



Center for Social Development

GEORGE WARREN BROWN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Measuring Volunteer Outcomes

Development of the International Volunteer Impacts Survey

Benjamin J. Lough
Center for Social Development
George Warren Brown School of Social Work

Amanda Moore McBride
Center for Social Development
George Warren Brown School of Social Work

Margaret S. Sherraden
University of Missouri-St. Louis
Center for Social Development,

2009

CSD Working Papers
No. 09-31

Campus Box 1196 One Brookings Drive St. Louis, MO 63130-9906 • (314) 935.7433 • csd.wustl.edu



Washington University in St. Louis

Measuring Volunteer Outcomes: Development of the International Volunteer Impacts Survey

Current research on international volunteering and service is largely descriptive but program administrators and policymakers seek information about outcomes. This article reports on a 90-item survey administered to 983 respondents. Using factor analysis procedures, we assess factor structure and reliability across a range of outcomes in an International Volunteer Impacts Survey (IVIS) instrument designed to measure IVS volunteer outcomes. Resulting outcome categories include international contacts, open-mindedness, international understanding, intercultural relations, global identity, social skills, life plans, civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, and financial contributions. In this article, we discuss research design, survey administration, and further development of the IVIS.¹

Key words: international volunteering, service, measurement, survey, impacts

Many international organizations and groups rely on international volunteers to increase capacity for service delivery and administration (Randel, German, Cordiero, & Baker, 2005; UNV, 2002). Due to a proliferation of international volunteer service (IVS) in recent years, IVS programs may be the most prevalent form of civic service today (McBride, Benítez, & Sherraden, 2003). Despite the prevalence, IVS impacts are not well understood. This lack of knowledge about the field overall is compounded by the expansion of diverse program models that send volunteers overseas (Allum, 2007; Caprara, Quigley, & Rieffel, 2009). To the extent that models differ in design, they also likely differ in outcomes. In order to create successful policy, promote effective practices, and enhance accountability, research is needed to investigate how outcomes vary across programs. This article reports on the results of the development and implementation of a survey tool that may help the IVS field assess differential effects across a range of program models and possible outcomes.

There is a substantial amount of descriptive information about the various models and intended outcomes of IVS (Jones, 2004; Machin, 2008; Powell & Bratović, 2006; Sherraden, Lough, & McBride, 2008). However, a majority of research is based on case and cross-sectional studies, which do not permit researchers to make causal inferences about the impact of IVS (Commission of the European Communities, 2004; Hodgkinson, 2004; Perry & Imperial, 2001; Powell & Bratović, 2006). In addition, nearly all of these studies cite positive effects on volunteers but rarely assess potential negative effects on volunteers or host organizations and communities (Sherraden, et al., 2008). Although scholars have developed a number of volunteer measurement toolkits in recent years that inform participatory appraisals and program evaluation (Daniel, French, & King, 2006; Dingle, Sokolowski, Saxon-Harrold, Smith, & Leigh, 2001; IVR, 2004), standardized surveys that measure the full range of possible IVS volunteer outcomes are unavailable.

In order to build a comparative evidence base, standardized surveys are needed that can be administered across IVS programs and contexts (Daniel, et al., 2006; Dingle, et al., 2001; IVR, 2004).

¹ The authors gratefully acknowledge the Ford Foundation for providing support for this research.

Standardized measures can unify future studies on IVS by specifying valid and reliable indicators (Powell & Bratović, 2006). To permit claims about impacts, standardized measures must be administered in time-series, group-based designs across programs and contexts. Using these measures and designs, the field can develop evidence about effective program attributes.

This study is part of a larger research study conducted by researchers affiliated with the Center for Social Development at Washington University's Brown School of Social Work. This study incorporates multiple programs that differ across key characteristics, e.g., organization type, internationality, directionality, length of service, and service activities. The study then uses a comparative design across programs, so that potential differences in outcomes can be compared. The design is longitudinal and quasi-experimental.

To assess outcomes on the volunteers, we developed a survey called the International Volunteering Impacts Survey (IVIS) that encapsulated a range of possible outcomes. We begin by briefly discussing outcomes expected from IVS. We then report on the results of factor analysis performed on the responses from a sample of 1,769 IVS volunteer and non-volunteer survey respondents from the two programs. We also report on the reliability of identified subscales. Finally, we discuss overall validity of the findings and implications of using the IVIS to study outcomes of international volunteering on volunteers.

Background

The International Volunteering Impacts Survey (IVIS) is based on a review of research that assesses effects of IVS on volunteers. In an effort to build survey items around the lived experiences of volunteers, Sherraden, Lough, and McBride (2008) completed a comprehensive review of existing research on IVS. The goal of grounding survey items in research of reported IVS outcomes is to ensure high content validity and to increase the overall practical utility of the survey results. In total, the authors reviewed more than 65 empirical studies addressing IVS effects on volunteers, organizations, and communities. Outcomes from previous studies on volunteers frequently coalesced around five main categories including skills and abilities, life plans, civic engagement, international contacts, and intercultural competence.

Previous studies identify a wide range of *skills and abilities* that volunteers gain from their experiences. These skills often vary across studies, and depend on volunteer activities and aims of sending and host organizations. Because of the variety of skills listed in these studies, we included in the pilot survey only those most frequently cited, including interpersonal cooperation, self-efficacy, self-reliance, leadership, time management, empathy, and language abilities (Brook, Missingham, Hocking, & Fifer, 2007; Cook & Jackson, 2006; Jones, 2005; Thomas, 2001).

Studies on IVS often report that intercultural volunteer experiences are “transformational,” leading to significant educational, occupational, and life changes (Cooney, 1983; Hudson, 1996; Jones, 2005; Kelly & Case, 2007). These changes in *life plans* often include a commitment to language learning and a movement towards education or occupations focused on international or social and economic development issues.

Another broad outcome is *civic engagement* or “...the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation” to promote “the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political

processes” (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi). This construct is broad. It includes a range of behaviors from continued volunteering to voting patterns. The pilot embraced the broad construct and included a variety of outcomes related to media attentiveness, volunteerism, community participation, philanthropy, political involvement, and advocacy work (Jennings & Zeitner, 2003; Putnam, 2000; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995).

Volunteers frequently report that their experiences also increase their *international social contacts*. In recent literature, social contacts and networks are increasingly referred to as social capital (Burt, 2000). However, the technical definition of social capital refers specifically to connections that help coordinate action to generate economic capital (DeFilippis, 2001). Because social ties gained through IVS are wider than their economic utility (McGehee & Santos, 2005), we categorize these outcomes more generally under the concept of social contacts. This concept includes the utilization of personal and organizational ties or connections with those in other countries.

Past studies claim IVS affects cross-cultural competence, intercultural effectiveness, intercultural competence, intercultural understanding, or multicultural competence (Alred, Byram, & Fleming, 2003). Of all of these variations, *intercultural competence* has perhaps received the greatest attention and scholarship and thus, is our term of choice (CILT, 2004; Deardorff, 2004; Fantini, 2007; Hammer, 2005; Zhao, 2002). Intercultural competence refers to “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2008, p. 33). More precisely, this consists of knowledge of international affairs, intercultural practices, and self-awareness of one’s own cultural identity; skills such as the ability to listen and relate to others; and attitudes such as open-mindedness, curiosity, and a respect towards different cultures and practices.

