g., the significance of the ANOVA test in Subscale 3 may be in question.

Fifth, this study examined only the pilot version of *Strength in Sharing*. Programs at this early stage of development may not have achieved their full capacity to provide a comprehensive program experience for participants. For this reason, certain outcomes may not currently be within reach. As the program matures, administrators at Frontier Council will undoubtedly make changes and improvements in order to increase the impact of intended outcomes. A future study should take place after the program "matures."

Sixth, while the items and subscales were inspected for face and content validity, they were not tested for construct validity. This researcher recognizes that the subscales may not be measuring what they are purported to be measuring. Furthermore, the adaptation of the Civic Responsibility Survey #1 to the current study could have corrupted any construct validity that its original authors may have developed.
Finally, the researcher suggests conducting follow-up interviews with non-completers. This is vital to an overall understanding of the study results, especially since scores by this group were inconsistent and at times contrary to what was expected.

Implications

Research conducted by Bentley and Nissan (1996) showed that youth service organizations can and do provide young people with a framework for learning prosocial activities. Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1996a, 1996b) point to the likelihood of caring and sharing as lifetime habits when children are exposed to them at an early age. These findings have great relevance for *Strength in Sharing* as a means of positively influencing the giving and serving behavior of new generations of girls and young women, and in building women who commit to lifelong philanthropy. Despite the preliminary findings of this study, the program’s objectives and its framework appear to be in line with current research on the subject.

In its time, the Clinton White House spoke of the importance of inculcating the tradition of sharing and giving in younger generations (The White House, 1999). The creation and implementation of *Strength in Sharing* by Girl Scouts of the USA across the United States suggests that the youth organization shares this viewpoint. Yet, more importantly, the collective effort and commitment of innumerable individuals, agencies, foundations, and groups across the country give rise to the belief that if the American philanthropic tradition is in danger, much will be undertaken to counteract sustained attenuation.
ENDNOTES

1 *Strength in Sharing* was created for all five age levels of Girl Scouting. Only the Cadette and Senior age levels were selected for the present study. The five age levels are: Daisy Girl Scout (kindergarten-grade 1 or 5-6 years old), Brownie Girl Scout (grade 1-3 or 6-8 years old), Junior Girl Scout (grade 3-6 or 8-11 years old), Cadette Girl Scout (grade 6-9 or 11-14 years old), and Senior Girl Scout (grade 9-12 or 14-17 years old).

2 Prior to random sampling, the second strata was purged of ineligible members using the following three parameters: 1) Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts who participated in *Strength in Sharing*, 2) Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts who were Independent Girl Members, i.e., not affiliated with a Girl Scout troop, and 2) Cadette and Senior Girl Scouts who attended special after-school-only programs.

3 Survey respondents had the opportunity of earning a “communications patch” if they returned their completed survey on time. The researcher hoped this incentive would boost the response rate.

4 Sixteen survey instruments that were returned to the researcher due to incorrect address information were not replaced with alternates.

5 While the study was conducted during the 2001-2002 membership year, the instrument was mailed according to address information from the 2000-2001 membership year.
year. As much as 15 percent of the study population may have transitioned from the Girl Scout program during this time. This may have affected the response rate.

6Handwritten responses to item 34 were recoded into a scale ranging from 1-5 depending on the number and the correctness of the organizations that were listed.

7The n-value in subscale 4 may appear low due to the influence of item 34, which asks respondents to list charitable organizations that help women, girls and/or families. These handwritten fill-in responses required the listing of specific organizations, and not just the recording of charitable activities. As an example, helping battered women was not an acceptable answer whereas Safe Nest Shelter for Women was an acceptable answer. Helping women with cancer was not an acceptable answer, yet the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation was an acceptable answer.
Table 1

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall response rate</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response rate by study group</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response rate by age level</th>
<th>Cadette</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All percentages were rounded.
Table 2

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown by study group and age level for returned surveys</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completers</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Girl Scouts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadette Girl Scouts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-completers</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Girl Scouts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadette Girl Scouts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Girl Scouts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadette Girl Scouts</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages were rounded.