Methods

This section reports on the data source and research design used in this study. It details the three main phases of the project including: (1) developing the survey, (2) piloting the survey, and (3) refining and validating the survey.

Data source

To advance knowledge about the impacts of international volunteering and service, the IVIS was administered using a quasi-experimental design. Following human subjects approval by the university’s institutional review board, we electronically surveyed three main groups including (1) prospective IVS volunteers (pre-test); (2) comparison non-volunteers who completed, or nearly completed, the volunteer application but did not serve; and (3) IVS volunteer alumni.

Prospective IVS volunteers are volunteers age 18 and older who enrolled to volunteer in the coming two months, while alumni are those who volunteered in the years 2002 or 2006. The non-volunteer comparison sampling frame included those who registered with one of the programs but canceled prior to participation. All respondents were randomly selected. Post-test results were not available for this analysis due to the time lag required for volunteers to return. (This study is currently in process, and will be completed in 2010.)

All respondents are from two different volunteer programs based in the United States; one short-term non-professional program ($\mu = 3.8$ weeks) and one long-term professional service program ($\mu = 46.2$ weeks). The short-term program has facilitated placements of over 15,000 multinational participants in ten countries since 1997. Volunteers typically serve in local social service agencies and provide direct care to individuals in childcare centers, homes for the elderly, schools, health clinics, centers for people with disabilities, or other community organizations. The majority of volunteers come from the United States, although some come from other English-speaking countries including the UK, Canada, and Australia. While the age range of participants is wide, the majority of volunteers are age 25 or younger. Volunteers are mostly female (79%), and more than 40% are students. Volunteers typically live in urban settings and board together with other volunteers. Short-term volunteers cancel primarily due to family and financial reasons.

The long-term program has placed thousands of volunteers in 16 countries. It provides volunteer opportunities through two placement programs. “Year programs” are 10 to 12 months in length, while “summer programs” are about two months in length. Seventy percent of the volunteers serve in the year-long programs, most are in their mid-twenties, and the majority of volunteers (71%) are female. This IVS organization places over 150 year-long volunteers and 125 summer volunteers annually. They teach in a variety of educational settings including elementary, high school, college, and adult education centers. The majority of volunteers come from the United States, and a handful come from other English-speaking countries. Volunteers participating in the year-long program must have a Bachelor’s degree and the program has a competitive selection process. Most volunteers live in rural settings with a host family. Long-term volunteers mainly canceled because of competing priorities of education, occupation, or other service opportunities.

Phase 1: Survey development

Scholars have developed a number of separate, stand-alone standardized surveys to measure the outcomes of volunteering overall (not just IVS) across the major outcome categories listed above, including intercultural competence (Hammer, Bennet, & Wiseman, 2003), cross-cultural adaptability (Kelley & Meyers, 1995), social capital (Grootaert, Narayan, Jones, & Woolcock, 2004; Onyx & Bullen, 2000), and specific skills or abilities (Sherer & Maddux, 1982; Weber, Weber, Sleeper, & Schneider, 2004). Although researchers can use each of these measures independently to assess volunteer outcomes, we aim to construct a survey that assesses all of them. We referenced these surveys for background and theoretical foundations, revised items, and constructed new items.

The initial list contained more than 250 possible survey items assessing each of the five main outcome areas. All items in the survey used a seven-point scale with response options: 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neutral, and 7 = strongly agree, to account for a wide amount of variation in response options presuming the presence of a latent continuous variable underlying the respondents attitudes and opinions (Clason & Dormody, 1994). Because outcomes depend largely on individual characteristics of the volunteer as well as characteristics of the IVS program (Sherraden, et al., 2008), we added approximately 30 items to assess the influence of demographic factors, motivations, past international and professional experience, foreign-language capacity, and the length and intensity of the volunteer placement.

To refine the survey, we asked 46 individuals, including 39 former IVS volunteers, four program administrators of IVS volunteer-sending organizations, and three IVS experts to review the list of

possible items. Each respondent offered feedback and suggestions on item wording and overall survey design. Respondents verified the relevance and content validity of the items measuring each concept. Based on their feedback, we removed over half of the original list, and refined the remaining sample items. After incorporating these changes, the final survey readied for piloting contained 110 items measuring five broad outcome categories, including 30 items of background information. After reducing the length of the instrument, we formally piloted this survey with prospective and returned volunteers.

Phase 2: Survey pilot

In spring 2008, we administered a pilot of the pre-test survey to 571 short-term international volunteers. We administered the surveys electronically via email and provided all participants with the Internet URL where they could complete the survey. Following two email reminders, 216 volunteers responded (120 prospective volunteers and 96 alumni), resulting in an overall response rate of 38%.

We use exploratory factor analysis with quartimax rotation to determine the factor structure within each major outcome area. We factored items together to determine the factor structure, and then separately to assess internal consistency within subscales. Basic assumptions of EFA were met including independence of observations and normal bivariate distribution for each pair of variables. We used maximum likelihood estimation procedures with scale-level data to determine factor loadings and identify communalities across each dimension. We used eigenvalues exceeding unity and scree plots to determine the appropriate number of factors to extract. Lambda coefficients with substantial loadings of 0.40 or higher were considered relevant.

We tested relevant items for coherence and reliability, retaining manifest variables that loaded onto a major factor. In order to test the reliability of each factor, we used Cronbach alpha with a cutoff point of .70 to estimate the internal consistency of each scale. Pearson correlations estimated the strength of relationships between identified subscales. Finally, we computed Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistics to determine sampling adequacy, and to better assess which variables to drop from resulting subscales. KMO statistics with a cutoff value of .60 or higher were used to predict data that were likely to factor well.

We ran a separate factor analysis on each of the five major constructs identified in the review of previous research. This exploratory analysis found that these major outcome categories were well represented in the survey items, but that the items represented more than the original five factors. From these, we extracted two new factors. The seven new factors fit roughly under the constructs of: international understanding, intercultural interest, civic activism, voting behaviors, media attentiveness, and internationally-related life plans, and social skills.

Results from this pilot suggested a number of changes to the survey instrument. We clarified item wordings and gave greater attention to defining and measuring the identified subscales. The subscale of skills and abilities was particularly poorly determined. We expanded factors that were not well-determined by adding additional items, or altered items to converge on other existing factors. These results provided a foundation for a more rigorous measurement tool. We dropped fifteen items and retained 90 items in the final survey, including 30 background items on volunteer demographics and program participation.

Phase 3: Survey validation

After revising the survey based on findings from the pilot test, we administered the full survey in spring 2008. Out of the 1,769 individuals we asked to complete the IVIS, 983 responded. These respondents included 325 prospective, 291 returned, and 367 comparison non-volunteers from the two programs (463 short term and 520 long-term), resulting in an overall response rate of 56%.