*The experimental group is composed of completers (those who finished Strength in Sharing) and non-completers (those who did not finish Strength in Sharing).
Table 3

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-completers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Girl Scouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Las Vegas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Am</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Am/Alas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-ethnic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The experimental group is composed of completers (those who finished *Strength in Sharing*) and non-completers (those who did not finish *Strength in Sharing*).
Table 4

MEAN SCORES FOR ALL STUDY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Completers</th>
<th>Non-completers</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 1 Connection to the community</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2 Civic awareness and attitudes</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3 Civic action and efficacy</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.076*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=25)</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4 Identification of needs</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 5 Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 6 Ability to work collaboratively</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=24)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.10 significant

Note: The experimental group is composed of completers (those who finished Strength in Sharing) and non-completers (those who did not finish Strength in Sharing).

The above mean values were generated for the completers, non-completers, and the control group using an ANOVA test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Non-completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Avg difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the community</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic awareness and attitudes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic action and efficacy</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic action and efficacy</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of needs</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 5</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work collaboratively</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The experimental group is composed of completers (those who finished Strength in Sharing) and non-completers (those who did not finish Strength in Sharing).
Table 6

MEAN SCORES FOR COMPLETERS AND THE CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the community</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic awareness and attitudes</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic action and efficacy</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=25)</td>
<td>(n=104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of needs</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td>(n=87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work collaboratively</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=24)</td>
<td>(n=105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above mean values were generated for completers and the control group using a difference of means t-test.

*Completers (those who finished Strength in sharing) are part of the experimental group.
Table 7

POINT DIFFERENCES FOR COMPLETERS AND THE CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the community</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic awareness and attitudes</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic action and efficacy</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 4</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of needs</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 5</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 6</th>
<th>Completers*</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work collaboratively</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg score: 3.901  Avg score: 3.785  Avg point diff: .116

*Completers (those who finished *Strength in Sharing*) are part of the experimental group.
Table 8

RESEARCH QUESTIONS, SURVEY ITEMS, AND SUBSCALES

Note: The number to the left refers back to the item number on the instrument.

Research question one: Does participation lead to an increase in attitudes concerning caring, compassion and civic-mindedness?

Subscale #1: Connection to the community
(Q9) It makes me feel good to contribute time and/or money to my community.
(Q13) I am not very involved in helping my community to be a better place.
(Q15) I feel personally attached or connected to the community (city, town or village) in which I currently live.
(Q25) It is partly my responsibility to help improve the community I live in.

Subscale #2: Civic awareness and attitudes
(Q10) I am aware of the important needs in my community.
(Q14) I feel like I am personally responsible for helping other people.
(Q16) It is easy for me to put aside my own interests in favor of a greater good.
(Q18) Even if I become involved in community issues, I am only one person and I cannot make a big difference.
(Q19) I often think about how national and/or local issues affect my community.
(Q22) Being concerned about national and/or local issues is great for other people, but not really for me.
(Q23) Most issues or problems in my community are already being handled well and I can’t think of a way to handle them better.
(Q24) I have noticed how people in my community are affected by community issues or problems.
(Q31) I am aware of what must be done in order to make my community a better place to live.
(Q32) I really never hear about volunteer opportunities that I can get involved in.

Subscale #3: Civic action and efficacy
(Q5) I feel I have the power to make a difference in my community (Community means the city, town or village that you live in).
(Q12) Providing volunteer service to local charities is something I do on a regular basis (Do not include religious organizations, such as a church, synagogue or mosque).
(Q17) I try to encourage others to participate in community service.
(Q20) Young people like myself should feel obligated to make the community a better place to live.
(Q21) I am involved in activities right now that are designed to make things better in my neighborhood or in my community.
(Q28) I need special skills or talent that I just don’t possess right now in order to make a difference in my community.
Research question two: Does participation in the Strength in Sharing program increase the ability to identify community needs involving women and/or girls?

**Subscale #4: Identification of needs**

(Q6) Women and/or girls in my community have certain needs that charities can help with.

(Q30) In my own unique way I do things to help improve the well-being of others (Think of people not in your family or related to you).

(Q34) Write down as many non-profit/charitable organizations as you can that provide services to women and/or girls (list up to five).

(Q35a) Does Girl Scouting help you to learn about charities in your community?

(Q35b) Does Girl Scouting help you to understand how charities help people?

(Q35c) Does Girl Scouting help you to increase your awareness of women's and/or girl's issues?

(Q35h) Does Girl Scouting help you to learn about social services available to women and/or girls in your community?

Research question three: Does participation in the Strength in Sharing program positively influence philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving?