Consistent with the pilot study methods, we used exploratory factor analysis with quartimax rotation to determine the factor structure of major outcomes. We removed a handful of items from factors that showed poor face validity or low factor scores. In total, we removed 17 of the 65 items, which had lambda coefficients that fell below the .40 simplex criteria, or which loaded on more than one factor. After removing each of these items individually, all remaining items converged on one of eleven major factors. The factors extracted include international contacts, open-mindedness, international understanding, intercultural relations, global identity, life plans, civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, financial contributions, and social skills. By summing the scores of manifest variables under each factor, we created eleven composite variables representing the eleven factors.

To assess theoretical validity of the IVIS, we evaluated the bivariate differences between prospective, alumni, and comparison volunteers using the mean score of the composite variables representing the eleven factors. Theoretically, alumni volunteers would rank higher on all subscales than individuals who had not yet served, and mean scores between the comparison group and the prospective volunteers should not show a significant difference. Independent sample *t*-tests were used to determine differences in group mean scores compared to the mean score of prospective volunteers.

Sample Characteristics

This section describes the sample characteristics of respondents in the final survey (phase 3) of the study. The average age of the respondents is 29, and 45% report incomes of less than \$15,000 per year. The majority, 57%, have a bachelor's degree, and 21% have a Master's degree or higher. Nearly 80% are single, white, and female (See Table 1). Many volunteers had lived abroad previous to this volunteer experience—69.8% on average. However, this statistic is skewed due to 20 high outliers—the median number of weeks lived abroad prior to volunteering is only ten. Overall, socio-demographic characteristics of the volunteer samples are similar to non-volunteer volunteer population characteristics indicating a relatively small sampling error.

Findings

This section reports on the IVIS full survey results, where each subscale represents a unidimensional factor. It presents factor solutions for the 11 subscales, correlations between subscales, and key descriptive statistics for each subscale. It also presents *t*-test differences between prospective IVS volunteers and IVS alumni and non-volunteer comparison groups to help determine the theoretical validity of these subscales.

Factor analyses indicate a single factor solution for all subscales. Total variance explained by each subscale ranges from 38.0% to 70.5%. Reliability estimates of internal consistency for all factors are quite high, ranging from 0.73 to 0.91, all exceeding the minimal reliability threshold. Nine of the eleven factors are relatively well-determined, with three or more items loading on each construct. The remaining two factors (media attentiveness and financial contributions) are not well-determined, with only two items loading on each construct. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures all exceed the .60 threshold, indicating sampling adequacy and relative factorial simplicity (Kaiser, 1974). Table 2 displays results of the single factor solutions.

Significant positive correlations between all subscales indicate that as one factor increases, every other factor also increases. Although 60 of the 62 correlations are significant where $\alpha = .01$, only three have correlation coefficients higher than .50, indicating a moderate degree of overlap in the measurement of subscale constructs. Social skills are highly correlated with open mindedness ($r = 0.55$), and international understanding is highly correlated with civic activism and media attentiveness ($r = 0.56$ and 0.51 respectively). These results indicate that the majority of subscale dimensions are relatively independent and can be interpreted separately, but that a few are closely related. Table 3 displays correlations between the IVIS subscales.

Descriptive information for the subscales presented in Table 4 displays variation in responses. Response scores are included for each subscale, and all have a positively skewed mean ($\bar{x} > 3.0$). Respondents rate themselves highest on measures of intercultural relations, open mindedness, media attentiveness, and skills and abilities—and lowest on measures of international contacts and civic activism. The table does not list Cronbach's alpha scores for the two factors that are underdetermined. With only two items loading on the concepts, these factors (media attentiveness and financial contributions) cannot adequately represent composite measures.

Six subscales exhibit differences that are consistent with theoretical expectations. The following subscales are significantly higher for IVS alumni than for prospective IVS volunteers: international contacts ($t = 11.70$, $df = 566$, $p < .001$), international understanding ($t = 5.24$, $df = 570$, $p < .001$), intercultural relations ($t = 3.86$, $df = 570$, $p < .001$), civic activism ($t = 3.35$, $df = 541$, $p < .01$), media attentiveness ($t = 4.48$, $df = 541$, $p < .001$), and financial contributions ($t = 3.75$, $df = 541$, $p < .001$). Each of these subscales also shows no difference between prospective volunteers and comparison non-volunteers, except for international contacts, which is slightly higher for the comparison group. Alumni ratings on the five remaining subscales are not significantly different from ratings by prospective volunteers, which is not consistent with theoretical expectations from previous IVS research. Table 5 presents a summary of these results.

Discussion

EFA procedures alter and expand the original five outcome categories originally extracted from past studies. Although we dropped a few items during the pilot and refinement stages, the two original constructs of internationally-related life plans, and international contacts remain virtually unchanged. However, the original concept of skills and abilities was an overly broad construct that is more meaningful when it focuses on specific social skills outcomes. Similarly, the idea of civic engagement is now divided into four sub-concepts: civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, and financial contributions. Finally, the original concept of intercultural competence is now

represented by four distinct concepts: open-mindedness, international understanding, intercultural relations, and global identity. The resulting 11 categories in this survey represent the major IVS volunteer outcomes discussed in previous research (Sherraden, et al., 2008).

Skills and abilities

Past research on IVS identifies a host of outcomes that lie beyond social skills including innovation, resourcefulness, and creativity (Brook, et al., 2007; Cook & Jackson, 2006; Kelly & Case, 2007), technical skills (Canada World Youth, 1993; Sherraden & Benítez, 2003), language skills (Cohn & Wood, 1985; Fantini, 2007), problem-solving (Cook & Jackson, 2006; Hammer, 2005), and self confidence (Canada World Youth, 1993; Davis Smith, Ellis, & Howlett, 2002; Kelly & Case, 2007). However, given realistic limitations on the length of surveys, it is difficult to assess the full range of skills and abilities related to international volunteering. Because increased social skills are the most frequently cited outcome of IVS studies, we are most eager to assess this construct. *Social skills* refer to competencies that contribute to effective interaction with others. These include a wide variety of skills such as communication, leadership, team cooperation, emotional and social sensitivity, control, and expressivity (Bierman & Furman, 1984; Riggio, 1986).

Although EFA procedures and reliability estimates indicate that the concept of social skills reliably measures a unidimensional construct, tests of difference indicate that it may be relatively weak at testing differences between prospective and returned volunteers. Theoretically, volunteer alumni should rate higher on this measure than prospective volunteers. The utility of this measure cannot be assessed accurately, however, without ruling out alternative explanations following a study using longitudinal design. This is the aim of studies currently in progress (Lough, McBride, & Sherraden, 2009, p. 38).

Internationally-related life plans

The concept of international life plans (consistent with the original conception) addresses the respondents' desire to study or work on international or social and economic development issues. Because previous studies on IVS report that international volunteering may lead to educational or occupational changes (Cooney, 1983; Hudson, 1996; Jones, 2005; Kelly & Case, 2007), bivariate differences from this study indicate that this construct may need further assessment using a true post-test design.