**Subscale #5: Philanthropic attitudes of giving and serving**

(Q7) Donating my volunteer time to improve my community is important to me.

(Q27) It is important for me to give money to causes I believe in.

(Q33) If I were asked to donate money to a charity right now, I would first have to think if there is anything I would like to buy for myself, before I just give my money away. (Do not include money you would give to a religious organization, such as a church, synagogue or mosque.)

(Q35e) Does Girl Scouting help you to consider new attitudes about giving money to charity?

(Q35i) Does Girl Scouting help you to learn about some new ways to get involved in your community?

(Q35f) Does Girl Scouting help you to increase the likelihood that you will volunteer your time for a charity in the future?

Research question four: Does engaging in the activities required by the Strength in Sharing program enhance the ability to work collaboratively?

**Subscale #6: Ability to work collaboratively**

(Q29) If everyone would just work together, many of my community's problems could be solved.

(Q35d) Does Girl Scouting help you to interact with important people outside your troop?

(Q35g) Does Girl Scouting help you to learn how to work together with adults outside your troop?

(Q35j) Does Girl Scouting help you to recognize that there are many ways of doing something when working with others?
Table 9

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR CADETTE GIRL SCOUT TROOPS

Note: For the “Strength in Sharing” pilot program, Cadette Girl Scout troops were required to complete activities two, four, and eight plus any two other selections of their choice.

Objective: To show Cadette Girl Scouts that they can make a difference in their community by learning about and addressing philanthropic issues and to help identify and serve causes involving women and girls.

1. Meet with a Girl Scout volunteer for staff member who is responsible for fund-raising in your council. Ask her questions about her job or position, including how fund-raising is important to Girl Scouting. Discuss with a staff member or volunteer how you can assist with a council fund-raising project by giving volunteer service time.

2. Find out how a local foundation (private, corporate, community, or public) receives money, and what kinds of activities and projects they fund. What is the typical size or range of actual gifts the foundations make? What are the foundation’s priorities? Are women fairly represented on each board? What amount of funding is directed toward women’s and girl’s causes?

3. Find out about a local charitable organization. How much of the money for the organization comes from donations? What percentage of their budget is itemized for administrative costs? For services to clients/customers? How do donations to this organization support specific services for women, girls, and/or families, for example, a maternal health or nutrition program? What does the gender, race, age, and skills mix of the board say about the organization? Many large foundations budget as little as 5 percent towards “women’s issues.” Why do you think this is true?

4. Find out about careers in philanthropy and what educational background and training it would take to pursue this career field. Check the Web under “giving and volunteering” or “philanthropy.” Check “careers in the non-profit sector” or www.msu.edu/~kl2phil/careers.html.

5. Follow the news in the business section of your daily newspaper or in the journals listed in the resources section. Who are the women giving philanthropically?

6. Go to the library or get on the Internet to research the statistics in your area on poverty, single-parent families, graduation rates from high school, teen pregnancy statistics, environmental issues, etc. What is one of the biggest issues your community has to address? Are other groups working to alleviate this issue? How can you work together? Contact the other groups and set up a plan to cooperate.

7. Visit a younger Girl Scout group. Read to them or tell them about Juliette Gordon Low, Girl Scouting’s founder. Her story is in each handbook. Share how she made a difference. Act out as troy about how Juliette Low collected money to start Girl Scouting. How did she inspire volunteers to help? Act out a final scent,
“If Juliette Low were alive today,” in which Juliette Low is meeting a challenge of today.

8. Decide on a council or community project that benefits the needs of women and girls. You may develop a budget that illustrates the cost and method for earning money to help support the project. (Check Safety-Wise for the proper procedure and guidelines). If the council has money available for special troop, group, or other projects, write a letter of proposal to the council for funds to complete the project. The letter can be short, stating the need of your plan of action.

This information has been reprinted from the “Strength in Sharing: Philanthropy in Girl Scouting” monograph booklet (Girl Scouts of the USA, 2000).
Note: For the “Strength in Sharing” pilot program, Senior Girl Scout troops were required to complete activities one, two, four, and seven plus one other selection of their choice.

Objective: To foster a habit of lifelong giving to community philanthropic causes that support the needs of women and girls.

1. Gather a list of the nonprofit organizations and foundations in your community that provide services for girls and women. Review copies of their annual report to assist you in learning about the foundation. Look to see how many women serve on the board or in high positions.