International contacts

Relevant items under the concept *international contacts* appropriately assess the nature of respondents' contacts living internationally, as well as how these contacts are used. Consistent with our original conception of this concept, it consists of personal and organizational ties to those in other countries, along with volunteers' correspondence with these contacts and volunteers' ability to use their contacts to connect to resources. In this sense, this concept encompasses the notion of social capital (using connections to coordinate action that generates economic capital—see DeFilippis, 2001), but is wider than the economic utility of these connections. Significant differences between alumni and prospective volunteers indicate relative theoretical validity for this construct. It is unknown why comparison non-volunteers also have higher reported intercultural contacts. However, more

contacts with individuals and organizations abroad may be one reason that individuals who applied to volunteer opted to cancel before completing their service with the organization.

Intercultural competence

Based on EFA findings, the original concept of intercultural competence is more accurately represented by four distinct concepts including open-mindedness, intercultural relations, international understanding, and global identity. Open-mindedness measures a volunteer's capacity to look at situations from multiple perspectives, to see various sides of a disagreement, and to have flexible thinking and ideas. William Hare explores the concept of *open-mindedness* in great detail (Hare, 1985, 1993). He asserts that a principal benefit of open-mindedness is that it "makes possible the assessment of claims to knowledge" through a willingness to revise one's opinion in the light of new evidence (1985, p. 91). Open-mindedness is not a concession to relativistic thought—but a willingness to try new things, to consider new facts, and to change views based on consideration of these facts. The open-mindedness concept is often associated with concepts of tolerance, peace, acceptance of diversity, and reduction of stereotypes and prejudice (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Hare, 1985).

Intercultural relations measures volunteers' interest in relationships with those of other cultural or ethnic backgrounds, along with actual relations with these peoples. Research on intercultural relations is concerned primarily with how peoples of different cultural backgrounds interact and how these interactions affect how they perceive and behave towards those in other ethnic and cultural groups (Berry, 1999; Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2003). Intercultural relations extends the concept of international contacts by measuring the cultural implications of personal interactions. Differences in this measure indicate that international volunteering may affect a volunteer's comfort with those in other cultures, along with their interest in and friendships with those of other cultural or ethnic backgrounds. These relations may be with those who live abroad or live in their country of origin. Findings indicate that this construct is theoretically consistent with expected differences between prospective and returned volunteers.

The concept of international understanding measures a volunteer's understanding of issues related to global poverty and economic development. Many question whether US citizens have sufficient *international understanding* of "the world beyond [their] national borders to evaluate information about international and global issues and make sound judgments about them" (Barker, 2000, p. 2). Although the items in this survey items cannot wholly gauge a person's ability to understand global issues, they do ask volunteers to gauge their own willingness to consider important international issues, and to weigh their perceived understanding of these issues. Returned volunteers appear to rate their level of international understanding higher than those who have not served overseas.

Volunteers rating high on the concept of *global identity* believe that geographic boundaries and national citizenship are less important than their responsibility to all nations of the world. It is conceptually tied to the idea of "world citizenship" and a recognition of the interdependence of national identities in a global society (Kim, 1999, p. 127). It refers to a volunteer's perception of a world culture and responsibility to global citizenships (Brecher, Childs, & Cutler, 1993). Some scholars suggest that strengthening global identity will enhance human rights and increase humanity's ability to address global issues, including environmental degradation, cures for epidemics, and exploration of outer space (Lizhi, 1993). Although difference tests trend towards significance,

initial findings indicate that IVS may not significantly affect volunteers' global identity, and in fact may strengthen their national awareness and allegiance. True longitudinal design will allow for a more rigorous assessment of this outcome.

Civic engagement

Civic engagement is a complex concept that is represented in this study by four subcategories including civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, and financial contributions. *Civic activism* encompasses many politically-oriented activities including boycotting, petitioning, attending political meetings, discussing politics, and contacting others to promote an issue (Norris, 2002; Pattie & Seyd, 2003). Although raising money for organizations and voting are typically considered a form of civic activism, items representing these activities in the analysis failed to load, or loaded on separate factors. This is perhaps unsurprising given the many other influences that may affect people's voting and giving behavior. Civic activism is considered an important component of an active and inclusive democracy, socioeconomic equality, and overall civic health (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). The high correlation between civic activism and international understanding suggests that as volunteers' understanding of global issues increases, so does their involvement in these activities.

Civic activism is closely related to the notion of *community engagement*. However, community engagement focuses on local and community involvement rather than on political activism. Voluntary engagement in their local community affairs is associated with increased health, education, regeneration activities, and overall community prosperity (Rogers & Robinson, 2004). Community engagement is also related to sociability and life satisfaction (Paek, Yoon, & Shah, 2004), and reduced crime through social monitoring and control (Rogers & Robinson, 2004; Zeldin, 2004). In his seminal book, Robert Putnam asserts that "community engagement fosters sturdy norms of reciprocity," which are necessary for the development of trust and societal stability (Putnam, 2000, p. 20). Bivariate differences suggest that international volunteering may not significantly affect local engagement.

Because media attentiveness and financial contributions loaded on separate factors but were not well-determined, they do not meet the standards to be considered sub-constructs of civic engagement. It is therefore difficult to determine the reliability of their composite mean differences. However, the addition of two or more items to each construct can provide greater substance to these ideas. *Media attentiveness* refers to keeping informed about local, national, or international news. *Financial contributions* refer to monetary donations to nonprofit or international organizations. This construct may be expanded by incorporating donations to individuals, to local organizations, or to organizations in the public sector.

Given the inter-correlations between concepts, scale independence between these concepts may be unattainable in a single survey. Given the practical utility of the survey, however, a high level of scale independence may or may not be desired. Because these concepts are related, it is reasonable that changes in one area may be associated with changes in the other areas. In this sense, there is little practical need for strict discrimination between concepts.

To refine the IVIS further, a few minor changes are still required. Factors that are not well-determined should be expanded by adding additional items, or altered to converge on other existing

factors. However, adding additional items, administering the scale in any form other than online, or administering it to different populations may affect scale reliability and should be reassessed.

Although differences across each of these outcome categories can give some indication of change, true differences need to be assessed more rigorously through multivariate analysis to account for correlations between constructs, sampling error, and spurious effects related to the volunteer program, socio-demographic characteristics of the volunteers, and other influencing factors. Future studies will gather longitudinal data on returned volunteers and assess true differences through multivariate analysis.

Implications and Conclusion

This study uses factor analyses, tests of internal consistency, inter-scale correlations, and t-tests of difference to examine the construct reliability and validity of the International Volunteer Impacts Survey (IVIS). This survey assesses major outcomes of IVS on volunteers as defined by previous research on international volunteering.

A limitation of this study is that it only samples volunteers from two IVS programs, the majority of whom come from the United States. Because this study is an exploratory analysis, replication with different programs and data is essential. Repeat administration with confirmatory factor analyses will help further validate and refine the IVIS and verify changes that volunteers experience through their service placement. Future versions of the survey could also integrate potential negative volunteer outcomes as well, since the current survey assesses only positively framed outcomes on which volunteers may score low but which are not explicitly negative.