2. Interview someone who works with planned giving, annual giving, philanthropic gifts, fund development or related topics.
   Prepare a list of interview questions such as:
   - How do you decide if an organization is a good one to give to?
   - How do you know how an organization spends its money?
   - How much money comes to the organization from donations?
   - What percentage of the organization’s budget is itemized for 1) administrative costs and 2) cost of services to clients/customers?
   - How do donations to this organization support services for women, girls, and/or families: for example, a program to prepare women to reenter the workforce?
   - A place to find out about funding opportunities for women is the Women’s Funding Network (www.wfnet.org) located in St. Paul, Minn. The Women’s Funding Network can inform you about programs in your state that fund young women’s initiatives, such as “Young Women for Change.”

3. Check with your girl scout council, United Way, or school counselor for organizations with youth advisory committees, and how you can become a member of one. As a member, volunteer to work on public speaking, mentoring, and philanthropic projects.

4. Decide on a community need that could be addressed by you or your group. Decide what you will do and what resources you will need to address this need. Write a plan or a grand to raise money for this cause.

5. Start or strengthen a book club. Read and discuss books of biography, history, fiction, and nonfiction that deal with philanthropic topics. Start with some of the books listed at the end of this booklet. You might also watch a popular video or movie on this topic.

6. Find out how you can assist with a councilwide Girl Scout fund-raising campaign in coordination with a council staff representative. Call your local council to find out if there is a campaign or an even that your group can join.

7. Pick a local organization that serves women and girls. Volunteer for at least six hours with that organization, learning about their services, how they are funded and what their needs are. Select a specific program that you or your group will
further support through a philanthropic act. Philanthropy is defined as "using resources to promote social change," not just addressing an immediate need. However, you may want to address an immediate need as part of a long-range project.

8. Plan a "Making a Difference in the Life of a Girl" day or night event and invite public and nonprofit organizations that address the needs of girls and women. These can include United Way, Boys and Girls Clubs, Kappa Delta sorority chapters, Rotary, the Elks, Soroptimists, Zonta, and/or other service organizations. After they speak about philanthropic programs that benefit women and girls, invite audience questions.

This information has been reprinted from the "Strength in Sharing: Philanthropy in Girl Scouting" monograph booklet (Girl Scouts of the USA, 2000).
Table 11

Cadette and Senior Girl Scout Philanthropy Survey
Approximate time required to complete: 20 minutes

Please return this survey by November 26, 2001

For this survey we are trying to learn something about the way you think about certain things. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Rely on your current feelings when you answer the questions, and be as honest as possible. Remember, your responses cannot be traced back to you—they are completely confidential. Simply follow the directions for each section, and please complete the survey by yourself. When you are finished, just mail the completed survey along with the Informed Consent Form for Parents/Guardians and the Youth Assent Form in the pre-stamped envelope we have provided. Questions? Just contact Juergen Barbusca at 385-3677 ext. 226.

SECTION A: Section A of this survey will ask you some general questions about yourself.

1: How old are you right now?

Age: ___________

2: What grade are you in right now?

Grade: ___________

3: Including this year, about how many years have you been a Girl Scout?

Number of years in Girl Scouting: ___________

4: What age level of Girl Scouting are you in right now? (Check one)

☐ Cadette Girl Scout (If you answered “Cadette” please go to Question 4a)
☐ Senior Girl Scout (If you answered “Senior” please go to Question 4b)

4a: If you are a Cadette Girl Scout, please check the box with the best response for the question below then go to Section B.

| Have you earned your Silver Award? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ☐ I'm earning it right now |

4b: If you are a Senior Girl Scout, please check the box with the best response for each question below then go to Section B.