Repeat administration of the IVIS will also build a database that can advance understanding of the predictors of international volunteering impacts. To claim “impacts,” research must incorporate findings from multiple programs that differ across key characteristics over time. The findings of this study suggest a need for widespread use of standardized surveys and rigorous methods to assess program effects on volunteers. Widespread use of these tools will allow the field to move beyond participatory appraisals and case studies, which do not permit causal inferences about the impact of IVS on volunteers.

The IVIS will enable researchers to measure multiple outcome areas across various groups over time. A significant advantage of the IVIS is the ability to administer the survey longitudinally using quasi-experimental design. This design is the standard for social science research and is the only one that allows claims of impacts on volunteers. A similar design is also necessary to build understanding of the impacts of IVS on host organizations and communities, an area of research that has received even less scholarly attention (Davis Smith, et al., 2002; Greenwood, Vo, & My, 2005; Sherraden, et al., 2008; Smith, Ellis, & Brewis, 2005).

Over the long-term, as more programs engage in research on volunteer outcomes, it will be possible to conduct comparative research across programs. Surveys can assess major outcomes and gather relevant individual and institutional characteristics. Comparative analysis of outcomes can inform empirically-based decisions on IVS policy and practice. These analyses will also build knowledge about the consequences of promoting diverse models of programs sending volunteers overseas

(Allum, 2007; Caprara, et al., 2009), and establish effective practices in international volunteer programming.

Depending on the objectives of specific volunteer programs, additional outcome categories could be included in IVS surveys. The IVIS currently includes single item questions that measure individual and institutional characteristics, as well as additional outcomes such as language-learning. However, program administrators may wish to assess additional outcomes. For instance, prior research identifies many competencies beyond social skills that volunteers may gain from international experiences. Researchers and evaluators could assess other skills in an addendum to the IVIS.

On a related note, scholars interested in a specific outcome area may want to consider using one of many existing surveys that measure specific unidimensional constructs. For instance, researchers interested in understanding how a volunteer experience affects volunteers' intercultural competence or adaptability may be best served by utilizing the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Index, or another surveys specifically developed to measure these concepts. Although some program administrators may wish to understand how IVS affects a singular outcome area, most believe that IVS affects volunteers in many areas.

This research advances development of a measurement tool aimed at identifying key impacts of IVS on volunteers. It responds to a frequent call to build a comparative evidence base on IVS outcomes with standardized measures that rigorously measure impacts across IVS programs and contexts (Daniel, et al., 2006; Dingle, et al., 2001; IVR, 2004; Powell & Bratović, 2006). As these measures are refined and implemented using rigorous research designs, scholars, practitioners, and policy makers can be more confident about the true impacts of international volunteering and service.

References

- Allum, C. (2007, September). *International volunteering and co-operation: New developments in programme models*. Paper presented at the IVCO 2007 Conference, Montreal, Canada.
- Alred, G., Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Intercultural experience and education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Barker, C. M. (2000, January). *Education for international understanding and global competence*. Paper presented at the Carnegie Corporation Convention, New York.
- Berry, J. W. (1999). Intercultural relations in plural societies. *Canadian Psychology, 40*(1), 12-21.
- Bierman, K. L., & Furman, W. (1984). The effects of social skills training and peer involvement on the social adjustment of preadolescents. *Child Development, 55*(1), 151-162.
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). *Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge.
- Brecher, J., Childs, J. B., & Cutler, J. (1993). *Global visions: beyond the new world order*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Brook, J., Missingham, B., Hocking, R., & Fifer, D. (2007). *The right person for the job*. Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia: Australian Volunteers International and Monash University.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 22*, 345-423.
- Canada World Youth. (1993). *Building a constituency for development, Volume 1*. Montreal, Quebec: Canada World Youth.
- Caprara, D., Quigley, K. F. F., & Rieffel, L. (2009). *International volunteer service: A smart way to build bridges*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- CILT, the National Centre for Languages (2004). *Intercultural Competence Assessment (INCA)*. London, UK: (Joint publication of CILT, the National Centre for Languages & Leonardo da Vinci II
- Clason, D. L., & Dormody, T. J. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 35*(4), 31-35.
- Cohn, S. F., & Wood, R. E. (1985). Foreign aid at the grass roots: The interaction of Peace Corps volunteers with host country people. *Human Organization, 44*(2), 167-171.
- Commission of the European Communities. (2004). *Impact assessment integrating ex-ante evaluation of the "Youth in Action" programme*. Brussels: SEC.

- Cook, P., & Jackson, N. (2006). *Valuing volunteering: A route to professional development, views from VSO volunteers and managers*. London: Chartered Management Institute & VSO.
- Cooney, D. F. (1983). *Changes in attitude and social involvement among returned overseas volunteers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, Bryn Mawr, PA.
- Daniel, P., French, S., & King, E. (2006). *A participatory methodology for assessing the impact of volunteering for development: Handbook for volunteers and programme officers*. Bonn, Germany: United Nations Volunteers & Centre for International Development Training.
- Davis Smith, J., Ellis, A., & Howlett, S. (2002). *UK-wide evaluation of the Millennium Volunteers Program*. London: Institute for Volunteering Research.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2004). *The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2008). Intercultural competence: A definition, model, and implications for education abroad. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education* (pp. 32-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- DeFilippis, J. (2001). The myth of social capital in community development. *Housing Policy Debate*, 12(4), 781-806.
- Dingle, A., Sokolowski, W., Saxon-Harrold, S. K. E., Smith, J. D., & Leigh, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Measuring volunteering: A practical toolkit*. Washington DC and Bonn, Germany: Independent Sector and United Nations Volunteers.
- Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Endicott, L., Bock, T., & Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral reasoning, intercultural development, and multicultural experiences: relations and cognitive underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 403-419.
- Fantini, A. E. (2007). *Exploring and assessing intercultural competence*. Brattleboro, VT: Federation of the Experiment in International Living.
- Greenwood, M., Vo, M., & My, T. T. (2005). *Volunteerism in Vietnam: Contributions to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals*. Hanoi, Viet Nam: United Nations Volunteers Programme.
- Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V. N., & Woolcock, M. (2004). *Measuring social capital: An integrated questionnaire*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Hammer, M. R. (2005). *Assessment of the impact of the AFS study abroad experience*. New York: AFS Intercultural Programs, Inc.

- Hammer, M. R., Bennet, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Hare, W. (1985). *In defence of open-mindedness*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Hare, W. (1993). *Open-mindedness and education*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Hodgkinson, V. A. (2004). Developing a research agenda on civic service. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(4), 184S-197S.
- Hudson, D. K. (1996). A new beginning: the U.S. Peace Corps and South Africa—An interview with Peace Corps deputy director Charles R. Baquet III. *Africa Today*, 43(2), 199-204.
- IVR. (2004). *Volunteering impact assessment toolkit: A practical guide for measuring the impact of volunteering*. London: Institute for Volunteering Research.
- Jennings, M. K., & Zeitner, V. (2003). Internet use and civic engagement: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67, 311-334.
- Jones, A. (2004). *Review of gap year provision*. London: University of London, Department for Education and Skills.
- Jones, A. (2005). Assessing international youth service programmes in two low-income countries. *Voluntary Action: The Journal of the Institute for Volunteering Research*, 7(2), 87-100.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Kelley, C., & Meyers, J. (1995). *The cross-cultural adaptability inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Kelly, S., & Case, R. (2007). *The overseas experience: A passport to improved volunteerism*. Toronto, Ontario: CUSO and the Center for Research and Education in Human Services.
- Kim, Y. S. (1999). Constructing a global identity: The role of Esperanto. In J. Boli & G. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Constructing world culture* (Vol. 127-148). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lizhi, F. (1993). Patriotism and global citizenship. In J. Brecher, J. B. Childs, & J. Cutler (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 279-282). Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Lough, B. J., McBride, A. M., & Sherraden, M. S. (2009). *Perceived effects of international volunteering: Reports from alumni* (CSD Working Papers RP09-10). St Louis: Center for Social Development.
- Machin, J. (2008). *The impact of returned international volunteers on the UK: A scoping review*. London: Institute for Volunteering Research.

- McBride, A. M., Benítez, C., & Sherraden, M. (2003). *The forms and nature of civic service: A global assessment* (CSD Research Report). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- McGehee, N. G., & Santos, C. A. (2005). Social change, discourse and volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 760-779.
- Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Onyx, J., & Bullen, P. (2000). Measuring social capital in five communities. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1), 23-42.
- Paek, H., Yoon, S., & Shah, D. V. (2004, May). *Contextual effects and community engagement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Pattie, C., & Seyd, P. (2003). Citizenship and civic engagement: Attitudes and behaviour in Britain. *Political Studies*, 51, 443-468.
- Perry, J. L., & Imperial, M. T. (2001). A decade of service-related research: A map of the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 462-479.
- Powell, S., & Bratović, E. (2006). *The impact of long-term youth voluntary service in Europe: A review of published and unpublished research studies*. Brussels: AVSO and ProMENTE.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Randel, J., German, T., Cordiero, M., & Baker, L. (2005). *International volunteering: trends, added value and social capital* (Development Initiatives Final Report). Oslo: Development Initiatives.
- Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 649-660.
- Rogers, B., & Robinson, E. (2004). *The benefits of community engagement: A review of the evidence*. London: Active Citizenship Centre.
- Sherer, M., & Maddux, J. E. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51(663-671).
- Sherraden, M. S., & Benítez, C. (2003). *North American community service pilot project* (CSD Research Report). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Sherraden, M. S., Lough, B. J., & McBride, A. M. (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(4), 395-421.

- Skocpol, T., & Fiorina, M. P. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Smith, J., Ellis, A., & Brewis, G. (2005). Cross-national volunteering: A developing movement? In J. Brundey (Ed.), *Emerging areas of volunteering* (pp. 63-76). Indianapolis: ARNOVA.
- Thomas, G. (2001). *Human traffic: Skills, employers and international volunteering*. London: Demos.
- UNV. (2002). Panellists urge government backing of voluntary action to meet development goals. Retrieved August 30, 2002, from <http://www.unv.org/en/news-resources/news/doc/panellists-urge-government-backing.html>
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, P. S., Weber, J. E., Sleeper, B. R., & Schneider, K. L. (2004). Self-efficacy toward service, civic participation and the business student: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(4), 359-369.
- Zeldin, S. (2004). Preventing youth violence through the promotion of community engagement and membership. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(5), 623-641.
- Zhao, C.-M. (2002). *Intercultural competence: A quantitative study of the significance of intercultural competence and the influence of college experiences on students' intercultural competence development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.

Table 1. Characteristics of respondents to the IVIS (N = 983)

Demographic Category	Percentage	Frequency
Sample group		
Prospective volunteers	33.1	325
Alumni volunteers	29.6	291
Comparison non-volunteers	37.3	367
Volunteer program		
Shorter-term	47.1	463
Longer-term	52.9	520
Education		
Some college or less	21.9	181
Bachelors degree	57.0	470
Masters, PhD, MD or other professional degree	21.1	174
Individual income		
Less than \$5,000	26.7	217
\$5,000-\$14,999	18.1	147
\$15,000-\$39,999	18.4	150
\$40,000-\$74,999	15.1	123
\$75,000 or more	7.2	59
Don't know or refused	14.5	118
Marital status		
Married or in a domestic partnership	14.8	122
Single never married	78.9	649
Widowed, divorced, or separated	6.3	52
Race		
Black or African American	2.8	23
White or Caucasian	80.5	656
Asian	8.5	69
Other	8.2	67
Gender		
Female	77.2	706
Male	22.8	208
	Mean (<i>sd</i>)	Range
Total weeks lived internationally	69.8 (175.6)	0-1935
Mean age (years)	28.6 (11.5)	18-90
Mean occupational experience (years)	5.5 (9.1)	0-51

Table 2. IVIS factor analysis results by IVS outcome subscale (N = 845)

International Contacts		Open Mindedness		Internationally-Related Life Plans	
<i>Factor items</i>	<i>λ</i>	<i>Factor items</i>	<i>λ</i>	<i>Factor items</i>	<i>λ</i>
Used int'l contacts to link others to resources	.80	Look at everybody's side of a disagreement	.75	Pursue internationally-related study	.94
Correspond with int'l people	.73	Look at situation from many points of view	.70	Pursue an internationally-related career	.89
Many int'l friends	.71	Flexible in thinking and ideas	.63	Pursue social- or economic-development-related study	.76
Used contacts to advocate for int'l causes	.70	Willing to try new things	.56	Pursue social- or economic-development-related career	.75
Connected with an int'l organization	.68	Appreciation of other cultures and customs	.54		
Given resources to int'l contact	.63	Hard to see things from the other points of view	-.48		
KMO	.86	KMO	.80	KMO	.68
Explained variance	50.5	Explained variance	38.0	Explained variance	70.5
Cronbach's alpha	.81	Cronbach's alpha	.76	Cronbach's alpha	.91
International Understanding		Intercultural Relations		Global Identity	
Consider how to solve int'l problems	.85	Interact with different cultural or ethnic backgrounds	.81	Responsibility to other nations should be as great as our own nation	.75
International issues are important	.77	Many friends with different cultural or ethnic backgrounds	.81	Better to be a citizen of the world than any one nation	.68
Good understanding of global poverty	.66	Interested in friendships with different cultural backgrounds	.63	Schools should teach the history of the world rather than own nation	.63
Good understanding of economic development	.57	Comfortable talking about diversity with people of different cultures	.59		
KMO	.72	KMO	.73	KMO	.68
Explained variance	52.2	Explained variance	51.8	Explained variance	47.4
Cronbach's alpha	.81	Cronbach's alpha	.80	Cronbach's alpha	.73
Civic Activism		Community Engagement		Media Attentiveness	
Help raise awareness of global issues	.75	Interested in joining local groups	.82	Keep informed about local or national news	.92
Attend political speeches, seminars, or teach-ins	.72	Try to make a positive difference in community	.75	Keep informed about international news	.75
Write organizations to voice views	.60	Interested in volunteering	.74	KMO, variance, alpha	NA
Discuss how political issues affect community	.54	Interested in being a part of community	.70	Financial Contributions	
Involved with an internationally-oriented group	.49	Can make a difference in community	.70	Contribute money to int'l organizations	.94
KMO	.81	KMO	.84	Contribute money to nonprofit organizations	.71
Explained variance	44.8	Explained variance	56.7		
Cronbach's alpha	.79	Cronbach's alpha	.87	KMO, variance, alpha	NA