| Have you earned your Silver Award? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ☐ I'm earning it right now |
| Have you earned your Gold Award? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ☐ I'm earning it right now |
**SECTION B:** In Section B please indicate how strongly you disagree or agree with each statement by circling the correct numbered answer on a scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree, and 5 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5: I feel I have the power to make a difference in my community. (Community means the city, town or village that you live in.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Women and/or girls in my community have certain needs that charities can help with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Donating my volunteer time to improve my community is important to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Only wealthy people usually contribute money to charitable organizations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: It makes me feel good to contribute time and/or money to my community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: I am aware of the important needs in my community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Charities don't need my money or time because they get enough support from the government.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Providing volunteer service to local charities is something I do on a regular basis. (Do not include money you would give to a religious organization such as a church, synagogue or mosque.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: I am not very involved in helping my community to be a better place.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: I feel like I am personally responsible for helping other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: I feel personally attached or connected to the community (city, town or village) in which I currently live.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: It is easy for me to put aside my own interests in favor of a greater good.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: I try to encourage others to participate in community service.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Even if I become involved in community issues, I am only one person and I cannot make a big difference.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: I often think about how national and/or local issues affect my community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Young people like myself should feel obligated to make the community a better place to live.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: I am involved in activities right now that are designed to make things better in my neighborhood or in my community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Being concerned about national and/or local issues is great for other people, but not really for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Most issues or problems in my community are already being handled well and I can't think of a way to handle them any better.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24: I have personally noticed how people in my community are affected by community issues or problems.  
25: It is partly my responsibility to help improve the community I live in.  
26: At charitable organizations, the budget for administrative costs usually runs higher than the budget for program costs.  
27: It is important for me to give money to causes I believe in.  
28: I need special skills or talent that I just don't possess right now in order to make a difference in my community.  
29: I believe that if everyone works together, many of my community's problems can be solved.  
30: In my own unique way I do things to help improve the well-being of others. (Think of people who are not in your family or related to you.)  
31: I am aware of what must to be done in order to make my community a better place to live.  
32: I never hear about volunteer opportunities that I can get involved in.  
33: If I were asked to donate money to a charity right now, I would first have to think if there is anything I would like to buy for myself, before I just give my money away. (Do not include money you would give to a religious organization such as a church, synagogue or mosque.)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECTION C:** In Section C please follow the directions given for each question.

34: Think about charitable or non-profit organizations in your community that help women, girls and/or families. How many can you name? Write down as many of these as you can (up to five) in the space below. If you can only think of part of the name, that's OK—you can include that too. *(Remember, please answer this question on your own)*

1)  
2)  
3)  
4)  
5)  

35: Have your involvement and experience in Girl Scouting changed your understanding of certain subjects? Please indicate to what extent your understanding or knowledge may have changed by circling the correct numbered answer on a scale of 1-5 where 1 = did not change at all, and 5 = changed a lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Girl Scouting help you to...</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) learn about charities in your community?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) understand how charities help people?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36: Did you take part in a Girl Scout activity called “Strength in Sharing: Philanthropy in Girl Scouting” between January and May 2001? (Mark the correct box)

☐ Yes (If you answered “yes” please go to Question 37)
☐ No (If you answered “no” please go to Question 39)

37: If you took part in the Strength in Sharing program, do you remember completing all the requirements and earning a patch, or did you stop working on the requirements at some point before completing them?

☐ My troop and I completed the requirements and earned the patch. (Please go to Question 38)
☐ My troop and I stopped working on the requirements and did not earn the patch. (Please go to Question 38)

38: What are some of the reasons why you took part in “Strength in Sharing?” (Please mark all the items that apply)

☐ My Girl Scout leader talked my troop into doing it.
☐ My Girl Scout troop voted to do it.
☐ I wanted to help others in my community.
☐ I thought it would be fun.
☐ I thought I would learn something new.
☐ Other Girl Scouts I knew were doing it.
☐ My parents wanted me to do it.
☐ Other reason (Write in if not included above):

39: Are you (Please check all those that apply):

☐ African-American (black)
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
☐ Caucasian (white)
☐ Latina
☐ Native American/Alaskan Native
☐ Multi-ethnic
☐ Other

Congratulations! You’ve reached the end! Please mail the completed survey right away along with the Informed Consent Form for Parents/Guardians and the Youth Assent Form in the pre-stamped envelope. We’ll send you your “communications patch” right away. Thanks for taking part in the survey!

This survey is being conducted by Juergen Barbacsa in conjunction with “Cross-Sectional Study of Strength in Sharing: Philanthropy in Girl Scouting.” 11/2001

Some questions in this survey may have a Copyright ©1998 from the University of California, Berkeley. Some questions have been used and/or adapted with permission from Andrew Furco, Parisa Muller, and Mary Sue Ammon.
REFERENCES


Levin, Gary. (September 24, 2001). Tribute telethon pulls in $100M. *USA Today*.


Springfield, Mass: Merriam Webster.