Social Skills					
Successful in social situations	.77	Good at working as part of a team	.71	KMO	.90
Communicate easily with other people	.77	Great leader when a task needs to be done	.68	Explained variance	53.0
Work effectively with people who are different	.76	Easily contribute to the development of others	.69	Cronbach's alpha	.89
Have many skills that are highly valued by others	.71				

Table 3. Correlations between IVS outcome subscales (N = 845)

	IC	OM	IU	IR	GI	SS	LP	CA	CE	MA	FC
International Contacts (IC)	--										
Open Mindedness (OM)	.11*	--									
International Understanding (IU)	.42**	.35**	--								
Intercultural Relations (IR)	.40**	.45**	.42**	--							
Global Identity (GI)	.12**	.21**	.30**	.15**	--						
Social Skills (SS)	.11*	.55**	.29**	.37**	.13**	--					
Life Plans (LP)	.26**	.10*	.37**	.22**	.16**	.07	--				
Civic Activism (CA)	.46**	.16**	.56**	.25**	.17**	.19**	.38**	--			
Community Engagement (CE)	.16**	.39**	.29**	.28**	.16**	.44**	.23**	.37**	--		
Media Attentiveness (MA)	.24**	.24**	.51**	.20**	.13**	.24**	.11**	.45**	.24**	--	
Financial Contributions (FC)	.32**	.19**	.27**	.11**	.09*	.20**	.00	.33**	.26**	.25**	--

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for the IVS outcome subscales (N = 845)

Subscale	<i>n</i>	mean (\bar{x})	<i>SEM</i> ($\sigma_{\bar{x}}$)	<i>sd</i>	Cronbach's <i>a</i>
International Contacts	923	3.66	.05	1.57	.81
Open Mindedness	913	5.90	.02	.74	.76
International Understanding	910	5.04	.04	1.13	.81
Intercultural Relations	910	5.93	.03	.99	.80
Global identity	910	5.29	.04	1.30	.73
Life Plans	855	4.51	.06	1.90	.91
Civic Activism	863	3.86	.05	1.35	.71
Community Engagement	866	5.73	.03	1.01	.87
Social Skills	859	5.92	.03	.80	.89
Media Attentiveness	863	5.85	.04	1.18	---
Financial Contributions	862	4.92	.06	1.70	---

Note: All subscales have a theoretical range of six points, with a maximum score of seven and a minimum score of one.

Table 5. Differences between prospective IVS volunteers, IVS alumni, and non-volunteer comparison groups (N = 845)

<i>Factor</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i> ^a	<i>Factor</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>
<i>International Contacts</i>				<i>Life Plans</i>			
Alumni	11.70	566	1.39**	Alumni	-.69	534	-.11
Comparison	3.18	651	.37*	Comparison	-.64	619	-.09
<i>Open Mindedness</i>				<i>Civic Activism</i>			
Alumni	-.21	571	-.01	Alumni	3.35	541	.37*
Comparison	-.91	655	-.05	Comparison	1.82	617	.20
<i>International Understanding</i>				<i>Community Engagement</i>			
Alumni	5.24	570	.48**	Alumni	-1.18	542	-.10
Comparison	1.77	652	.16	Comparison	-1.78	620	-.15
<i>Intercultural Relations</i>				<i>Media Attentiveness</i>			
Alumni	3.86	570	.31**	Alumni	4.48	541	.43**
Comparison	.59	652	.05	Comparison	.67	617	.06
<i>Global Identity</i>				<i>Financial Contributions</i>			
Alumni	-1.92	570	-.21	Alumni	3.75	541	.53**
Comparison	.09	652	.01	Comparison	.76	616	.10
<i>Social Skills</i>							
Alumni	.60	540	.04				
Comparison	1.47	618	.04				

^a Difference is compared to the mean score of prospective volunteers—a positive differences indicates a higher mean score on this factor, ** $p < .001$, * $p < .01$

Appendix

A Study of the Impacts of International Volunteering and Service Baseline Survey

The overall purpose of The International Volunteering Impacts Survey (IVIS) is to assess the possible impacts of international volunteer service on the volunteers. The IVIS is publically available to the field for implementation. However, the context of administration of IVIS during its development should be replicated in order to maintain its validity and reliability.

The IVIS was tested for reliability and validity using responses from individuals who enrolled in one of two volunteering sending programs: a short-term nonprofessional program and a longer-term professional program. The majority of respondents were US citizens, and all were English speaking. All respondents were aged 18 or older.

The survey was designed to be administered to outgoing volunteers (pre-test) and returned volunteers (post-test), as well as to those who do not volunteer internationally (comparison group). The context of administration included an email with a link to the survey, which respondents then completed online. Surveyors contacted non-respondents a total of three times via email to encourage participation.

As a self-report survey, volunteers rated a number of areas including motivations for volunteering, international contacts, open-mindedness, international understanding, intercultural relations, global identity, social skills, life plans, civic activism, community engagement, media attentiveness, and financial contributions.

Participation in this survey was completely voluntary, and volunteers could choose not to respond to any questions that they did not wish to answer. They were not penalized in any way should they have chosen not to participate or withdraw, and were compensated even if they chose not to complete the study. Survey administrators did everything they could to protect the privacy of responses. Respondents should allow approximately 20 minutes to complete this survey.

Reliability and validity of the IVIS can only be generalized to the population from which the survey results were drawn. As such, this survey may be less reliable for volunteers in other contexts. To the degree that the research design, sampling, and administration of the IVIS are altered, the validity and reliability of the survey will be affected.

When using this survey, please cite as: Lough, B. J., McBride, A. M., & Sherraden, M. S. (2009). *Measuring volunteer outcomes: Development of the International Volunteer Impacts Survey* (CSD Working Paper 09-31). St Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.

→ **Begin Survey**

By clicking on the continue button below acknowledging that you have read these statements, you indicate your willingness to participate in the survey. I have read this study information sheet and have been given a chance to ask questions. I agree to participate in the research study on the Impacts of International Volunteering and Service.

1. Have you participated in a volunteer activity through or for an organization within the past 12 months?

- Yes
- No

2. Have you ever participated in an international volunteer activity (in a nation outside your own)?

- Yes
- No

3. Sometimes people don't think of activities they do infrequently or activities they do for children's schools or youth organizations as volunteer activities. Have you done any of these types of volunteer activities within the past 12 months?

- Yes
- No

4. With which organization did you perform the international volunteer activity(ies)? Please check all that apply.

- Organization 1
- Organization 2
- Organization 3
- Not performed through an organization
- OTHER: Please indicate the name(s) of the organization(s). _____

5. How many total weeks did you participate in the international volunteer activity(ies)? (Note: 1 year = 52 weeks)

6. Approximately how many hours per week did you participate in the international volunteer activity(ies)?

Motivation

7. Please indicate how much the following factors influenced you to inquire about volunteering internationally. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I had a desire to participate in volunteering as a way to reduce social or economic inequality.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I thought that the volunteer experience would give me skills useful in school or in a job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had a desire to make a difference by helping others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I needed a job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A friend or coworker was involved with the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was asked by a school or organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was required to volunteer as part of a course requirement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to make friends and meet people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to gain greater cross-cultural understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to travel or live abroad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to gain international experience and language skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to have a challenging and meaningful experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other motivations for volunteering internationally (PLEASE WRITE IN YOUR REASON):
 If you would like to say more about your motivation, you may also write this in the box below.

International Contacts

8. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I have many friends, acquaintances, or contacts that live in other countries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequently write letters, send emails, or have other correspondence with people internationally.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am closely connected with an organization(s) that works internationally.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have personally given money or other useful resources to contacts living in other countries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have used my international contacts to link people or organizations to useful resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have used my connections to advocate for people or organizations internationally (e.g. lobbied for policy changes, wrote an email or newsletter, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Intercultural Relations

9. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I frequently interact with people from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Many of my friends are of different backgrounds from me (racial, cultural, ethnic or language).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am highly interested in working or forming friendships with people of different cultural backgrounds.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am very comfortable talking about diversity with people of different cultures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Open Mindedness

10. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
Whatever the situation, I almost always look at it from many points of view.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have a very strong appreciation of other nations' cultures and customs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I sometimes find it hard to see things from the "other person's" point of view.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am very willing to try new things.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am very flexible in my thinking and ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Global Identity

11. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
It would be better to be a citizen of the world than of any particular nation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our responsibility to people of other nations should be as great as our responsibility to people of our own nation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our schools should teach the history of the world rather than the history of our own nation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

International Understanding

12. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
International issues and affairs play an important role in my life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I think a lot about the problems of nations outside my own and how they might be solved.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have a good understanding of the reasons for global poverty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have a good understanding of how low-income countries can better develop their economies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Civic Activism

13. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I am involved with an internationally-oriented group, project, or club.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I often discuss how larger political issues affect my community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequently write or e-mail newspapers or organizations to voice my views on an issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequently attend speeches, informal seminars, or teach-ins about political issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I often help raise awareness of global issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Community Engagement

14. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I am very interested in being a part of my community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel I have the ability to make a difference in my community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I try to find the time to make a positive difference in my community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am highly interested in volunteering.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am very interested in joining local groups, projects or clubs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Media Attentiveness

15. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I keep informed about local news.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I keep informed about national news.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I keep informed about international news.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Financial Contributions

16. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I contribute money to local non-profit organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contribute money to national organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contribute money to international organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Social Skills

17. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I communicate very easily with other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I work very effectively with people who are different from me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have many skills that are highly valued by others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am very good at working as part of a team.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can easily contribute to the personal development of others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am successful in social situations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am a great leader when a task needs to be done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Second Language Ability

18. Please check the one item below that best describes your ability to speak in a second language. If you plan to volunteer internationally, please indicate your ability to speak in the host country language where you hope to serve.

- No ability at all
- Able to communicate only in a very limited capacity
- Able to satisfy basic survival needs and minimum courtesy requirements
- Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements
- Able to speak with sufficient grammatical accuracy and vocabulary to discuss relevant professional areas
- Able to speak fluently and accurately in all situations
- Proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker

Internationally-Related Life Plans

19. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Use a scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Please check one box for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neither (4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I plan to pursue a field of study related to social or economic development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I plan to pursue a career related to social or economic development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I plan to pursue an internationally-related field of study.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I plan to pursue an internationally-related career.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND

Previous Exposure to Diversity

20. How much were each of the following people a part of your everyday life in your earlier life experiences? Please note changes in the response options. Use a scale where 1 = none, 4 = average, and 7 = a great deal. Please check one box for each statement.

	None (1)	(2)	(3)	Average (4)	(5)	(6)	A Great Deal (7)
Individuals with disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individuals of a different ethnicity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individuals from a different socioeconomic background	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individuals with different political orientations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individuals with different religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. How many total years or weeks have you spent overseas before the age of 18 (include all experiences—volunteering, working, etc.)?

YEARS [please enter zero (0) if less than one year]

WEEKS

22. How many total years/weeks have you spent overseas after the age of 18 (include all experiences—volunteering, working, etc.)?

YEARS [please enter zero (0) if less than one year]

WEEKS

23. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- 8th grade or less
- Some high school, no diploma
- High school graduate
- High school diploma or the equivalent (for example, GED)
- Some college, but no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Ph.D., M.D. or other professional degree

24. How many total years have you worked professionally?

YEARS [please enter zero (0) if less than one year]

25. How often do you attend religious services?

Never (1)	(2)	(3)	Occasionally (4)	(5)	(6)	Very Often (7)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26. What is your date of birth?

____/____/____

27. What is your sex?

- Male
- Female

28. What is your current marital status?

- Married
- Single, never married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- In a domestic partnership

29. How many children do you have, if any? [please enter a zero (0) if none]

30. How many of your children currently live with you?

31. What country were you born in?

32. What is your race?

- Black or African American
- White or Caucasian
- Asian
- Other: PLEASE SPECIFY RACE _____

33. Which of the amounts below best represents your total individual income in 2007 before taxes? Please include wages, salaries, interest, dividends, social security, and all other forms of income.

- Less than \$5,000
- \$5,000 –\$9,999
- \$10,000 –\$14,999
- \$15,000 – \$19,999
- \$20,000 –\$24,999
- \$25,000 –\$29,999
- \$30,000 –\$39,999
- \$40,000 –\$49,999
- \$50,000 –\$59,999

- \$60,000 –\$74,999
- \$75,000 –\$99,999
- \$100,000 –\$149,999
- \$150,000 or more
- Don't know
- Refused

34. Which of the amounts below best represents the total annual income in 2007 for all members of your HOUSEHOLD before taxes? Please include wages, salaries, interest, dividends, social security, and all other forms of income.

- Less than \$5,000
- \$5,000 –\$9,999
- \$10,000 –\$14,999
- \$15,000 – \$19,999
- \$20,000 –\$24,999
- \$25,000 –\$29,999
- \$30,000 –\$39,999
- \$40,000 –\$49,999
- \$50,000 –\$59,999
- \$60,000 –\$74,999
- \$75,000 –\$99,999
- \$100,000 –\$149,999
- \$150,000 or more
- Don't know
- Refused

Final Comments and Suggestions

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey! If you have any additional comments, please type your responses in the box below: