VOLUNTEER ATTITUDES TOWARD

HOMELESSNESS – A TEST OF CONTACT

HYPOTHESIS

By

HEATHER CHANCELLOR

Bachelor of Arts in Sociology

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

2010

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2014

VOLUNTEER ATTITUDES TOWARD

HOMELESSNESS – A TEST OF CONTACT

HYPOTHESIS

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Laura Barnes

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Lucy Bailey

Dr. Mwarumba Mwavita

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take the opportunity to thank everyone who has been so supportive of me throughout the process of earning my Master's degree. My committee members—Dr. Laura Barnes (Chair), Dr. Mwarumba Mwavita, and Dr. Lucy Bailey—have been extremely accommodating and committed throughout this entire process. Dr. Barnes, thank you for always being available for meetings and for understanding my passion for this project. You were genuinely interested in my ideas, and I always left your office feeling motivated. Dr. Mwavita, thank you for your keen attention to the methodology section. Your advice helped me to conceptualize my methods which, in turn, allowed the data collection process to flow more smoothly. Dr. Bailey, your editing skills have been invaluable. Your guidance throughout the writing process was integral to the success of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Chan Hellman. You instilled in me the worth of my skillset and have been a great mentor.

Thank you to the staff of the soup kitchen which served as the data collection site. They allowed me to move freely throughout their facility and treated me like one of the group. A special thanks to the study participants, without whom I would have nothing to say in my results section.

Next, I would like to express a deep gratitude to my family for providing me a safe space to express my concerns and doubts throughout this process as well as a loving space to share in my achievements. I am also grateful for my brother, Blake. You have been a true friend throughout this process and I truly cherish our relationship. I would especially like to thank my mom. You taught me the value of gaining one's independence through education, and you are responsible for the woman I am today, and for that, I thank you.

I would also like to thank my dogs, Kendall and Charles. They always understood when I needed

time to work, but more importantly, they knew when I needed time to play.

And last, but certainly not least, John. You have been a pillar of unwavering support and a deep well from which I am able to draw strength. You have been my biggest advocate throughout this process, and without your encouragement to persevere through the toughest of times, I may not be here writing my acknowledgements today. Thank you.

Name: HEATHER CHANCELLOR

Date of Degree: MAY, 2014

Title of Study: VOLUNTEER ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMELESSNESS – A TEST OF
CONTACT HYPOTHESIS

Major Field: EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

The contact hypothesis, as outlined by Gordon Allport (1946), suggests that intergroup contact with a marginalized group may lead to a better understanding of said group. As such, the focus of this study was to test the contact hypothesis among a group of soup kitchen volunteers who serve the homeless at a local soup kitchen. A cross-sectional survey design was implemented, and data was collected at the soup kitchen during volunteering shifts from October 2013 to February 2014. A total of 129 volunteers agreed to participate in the survey. Contact with the homeless was operationalized utilizing three components: length of time volunteering, type of volunteering: "new or episodic" versus "established or continuous" and capacity of volunteering: serving on food line, grocery assistance, pantry service or anywhere needed. As expected, the results indicated religion and political affiliation were significant predictors of the belief that societal causes may lead to homelessness. More specifically, non-Protestants and Democrats were more likely to believe societal causes may lead to homelessness. Women were more likely to express a belief that childhood causes may lead to homelessness. The community service attitudes scale was a significant predictor of both the societal causes and childhood causes subscales, and proved to be the best predictor of attitudes. None of the three components of contact were found to be statistically significant predictors of attitudes toward the homeless. This finding may be a function of the overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward the homeless held by all of the soup kitchen volunteers rather than theoretical errors in the contact hypothesis. The overall positive attitudes of the volunteers may have been a result of location as well as the time of year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Homelessness is prevalent in our society. National data from the January 2012 "point-in-time" count reports that 633,782 people experience homelessness on any given night (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2013). The point-in-time survey is conducted once a year and provides a "snapshot" of homelessness. Homelessness is multi-faceted issue with many contributing factors, including lack of affordable housing and lack of gainful employment. Since 1980, federal support for affordable housing has fallen by 49 percent (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2005). The unemployment rate is at 7.4 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). As a result of decreasing availability of supportive housing and increased unemployment rates, homelessness is on the rise. Emergency shelters and soup kitchens are among the social service agencies feeling the pressure of the increase in homeless numbers. In recent years, the social services sector has received less funding from the federal government (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2013). As a result, these agencies rely heavily on volunteers.

As the next chapter describes in greater detail, volunteerism is a large business in the United States. In 2011, it was estimated that volunteers gave 7.9 billion hours of unpaid work resulting in a $171 billion industry (Independent Sector, 2011). As such, non-profit agencies save money by utilizing the work of volunteers. In 2012, about 64.5 million people volunteered for an organization at least once. Of those volunteers, 33.1 percent volunteered at religious organizations, 25.5 percent volunteered at educational or youth organizations and 14.2 percent volunteered at social or community organizations, including those serving the homeless (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). With regard to volunteer activities, 10.9 percent of volunteers participated in collecting, preparing or distributing food (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). Just as volunteers provide a variety of services; it is believed that volunteers

offer their services for a variety of reasons – religious commitments, moral obligation, reciprocity, etc., but no matter the reason, many participants reported feelings of joy as a result of volunteering (Agans, Liu, Jones, Verjan, Silverbush &Kalsbeek, 2011; Cloke, Johnsen &May 2007; Harrison, 1995). This joy may be a result of the direct contact with the clients they serve. As volunteers become acquainted and build relationships with those who receive the services, it is possible that they begin to view the homeless as more rather than less similar to them. Due to this contact, the literature suggests that volunteers may have a better understanding of homelessness and as a result become more accepting and develop less stigmatizing attitudes toward the homeless.

This concept, the contact hypothesis, was first developed by Gordon Allport (Allport & Kramer, 1946). He believed that prejudice was a result of in-group members holding stigmatizing attitudes toward out-group members. He posited that intergroup contact could reduce negative attitudes toward the out-group because direct contact could promote feelings of shared beliefs and experiences. Allport (1946) also identified four conditions, when, if all met, the positive results of the contact would be the most profound. These four conditions include: *equal group status*, *common goals*, *intergroup cooperation*, and *support of authority* (Pettigrew, 1998). *Equal group status* refers to the concept that all groups expect and perceive the same status. The *common goal* condition refers to the idea that all parties are actively pursuing a shared objective. *Intergroup cooperation* refers to all groups working together to reach a mutual purpose. The final condition: *support of authority* refers to all groups sharing a respect for authority during the intergroup contact (Pettigrew, 1998).

The existing literature surrounding the contact hypothesis in relation to studies of the homeless has found support for the contact hypothesis (Knecht &Martinez, 2009; Knecht &Martinez, 2012; Link, Schwartz, Moore, Phelan, Struening, Stueve & Colten, 1995; Lee, Farrell & Link, 2004). The results from these studies suggest that even minimal contact, such as contact from one event, may lead to more positive attitudes, and prolonged exposure may lead to a better understanding of homelessness, a greater willingness to affiliate with the homeless as well as less fear of the homeless.

2

Statement of Problem

Although studies conducted with volunteers who work with the homeless provided compelling evidence for the contact hypothesis, they do not offer an in-depth evaluation of how length, type and capacity of volunteering with the homeless may affect attitudes toward the homeless. For instance, do volunteers who have served longer tend to have more positive attitudes than those who are just beginning? Does a history of continual service as a volunteer predict more positive attitudes than a history of episodic service? Does volunteering, that involves more intense contact with the homeless, predict more positive attitudes than service involving less contact? Answering these questions may provide insight into attitudes of soup kitchen volunteers as well as the overall importance of volunteering with the homeless.

Purpose of Study

As no known research has been conducted to test the contact hypothesis with regard to the homeless among "new or episodic" and "established or continuous" soup kitchen volunteers, the purpose of this study is to investigate the contact hypothesis utilizing length (frequency and consistency), type and capacity of volunteering tasks to explore soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. Specifically, the present study seeks to assess the differences between two types of soup kitchen volunteers, those termed "new or episodic" and "established or continuous" (Harrison, 1995), and whether they differ in their views of the causes of homelessness, effectiveness of solutions, and willingness to affiliate with the homeless. Episodic volunteerism refers to a planned, isolated departure from one's normal routine, whereby one performs fairly novel tasks; whereas continuous volunteerism refers to performing the same or similar tasks on a regular basis, comparable to that of a paid work setting. Relevant demographic variables, as found in the previous reviewed literature, are tested as predictors of attitudes toward homelessness. Next, the researcher will assess willingness to help among the volunteers as a predictor of attitudes toward the homeless. Lastly, the researcher will examine sympathy as a predictor of attitudes toward the homeless.

Significance

      This study will address how varying levels of contact with the homeless impact attitudes toward the homeless among two groups: "new or episodic" volunteers and "established or continuous" volunteers. The contact hypothesis would suggest that due to capacity of volunteering, increased frequency, as well as type of volunteering, "established or continuous" volunteers would have a more sympathetic understanding of homelessness resulting in less stigmatizing attitudes, and a greater desire to better the community through community service than "new or episodic" volunteers. The results of this study may lend credence to the argument that not only is volunteering important, but it is also necessary to volunteer frequently to make the greatest impact on attitudes. By beginning to understand the characteristics, differences and attitudes of the two groups who volunteer with the homeless we can begin to suggest the importance of continuous volunteering with the homeless. By not pursuing this research, we may maintain limited understanding of the implications of contact with the homeless through volunteering as it relates to attitudes toward the homeless (Booth, Colomb & Williams, 2008).

Foundational Terms

Community Service – An effort that sensitizes one to community needs and shows how one's time can make a difference in one's community (Shiarella, McCarthy & Tucker, 2000).

Contact hypothesis – Proposes that interaction between members of different groups reduces intergroup prejudice if – and only if – certain optimal conditions are present. These conditions include: equal group status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support of authority (Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux, 2005; Pettigrew, 1998).

Continuous volunteering – An act of performing volunteer-tasks on a successive basis, such as weekly or biweekly, similar to that of paid or conventional work settings (Harrison, 1995).

Episodic volunteering – A carefully considered or controlled departure from one's attendance routine whereby one performs fairly novel tasks during one or more isolated occasions (Harrison, 1995).

Homelessness – "Any person living in a place not meant for human habitation, an emergency shelter, transitional living housing, a motel or hotel, 'doubled up', families with children or unaccompanied youth

living in unstable housing, people fleeing a domestic violence situation, or those who are exiting housing in which they temporarily resided" (Housing and Urban Development, 2013).

Social Stigma – An attribute that tarnishes one identity, prohibits one from full social approval, and blames one as if situation is one's fault (Goffman, 1963; Phelan & Link, 1997).

Sympathy – Feelings of sorrow, care, hope or concern for humans, and animals alike, who are disempowered or suffering (Clark, 1987; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Lee, 2009; Wispe, 1991).

<div align="center">

Operational Definitions

</div>

Type of volunteering contact: For the purposes of this study, type of volunteering will refer to "established or continuous" and "new or episodic" volunteers. This concept was conceptualized using Harrison's (1995) distinction between continuous versus episodic volunteering. After allowing the participants to read the definitions of "established or continuous" and "new or episodic" volunteering, they were asked to self-report which label best described them. The survey question asked, "Do you consider yourself a continuous or episodic volunteer at the soup kitchen?"

Length of volunteering contact: With regards to this study, length of volunteering contact will refer to the amount time a study participant has volunteered. The survey question asks, "How long have you volunteered at the soup kitchen?" The survey asked the participants to respond in years, if possible.

Capacity of volunteering contact: For this study, capacity of volunteering contact will pertain to the level of intensity of volunteering (serving in food line, grocery assistance, pantry assistance, or anywhere needed) a study participant experiences when volunteering at the soup kitchen. It has been assumed that those who serve on the food line have direct contact with the homeless for the duration of time they are volunteering, those who serve in grocery assistance have less intense contact as they are bagging groceries and placing them on shelf for homeless clients to pick up, and those who work in pantry assistance have the least intense contact as they are not in sight of the homeless clients and do not typically converse with them.

Attitudes toward Homelessness: For the purposes of this project, attitudes toward homelessness were operationalized using four components: societal causes, childhood causes, affiliation, and solutions-based.

Societal causes refer to idea that homelessness is due to societal defects. Childhood causes pertain to the notion that homelessness is due to issues from childhood. Affiliation is the willingness to affiliate with the homeless. Solutions-based refers to the idea that there are viable solutions for the issue of homelessness.

Research Questions

1. Do demographic variables such as gender, race, age, religion, political identity, education level, and income level predict attitudes toward the homeless?

2. Do level of sympathy and attitudes toward community service predict attitudes toward the homeless?

3. Do type of volunteering and length of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

4. Does capacity of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

5. After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, does length of contact with the homeless significantly predict attitudes toward the homeless?

6. After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that type of volunteering predicts attitudes toward the homeless?

7. After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that continuous volunteers with longer and more intense contact have less stigmatizing attitudes than episodic volunteers who have shorter and less intense contact?

Instruments used in the Study

Attitude toward Homelessness Inventory (ATHI) – This is an 11-item multidimensional instrument designed to evaluate attitudes toward the homeless.

Trait Sympathy Scale (TSS) – This is an 18-item multidimensional instrument designed to evaluate trait sympathy.

Community Service Attitudes Scale (CSAS) – This is a 31-item multidimensional instrument designed to evaluate attitudes toward community service participation.

Researcher Positionality Statement

I became interested in the phenomenon of homelessness when I began working for a local non-profit serving homeless youth. As a native Tulsan, I was surprised by the overwhelmingly large

population of the homeless in my community. As I continued my work with the homeless youth, I became aware of the social services, provided by various non-profits, for the homeless. One such non-profit was a soup kitchen located in the basement of an episcopal church – Iron Gate. Through my work, I became heavily involved with the soup kitchen as many of the young people we served were also clients of the soup kitchen. As such, we conducted outreach services at the soup kitchen and as a result, I became acquainted with the soup kitchen staff. It was through this connection with the soup kitchen that I was able to gain unique entree for a qualitative study I conducted on volunteers' perceptions of the homeless. After collecting such interesting data on volunteers, I decided to use the qualitative findings to inform my quantitative thesis project. Since I had an established relationship with the soup kitchen staff through my work with the non-profit as well as my qualitative study, I was able to move freely about the soup kitchen to survey the volunteers for my thesis project on volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. Due to this exclusive access, I was able to connect with potential survey participants on a more intimate level and this was evident in the results of the study. Furthermore, I believe this access was integral to the success of my project.

Summary

The present chapter has briefly introduced the issue of homelessness, statistics on the volunteer sector, and the contact hypothesis – the theoretical framework under which this project was developed. This chapter has also laid the groundwork for the problem and purpose of the study as well the significance and implications of not pursuing this research (Booth *et al*., 2008). The effort of studying the contact hypothesis with regard to volunteering with the homeless may provide insights into the importance of volunteering for an extended period of time in order to have the greatest impact on attitudes toward the homeless. The results of this research may provide useful and practical knowledge to the community at large through evidence that volunteering with the homeless can lead to a measurable change in one's attitude toward the homeless. Chapter II will explore the previous literature related to the contact hypothesis with regard to homelessness as well as the constructs of interest: specific demographic

variables, sympathy and attitudes toward community service as they relate to attitudes toward the

homeless.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Homelessness has been a salient social and human rights issue for many decades due to its complexity and pervasiveness. The word *homeless* can conjure images of old men begging on street corners and sleeping in cardboard boxes, but chronic homelessness accounts for less than 16% of all people experiencing homelessness (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2013). In the last thirty years, the public has become increasingly aware of homelessness as the complexity of the issue has become more widely known. According to recent statistics, over 1.6 million children are homeless each year (National Center on Family Homelessness, 2010); in the 1980s family homelessness reached levels surpassing the Great Depression (Polakow, 2003). This statistic speaks to the complex demographics of homelessness and its implication for different groups of people. The current economy has directly shaped the experiences of homeless individuals as local, state and the federal government have limited spending on agencies that provide support for the homeless (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2011). Research has been conducted on the phenomenon of homelessness with regard to causes of homelessness, public attitudes toward the homeless, contact with the homeless, and volunteers working with the homeless.

Research has been conducted on the general public's attitudes toward the homeless (Agans *et al* ., 2011, Benedict, 1988; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1991; Lee, Hinze Jones &Lewis, 1990; Lee, Lewis & Hinze Jones, 1992; Lee, Tyler & Wright, 2010; Morgan, Wallace Goddard & Newton Givens, 1997; Pelligrini, Queirolo, Monarrez &Valenzuela, 1997; Phelan, Link, Stueve & Moore, 1995; Phelan, Link,

Moore & Stueve 1997; Toro, Tompsett, Lombardo, Philappot, Nachtergael, Galand, Schlienz, Stammel, Yabar, Blume, MacKay & Harvey, 2007; Toro & McDonnell, 1992).

In the last 20 years, however, relatively few studies have been conducted with volunteers who work with the homeless (Cloke *et al*., 2006; Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Knecht & Martinez, 2009 & 2012).

Attitudes toward Homelessness

The way in which non-marginalized people view marginalized groups such as the homeless has been a topic of research for many years. An awareness of the plight of the homeless is important to consider as the public's opinion can influence how the issue is addressed (Agans *et al*., 2011; Toro & McDonnell, 1992). Agans and colleagues (2011) conducted a national study, in which they found that the more citizens are aware of the complexity of homelessness, the more they believe it to be a major issue. Several demographic and socioeconomic factors such as gender, age, education level, income level, religion, political identification, race and ethnicity, and region have been studied with regard to a person's attitude toward the homeless (Alexander & Link, 2003; Blasi, 2000; Furnham, 1996; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Lee *et al*., 1990, 1992, 2004; Link *et al*., 1995; Pellegrini *et al*., 1997; Phelan & Link, 2004; Phelan *et al*., 1995). However, due to the multi-dimensionality of demographic and socioeconomic factors, it is difficult to isolate any one characteristic as influential in explaining a person's attitudes toward homelessness. In addition to demographic and socioeconomic factors, various dimensions of attitudes including causal beliefs, social desirability, perceived dangerousness, support for economic aid, support for civil liberties, and tolerance will be discussed in this section.

Of the research reviewed in this chapter, many of the findings revealed that respondents reported believing there are several causes of homelessness. In national and local surveys, respondents cited structural forces such as lack of affordable housing and lack of gainful employment as pathways to homelessness (Kingree & Daves, 1997; Lee *et al* ., 1990; Lee *et al* ., 1992; Lee *et al* ., 2010). A few national and local studies found that participants who believe structural forces are a cause of homelessness also consider homelessness to be an important issue and are more likely to be opposed to

10

laws harmful to the homeless (Agans *et al*., 2011; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 2004.

Many studies test generic demographic variables to report on the general public's attitudes toward the homeless. The studies reviewed in the following paragraphs illuminate similar findings.

A few national and local studies researched causal beliefs about homelessness by status. The results indicated that respondents who reported being young, female, politically liberal, black, and/or well-educated were more inclined to view structural forces as the major cause for homelessness as well as showed an increased support for government involvement including economic aid for the homeless (Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995).

However, in a few national studies, respondents who reported belonging to ethnic minorities, having less formal education, and having less income were more likely to perceive the homeless as dangerous and have a higher regard for social distance, on average (Alexander & Link, 2003; Link *et al*., 1995; Phelan & Link, 2004). These reported findings may be due, in part, to less contact with the homeless which could result in a lack of understanding of homelessness. Though it is difficult to identify any one characteristic as a reason for the misconceptions regarding homelessness, perhaps those with less formal education and less income have less time to devote to volunteering or any form of exposure to the homeless, for that matter, that may lend to a better understanding of homelessness.

The results from the next few surveys were captured utilizing a telephone survey format, meaning the researchers randomly selected phone numbers in a national database. The researchers then telephoned the participants and asked them to respond to the survey via a telephone interview.

Data from a national telephone survey was analyzed by Lee and company (1992). They found that high percentages of respondents reported structural factors as a cause of homelessness, but males were slightly less likely than females to report this belief.

In a national, cross sectional telephone survey Alexander and Link (2003) found that respondents reporting a younger age were less likely to perceive the homeless as dangerous as well as reported wanting less social distance from the homeless. In a national survey employing vignettes involving the

11

homeless and mental illness, Phelan and Link (2004) found that perception of the homeless as dangerous first declined and then increased with age. A telephone survey used by Phelan and company (1995) also found that younger respondents reporting feeling the homeless deserved more civil liberties. In this study, age was categorized into four groups: 18-24, 25-54, 55-64, and 65 and over. In the same study, higher educational attainment was positively correlated with increased tolerance of homelessness.

A national, telephone survey found that as household income increased, the percent of respondents who believed structural forces were the cause of homelessness increased as well until reaching a plateau at the income marker of $50,000. A smaller percentage of respondents reporting an income of $50,000 or more believed society was the cause of homelessness (Lee *et al*., 1992).

As the review transitions from a discussion of telephone survey results, the next section reviews the literature surrounding region as potential predictor for attitudes toward the homeless.

In national and a local study in Nashville, researchers explored region as a possible indicator of attitudes toward the homeless. As such, it was found that respondents living in coastal and north central regions of the United States reported viewing structural issues as a major cause of homelessness as well as reported being more tolerant of homelessness (Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee, Link & Toro, 1991; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995). As Lee and company (2004) pointed out respondents living in coastal and north central regions of the country may have greater awareness of the homeless, and are more understanding of their situations. This could be due, in part, to greater contact with the homeless as there are a great number of metropolitan areas in the coastal and north central regions of the United States. Contact with the homeless and its effect on attitudes will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Interestingly, a global study conducted by Toro and cohort (2007) consisting of 1,546 individuals across five industrial countries: United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, and Italy found that the United States had the highest prevalence of homelessness, but respondents showed less sympathy toward the homeless comparatively. This could be due, in part, to America's obsession with individualism, centuries of immigration, and lack of social welfare reforms (Toro *et al*., 2007). Germany reported the lowest prevalence of homelessness. The researchers speculated the findings could be a result

12

of Germany's comprehensive social welfare system and socialized health care system. Remarkably, results indicated that Belgium and Italy respondents reported the highest frequency of seeing a panhandler and talking with a homeless person German respondents reported the highest frequency of seeing a homeless person (Toro *et al*., 2007). This reported increase in contact with the homeless could be a link to the more sympathetic attitudes. The study implemented a 63-item survey that assessed attitudes, knowledge, opinions, and public policy regarding the homeless (Toro *et al*., 2007).

Many of the results reviewed in this section of the literature review highlight the general public's overarching attitudes toward the homeless. While these results are important in understanding general ideas about how survey respondents view the homeless, it is necessary to include studies which focus on more specific types of respondents. The next two studies reviewed in this section describe the results from academic surveys. However, academic survey results should be interpreted with caution as there are often discrepancies in attitudes toward social issues between the general public and individuals who pursue higher education.

In a large, academic survey conducted by Pellegrini and group (1997) undergraduate students were asked about their beliefs of causes of homelessness, how much money should be spent on the homeless, as well as their political identification. Those who self-identified politically as Democrat and liberal reported believing that structural forces are a major cause of homelessness, and they were more likely to be in favor of paying more taxes and increasing government spending on the homeless. On the contrary, those who self- identified as Republican and conservative were more likely to believe that internal forces, such as laziness, mental illness, etc. are the cause of homelessness, and, were less likely to support the notion of paying more taxes or increase government spending on homelessness (Pellegrini *et al*., 1997).

Zrinyi and Balogh (2004) conducted an academic study using nursing and paramedic students. Hospital nurses and paramedics are often exposed to homeless individuals through their work. The purpose of the study was to assess the students' attitudes toward the homeless. The results of this study indicated that paramedics reported having less fear of the homeless than nurses, but nurses felt more

13

sympathy toward the homeless. These results could be due, in part, to the different circumstances in which the students encountered the homeless individual. A paramedic would likely encounter the homeless person on the street where he, the homeless person, may be more comfortable. On the other hand, a nurse might encounter the homeless person in an unfamiliar setting such as a hospital, and as a result he may be more subdued.

After reviewing attitudes toward the homeless based on various demographic variables, it is essential to bear in mind that personal characteristics and socioeconomic statuses are not stagnant variables, and attitudes can certainly change based on various situations and experiences. Given this notion, concrete attitudes toward the homeless cannot be based on these characteristics alone. However, in various studies, it has been found that young respondents reported the homeless are worthy of more civil liberties, are less likely to view the homeless as dangerous, and that the government should spend more on the homeless (Alexander & Link, 2003; Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995). In a few studies, researchers found those who identify as female, politically liberal, black, and/or well-educated were in favor of more federal spending on homelessness (Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995). Other studies found that those who self-identified as ethnic minorities, those who have less formal education, and have less income were more likely to view the homeless as dangerous, in general (Alexander & Link, 2003; Link *et al*., 1995; Phelan & Link, 2004). Surveys conducted in coastal areas reported respondents as more tolerant of homelessness (Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 1991; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995). Pellegrini and group (1997) reported undergraduate students who self-identified politically as Democrat and liberal were more likely to blame structural forces for homelessness and less stigmatizing attitudes toward the homeless, whereas those who self- identified as Republican and conservative were more likely to blame personal misgivings for homelessness, hold more stigmatizing views, and be less in favor of government spending.

With that being said, it is imperative to remember that just as homelessness is a complex issue, the characteristics that contribute to a person's beliefs and attitudes toward homelessness are complex.

The following section will describe various factors, apart from personal characteristics and socioeconomic statuses, research has noted as contributing toward the homeless.

Constructs that Contribute to Attitudes toward Homelessness

In addition to elements such as identity/socioeconomic status, previous literature has identified constructs such as "willingness to help", "sympathy", and "social stigma" as factors that may contribute to attitudes toward homelessness. As such, "willingness to help" and "sympathy" will be reviewed with regard to homelessness. Finally, "social stigma" as it relates to homelessness will be reviewed.

"Willingness to help"

Willingness to help has been investigated with regard to people's attitudes toward the homeless. Willingness to help is best described as an interest to help anyone in need. This subsection will describe previous literature written on willingness to help as it relates to homelessness.

An academic study found that of the respondents who expressed a willingness to help, 54 percent reported they were willing to serve the homeless in a soup kitchen, and 80.4 percent of respondents said they were willing to work in a homeless shelter (Morgan *et al*., 1997). Morgan and cohort (1997) also found that liberal political orientation, religiosity, and past helping behavior were all positively correlated with willingness to help ($p < .01$). In a national study conducted by Link and colleagues (1995), 36 percent of respondents expressed a willingness to volunteer for two hours a month to serve the homeless. Using a national, cross-sectional design, Lee and colleagues (2004) found that over 30 percent of respondents reported a willingness to sacrifice their time. An academic study was conducted in the northeastern United States and found that respondents who had previously volunteered with the homeless were more likely to report greater intentions of willingness to help (Bryan, Hammer & Fisher, 2000).

"Sympathy"

Some studies have reported higher rates of sympathy for the homeless in the last twenty five years (Agans *et al*., 2011; Benedict, 1988; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Toro & McDonnell, 1992). Agans and group (2011) conducted a telephone survey in Los Angeles and found that participants who reported feeling sympathy for the homeless were less likely to have stereotypical views of the homeless

and were also four times more likely to believe the problem of homelessness was getting worse. Benedict (1988) conducted a street-corner survey in New York among suburban and New York City respondents and found that 11.4 percent of suburban and 13.3 percent of New York City participants reported sympathy or concern as the most common feeling when seeing a homeless person. Guzewicz and Takooshian (1992) also conducted a study in New York and found respondents who reported feeling sympathy toward the homeless also reported being more opposed to laws prohibiting the homeless from begging, more likely to feel the size of the homeless population was large, and were more likely to *see* rather than *overlook* the homeless. Toro and McDonnell (1992) conducted a telephone survey in northeastern, metropolitan area and found that respondents reported feeling more concern and support toward the homeless around the holiday season.

Bryan (2000) assessed patterns of communally-oriented individuals. They found that students who scored higher in communal orientation (having care and concern for family and friends) were more likely to be understanding to the plight of the homeless.

<div align="center">"Social Stigma"</div>

The social stigma surrounding homelessness is as pervasive as homelessness itself. The previous literature on social stigma and homelessness is discussed in this subsection.

Social stigma can be defined as an attribute that tarnishes one identity, prohibits one from full social approval, and blames one as if situation is one's fault (Goffman, 1963; Phelan and Link, 1997). Stigmatization of a marginalized group can have major consequences for how those in said group are not only treated by others, but also how they come to view themselves. Link and Phelan (2001) found that those who reported belonging to a stigmatized group began to believe the stereotypes given to them and further devalued themselves. Alexander and Link (2003) conducted a study using a large, national telephone survey assessing social stigma, mental illness, and homelessness. They found that when participants reported perceiving someone to be homeless and having mental illness, they were more likely to view that person as less socially desirable. In a large, national study conducted by Phelan and colleagues, participants were read one of four possible versions of a vignette designed to differentiate

<div align="center">16</div>

respondents' attitudes toward the homeless versus domiciled persons. The results indicated that when the vignette subject was described as "homeless," rather than a non-homeless poor person, respondents were more likely to express greater social distance (Phelan *et al.*, 1997). This may be the result of the media labeling homelessness as an outcome of structural forces, while concurrently depicting the homeless as "dirty" and "dangerous." This study underscored the stigma surrounding the word the "homeless" when used as an adjective to describe a person.

The factors listed and reviewed in the above section have all been linked to attitudes toward the homeless. These factors are susceptible to change, and one possible method of invoking change is to increase contact with the homeless. The next section of this paper will review how contact with the homeless can act as a facilitator of change in attitudes toward the homeless.

Contact Hypothesis and Homelessness

Gordon Allport (1946) is widely credited with the formulation of the contact hypothesis. The contact hypothesis states that interaction among in-group and out-group members can reduce prejudice if certain conditions are met (Dixon *et al.*, 2005). These certain conditions are considered to be the basis of what is referred to as "good contact." Good contact refers to the idea that when the optimal conditions for contact, such as *equal group status, common goals, intergroup cooperation,* and *support of authority*, occur, the contact results in the most effective prejudice reduction (Dixon *et al.*, 2005; Pettigrew, 1998). Interestingly, racial and ethnic relations have been the epicenter of much of the work regarding contact hypothesis (Knecht & Martinez, 2009). Though of much of the research on contact hypothesis has been conducted in those fields, this section of the review will discuss the contact hypothesis with regard to homelessness.

The media has depicted the general public as growing weary in their support for the homeless, citing that the increased volume and contact with the homeless has made people less sympathetic, this concept has been termed "compassion fatigue", but there is no empirical evidence to support that claim (Link *et al.*, 1995). Much of the research conducted on the contact hypothesis and the homeless supports just the opposite; the more contact one has with the homeless, the less likely he will have stigmatizing

views toward the homeless as a group. In order to combat this claim of "compassion fatigue" toward the homeless, Link and company (1995) designed a cross-sectional, national study to test for evidence of "compassion fatigue." The findings yielded the exact opposite; 86 percent of respondents reported feeling sad and sympathetic, 77 percent disagreed that they felt less empathetic than they had in the past. Forty percent of respondents also reported a willingness to pay more in taxes and 36 percent reported a willingness to volunteer more in order to help the homeless (Link *et al*., 1995).

The next several paragraphs of this section will discuss how varying levels of contact with the homeless can result in less stigmatizing, less prejudice, less perceived danger, and less desired social distance with the homeless.

A few articles have been written discussing the differences between different types of contact and how that affects attitudes toward the homeless. Benedict (1988) conducted a study using residents of a large, coastal metropolitan area and compared them to residents from a suburban area with regards to attitudes toward the homeless. Both groups reported having a great deal of exposure to the homeless and both groups reported feeling concern or sympathy for the homeless. In two, separate local surveys, respondents who reported having contact with the homeless reported less prejudice toward the homeless (Lee, 1990; Toro & McDonnell, 1992).

An academic study was conducted with Internal Medicine residents and found that after a two-week rotation working consistently with homeless patients, the physicians had less stigmatizing attitudes toward the homeless than before the rotation (Buchanan, Rohr, Kehoe, Glick & Jain, 2004; Buchanan, Rohr, Stevar & Sai, 2007).

Communities with larger homeless populations provide more opportunities for citizens to have contact with the homeless and as a result affect attitudes toward the homeless (Lee *et al*., 2004). Due to the varying levels of homelessness in any given city, there may be differing attitudes toward the homeless across various cities. In addition, the more homeless people there may be in any given city, the higher media coverage of the community issue (Lee *et al*., 2004).

In 2004, Lee and company conducted a study using a nation-wide, cross-sectional survey to evaluate attitudinal changes concerning the contact hypothesis a step further by examining, not only the effects of overall exposure on attitudes toward the homeless, but four categories of exposure with a marginalized group: *information*, *observation*, *interaction*, and *membership*. These key terms are defined as followed: *information* includes media coverage, lectures, and informal conversations; *observation* includes frequent visual contact with the out-group; *interaction* includes face-to-face meaning of contact; and finally, *membership* includes an individual or family member who at one point was a member of the out-group (Lee *et al*., 2004). The findings were statistically significant for the overall exposure and the four dimensions of exposure; information, observation, interaction, and membership resulted in less stigmatizing attitudes toward the homeless at the p <.001 level (Lee *et al*., 2004). In addition, they found that exposure accounted for an additional 20 percent of the variation in respondents reporting they believed that homelessness was due to structural causes.

Alexander and Link (2003) conducted a large, national study measuring four different types of contact: *family*, *friend/spouse*, *public*, and *work* and its effects on attitudes toward a marginalized group. The key terms are defined as followed: *family* includes having a child, parent, sibling or self as member of out-group; *friend/spouse* includes having a friend or spouse as member of out-group; *public* includes seeing members of out-group in public; and, *work* includes having worked or volunteered with members of the out-group (Alexander & Link, 2003). One hypothesis tested was that increased total contact with a marginalized group would result in decreased stigma, less perceived danger, and less desired social distance. The researchers found strong support for this hypothesis. The second hypothesis evaluated four contact types that may predict general dangerousness. The results indicated that the respondents who experienced any of the four types of contact perceived the marginalized group as less dangerous (Alexander & Link, 2003).

Knecht and Martinez (2009, 2012) conducted a local study testing the contact hypothesis and homelessness. They implemented a pre/post research design among volunteers at a one-day event for the

19

homeless, and found that after the event those who had contact with the homeless reported feeling sympathy toward and less uneasy around the homeless.

Many studies have been conducted on attitudinal change among volunteers toward the homeless after having contact with the homeless. Many of these studies have hypothesized that extended contact with the homeless could result in a better understanding, less perceived danger, and less desired social distance with regards to homelessness (Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Kingree & Daves, 1997; Knecht & Martinez, 2009; Knecht & Martinez, 2012; Tse, Firmin, Johnson, Vorobyov & McKeon, 2006). These studies are discussed on the next page in greater detail in the section, Volunteer Attitudes toward Homelessness.

The next section of the review will describe the previous literature that has been written on the different types of volunteering as well as motivations to volunteer.

Volunteer Motivations

This section will review the different types of volunteering as well as the various motivations to volunteer. People volunteer for different reasons and at different times of the year. Toro and McDonnell (1992) found that respondents feel more sympathy toward the homeless around the holidays and as a result may feel more inclined to volunteer. Harrison (1995) discussed the difference between episodic and continuous volunteering, as well as the various motivations to participate in volunteer work. In his study at a small, local shelter he argued that most volunteer work is episodic rather than continuous meaning it is an act that is meticulously planned and deliberately carried out as a departure from one's routine. As such, the present study will attempt to identify varying attitudes toward the homeless of those who participate in continuous volunteering and those who participate in episodic volunteering at or near the holidays or any other time of the year.

Harrison (1995) also investigated intentions to volunteer by examining four concepts: *expected outcomes* (costs and rewards) of volunteering, *subjective norms* (what important others think I should do) surrounding volunteering, *perceived behavioral control* (can successfully volunteer if choses to do so),

and *moral obligation* (an internalized pressure to be consistent with one's morals). The results indicated that all four concepts predicted one's intention to volunteer.

Cloke and cohort (2007) investigated volunteer motivations by conducting qualitative interviews with volunteers across ten different organizations geared toward aiding the homeless. Throughout conducting the interviews, Cloke and his team discovered two major reasons why the volunteer participants were motivated to serve, the first of which was related to many volunteers who identified a faith commitment. The volunteers said it was their duty as Christians to give back to the community and serve those in need. The other major motivator to volunteer was the personal experience of being in a situation of need; volunteers who identified this as a reason wanted to return the favor (Cloke *et al.*, 2007).

The studies reviewed in this section found that participants experienced joy from volunteering and it is something they want to do (Cloke *et al.*, 2007; Harrison 1995). In addition to the different types of volunteering and motivations to volunteer it is important to discuss volunteer attitudes toward the homeless. As such, the next section will review the literature that has been written on volunteer attitudes toward the homeless.

Volunteer Attitudes toward Homelessness

As volunteers are often on the front lines of service, attempting to understand the attitudes they hold toward the clients they serve is key. This section will review previous literature that has been written on volunteer interactions with and attitudes toward the homeless.

Students are often a quick, convenient, and accessible sampling population. As a result, many researchers conduct studies using student populations. Hocking and Lawrence (2000) gave students a pretest that measured their perceptions of the seriousness of eight social problems. The students then spent an evening in a local shelter where they participated in various volunteering activities such as preparation of meals, housekeeping chores, and recreational activities. After the shelter experience was complete, the students were asked to fill out a survey regarding attitudes and opinions toward the homeless. The results indicated that a single prosocial interaction with homeless individuals can result in

changes in attitudes, beliefs, and behavioral intentions, including willingness to persuade others to help the homeless (Hocking & Lawrence, 2000). In the same study, qualitative data was collected in the form of a paper students wrote about their experiences at the shelter. The qualitative findings underscored the encouraging findings in the quantitative section of the study.

Knecht and Martinez (2012) conducted a similar study by asking students to take a pre-test, work at a day-long, city-wide resources fair for the homeless, and take a posttest. Knecht & Martinez (2012) furthered their findings by comparing those who voluntarily worked with the homeless and service learners who were there for a grade. They found that both groups reported feeling more comfortable around the homeless, held fewer stereotypes, and had greater sympathy for the homeless after the volunteering event.

Many of the students from both studies noted the experience as life changing and rewarding. As a result of the contact with homeless individuals, the students also commented on the desire to change the stereotypes surrounding homelessness (Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Knecht & Martinez, 2012).

Kingree and Daves (1997) found similar results when they conducted studies with college students to evaluate attitudes toward the homeless. These researchers were interested in measuring not only how the students felt about the homeless, but also if contact with and reading about homelessness would have any effect on the students' attitudes. Not unlike the study conducted by Hocking and Lawrence (2000), Kingree and Daves subjected the students to pre- and posttests. They found that the students who had contact with the homeless and those who read personal stories about the homeless reported less stigmatizing attitudes and greater optimism regarding solutions for homelessness (Kingree & Daves, 1997).

Cloke and company (2007) conducted qualitative interviews measuring volunteer attitudes and ethical dilemmas among several agencies. Volunteers across the different agencies serving the homeless acknowledged the change in attitude they experienced after having volunteered with the homeless and "gotten to know them" (Cloke *et al*., 2007). The researchers found that in addition to the volunteers feeling sympathy for the clients they also felt a need to "fix" the clients they served. The volunteers also

22

commented on the importance of spending time rather than only giving money to an agency that serves the homeless (Bloom & Kilgore, 2003; Cloke *et al.*, 2007).

Summary

Not unlike other social issues, homelessness is a controversial topic. The present chapter has been devoted to understanding previous literature written on attitudes toward homelessness in order to provide new literature that can add to the current body of work. The literature reviewed has indicated that many people feel sympathy toward the homeless (Agans *et al.*, 2011; Benedict, 1988; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Toro & McDonnell, 1992) and view homelessness as a societal and structural problem (Kingree & Daves, 1997; Lee *et al.*, 1990; Lee *et al.*, 1992; Lee *et al.*, 2010). The literature also indicates that many different socioeconomic factors can contribute to the way in which homelessness in viewed (Blasi, 2000; Furnham, 1996; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Lee *et al.*, 1990).

The constructs *willingness to help* and *sympathy* were also considered highly correlated positive attitudes toward the homeless (Bryan *et al.*, 2000; Knecht & Martinez, 2009, 2012; Lee *et al.*, 2004; Link *et al.*, 1995; Morgan *et al.*, 1997). Recent literature has indicated that contact with the homeless can result in a better understanding of homelessness as well as provide more comfort and less perceived danger toward the homeless (Alexander & Link, 2003; Benedict, 1988; Buchanan *et al.*, 2004, 2007; Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Kingree & Daves, 1997; Knecht & Martinez, 2009; Knecht & Martinez, 2012; Lee *et al.*, 1990; Lee *et al.*, 2004; Link *et al.*, 1995; Toro & McDonnell, 1992; Tse *et al.*, 2006; Zrinyi & Balogh, 2004).

In addition to attempting to understand the general public's attitudes of the homeless, researchers have made an effort to understand volunteers' attitudes toward homelessness. As such, it is important to understand the demographics of those who volunteer as well as the motivations that compel them to do so. Previous literature has indicated that people volunteer for many different reasons and most volunteering is episodic rather than continuous (Cloke *et al.*, 2007; Harrison, 1997). Literature reviewed in this chapter also pointed to volunteers having less stigmatizing attitudes toward the homeless due, in part, to contact with the homeless through volunteering (Bloom & Kilgore, 2000; Cloke *et al.*, 2007;

Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Kingree & Daves, 1997; Knecht & Martinez, 2009; Knecht & Martinez, 2012).

The studies reviewed in this chapter provided a foundation of research to which the present study can contribute. The purpose of the present study is to provide a test of the contact hypothesis with regard to attitudes toward the homeless among soup kitchen volunteers by investigating the length of volunteering, type of volunteer "new or episodic" and "established or continuous", as well as capacity of volunteering. Participants' sympathy toward the homeless and attitudes toward community service will also be studied. This research is important as it will, not only, begin to fill the gap of research conducted on the contact hypothesis and attitudes toward homelessness held by soup kitchen volunteers, but also add to the knowledge of volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. Chapter III will provide the details of the methodology of this project.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the contact hypothesis utilizing length (frequency and consistency), capacity and type of volunteering tasks to explore soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. Specifically, the present study sought to assess the differences between two types of soup kitchen volunteers, those termed "new or episodic" and "established or continuous" (Harrison, 1995), and whether they differ in their views of the causes of homelessness, effectiveness of solutions, and willingness to affiliate with the homeless. Demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service were also used as predictors of attitudes toward the homeless. The contact hypothesis was used as a theoretical framework through which inferences about the soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes were drawn. This chapter describes the methodology employed to complete this study. The Institutional Review Board at Oklahoma State University approved this methodology before participant recruitment began. The IRB approval letter can be found in Appendix A.

Chapter III is divided into two sections: preliminary procedures and operational procedures. The first section, preliminary procedures, is further divided into four subsections: preliminary meeting, selection of subjects, selection of instruments, and selection of the data collection site. The second section is further divided into three subsections: procedure meeting, data collection procedures for soup-kitchen volunteers, and data analysis.

Preliminary Procedures

Preliminary Meeting

25

Prior to the selection of subjects, the researcher met with the staff and Executive Director of a local soup kitchen to discuss the proposed study. The soup kitchen staff and Executive Director were assured that the proposed study would be reviewed by the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board. This meeting resulted in a signed letter of support, which is provided in Appendix B, from the soup kitchen Executive Director stating her understanding and willingness to cooperate with the researcher on the study.

Selection of Subjects

A method of non-random sampling known as convenience sampling was employed in this study. Convenience sampling is the process of including those who are available and interested in participating (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009). Convenience sampling was utilized to recruit the volunteer participants.

For the volunteer participants, both female and male volunteers were recruited at a local soup kitchen serving the homeless. In addition, two groups of volunteers were actively recruited: "new or episodic" volunteers and "established or continuous" volunteers. In order to recruit potential participants, the researcher posted a flyer on the volunteer and staff bulletin board near the kitchen area where the volunteers worked, shown in Appendix C. In addition, the researcher had direct contact with the volunteers by approaching them before, during, or after their volunteering shift.

To be eligible to participate as a volunteer subject in the present study, the volunteers had to be over eighteen years old as well as be a current volunteer at the soup kitchen.

Prior to advertising and recruiting for the present study, an a priori procedure was conducted to determine how many participants were needed in the sample. The researcher conducted a priori power analysis using the GPower 3.1software for windows. An a priori procedure is a power analysis conducted before implementing a research project in order to assess how many participants are needed to reach statistical significance. The a priori procedure indicated that with a moderate effect size of 0.15 as measured using Cohen's d (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003), alpha level of 0.05, power of 0.95, and 12 predictors, a total sample size of 178 is needed to reach statistical significance.

Selection of Instruments

The present study employed a cross-sectional survey design in order to collect data from respondents at a single point in time, in effect providing a snapshot of the participants' attitudes toward the homeless (Gay *et al*., 2009). The survey was a compilation of demographic information, volunteering information, as well as three separate instruments measuring attitudinal variables. The survey consisted of both structured and unstructured items. Structured items require the respondent to choose from a provided list of answers, and unstructured items provide the respondent the freedom to answer the question in her own words (Gay *et al*., 2009). The total survey is shown in Appendix D.

The present study utilized three instruments, they are described as follows:

1. Attitudes Toward Homelessness Inventory (ATHI) – This 11-item, multidimensional instrument is designed to measure attitudes toward the homeless. The principal intention of this instrument was to evaluate changes in attitudes using a small-item scale (Kingree & Daves, 1997). In addition, the instrument was created in order to test the current attitudes toward the homeless as much of the literature had dated back to the late eighties and early nineties (Kingree & Daves, 1997). The items from the ATHI were developed from literature concerning homelessness, stigmatization, causal attribution, and attitudes toward mental illness (Kingree & Daves, 1997). As a result of these concepts found in the literature, the ATHI contains four subscales – (1) personal causation (PC - homelessness is due to individual deficiencies); (2) societal causation (SC - homelessness is due to societal defects); (3) affiliation (AFF - willingness to affiliate with homeless persons); and (4) solutions (SOL - there are viable solutions to homelessness). A sample item from the affiliation scale is provided here: I feel uneasy when I meet homeless people (Kingree & Daves, 1997). The items are presented with a six-point Likert response format (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 = somewhat disagree, 5 = disagree, and 6 = strongly disagree) (Kingree & Daves, 1997). However, items were coded so higher scores represented a more positive response to the items.

Psychometric properties on the ATHI were reported in four separate studies. The first study, as reported by Kingree and Daves (1997), consisted of 383 students enrolled in introductory psychology courses at Georgia State University. The students were given a 27-item version of the ATHI. The internal consistency coefficients were as follows: PC = .72, SC = .72, AFF = .65, SOL = .60 and the total = .71. The findings from that study resulted in an 11-item final version of the ATHI. The second study had two goals: (1) to reproduce similar results from study 1, and (2) to further demonstrate construct validity (Kingree & Daves, 1997). The 11-item version of the ATHI along with other instruments was given to 203 undergraduate students in exchange for credit in a psychology course at Georgia State University. The internal consistency coefficients were as follows: PC = .73, SC = .70, AFF = .67, SOL = .57 and the total = .72.

The third study was conducted utilizing 154 low-income persons who enrolled in an in-patient, substance-abuse treatment program. The participants were given the 11-item ATHI and were asked a single item regarding their personal experience with homelessness. The internal consistency coefficients were as follows: PC = .68, SC = .64, AFF = .61, SOL = .77 and the total = .71. The fourth and final study was conducted in order to measure changes in attitudes toward the homeless. The ATHI was administered at the beginning of the semester to 238 students who were enrolled in an undergraduate psychology courses. Students could choose to participate in an experiment involving essays on structural causes of homelessness, individual causes of homelessness, and environmental issues which was used as the control group. The ATHI was also included in the reading packets. The results indicated that the students who read essays stressing structural causes were more likely to believe structural issues were the cause of homelessness. Whereas those who read essays highlighting individual causes for homelessness were more likely to believe individuals were to blame for being homeless (Kingree & Daves, 1997). Construct validity was evaluated by assessing the correlations between the ATHI with gender, race, and Belief in a Just World Scale (Kingree & Daves, 1997).

28

The ATHI was chosen for the present study because the researcher was interested in measuring the various dimensions of attitudes toward the homeless using a small number of items. The ATHI is shown in Appendix E.

2. Trait Sympathy Scale (TSS) – This 18-item, multidimensional instrument is designed to measure trait sympathy. The primary intention of creating this instrument was to develop a multidimensional sympathy instrument based on sympathy-specific theory. Before the TSS was created, Davis's (1983) Empathy Concern subscale on the Interpersonal Reactivity Index had been commonly used to measure sympathy; however, it was not based on sympathy-specific trait theory (Lee, 2009). The TSS contains three subscales – (1) sympathy for the disempowered (SDS); (2) sympathy for the feelings of others (SFS); and (3) sympathy for animals (SAS). These three subscales comprise the total scale, General Trait Sympathy. A sample item from the scale is provided here: I would probably become teary eyed or close to crying if I were to see a homeless child eating out of a trash can (Lee, 2009). The items are presented with a six-point Likert response format (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 = somewhat disagree, 5 = disagree, and 6 = strong disagree) (Lee, 2009). Items were coded so that higher scores on the scale represented a more positive response.

Psychometric properties for the TSS were evaluated by conducting three separate studies. The purpose of study one, as reported by Lee (2009), was to create and assess items to measure trait sympathy. A 59-item version of the TSS was given to 732 students in a large southeastern university. The internal consistency coefficients for this study were as follows: SDS = 0.72, SFS = .75, SAS = .81 and General Trait Sympathy (GTS -total) = 0.80. The main objective for study two was to identify whether the TSS had convergent and discriminant validity. A group of 137 undergraduate students from a liberal arts university were selected for this study. A self-report survey was administered as well as an informant-report survey. Similar to study one, the internal consistency reliability scores from the self-reported surveys were high; SDS = .87, SAS = .84, SFS = .81 and GTS = .89. The internal consistency reliability scores from the informant-reported surveys were as follows: SDS = .88, SAS = .86, SFS = .64 and GTS = .88. Construct validity was demonstrated through the correlations between the TSS with gender,

29

emotional empathy, callousness, and empathetic concern (Lee, 2009). To test for convergent validity, a multitrait-multimethod matrix design was used. High convergence and evidence for discriminant validity was found among the self-reported TSS and informant-reported TSS (validity value rs from .46-.61) (Lee, 2009). The goal for the third and final study was to evaluate predictive validity. Eighty-one students from a liberal arts school participated in the study. Just as in the other two studies, internal consistency reliability scores were high; SDS = .75, SAS = .85, SFS = .81 and GTS = .83. Evidence for predictive validity was provided by the significant regression coefficients on the TSS subscales predicting film elicited state sympathy.

The TSS was chosen for the present study because of the researcher's interest in measuring sympathy as a predictor of attitudes toward the homeless. The TSS provides a multidimensional measure of trait sympathy. The TSS also offers many advantages over the Empathetic Concern subscale in the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. The TSS is shown in Appendix F. The construct sympathy has been defined in the *Foundational Terms* section of Chapter I. In addition, Chapter II provides a section, *Constructs that Contribute to Attitudes toward Homelessness*, which further describes the construct as it relates to homelessness.

3. Community Service Attitude Survey (CSAS) – This 31-item, multidimensional instrument designed to measure attitudes toward community service participation. This instrument was developed using Schwartz's (1977) Altruistic Helping Behavior Model. This model explains the human awareness to the needs of others as well as the degree to which humans choose to help others in need (Schwartz, 1977). The Schwartz model addresses both the cognitive and affective steps a person takes resulting in a helping behavior (Shirarella *et al*., 2000). This instrument was developed to evaluate attitudes toward helping at each step of the model (Shiarella *et al*., 2000). The CSAS contains eight subscales – (1) normative helping attitudes; (2) connectedness; (3) costs; (4) awareness; (5) intentions; (6) benefits; (7) seriousness; (8) career benefits. A sample item from the scale is provided here: When I meet people who are having a difficult time, I wonder how I would feel if I were in their shoes (Shiarella *et al*., 2000). The items are presented with a six-point Likert response format (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 =

somewhat disagree, 5 = disagree, and 6 = strong disagree) (Shiarella *et al.*, 2000). Items were coded so that higher scores would represent a more positive response to the scale.

Psychometric properties were reported for this scale using college students at a western university. The first study, as reported by Shiarella and company (2000), was intended to evaluate the internal consistency reliability scores using 437 students. The students were given a 70-item scale, of those 70 items, 59 were on community service attitudes. The internal consistency reliability scores are as follows: normative helping behavior = .92, connectedness = .93, costs = .85, awareness = .85, intentions = .86, benefits = .79, seriousness = .84 and career benefits = .72. In order to test for construct validity, the CSAS scales were evaluated against other variables possibly expected to be related to them. Evidence for construct validity was provided by the lack of relationship among the other variables with the scales (Shiarella *et al*., 2000).

The CSAS was chosen for the current study because of the researcher's interest in measuring the difference between new/episodic versus continuous/established soup kitchen volunteers and attitudes toward community service. The CSAS is shown in Appendix G.

Data Collection Site

The soup kitchen was selected for the site of data collection from the volunteer participants. The researcher chose a soup kitchen in downtown Tulsa, where many homeless individuals reside. The soup kitchen began operations in 1978 by providing sandwiches to hungry individuals and is located in the basement of an Episcopal church, though the soup kitchen is a separate entity with a 501(c)(3) classification. In 2013, 4,874 volunteers provided 10,629 hours of community service (Iron Gate, 2013). This specific soup kitchen was chosen, in part, because of the reciprocal relationship that has been cultivated among the staff, volunteers, and "guests." The staff and volunteers refer to those who receive services from the soup kitchen as "guests" rather than clients, in an effort to create more of an *equal group status* among all of those who work, volunteer, and attend the soup kitchen. Every day the staff, volunteers, and "guests" come together at the soup kitchen for one *common goal*: to feed the hungry and homeless. The staff, volunteers, and "guests" work together to ensure that all of those who are hungry are

31

fed that morning. While the staff orders food from the food bank, the volunteers make grocery bags and serve the food, and the "guests" wash their plates, wipe the tables, and sweep the floors; this is all done through an *intergroup cooperation* effort. Finally, the soup kitchen staff, volunteers, and "guests" all function under the assumption that the law will be upheld through *support of authority*. This effort is vital in order to maintain the safety of all of those who are present at the soup kitchen.

Volunteers were asked to participate in the survey either before, during or after their shift depending on the volume of homeless guests being served that day. Several small, quiet spaces within the soup kitchen were used for the completion of the surveys.

Operational Procedures

Procedure Meeting

Prior to the distribution of surveys and the data collection process, the researcher held an optional meeting with the soup kitchen staff in order to inform them of the voluntary nature of the study. The staff was asked not to participate in any aspect of the data collection process beyond identifying volunteers to the researcher so as to avoid any volunteer participation coercion.

Data Collection Procedures for Volunteers

The potential participants were verbally informed of the voluntary nature of the study as well as given a survey packet including an information sheet describing the voluntary nature of the study. The researcher visited the soup kitchen on several occasions in order to identify potential survey participants. Data was collected from October 2013 to February 2014.

Data analysis

All statistical analyses from data collection were completed using SPSS 19.0 and 20.0 for Windows. All scaled instruments measuring study variables were evaluated for reliability using the data at hand. The ATHI was evaluated at the subscale and total scale level to determine whether it was better suited to subscale or total scale interpretation. It was decided not to employ a multivariate analysis using multiple outcome variables as the four dependent variables did not overlap. Based on this, it was decided to treat the four subscales as independent outcome variables. Due to the low item-total correlation

of the one of the personal causation subscale items, the item was dropped resulting in an improved alpha. This changed the personal causation subscale from a three-item subscale to a two-item subscale renamed (childhood causes). Childhood causes refers to the idea that homelessness is due to childhood causes.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Psychometric properties including sample size, means, standard deviations, internal consistency reliability scores, range, and skewness of the major study variables were tested. The acceptable Type I error rate was set to .05.

Research Question 1: Do demographic variables such as gender, race, age, religion, political identity, education level, and income level predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question one was addressed through an examination of the correlations including: Pearson r coefficients (for continuous variables), phi coefficients (for nominal variables), Spearman rho (for ordinal variables), and point biserial (for nominal and continuous variables) of the demographic variables: gender, age, race, education level, religion, political identification and income level with the outcome variables: societal causes, affiliation, solutions, and childhood causes.

A regression model was also used to address which demographic variables were significant predictors of attitudes toward the homeless. The variables shown to be significant predictors were used as the demographic variables in the final three research questions.

Research Question 2: Do level of sympathy and attitudes toward community service predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question two was addressed through the examination of Pearson r correlations of the independent variables: trait sympathy and community service attitudes variables with the outcome variables: societal causes and childhood causes.

Research Question 3: Do type of volunteering and length of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question three was addressed through the examination of correlations of independent variables: "type" of volunteering and "length" of volunteering with outcome variables: societal causes and childhood causes.

Research Question 4: Does capacity of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question four was addressed through spearman rho correlation of the independent variable: capacity of contact with the outcome variables: societal causes and childhood causes.

Research Question 5: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, does length of contact with the homeless significantly predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question five was addressed through two hierarchical regression models. The first model contained three blocks. The first block consisted of the demographic variables: religion and political affiliation found to be significant predictors of attitudes. The second block consisted of the TSS as well as the CSAS. The third block consisted of "length of contact" variable. The outcome variable used was the societal causes of attitudes toward the homeless. The second model contained three blocks as well. The first block consisted of the demographic variable: religion. The second block consisted of the TSS as well as the CSAS. The third block consisted of "length of contact" variable.

Research Question 6: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that type of volunteering predicts attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question six was addressed through two three block hierarchical regression models. The first block contained the demographic variables: religion and political affiliation. The second block contained the TSS as well as the CSAS. The third block contained "type of contact" variable ("established or continuous" versus "new or episodic"). The outcome variable was societal causes. The second model consisted of three blocks as well. The first block contained the demographic variable: gender. The second block contained the TSS as well as the CSAS. The third block contained "type of contact" variable ("established or continuous" versus "new or episodic").

Research Question 7: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that continuous volunteers with longer and more intense

contact have less stigmatizing attitudes than episodic volunteers who have shorter and less intense

contact?

Research question seven was addressed through two hierarchical regression models. Each model contained four blocks consistent with the findings from the literature review. The first block consisted of demographic variables: religion and political affiliation. The second block consisted of the TSS and CSAS variables. The third block consisted of the length and type of volunteers. The fourth block consisted of capacity of volunteering (serve in food line, grocery assistance, pantry, or anywhere). The outcome variable was societal causes. The second model also contained four blocks. The first block consisted of demographic variable: gender. The second block consisted of the TSS and CSAS variables. The third block consisted of the length and type of volunteers. The fourth block consisted of capacity of volunteering (serve in food line, grocery assistance, pantry, or anywhere).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter IV discusses the results of the present study. The results include two subsections: psychometric analyses and the results of the statistical analyses used to test the research questions.

Results

In Table 1 below, the sample characteristics were categorized by type of volunteer, "continuous" versus "episodic" in which continuous refers to a participant who volunteers on a weekly or biweekly basis and episodic refers to a participant who volunteers during one or more isolated occasions. Approximately 37.9% of respondents identified as continuous volunteers whereas 62.1% of respondents identified as episodic volunteers. It is interesting to note that the average age of episodic volunteers was almost eight years younger than the average age of the continuous volunteers. Both volunteer groups self-reported as predominantly Republican, Protestant, Caucasian females with college degrees. All frequencies and percentages are reported in the actual survey categories; however, the demographic variables were collapsed into dichotomous variables for data analysis purposes (Keith, 2006).

Table 1
Sample Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Continuous (%)	Episodic (%)
Gender		
Male	19 (39.6)	33 (41.3)
Female	29 (60.4)	47 (58.8)
Ethnicity		
African American	0	2 (2.5)
Caucasian	41 (87.2)	72 (90.0)
Hispanic	1 (2.1)	0
Native American	2 (4.3)	4 (5.0)
Other	3 (6.4)	2 (2.6)
Religion		
Catholic	2 (4.1)	10 (12.5)
Judaism	1 (2.1)	0
Protestant	29 (59.2)	51 (63.8)
No Affiliation	6 (12.2)	16 (20.0)
Other	11 (22.4)	3 (3.7)
Political Identity		
Democrat	14 (28.6)	19 (23.8)
Republican	24 (49.0)	40 (50.0)
Independent	5 (10.2)	10 (12.5)
No Affiliation	5 (10.2)	11 (13.8)
Other	1 (2.0)	0
Education Level		
< High School Graduate/GED	0	1 (1.3)
High School Graduate	5 (10.4)	5 (6.3)
Technical School	1 (2.1)	5 (6.3)
Some College	15 (31.8)	17 (21.3)
College Graduate	25 (52.1)	40 (50.0)
Post Graduate	2 (4.2)	12 (15.0)
Income Level		
< $25,000	7 (14.3)	7 (13.8)
$25,000 - $49,999	9 (18.4)	14 (17.5)
$50,000 - $99,999	15 (30.6)	17 (21.3)
$100,000 - $149,999	11 (22.4)	16 (20.0)
Other/Prefer not to answer	7 (14.3)	26 (27.5)
Age		
	50.33 (16.87)	42.75 (16.65)

Note. Mean age (with standard deviations) are reported.
N = 129, Continuous n = 49, Episodic n = 80

Psychometric Analyses

Item analysis reliability analyses were conducted on the three instruments used in the survey: the Attitudes toward Homelessness Inventory, the Trait Sympathy Scale, and the Community Service Attitudes Scale. Reliability is defined as the extent to which a test *consistently* measures whatever it is measuring (Gay *et al*., 2009). In this study, the researcher estimated the reliability of scales and the reliability of the subscales within each scale. For this study, coefficient alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of test items.

With regard to the Attitudes Toward Homelessness Inventory, it was anticipated that the total scale score may not be appropriate as the subscales proved to be more effective on their own and the total scale score was not meaningful. As such, it was determined that the items measured four attitudinal constructs – a belief in the childhood causes of homelessness, a belief in societal causes of homelessness, solutions to homelessness, as well as willingness to affiliate with the homeless. After conducting the reliability coefficient on the total scale score, it was determined that the total scale score was not appropriate to use due to the unacceptably low reliability coefficient ($\alpha = .39$). In addition, due to the low item-total correlation, it was decided to delete item twenty-five, "Most homeless persons are substance abusers." The deletion of this item did not damage the construct validity, and in fact, deleting this item resulted in an improved alpha. Deleting this item resulted in changing the personal causes subscale from a 3-item scale to a 2-item subscale as well as renaming it "childhood causes." A reliability analysis was conducted for each subscale of the ATHI. Results are displayed in Table 2, and based on these results it was decided to use the subscales: societal causes ($\alpha = .88$), affiliation ($\alpha = .70$), solutions ($\alpha = .75$) and childhood causes ($\alpha = .71$) as the dependent variables.

In Table 2 below, the results of the Trait Sympathy Scale, which measures a respondent's capacity for sympathy, psychometric analyses indicated the internal consistency of the scale was more than adequate ($\alpha = .89$). An inspection of item-total correlations and the re-computation of coefficient alpha with item removed did not suggest that any items should be removed from the TSS.

The Community Service Attitudes Scale, which measures a respondent's attitude about community service, was subjected to the same psychometric analyses: item statistics, inter-item correlations, item totals and scale statistics. Based on the results, it was determined the CSAS total scale score was appropriate to use as the internal consistency was excellent (α = .97).

Table 2

Psychometric Properties of the Major Study Variables

Variable	N	M	SD	α	Range		Skew
					Potential	Observed	
Societal Causes Scale	125	11.86	4.07	0.88	3-18	3-18	-0.39
Affiliation Scale	129	9.8	2.11	0.70	2-12	3-12	-0.84
Solutions Scale	125	14.06	3.23	0.75	3-18	3-18	-0.99
Childhood Causes Scale	123	8.19	2.33	0.71	2-12	2-12	-0.26
Trait Sympathy Scale	123	90.88	12.03	0.89	18-108	35-108	-1.18
Community Service Attitudes Scale	127	166.55	19.54	0.97	31-186	55-186	-2.09

Table 3 below displays the corrected item-total correlations for each item in the Attitudes Toward Homelessness Inventory. The items are presented by subscale. Please note that the last item "Most homeless people are substance abusers" in the childhood causes subscale has been deleted.

Table 3

Item Analysis for the Attitudes Toward Homelessness Inventory

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
ATHI - Societal Causes	
Government cutbacks may have made homeless problem worse	0.77
Low minimum wage guarantees large homeless population	0.72
Government cutbacks in welfare contribute to homelessness	0.81
	Alpha = .88
ATHI - Affiliation	
I feel comfortable eating with homeless person	0.56
I feel uneasy when I meet homeless people	0.56
	Alpha = .70
ATHI - Childhood Causes	
Parents took little interest in them as kids	0.54
Homelessness can be traced to childhood emotional experiences	0.52
Most homeless people are substance abusers	.36 (item deleted)
	Alpha = .71
ATHI – Solutions	
Rehab programs for homeless are too expensive	0.53

Little can be done for homeless, except make them comfortable	0.71
Homeless person cannot adopt normal lifestyle	0.52
	Alpha = .75

Table 4 below displays the corrected item-total correlations for each item in the Trait Sympathy

Scale. The total scale score for the TSS was utilized as a predictor variable in the research questions.

Table 4

Item Analysis for the Trait Sympathy Scale

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
It breaks my heart when people get made fun of for disabilities	0.48
I would become teary eyed to homeless child eating trash	0.63
It breaks my heart to know children are being abused	0.51
To see elderly person fall down would break my heart	0.53
It would break my heart to see elderly person humiliated	0.55
I feel sorry for victims of child abuse	0.34
I don't get emotional when I see people cry	0.54
I become teary eyed when I see others crying	0.50
I don't have feelings of concern when I see other crying	0.54
I don't get emotional when others around me feel embarrassed	0.55
I'm inclined to feel troubled when I see someone crying	0.41
It doesn't bother me much when sensitive people get feelings hurt	0.51
It would really disturb me to see a wounded animal suffering	0.57
It disturbs me to know people are cruel to animals	0.58
Seeing animals get hurt doesn't bother me much	0.63
I feel bad for animals when I know they are in pain	0.56
I feel sorry for animals that are teased at zoos and circuses	0.56
I feel bad for animals on TV that are attacked by predators	0.50
	Alpha = .89

Table 5 below displays the corrected item-total correlations for each item in the Community

Service Attitudes Scale. The total scale score for the CSAS was utilized as a predictor variable in the

research questions.

Table 5

Item Analysis for the Community Service Attitudes Scale

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
Community groups need our help	0.75
There are people in our community who need our help	0.73
There are needs in the community	0.70

There are people who have needs which are not met	0.66
Volunteer work at community agencies helps solve social issues	0.57
Volunteers in community agencies make a difference	0.54
College student volunteers can help improve local community	0.75
Volunteering in community projects can improve the community	0.84
The people who help, the better things will get	0.78
Contributing my skills will make the community a better place	0.81
My contribution to the community will make a difference	0.74
I can make a difference in the community	0.77
I am responsible for doing something to improve the community	0.76
It is my responsibility to help others in need	0.76
It is important to have a sense of contribution to my community	0.79
IT is important to gain responsibility through community service	0.69
I feel an obligation to contribute to the community	0.65
Other people deserve my help	0.71
It is important to help people in general	0.76
Improving communities is important to maintaining society	0.79
Our community needs good volunteers	0.82
All communities need good volunteers	0.80
It is important to provide a useful skills through community service	0.83
I wonder how I would feel in others shoes	0.51
I feel bad some community members are suffering	0.78
I feel bad about the disparity among community members	0.65
Lack of community service will cause damage to our society	0.69
Without community service, disadvantaged citizens have no hope	0.57
Community service is necessary to making the community better	0.78
It is critical that citizens become involved in community service	0.79
Community service is crucial to the solution of community problems	0.80
	Alpha = .97

Results for Research Questions

Research Question 1: Do demographic variables such as gender, race, age, religion, political identity, education level, and income level predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Correlations of the demographic variables with the subscales of the ATHI ranged from -.03 to .28. The results from Table 6 below demonstrate that gender, religion, and political identity were significant predictors of the societal causes subscale and the childhood causes subscale of the ATHI. None of the demographic variables showed significant correlation with the solutions subscale or the

41

affiliation subscale. As a result, these three demographic variables will be used in hierarchical regression models used to answer research questions five, six, and seven for the societal and childhood causes subscales of the ATHI. A correlation matrix including all of the predictor variables as well as the outcome variables is included in Appendix H.

It is interesting to note that religion and political affiliation were positively correlated with societal causes. This can be interpreted as non-protestants and those who affiliated with an "other" political group were more likely to believe in societal causes of homelessness than Protestants. Gender and childhood causes were correlated as well. This can interpreted as respondents who self-reported as females were more likely to believe in childhood causes of homelessness. Age was also positively correlated with gender, ethnicity, and education; and was negatively correlated with political affiliation. This can be interpreted as age increases; the respondent was more likely to be a non-minority, male who affiliates with the Republican Party and who was not a college graduate. Another interesting correlation was that of income with ethnicity, political affiliation, and education. This correlation can be interpreted as income increases; the respondent was more likely to be a non-minority with "other" political affiliation and not a college graduate. Political affiliation was correlated with religion and education. This can be interpreted as a respondent who self-reported as having an "other" political affiliation was more likely to be a non-protestant without a college degree.

Table 6

Demographic Characteristics and Correlations with Outcome Variables

Variable	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Societal Causes Scale	125	—										
2. Affiliation Scale	129	0.11	—									
3. Solutions Scale	125	0.07	.28*	—								
4. Childhood Causes Scale	123	-0.09	-0.03	.22*	—							
5. Gender	128	0.09	-0.05	0.04	.19*	—						
6. Age	128	0.05	0.06	-0.03	0.02	-.27**	—					
7. Race	123	0.02	-0.02	-0.1	0.05	-0.13	.29**	—				
8. Religion	129	.29**	-0.02	-0.03	0.07	-0.02	-0.04	0.05	—			
9. Political Affiliation	129	.33**	-0.16	0.0	0.00	0.13	-.24**	-0.01	.21*	—		
10. Education Level	128	0.05	0.09	-0.1	0.01	0.06	.26**	-0.02	0.12	.36**	—	
11. Income Level	129	0.03	-0.14	-0.02	0.04	0.15	0.13	.45**	0.21	.39*	.26**	—

Note. Correlations were conducted using point biserial, Phi coefficient, Spearman rho, and Pearson r coefficients. Gender was coded as male = 0 & female = 1, Race was coded as minority = 0 & non-minority = 1, Religion was coded as Protestant = 0 & non-Protestant = 1, political affiliation was coded as Republican = 0, Democrat = 1, and other = 2, Education was coded as college graduate = 0 & non-college graduate =1, Income level was coded as <$25,000 = 1, $25,000-$49,999 =2, $50,000-$99,999 = 3, and $100,000+ = 4.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

In Table 7 below, the means and standard deviations for the categorical variables on each dependent variable are included. The means and standard deviations show the comparative relationships of the categorical variables with the outcome variables.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Categorical Variables on each Dependent Variable

Variable (n = 129)	Societal Causes M (SD)	Childhood Causes M (SD)	Affiliation M (SD)	Solutions M (SD)
Gender				
Male (n = 52)	11.39 (4.46)	*7.67 (2.35)	9.92 (2.20)	13.88 (3.45)
Female (n = 76)	12.14 (3.79)	8.58 (2.27)	9.72 (2.08)	14.15(3.10)
Ethnicity				
Minority (n = 14)	11.40 (4.20)	7.90 (2.60)	10.60 (1.51)	15.10 (3.41)
Non-Minority (n = 113)	11.75 (4.08)	8.31 (2.31)	9.69 (2.16)	13.95 (3.24)
Religion				
Protestant (n = 80)	*10.96 (4.33)	8.05 (2.16)	9.84 (2.14)	14.13 (2.92)
Non-Protestant (n = 49)	13.39 (3.07)	8.40 (2.57)	9.73 (2.11)	13.96 (3.70)
Political Affiliation				
Republican (n = 64)	*10.48 (4.17)	7.87 (2.34)	10.14 (2.12)	13.71 (2.98)
Democrat (n = 33)	*14.48 (2.73)	8.71 (2.10)	9.36 (1.80)	14.79 (3.46)

Other (n = 32)	12.86 (3.86)	7.38 (2.42)	9.44 (2.45)	12.93 (3.50)
Education Level				
College Graduate (n = 79)	11.67 (4.09)	8.17 (2.32)	9.66 (2.02)	14.29 (2.95)
Non College Graduate (n = 49)	12.11 (4.09)	8.23 (2.39)	10.04 (2.29)	13.61 (3.65)
Income				
< $25,000 (n = 14)	13.84 (3.56)	7.00 (2.96)	10.50 (1.99)	12.29 (4.48)
$25,000 - $49, 999 (n = 23)	11.18 (3.96)	7.59 (1.94)	9.65 (2.44)	13.87 (3.21)
$50, 000 - $99,999 (n = 32)	10.88 (4.14)	8.97 (2.01)	9.84 (2.20)	14.20 (3.62)
$100, 000+ (n = 60)	12.89 (3.49)	8.81 (2.28)	9.41 (2.00)	14.11 (2.98)

*p<.05

For the two scales of the ATHI, statistical assumptions for the use of multiple regression analysis were tested prior to conducting the regression analysis. Because of the relatively small sample size, only the variables that had significant zero order correlations with the dependent measures were included in the regression analysis. These results are presented in the section that follows. The statistical assumptions for the research questions including independence, homogeneity of variance/homoscedasticity, linearity, normality, and multicollinearity were tested and found to be reasonably met. A test for outliers was conducted as well. For further information regarding the details of each assumption tested, please see Appendix I.

Societal Causes. In Table 8 below, a multiple regression analysis was used to test the combined effect of political affiliation and religion with societal causes. Results are displayed in Table 4 below. The model was statistically significant [F (3,106) = 12.75, p < .01]. Both religion [t = 3.23, df = 106, p < .01] and political affiliation – republican compared to democrat [t = .43, df = 106, p <.01] were significant predictors. However, the republican compared to other was not a significant predictor. *This means that non-protestants compared to Protestants and democrats compared to republicans were more likely to hold the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness.* The multiple R^2 indicates that approximately 27% of the variation in the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by political affiliation and religion.

44

Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis Among
Predictor Variables Religion and Political
Affiliation with Outcome Variable-Societal
Causes

Predictor	Societal Causes	
		β
Religion		0.28**
Republican/Democrat		0.39**
Republican/Other		0.16
R^2	0.27**	
F (3,106)	12.75**	
n	110.00	

Note. Republican/Democrat = Democrat compared to
Republican and Republican/Other = Other compared
to Republican
*p < .05, **p < .01

Childhood Causes. In the following section, childhood causes was regressed on gender. Since gender was the only demographic variable significantly related to childhood causes, a simple regression model was conducted. The results shown in Table 9 below indicate that gender was a significant predictor of the belief that childhood causes may lead to homelessness. The model was statistically significant with F (1,120) = 4.66, p = .03. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 4% of the variation in the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by gender. *Females were more likely hold this attitude.*

Table 9

Simple Regression Analysis Among
Predictor Variable-Gender
with Outcome Variable-Childhood
Causes

Predictor	Childhood Causes	
		β
Gender		.19*
R^2	0.04*	
F (1,120)	4.66*	

Note. N = 122
*p < .05, **p < .01

Research Question 2: Do sympathy and attitudes toward community service predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question two examined whether the Trait Sympathy Scale and Community Service Attitudes Scale predicted attitudes toward the homeless. In Table 10 below, the Community Service Attitudes scale has a small, positive significant correlation with the societal causes subscale of the ATHI. *This can be interpreted as those who believe community service is important were more likely to hold the belief that societal causes may lead to homelessness.*

The trait sympathy scale has a small, positive correlation with the societal causes subscale. *This can be interpreted as a respondent who reported as more sympathetic, was also more likely to hold the belief that societal causes may lead to homelessness.*

Interestingly, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were moderately and positively correlated with one another. *This relationship suggests that the more sympathetic a participant reported to be; the more likely the respondent was to believe in the importance of community service as well.*

Table 10
Trait Sympathy and Community Services Attitudes Correlations with Outcome Variables

Variable	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Societal Causes Scale	125	11.86	4.07	—			
2. Childhood Causes Scale	123	8.19	2.33	-0.09	—		
3. Trait Sympathy Scale	123	90.88	12.03	.18*	0.02	—	
4. Community Service Attitudes Scale	127	166.6	19.54	.33*	-0.14	.57**	—

Note. Means and Standard Deviations are represented in vertical columns. Higher scores are indicative of stronger agreement among all scales. All correlations were conducted using Pearson r coefficients.
*p < .05, **p < .01

Research Question 3: Do type of volunteering and length of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Research question three asked if type of volunteering and length of volunteering predicted attitudes toward the homeless. Table 11 below indicates neither type of volunteering, "new or episodic" and "established or continuous" nor length of time volunteering (measured in years) were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables (ATHI subscales). Although the correlations were non-

significant, type of volunteer was negatively correlated with societal causes. *This can be interpreted a volunteer who reported as episodic was likely to believe that societal causes may lead to homelessness.* Type of volunteer had a non-significant negative correlation with length of volunteering. *This can be interpreted as a volunteer who reported as episodic did not have a longer history of volunteering at the soup kitchen.*

Table 11

Type of Volunteer and Length of Volunteering and Correlations with Outcome Variables

Variable	N	1	2	3	4
1. Societal Causes Scale	125	—			
2. Childhood Causes Scale	123	-.09	—		
3. Type of Volunteer	129	-.11	0.01	—	
4. Length of Volunteering	125	0.00	0.02	-.09	—

Note. Correlations were conducted using point biserial and Pearson r coefficients. Type of Volunteer was coded as 0 = Continuous & 1 = Episodic. Length was coded as a continuous variable .
*p < .05, **p < .01

Research Question 4: Does capacity of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

The below correlation matrix (Table 12) provides the correlation data for the independent variable, capacity of volunteering contact with the ATHI subscales. Capacity refers to the level of intensity of volunteering (serving in food line, grocery assistance, pantry assistance, or anywhere needed) a study participant experiences when volunteering at the soup kitchen. Capacity was coded using a rank order coding due to the increasing level of intensity of volunteering with the homeless and a Spearman rho correlation was calculated. Based on the results below, volunteer capacity is not significantly correlated with any of the ATHI subscales. Although non-significant, capacity had small positive correlations with both societal and childhood causes. *This can be interpreted as a volunteer who had more intense contact with the homeless was more likely to societal and childhood causes may lead to homelessness.*

Table 12

Capacity and Correlations with Outcome Variables

Variable	N	1	2	3
1. Societal Causes Scale	125	—		
2. Childhood Causes Scale	123	-.09	—	
3. Capacity	129	0.02	0.04	—

Note. Correlations were conducted using Pearson r and Spearman rho. Capacity was coded as Pantry = 0, Grocery = 1, As needed = 2 and Food line = 3.

*p < .05, **p < .01

Research Question 5: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, does length of contact with the homeless significantly predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Societal Causes. In Table 13 below, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to investigate each variable's unique contribution to societal causes. In the first step, religion and political affiliation were regressed on societal causes. The results indicated a statistically significant F (3, 98) = 11.35, p < .001, the variables accounted for approximately 26% of variance in societal causes. In the second step, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a statistically significant F (5, 96) = 14.13, p < .001, these variables accounted for an additional 17% of variance in societal causes. In the third step, length was entered. The results indicated the overall model is still significant F (6, 95) = 12.15, p < .001; however, the length variable did not contribute any additional variance thus was not a significant predictor.

Additionally, it was found that in the first step both religion [t= 2.84, df = 98, p <.01] and Republican/Democrat [t = 4.28, df = 98, p < .01] were significant predictors. In the second step, CSAS was a significant predictor [t = 4.21, df = 96, p < .01] over and above demographic variables. However, trait sympathy was not a significant predictor [t = .04, df = 96, p = .97]. After controlling for the preceding variables in the model, length of time volunteering was not a significant predictor [t = 1.31, df = 95, p = .19]. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 43% of the variation in the attitude that

society causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by religion, political affiliation, sympathy,

attitudes toward community service, and length of time volunteering at the soup kitchen.

Table 13
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor
Variables - Religion, Political Affiliation, TSS, CSAS,
and Length of time Volunteering with Outcome
Variable - Societal Causes

Predictor	Societal Causes	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.26**	
Protestant/Non-Protestant		.25**
Republican/Democrat		.40**
Republican/Other		.17
Step 2	.17**	
TSS		.00
CSAS		.41**
Step 3	.01	
Length		.10
Total R^2	.43**	
n	102	

Note. Republican/Democrat = Democrat compared to
Republican and Republican/Other = Other compared
to Republican. TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale,
CSAS = Community Service Attitudes Scale,
Length = Length of time volunteering at
soup kitchen (in years)
*p < .05, **p < .01

Childhood Causes. In Table 14 below, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted

to investigate each variable's unique contribution to childhood causes. In the first step, gender was

regressed on childhood causes. The results indicated a non-significant $F(1, 113) = 2.27$, $p = .14$, but the

variable accounted for approximately 2% of variance in childhood causes. In the second step, trait

sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a statistically significant F

$(3,111) = 2.95$, $p = .04$, and these variables accounted for an additional 5% of variance in childhood

causes. In the third step, length was entered. It was not a significant predictor, $F(4,110) = 2.26$, $p = .07$,

of childhood causes.

Additionally it was found that in the first step gender [t= 1.51, df = 113, p =.14] was not a significant predictor. In the second step, CSAS was a significant predictor [t = -2.53, df = 111, p = .01]. However, trait sympathy was not a significant predictor [t = 1.24, df = 111, p = .22]. In the third step, length of time volunteering was not a significant predictor [t = .53, df = 110, p = .60]. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 8% of the variation in the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by gender, sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and length of time volunteering at the soup kitchen.

Table 14
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor
Variables - Gender, TSS, CSAS, and Length of
time Volunteering with Outcome
Variable - Childhood Causes

	Childhood Causes	
Predictor	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	0.2	
Gender		0.14
Step 2	.05*	
TSS		0.1
CSAS		-.28*
Step 3	0.0	
Length		0.05
Total R^2	0.08	
n	115	

Note. TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale, CSAS = Community
Service Attitudes Scale, Length = Length of time
Volunteering at Soup Kitchen (in years)
*p < .05, **p < .01

Research Question 6: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that type of volunteering predicts attitudes toward the homeless?

Societal Causes. In Table 15 below, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to investigate each variable's unique contribution to societal causes. In the first step, religion and political affiliation were regressed on societal causes. The results indicated a statistically significant F (3,101) =

12.24, p < .01,   the variables accounted for approximately 27% of variance in societal causes. In the

second step, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a

statistically significant F (5, 99) = 15.20, p < .01, these variables accounted for an additional 17% of

variance in societal causes. In the third step, type of volunteering was entered, and although the results

indicated the overall model remained significant F (6, 98) = 12.66, p < .01, the type of volunteering

variable did not contribute any new variance.

Additionally, it was found that in the first step both religion [t= 2.93, df = 101, p <.01] and

Republican/Democrat [t = 4.40, df = 101, p < .01] were significant predictors. In the second step, CSAS

was a significant predictor [t = 4.30, df = 99, p < .01]. However, trait sympathy was not a significant

predictor [t = .003, df = 99, p = 1.00]. In the third step, type of volunteering was not a significant

predictor [t = -.63, df = 98, p = .53]. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 44% of variation in the

belief that societal causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by religion, political affiliation,

sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and type of volunteering.

Table 15
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor
Variables - Religion, Political Affiliation, TSS, CSAS,
and Type of Volunteering with Outcome
Variable - Societal Causes

Predictor	Societal Causes	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.27**	
Religion		.26**
Republican/Democrat		.40**
Republican/Other		0.18
Step 2	.17**	
TSS		0.0
CSAS		.41**
Step 3	0.0	
Type		-.05
Total R^2	.44**	
n	105	

Note. Republican/Democrat = Democrat compared to
Republican and Republican/Other = Other compared

51

Childhood Causes. In Table 16 below, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to investigate each variable's unique contribution to childhood causes. In the first step, gender was regressed on childhood causes. The results indicated a non-significant $F (1,116) = 2.96$, $p = .09$, and the variable accounted for approximately 3% of variance in childhood causes. In the second step, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a statistically significant $F (3,114) = 2.74$, $p = .05$, these variables accounted for an additional 4% of variance in childhood causes. In the third step, type of volunteering was entered. The overall model resulted in a non-significant $F (4,113) = 2.04$, $p = .09$.

Additionally, the unique contributions of each variable were evaluated. In the first step, gender was not a significant predictor [$t = 1.72$, $df =116$, $p = .009$]. In the second step, sympathy was not a significant predictor [$t = 1.13$, $df =114$, $p = .26$]; however, attitudes toward community service was a significant predictor [$t = -2.26$, $df =114$, $p = .03$]. In the third step, type of volunteer was not a significant predictor [$t = -.06$, $df =113$, $p = .95$]. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 7% of the variation in the belief that childhood causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by attitudes toward community service.

Table 16
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor Variables - Gender, TSS, CSAS, and Type of time Volunteering with Outcome Variable - Childhood Causes

	Childhood Causes	
Predictor	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	0.03	
Gender		0.06
Step 2	.04*	
TSS		0.1
CSAS		-.25*

Step 3	0.0	
Type		-0.01
Total R^2	0.07	
n	118	

Note. TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale, CSAS = Community
Service Attitudes Scale, Type = Type of Volunteering
at Soup Kitchen (Episodic vs. Continuous)
*p < .05, **p < .01

***Research Question 7: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes
toward community service, will we find that continuous volunteers with longer and more intense
contact have less stigmatizing attitudes than episodic volunteers who have shorter and less intense
contact?***

Societal Causes. In Table 17 below, a four-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to
investigate each variable's unique contribution to societal causes. In the first step, religion and political
affiliation was regressed on societal causes. The results indicated a statistically significant $F_{(3, 98)} =$
11.35, $p < .01$, and the variables accounted for approximately 26% of variance in societal causes. In the
second step, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a
statistically significant $F_{(5, 96)} = 14.13$, $p < .01$, these variables accounted for an additional 17% of
variance in childhood causes. In the third step, type and length of time volunteering were entered, and
although the results indicated the overall model remained significant $F_{(7, 94)} = 10.37$, $p < .01$; these two
variables were not significant predictors. Finally, capacity of volunteering was entered into the model,
and again the overall model remained significant, $F_{(10, 91)} = 8.26$, $p < .01$, the capacity variables did not
contribute any unique variance to the model.

Additionally, it was found that in the first step both religion [t= 2.84, df = 99, p <.01] and
Republican/Democrat [t = 4.28, df = 98, p < .01] were significant predictors. In the second step, CSAS
was a significant predictor [t = 4.21, df = 96, p < .01]. However, trait sympathy was not a significant
predictor [t = .04, df = 96, p = .97]. In the third step, neither type of volunteering [t = -.50, df = 94, p =
.62] nor length of time volunteering [t = 1.26, df = 94, p = .21] were significant predictors. In the final

step, none of the capacity variables Capacity/Pantry [t = .30, df = 91, p = .77]; Capacity/Grocery [t = 1.08, df = 91, p = .29]; Capacity/Food Line [t = .58, df = 91, p = .56] were significant predictors. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 44% of variation in the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness was predicted by religion, political affiliation, sympathy, attitudes toward community service, type, length, and capacity of volunteering.

Table 17

Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor Variables - Religion, Political Affiliation, TSS, CSAS, and Type, Length of time, and Capacity of Volunteering with Outcome Variable - Societal Causes

Predictor	Societal Causes	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.26**	
Protestant/Non-Protestant		.25**
Republican/Democrat		.40**
Republican/Other		0.17
Step 2	.17**	
TSS		0.0
CSAS		.41**
Step 3	.01**	
Type		-0.04
Length		0.1
Step 4	.00**	
Capacity/Pantry		0.03
Capacity/Grocery		0.09
Capacity/Food Line		0.05
Total R^2	.44**	
n	102	

Note. Republican/Democrat = Republican compared to Democrat and Republican/Other = Republican compared to Other.
TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale, CSAS = Community Service Attitudes Scale, Type = Episodic vs. Continuous, Length = Length of time Volunteering at Soup Kitchen (in years), and Capacity/Pantry = Pantry compared to As Needed, Capacity/Grocery = Grocery as compared to As Needed, Capacity/Food Line = Food line as compared as As Needed.

Childhood Causes. In Table 18 below, a four-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to investigate each variable's unique contribution to childhood causes. In the first step, gender was regressed on childhood causes. The results indicated a non-significant $F (1,113) = 2.27$, $p = .14$, and the variable accounted for approximately 2% of variance in childhood causes. In the second step, trait sympathy and community service attitudes were entered. The results indicated a statistically significant $F (3,111) = 2.95$, $p = .04$; these variables accounted for an additional 5% of variance in childhood causes. In the third step, type and length of volunteering were entered. These variables resulted in a non-significant $F (5,109) = 1.80$, $p = .12$, and did not account for additional variance in the model. Finally, capacity of volunteering was entered and resulted in a non-significant $F (8,106) = 1.34$, $p = .23$.

Table 18
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Among Predictor
Variables - Gender, TSS, CSAS, and Type,
Length of time, and Capacity of Volunteering
with Outcome Variable - Childhood Causes

Predictor	Childhood Causes	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	0.02	
Gender		0.14
Step 2	0.05*	
TSS		0.14
CSAS		-0.28*
Step 3	0.0	
Type		-0.01
Length		0.05
Step 4	0.02	
Capacity/Pantry		-.13
Capacity/Grocery		0.02
Capacity/Food Line		-.05
Total R^2	0.09	
n	115	

Note. TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale, CSAS = Community
Service Attitudes Scale, Type = Episodic vs. Continuous,
Length = Length of time Volunteering at Soup Kitchen
(in years), and Capacity/Pantry = Pantry compared to

Additionally, the unique contributions of each variable were evaluated. In the first step, gender was not a significant predictor [t = 1.50, df =113, p = .14]. In the second step, sympathy was not a significant predictor [t = 1.24, df =111, p = .22]; however, attitudes toward community service was a significant predictor [t = -2.53, df =111, p = .01]. In the third step, neither type [t = -.08, df =109, p = .94] not length of volunteering [t = .52, df =109, p = .61] were significant predictors. In the final step, none of the capacity variables Capacity/Pantry [t = -1.26, df = 106, p = .21]; Capacity/Grocery [t = .22, df = 106, p = .83]; Capacity/Food Line [t = -.48, df = 106, p = .63] were significant predictors. The multiple R^2 indicated that approximately 9% of the variation in the belief that childhood causes may lead to homelessness could be predicted by the gender, sympathy, attitudes toward community service, as well as type, length, and capacity of volunteering.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the purpose of the present study as well as provided the sample characteristics, psychometric properties, and assumptions of the analyses as well as detailed the results of the statistical analyses used to test each research question. This section also briefly summarizes each research question as well as describes the sections of chapter V.

RQ1: A review of the correlation matrix indicated that only religion, political affiliation, and gender were correlated with the dependent variables: societal and childhood causes. More specifically, religion and political affiliation were correlated with societal causes and gender was correlated with childhood causes. The first correlation can be interpreted as a respondent who self-reported as a non-protestant was more likely to hold an attitude that attributes homelessness to societal causes. Similarly, a respondent who self-reported as non-republican (Democrat or other) was more likely to hold the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness and females were more likely than males to endorse childhood causes leading to homelessness.

56

RQ2: A review of the correlation matrix revealed that sympathy (r (120) = .18, p = .05) had a small, positive correlation with the societal causes scale. This can be interpreted as the level of sympathy increases; the more likely the respondent had a high score on the societal causes scale, meaning the respondent reported to believe that societal causes may lead to homelessness. The community service scale was correlated with three of the four subscales: societal causes (r (124) = .33, p < .001), affiliation (r (127) = .20, p = .03), and solutions (r (124) = .27, p = .001). This can be interpreted as respondents who reported holding the attitude that community service is important also held the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness, would be more likely to affiliate with the homeless, as well an attitude that there is a solution to homelessness.

RQ3: No statistically significant findings were reported. However, type of volunteer was negatively correlated with societal causes, though the correlations were non-significant. Type of volunteer had a non-significant negative correlation with length of volunteering.

RQ4: The capacity variable, operationalized as serving in the pantry, grocery assistance, serving on the food line, or serving as needed, was not a significant predictor of the subscales of attitudes toward the homeless. Although non-significant, capacity had small positive correlations with both societal and childhood causes.

RQ5: Length of contact did not prove to be a significant predictor of either the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness or the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness.

RQ6: Type of volunteer (continuous vs. episodic) was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward the homeless over and above the demographic, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service variables.

RQ7: The final research question tested the impact of capacity of volunteering with the homeless over and above demographic variables, sympathy, attitudes toward community service, as well as length and type of volunteering. The results indicate capacity was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward the homeless.

The following chapter, Chapter V, will summarize the purpose of the present study and provide the conclusions drawn from the results of the statistical analyses. In addition, this chapter will offer implications of the present research, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, as well as a final conclusion of the research project.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the purpose of this research study. Next, conclusions based on the statistical findings are discussed. Then, implications of the present research, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research are described. Lastly, a final conclusion of the present research study is provided.

Summary of Purpose

Although literature on the contact hypothesis with regard to homelessness has grown throughout the last several years (Alexander & Link, 2003; Benedict, 1988; Buchanan *et al* ., 2004, 2007; Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Kingree & Daves, 1997; Knecht & Martinez, 2009, 2012; Lee *et al* ., 1990, 2004; Link *et al* ., 1995; Toro & McDonnell, 1992; Tse *et al* ., 2006; Zrinyi & Balogh, 2004), minimal research has been conducted to test the contact hypothesis with regard to type: "new or episodic" and "established or continuous", length, and capacity of volunteering with the homeless. As such, the purpose of this study was to investigate the contact hypothesis utilizing length (frequency and consistency), capacity and type of volunteering tasks to explore soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. Specifically, the researcher sought to assess the differences between two types of soup kitchen volunteers, those termed "new or episodic" and "established or continuous" (Harrison, 1995), and whether they differ in their views of the causes of homelessness, effectiveness of solutions, and

59

willingness to affiliate with the homeless. Additionally, demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service were tested as predictors of attitudes toward the homeless. Although the number of subjects recommended by the a priori power analysis was not reached, some analyses reached statistical significance.

Conclusions for Research Questions

Research Question 1: Do demographic variables such as gender, race, age, religion, political identity, education level, and income level predict attitudes toward the homeless?

An interesting finding from the demographics was that the majority of episodic volunteers were younger whereas the majority of continuous volunteers were older. This finding is possibly due to the many college students coming home from school during the holidays to volunteer. On the other hand, the continuous volunteers were, on average, older in age and this may be due to the fact that many of the volunteers were retired and spent their time volunteering on a regular basis. This is revealing as it demonstrates a choice to spend time volunteering rather than participating in other activities.

The finding that non-Protestant Democrats view society as a contributing factor to homelessness was consistent with the previous literature (Lee *et al.*, 1990; Lee *et al.*, 1992; Pellegrini *et al.*, 1997; Phelan 1995). The political affiliation results were not surprising as they seem to align with the way in which Democrats have historically valued social issues. With regards to religion, non-Protestants may be more likely to view society, rather than the individual, as a cause of homelessness due to a historically greater sense of community found among Catholicism. It is important to note that several of the volunteers who identified as non-protestant were Catholic and the soup kitchen is located in the basement of an Episcopal church. On the other hand, individualism has often been viewed as a cornerstone of Protestantism (Toro *et al.*, 1997) and may be a reason why Protestants are less likely to hold the belief that society is a cause of homelessness.

Gender was also found to be a significant predictor of the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness; more specifically, women were more likely to hold the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness. This finding was expected as women are sometimes viewed as more nurturing,

understanding, and sympathetic to the plights of others. Furthermore, it's possible that the women at the soup kitchen were mothers and felt that poor upbringings filled with abuse and neglect could lead to homelessness. However, it was expected that gender would account for more variance as gender as a predictor variable was so prevalent in the literature. These results further substantiate the previous literature that women with left-leaning political affiliation are more likely to blame society rather than the individual with regards to homelessness (Lee *et al*., 1990; Lee *et al*., 1992; Phelan 1995).

Research Question 2: Do sympathy and attitudes toward community service predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Based on previous literature, sympathy is a common reaction to seeing a homeless person (Agans *et al*., 2011; Benedict, 1988; Cloke *et al*., 2007; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992; Toro & McDonnell, 1992). As such, it was expected that sympathy would be positively connected with the societal causes subscale of the ATHI with regards to the soup kitchen volunteers. A correlation such as this makes sense as one who feels sympathetic toward the homeless may be more likely to view society as a cause of homelessness rather than the homeless individual (Agans *et al*., 2011; Bryan *et al*., 2000; Guzewicz & Takooshian, 1992).

The positive relationship between community service attitudes and the ATHI subscales: societal causes, affiliation, and solutions was consistent with the previous literature (Bryan *et al*., 2000; Lee *et al*., 2004; Link *et al*., 1995; Morgan *et al*., 1997). These relationships make intuitive sense as those who feel that community service is important may be more likely to volunteer and spend their time with the homeless. The most interesting relationship between community service attitudes and the ATHI subscales was that of the association among community service attitudes and solutions. Not only is this finding consistent with previous literature (Kingree & Daves, 1997), it is understandable that a person who holds community service in high regard would also hold the attitude that there is a solution to homelessness, and perhaps, that is a driving reason the person chooses to volunteer at an organization that provides services for the homeless.

Another intuitive existing relationship, which is also consistent with previous literature (Link *et al.*, 1995), is that of the one between sympathy and community service attitudes. This correlation makes sense as those who are more sympathetic would perhaps be more likely to want to volunteer their time and view community service as an important task. These respondents may also, due to their sympathy, hold the attitude that the homeless are community residents in need of help from others and feel that it is their civic duty to help those in need.

Research Question 3: Do type of volunteering and length of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Although there were no statistically significant findings to report, it is important to note that small, negative correlations among the variables existed. This suggests that episodic volunteers were less likely to believe in societal causes leading to homelessness, less likely to be willing to affiliate with the homeless, and less likely to believe there is a solution to homelessness. Although these findings were non-significant, they align with the expectation that more continuous volunteers have more positive attitudes toward the homeless. It is possible that with a larger sample size with a larger range of volunteering time and type of volunteers as well as a longer data collection time, statistically significant findings may be found. With regards to length of time volunteering, an interesting, non-significant relationship between length of time volunteering and solutions for homelessness emerged. Though non-significant, the longer a volunteer reported volunteering at the soup kitchen, the more likely the volunteer was to believe there was not a solution to homelessness. It is possible that the longer a person volunteers, the less hopeful they become about the solutions for homelessness. This could be because as they continue to volunteer, they continue to see many homeless people and they do not the problem being resolved.

Research Question 4: Does capacity of contact predict attitudes toward the homeless?

The capacity variable, operationalized as serving in the pantry, grocery assistance, serving on the food line, or serving as needed, was not a significant predictor of the subscales of attitudes toward the homeless. Small, positive yet non-significant correlations existed with capacity, societal and childhood

causes. It was expected that volunteers with more intense contact with the homeless would have more positive attitudes toward the homeless. It is believed that with a larger sample size, significant findings could be reached.

Research Question 5: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, does length of contact with the homeless significantly predict attitudes toward the homeless?

Length of contact did not prove to be a significant predictor of either the attitude that societal causes may lead to homelessness or the attitude that childhood causes may lead to homelessness. This finding, although non-significant, was not expected. The expectation was that longer time volunteering would lead to more positive attitudes. The short average length of time volunteering among the volunteers may be a reason for lack of significant findings. It is possible that with an increased number of respondents, specifically those who self-reported as continuous volunteers, length of time may be a significant contributor to attitudes toward the homeless. Interestingly, the community service attitudes variable had a negative Beta coefficient in the childhood causes hierarchical regression. This may suggest a suppression due to gender.

Research Question 6: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that type of volunteering predicts attitudes toward the homeless?

Type of volunteer (continuous vs. episodic) was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward the homeless. This lack of a significant finding was unexpected as well. The expectation was that continuous volunteers would have more positive and less stigmatizing views of the homeless, but it was discovered that both continuous and episodic volunteers were overwhelmingly positive toward the plight of the homeless. This may be simply because they were volunteers and were already more inclined to have positive thoughts and attitudes about the homeless due to the simple fact that they voluntarily chose to volunteer with the homeless.

Research Question 7: After controlling for relevant demographic variables, sympathy, and attitudes toward community service, will we find that continuous volunteers with longer and more intense contact have less stigmatizing attitudes than episodic volunteers who have shorter and less intense contact?

Capacity was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward the homeless. This finding does not necessarily imply that this element of the contact hypothesis is inaccurate, but rather this sample of soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless was not reliant on the amount and intensity of contact with the homeless. This is evidenced by the finding that the general attitudes toward the homeless were overall positive. The lack of statistical significance may be explained by methodological issues. Low sample size and low power could have affected this outcome.

<div align="center">

Implications

</div>

This research may be used as a springboard for future research in the field of contact hypothesis with regard to homelessness at the community level. These results could be beneficial to the leadership at the soup kitchen, especially those in the marketing department, as well as community-wide leadership. As such, a technical report including these results will be provided to the soup kitchen for marketing and fundraising purposes. Additionally, these results may be used to encourage community members, not currently volunteering, to volunteer at a local soup kitchen in order to gain a better understanding of the growing population of the homeless in our community. Moreover, these findings suggest more research needs to be done regarding contact hypothesis with soup kitchen volunteers serving the homeless. It is possible that, with less homogenous participants, prolonged and intentional exposure to the homeless through volunteering at a soup kitchen, with a dignified approach to serving the homeless such as the one used in this study, may lead to more positive attitudes toward the homeless. Finally, it is possible that comparing volunteers to non-volunteers may yield more significant results.

In addition to the practical implications of this study, there are also implications for gaining knowledge in this field of research. The results of this study have provided a glimpse of soup kitchen volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless. These findings are of great importance as no known research

regarding contact hypothesis with soup kitchen volunteers has been done, and with so many people choosing to participate in food service volunteering (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013), it is immensely important to understand how this type of volunteering influences a volunteer's attitude toward the homeless.

Limitations

This study had several limitations, the first of which being the data collection process. A cross-sectional design was utilized thus limiting the diversity, possibility of causal associations, as well as the generalizability of the results. Timing of data collection could have resulted in biased responses as well. The data was collected from October 2013 to February 2014, including the peak time for volunteering – the holidays. This issue of timing could also be a reason why over half of the respondents reported as episodic rather than continuous as many people express their gratitude through volunteering. Utilizing only soup kitchen volunteers may also have biased the results. Food service can sometimes lead to an interesting sense of community among members not found in other volunteering settings. The difference among food serving volunteering and non-food serving volunteering may be worth further pursuing. The soup kitchen being located in the basement of an Episcopal church may have led to certain biases as well, as this perceived religious affiliation may attract or deter certain volunteers. As such, the variance may have been limited due to the homogenous nature of the volunteers.

In addition, the self-report nature of the instruments utilized in the survey limited the reliability of the results. Sample size was another limitation to this study. Due to the time constraint of the data collection process, the sample size was low. The instruments had acceptable levels of reliability and validity; however, measurement error still exists, limiting statistical analysis.

Another limitation was that one of the items on the ATHI did not function as the previous literature suggested it would, and as a result, the item was removed from analysis. This limited the researcher's ability to utilize all components of the instrument. Additionally, the ATHI total scale score was not a reliable score. This limitation resulted in the use of subscales for the dependent variables. Two of the four subscales were used as the dependent variables when testing the research questions.

65

Lastly, a specific set of variables were used in the model, and although they accounted for some variance in the dependent variables, other variables may have yielded a different statistical result.

Future Research

Despite the many limitations of this study, the results of the present study suggest further research on various demographic variables, sympathy, attitudes toward community service as well as the components (length, type, and capacity) of contact hypothesis should be pursued. In order to expand the scope of this research topic, future researchers should focus on study designs that will increase the diversity of the volunteers, and as a result, magnify the generalizability of the findings. In order to assess volunteer attitudes toward the homeless most effectively, it would be ideal to select a comparison group consisting of non-volunteers of who are well-matched to the volunteer group. Employing this design, inferences could be made about volunteer attitudes as compared to non-volunteer attitudes. Additionally, it would be interesting to conduct a study comparing volunteers' attitudes from various local organizations serving the homeless. The findings from a study such as this could further the generalizability of results among volunteers who serve the homeless.

Given the optimal conditions (*equal group status, common goals, intergroup cooperation,* and *support of authority*), hypothesized by Allport (1946) to be fundamental to the success of the contact hypothesis, a study that more closely monitors these conditions could provide meaningful outcomes for a true measure of contact hypothesis. In order to test the contact hypothesis, future researchers could also conduct a correlational longitudinal study whereby volunteer attitudes are measured before volunteering with the homeless and then again after volunteering. These potential results could lend to inferences regarding change in volunteers' attitudes as a result of contact with the homeless. Studies such as this have been conducted in other parts of the country (Bloom & Kilgore, 2000; Harrison, 1995; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Kingree & Daves, 1997; Knecht & Martinez, 2009; Knecht & Martinez, 2012). It would perhaps be of merit to conduct similar studies to the ones cited above to compare the results from this community with the results from other studies.

Due to the intercorrelations among some of the predictor variables, specifically religion and political affiliation, it may of value to conduct a factorial analysis of variance model in order to scan for interactions among the variables. These interactions could provide important information with regards to how the predictor variables are functioning with one another. Finally, due to the complications encountered with the ATHI, it would be interesting to create an instrument that evaluates attitudes toward the homeless by combining elements of the ATHI with a scale similar to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1933) as well as items that measure attitudes toward mental illness and substance abuse in the homeless population. These issues are often times fundamental to the attitudes toward the homeless. In doing so, various components of attitudes such as societal causes, mental illness and substance abuse as well as a respondent's willingness to affiliate with a marginalized group could be evaluated within one scale.

Final Conclusions

Overall, the attitudes toward community service variable proved to be the best predictor of attitudes toward homelessness as measured by the ATHI subscales. Although the components of the contact hypothesis did not prove to explain any of the volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless, it does not mean that the contact hypothesis is not a working theory. As outlined in chapter II, much of the previously reviewed literature supports the notion of the contact hypothesis as a valid predictor of attitudes toward the homeless. As such, it is believed that the lack of statistically significant findings in this study was possibly due to methodological limitations rather than theoretical errors. Time of year may have biased the responses of the volunteers. It is possible that volunteers held overwhelmingly positive and sympathetic attitudes toward the homeless due to the surveys being collected primarily during the holiday season. This finding was consistent with previous literature (Toro & McDonnell, 1992). The lack of statistically significant findings suggests the need to further examine volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless outside of the holiday season. Additionally, it is possible that the "optimal conditions" for contact hypothesis, as outlined by Allport (1946), were not met during some of the volunteer interactions with the homeless. As such, the components of the contact hypothesis should be further reviewed, and

67

perhaps it would be of merit to ensure the optimal guidelines of contact hypothesis are met during all interactions between volunteers and the homeless individuals.

Moreover, in order to fully understand the results of this study, it is necessary to be aware of and understand the uniqueness of Tulsa with regards to philanthropy. Tulsa is equipped with several non-profits which provide a great deal of volunteering opportunities for citizens. In addition, Tulsa has a large philanthropic community consisting of many large and small family foundations, and in 2012, was ranked 18th in charitable contributions out of 11,000 U.S. cities (The Chronicle of Philanthropy, 2012). As such, the charitable nature of Tulsans may have contributed to the overwhelmingly positive responses toward the homeless from the survey participants.

REFERENCES

Agans, R.P., Liu, G., Jones, M., Verjan, C., Silverbush, M., Kalsbeek, W.D. (2011). Public Attitudes Toward the Homeless. AAPOR, 5934-5946.

Alexander, L., Link, B. (2003). The Impact of Contact on Stigmatizing Attitudes Toward People with Mental Illness. *Journal of Mental Health*, 12, 271-289.

Allport, G.W., Kramer, B.M. (1946). Some Roots of Prejudice. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 22, 9-39.

Benedict, A. (1988). Attitudes Toward the Homeless in Two New-York-City Metropolitan Samples. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 17, 90-98.

Blasi, G. (2000). Advacacy and Attribution: Shaping and Responding to Perceptions of the Causes of Homelessness. *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*.

Bloom, L., Kilgore, D. (2003). The Volunteer Citizen After Welfare Reform in the United States: An Ethnographic Study of Volunteerism in Action. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization*, 14, 431-454.

Bogardus, E.S. (1933). A Social Distance Scale. *Sociology and Social Research,* 17, 265-271.

Booth, W.C., Colomb, G.C., Williams, J.M. (2008). *The Craft of Research (3rd Edition).* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd.

Bryan, A.D., Hammer, J.C., Fisher, J.D. (2000). Whose Hands Reach Out to the Homeless? Patterns of Helping Among High and Low Communally Oriented Individuals. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 887-905.

Buchanan, D., Rohr, L., Kehoe, L., Glick, S.B., Jain, S. (2004). Changing Attitudes Toward

      Homeless People. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 19, 566-568.

Buchanan, D., Rohr, L., Stevar, L., Sai, T. (2007). Documenting Attitude Changes Towards

      Homeless People: Comparing Two Standardised Surveys. *Medical Education*, 41, 346-

      348.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (August 26, 2013). Databases, Tables & Calculators by Subject.

      Retrieved from http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS14000000.

Clark, C. (1987). Sympathy Biography and Sympathy Margin. *American Journal of Sociology,*

      93, 290-321.

Cloke, P., Johnsen, S., May, J. (2007). Ethical Citizenship? Volunteers and the Ethics of

      Providing Services for Homeless People. *Geoforum*, 38, 1089-1101.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., Aiken, L.S. (2003). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation*

      Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (3rd Edition). Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

      Associates, Inc.

Davis, M.A. (1983). Measuring Individual Differences in Empathy: Evidence for a

      Multidimensional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 13-126.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the Optimal Contact Strategy: A Reality

      Check for the Contact Hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, 697-711.

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P.A. (1987). The Relation of Empathy to prosocial and related Behaviors.

      Psychological Bulletin, 101, 91-119.

Furnham, A. (1996). Attributions for the Increase in Urban Homelessness. *Journal of Social*

      Behavior & Personality, 11, 189-200.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis*

      and Applications (9th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Goffman, I. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon and

      Schuster.

Guzewicz, T., Takooshian, H. (1992). Development of a Short-Form Scale of Public Attitudes Toward Homelessness. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 1, 67-79.

Harrison, D. (1995). Volunteer Motivation and Attendance Decisions: Competitive Theory Testing in Multiple Samples From a Homeless Shelter. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 371-385.

Hocking, J., Lawrence, S. (2000). Changing Attitudes Toward the Homeless: The Effects of Prosocial Communication With the Homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 91-110.

Independent Sector. (June 18, 2013). Independent Sector's Value of Volunteer Time. Retrieved from http://independentsector.org/volunteer_time.

Iron Gate. (December 28, 2013). About Iron Gate. Retrieved from http://www.irongatetulsa.org/about-us/.

Keith, T.Z. (2006). *Multiple Regression and Beyond*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Kingree, J.B., Daves, W. (1997). Preliminary Validation of the Attitudes Toward Homelessness Inventory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 265-288.

Knecht, T., Martinez, L. (2009). Humanizing the homeless: Does contact erode stereotypes? *Social Science Research,* 38, 521-534.

Knecht, T., Martinez, L. (2012). Engaging the Reluctant? Service Learning, Interpersonal Contact, and Attitudes toward Homeless Individuals. *Political and Science and Politics*, 45, 106-111.

Lee, B. A., Farrell, C., Link, B. (2004). Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis: The Case of Public Exposure to Homelessness. *American Sociological Review,* 68, 40-63.

Lee, B.A, Hinze Jones, S., Lewis, D. (1990). Public Beliefs About the Causes of Homelessness. *Social Forces*, 69, 253-265.

Lee, B.A., Lewis, D., Hinze Jones, S. (1992). Are the Homeless to Blame? A Test of Two

    Theories. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33, 535-552.

Lee, B.A., Link, B.G., Toro, P.A. (1991). Images of the Homeless: Public Views and Media

    Messages. *Housing Policy Debate*, 2, 649-682.

Lee, B.A., Tyler, K.A., Wright, J.D. (2010) The New Homelessness Revisited. *Annual Review of*

    Sociology, 36, 501-521.

Lee, S.A. (2009). Measuring Individual Differences in Trait Sympathy: Instrument Construction

    and Validation. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91, 568-583.

Link, B., Schwartz, S., Moore, R., Phelan, J., Struening, E., Stueve, A., Colten, M.E. (1995).

    Public Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs About Homeless People: Evidence for

    Compassion Fatigue? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 533-555.

Lomax, R.G., Hahs-Vaughn, D.L. (2012). *Statistical Concepts A Second Course (4ᵗʰ Edition).*

    New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group.

Morgan, M.M., Wallace Goddard, H., Newton Givens, S. (1997). Factors that Influence

    Willingness to Help the Homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 6, 45-

    56.

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (January 17, 2013). State of Homelessness: Chapter One

    – Homelessness Counts. Retrieved from

    http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/soh-2012-chapter-one-homelessness-

    counts.

National Center on Family Homelessness. (June 17, 2013). Children. Retrieved from

    http://www.familyhomelessness.org/children.php?p=ts.

National Low Income Housing Coalition. (June 17, 2013). Public Housing. Retrieved from

    http://nlihc.org/issues/public-housing.

Pellegrini, R., Queirolo, S., Monarrez, V., Valenzuela, D. (1997). Political Identification and
   Perceptions of Homelessness: Attributed Causality and Attitudes on Public Policy.
   Psychological Reports, 80, 1139-1148.

Pettigrew, T. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Phelan, J.C. Link, B.G. (2004). Fear of People with Mental Illness: The Role of Personal and
   Impersonal Contact and Exposure to Threat or Harm. *Journal of Health and Social
   Behavior*, 45, 68-80.

Phelan, J.C., Link, B.G., Moore, R.E., Stueve, A. (1997). The Stigma of Homelessness: The
   Impact of the Label "Homeless" on Attitudes Toward Poor Persons. *Social Psychology
   Quarterly*, 60, 323-337.

Phelan, J.C., Link, B.G., Stueve, A., Moore, R.E. (1995). Education, Social Liberalism, and
   Economic Conservatism: Attitudes Toward Homeless People. *American Sociological
   Review*, 60, 126-140.

Polakow, V. (2003). Homeless Children and Their Families: The Discards of the Post-Welfare
   Era. In S. Books (Ed.), *Invisible Children in the Society and Its Schools* (pp.1-258).
   Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Schwartz, S.H. (1977). Normative Influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in
   Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 221-279.

Shiarella, A.H., McCarthy, A.M., Tucker, M.L. (2000). Development and Construct Validity of
   Scores on the Community Service Attitudes Scale. *Educational and Psychological
   Measurement*, 60, 286-300.

The Chronicle of Philanthropy. (April 11, 2014). Retrieved from
   http://philanthropy.com/section/Home/172.

Toro, P.A., McDonnell, D.M. (1992). Beliefs, Attitudes, and Knowledge About Homelessness: A
   Survey of the General Public. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20, 53-80.

Toro, P.A., Tompsett, C.J., Lombardo, S., Philippot, P., Nachtergael, H., Galand, B., Schlienz, N., Stammel, N., Yabar, Y., Blume, M., MacKay, L., Harvey, K. (2007). Homelessness in Europe and the United States: A Comparison of Prevalence and Public Opinion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 505-524.

Tse, L., Firmin, M., Johnson, C., Vorobyov, Y., McKeon, J. (2006). Attitude Shifts: A Qualitative Analysis of Students' Awareness and Reaction to the Homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 15, 229-252.

United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (June 17, 2013). Retrieved from http://www.usich.gov/.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (February 22, 2013). Retrieved from: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD.

Wispe, L. (1991). *The Psychology of Sympathy.* New York: Plenum.

Zrinyi, M., Balogh, Z. (2004). Student Nurses Attitudes Towards Homeless Clients: A Challenge For Education and Practice. *Nursing Ethics*, 11, 334-348.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB OUTCOME LETTER

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2013

IRB Application No   ED13172

Proposal Title: Volunteer Attitudes toward Homelessness - A Test of Contact Hypothesis

Reviewed and   Exempt
Processed as:

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved   Protocol Expires: 10/28/2016

Principal
Investigator(s):

Heather Chancellor   Laura Barnes
116 S Indianapolis Ave   700 N. Greenwood
, OK   Tulsa, OK 74106

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the
rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that
the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45
CFR 46.

☐ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval
stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol
   must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval. Protocol modifications requiring
   approval may include changes to the title, PI, advisor, funding status or sponsor, subject population
   composition or size, recruitment, inclusion/exclusion criteria, research site, research procedures and
   consent/assent process or forms.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar
   year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are
   unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the
authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the
IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Dawnett Watkins 219 Cordell North
(phone: 405-744-5700, dawnett.watkins@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF SUPPORT

IRON GATE

October 2, 2013

Dear Institutional Review Board:

On behalf of Iron Gate, we are thrilled to write this letter of support for the study titled: Volunteer Attitudes toward Homelessness – A Test of Contact Hypothesis. Last spring, our agency worked closely with Heather Chancellor throughout her efforts to conduct qualitative interviews regarding volunteer perceptions of homelessness. It is our understanding that the present study was a result of this effort. We have met with Heather to discuss the scope of the present study. Based on our discussion of the project, we are happy to provide Heather the time and space she needs to complete this project.

We are excited to be a part of this project and look forward to the results yielded from this study as we hope it will allow us to better understand our volunteers' attitudes toward the homeless individuals we serve.

Sincerely,

Connie Cronley
Executive Director, Iron Gate

501 South Cincinnati, Tulsa, OK 74103 . Phone 918-359-9017 . Email: ccronley@irongatetulsa.org
www.irongatetulsa.org
Feeding the Hungry and Homeless of Tulsa – Every Day

78

APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

Recruitment Script
Volunteer Attitudes toward Homelessness – A Test of Contact Hypothesis
2013

The purpose of the proposed study is to examine volunteers' attitudes and beliefs related to volunteering with homeless individuals.

You will be asked to take a survey about attitudes toward the homeless based on your contact with the homeless at the soup kitchen. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. After the data has been collected and analyzed, you will be given the opportunity to read the research findings and the report.

To Sign Up for the Study contact:
Heather Chancellor: heather_chancellor@yahoo.com; 918-549-8841

Consistent with previous research in this area, we will request basic demographic information (e.g. age, gender, etc.). Your names will not be given or used in any way. The information you submit can only be accessed by our research team and the University Research Compliance office. All data collected in this study will remain anonymous and no identifying information will be attached to data or reports. There are no known risks associated with this project, which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Questions?

Heather Chancellor, **heather_chancellor@yahoo.com**, 918-549-8841
Dr. Laura Barnes, **laura.barnes@okstate.edu**, 918-594-8517
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX D

PROJECT SURVEY

Section 1:

1. What is your   ☐ Male   ☐ Female
gender?

2. What is your age?   _____

3. What is your ethnicity? (please check all that apply)

    ☐ African American   ☐ Hispanic
    ☐ Asian   ☐ Native American
    ☐ Caucasian   ☐ Prefer not to answer

4. What is your highest level of education?

    ☐ Less than 12th grade   ☐ Some college
    ☐ High School graduate/GED   ☐ College graduate
    ☐ Technical school   ☐ Other:_____

5. Are you currently a student (If yes, please indicate what level)?

    ☐ Yes   ☐ No
    ☐ Undergraduate
    ☐ Graduate

6. What is your occupation? _____

7. What is your current employment/student status (please mark all that apply)?

    <u>Employment</u>   <u>Student</u>

    ☐ Full-time employed   ☐ Full-time student
    ☐ Part-time employed   ☐ Part-time student
    ☐ Unemployed
    ☐ Retired

8. To what income bracket does your family belong?

☐ Less than $25,000   ☐ $25,000 - $49,999
☐ $50,000 – $99,999   ☐ $100,000 - $149,999
☐ Prefer not to answer   ☐ Other:_____

9. With which faith do you affiliate?

☐ Protestant (Please indicate your   ☐ Catholic
denomination below)

_____
☐ Judaism   ☐ Muslim
☐ No affiliation   ☐ Other:_____

10. With which political party do you most identify?

☐ Democrat   ☐ Independent
☐ Republican   ☐ Other (e.g. Green party, etc.)
☐ No affiliation

Section 2:
These next few questions pertain to your soup kitchen volunteering activities. Please use the following definitions to answer the questions below:

-   *Continuous volunteering* is any volunteer work done on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.
-   *Episodic volunteering* is volunteer work done during one or more isolated occasions.

11. Based on the above definitions, do you consider yourself a continuous or episodic volunteer at the soup kitchen?

☐ Continuous   ☐ Episodic

12. How long have you volunteered at the soup kitchen (Please answer in years, if possible)?

_____

13. In what capacity do you volunteer at the soup kitchen?

83

☐ Serve in food line ☐ Serve in pantry (bagging groceries)

☐ Grocery Assistance ☐ Other: _____

Please refer to the previous question:

14. Which do you prefer?

☐ Serve in food line ☐ Serve in pantry (bagging groceries)

☐ Grocery Assistance ☐ Other:_____

15. How often do you volunteer at the soup kitchen?

☐ This is my first time. ☐ I volunteer around the holidays.

☐ Once or twice a week on a regular basis. ☐ Once or twice a month on a regular basis.

☐ Once or twice a week during parts of the year. ☐ Once or twice a month during parts of the year.

Section 3:
These next questions pertain to your general volunteering history.

Volunteering is any task for which you were NOT PAID. Please consider only volunteering work done for an organization.

16. How long have you volunteered (Please answer in years, if possible)?
_____

17. Please describe your general volunteering history.
_____
_____
_____
_____

Section 4:
Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

18. Recent government cutbacks in housing assistance for the poor may have made the homeless problem in this country worse.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

19. The low minimum wage in this country virtually guarantees a large homeless population.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

20. Recent government cutbacks in welfare have contributed substantially to the homeless problem in this country.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

21. I would feel comfortable eating a meal with a homeless person.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

22. I feel uneasy when I meet homeless people.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

23. Homeless people had parents who took little interest in them as children.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

24. Most circumstances of homelessness in adults can be traced to their emotional experiences in childhood.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

25. Most homeless persons are substance abusers.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

26. Rehabilitation programs for the homeless are too expensive to operate.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

27. There is little that can be done for people in homeless shelters except to see that they are comfortable and well fed.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

28. A homeless person cannot really be expected to adopt a normal lifestyle.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

Section 5:
Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

29. It breaks my heart to hear about people   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
with disabilities getting made fun
of for their disabilities.

30. I would probably become teary   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
eyed or close to crying if I were to see a
homeless child eating out of a trash can.

31. It breaks my heart to know that there are   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
children out there being abused by
their own flesh and blood.

32. To see an elderly person fall down   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
and get hurt would really break my
heart.

33. It would break my heart to see an elderly   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
person humiliated because he or she accidentally
urinated on him or herself.

34. I can't help but feel sorry for victims   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
of child abuse.

35. I really don't get emotional when I   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
see people crying.

36. It's common for me to become teary eyed or   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
close to crying when I see others crying.

37. I don't tend to have feelings of sorrow   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
or concern when I see others crying.

38. I don't usually get emotional when others   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
around me feel embarrassed or ashamed.

39. I'm inclined to feel really troubled when   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
someone I know is crying.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

40. It doesn't bother me very much when   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
sensitive people get their feelings hurt.

41. It would really disturb me to see a wounded   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
animal suffering in pain.

42. It really disturbs me to know that some   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
people are cruel and abusive to
their pets.

43. Seeing animals get hurt doesn't bother   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
me very much.

44. I often feel bad for animals when I know   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
that they are in pain.

45. I feel really sorry for animals that get teased   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
or taunted at zoos and circuses.

46. I tend to feel bad for the animals I see on TV   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
that are attacked by predators such as lions, tigers, etc.

Section 6:
Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the
following statements.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

47. Community groups need our help.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

48. There are people in the community who need help.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

49. There are needs in the community.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

50. There are people who have needs which are not   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
being met.

51. Volunteer work at community agencies helps solve   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
social problems.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

52. Volunteers in community agencies make a difference,   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
if only a small difference.

53. College student volunteers can help improve the   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
local community.

54. Volunteering in community projects can greatly enhance the community's resources. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

55. The more people who help, the better things will get. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

56. Contributing my skills will make the community a better place. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

57. My contribution to the community will make a real difference. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

58. I can make a difference in the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

59. I am responsible for doing something about improving the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

60. It is my responsibility to take some real measures to help others in need. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

61. It is important to me to have a sense of contribution and helpfulness through participating in community service. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

62. It is important to me to gain an increased sense of responsibility from participating in community service. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

63. I feel an obligation to contribute to the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

64. Other people deserve my help. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

65. It is important to help people in general. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

①= Strongly Agree　　②= Agree　　③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree　　⑤= Disagree　　⑥= Strongly Disagree

66. Improving communities is important to maintaining a quality society. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

67. Our community needs good volunteers. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

68. All communities need good volunteers. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

69. It is important to provide a useful service to the community through community service.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

70. When I meet people who are having a difficult time, I wonder how I would feel if I were in their shoes.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

71. I feel bad that some community members are suffering from a lack of resources.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

72. I feel bad about the disparity among community members.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

73. Lack of participation in community service will cause severe damage to our society.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

74. Without community service, today's disadvantaged citizens have no hope.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

75. Community service is necessary to making our communities better.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

76. It is critical that citizens become involved in helping their community.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

77. Community service is a crucial component of the solution to community problems.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

Thank you for completing the survey.

APPENDIX E

ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMELESSNESS INVENTORY

ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMELESSNESS INVENTORY:

Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

18. Recent government cutbacks in housing assistance for the poor may have made the homeless problem in this country worse.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

19. The low minimum wage in this country virtually guarantees a large homeless population.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

20. Recent government cutbacks in welfare have contributed substantially to the homeless problem in this country.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

21. I would feel comfortable eating a meal with a homeless person.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

22. I feel uneasy when I meet homeless people.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

23. Homeless people had parents who took little interest in them as children.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

24. Most circumstances of homelessness in adults can be traced to their emotional experiences in childhood.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

25. Most homeless persons are substance abusers.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

26. Rehabilitation programs for the homeless are too expensive to operate.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

27. There is little that can be done for people in homeless shelters except to see that they are comfortable and well fed.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

28. A homeless person cannot really be expected to adopt a normal lifestyle.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

APPENDIX F

TRAIT SYMPATHY SCALE

TRAIT SYMPATHY SCALE:
Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

29. It breaks my heart to hear about people   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
with disabilities getting made fun
of for their disabilities.

30. I would probably become teary   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
eyed or close to crying if I were to see a
homeless child eating out of a trash can.

31. It breaks my heart to know that there are   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
children out there being abused by
their own flesh and blood.

32. To see an elderly person fall down   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
and get hurt would really break my
heart.

33. It would break my heart to see an elderly   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
person humiliated because he or she accidentally
urinated on him or herself.

34. I can't help but feel sorry for victims   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
of child abuse.

35. I really don't get emotional when I   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
see people crying.

36. It's common for me to become teary eyed or   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
close to crying when I see others crying.

37. I don't tend to have feelings of sorrow   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
or concern when I see others crying.

38. I don't usually get emotional when others   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
around me feel embarrassed or ashamed.

39. I'm inclined to feel really troubled when   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
someone I know is crying.
\

40. It doesn't bother me very much when sensitive people get their feelings hurt.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

41. It would really disturb me to see a wounded animal suffering in pain.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

42. It really disturbs me to know that some people are cruel and abusive to their pets.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

43. Seeing animals get hurt doesn't bother me very much.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

44. I often feel bad for animals when I know that they are in pain.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

45. I feel really sorry for animals that get teased or taunted at zoos and circuses.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

46. I tend to feel bad for the animals I see on TV that are attacked by predators such as lions, tigers, etc.   ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

APPENDIX G

COMMUNITY SERVICE ATTITUDES SCALE

COMMUNITY SERVICE ATTTITUDES SCALE:

Please mark the circle that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

①= Strongly Agree   ②= Agree   ③= Somewhat Agree
④= Somewhat Disagree   ⑤= Disagree   ⑥= Strongly Disagree

47. Community groups need our help. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

48. There are people in the community who need help. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

49. There are needs in the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

50. There are people who have needs which are not being met. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

51. Volunteer work at community agencies helps solve social problems. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

52. Volunteers in community agencies make a difference, if only a small difference. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

53. College student volunteers can help improve the local community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

54. Volunteering in community projects can greatly enhance the community's resources. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

55. The more people who help, the better things will get. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

56. Contributing my skills will make the community a better place. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

57. My contribution to the community will make a real difference. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

58. I can make a difference in the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

59. I am responsible for doing something about improving the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

60. It is my responsibility to take some real measures to help others in need. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

61. It is important to me to have a sense of
contribution and helpfulness through
participating in community service. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

62. It is important to me to gain an increased sense
of responsibility from participating in community service. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

63. I feel an obligation to contribute to the community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

64. Other people deserve my help. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

65. It is important to help people in general. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

66. Improving communities is important to
maintaining a quality society. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

67. Our community needs good volunteers. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

68. All communities need good volunteers. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

69. It is important to provide a useful service to
the community through community service. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

70. When I meet people who are having a
difficult time, I wonder how I would feel if
I were in their shoes. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

71. I feel bad that some community members
are suffering from a lack of resources. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

72. I feel bad about the disparity among
community members. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

73. Lack of participation in community service
will cause severe damage to our society. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

74. Without community service, today's disadvantaged
citizens have no hope. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

75. Community service is necessary to making our
communities better. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

76. It is critical that citizens become involved
in helping their community. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

77. Community service is a crucial component ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
of the solution to community problems.

APPENDIX H

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND INTERCORRELATIONS WITH OUTCOME VARIABLES

Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. SC	125	—															
2. AFF	129	11	—														
3. SOL	125	7	28*	—													
4. Child	123	-09	-03	22*	—												
5. Gender	128	09	-05	04	19*	—											
6. Age	128	05	06	-03	02	-27**	—										
7. Race	123	02	-02	-10	05	-13	29**	—									
8. Religion	129	29**	-02	-03	07	-02	-04	05	—								
9. Political Identity	129	33**	-16	0	0	13	-24**	-01	21*	—							
10. Education Level	128	05	09	-10	01	06	26**	-02	12	36**	—						
11. Income Level	129	03	-14	-02	04	15	13	45**	21	39*	26**	—					
12. TSS	123	18*	15	16	02	27**	-10	-09	08	-08	13	01	—				
13. CSAS	127	33*	20*	27**	-14	12	-03	-10	03	-14	05	-15	57**	—			
14. Type of Volunteer	129	-11	-14	-02	01	-02	-24**	-04	-05	07	-09	13	0	05	—		
15. Volunteer Length	125	0	11	-01	02	-11	26**	10	02	-04	0	15	05	0	-09	—	
16. Volunteer Capacity	129	02	-02	01	04	12	13	10	22	26	10	11	-08	-05	09	14	—

Note. Correlations were conducted using point biserial, Phi coefficient, Spearman rho, and Pearson r coefficients. Decimals were removed for formatting purposes. SC = Societal Causes, AFF = Affiliation, SOL = Solutions, Child = Childhood Causes, TSS = Trait Sympathy Scale, CSAS = Community Service Attitudes Scale and Volunteer Length were interval level variables. Gender was coded as male = 0 & female = 1, Race was coded as minority = 0 & non-minority = 1, Religion was coded as Protestant = 0 & non-Protestant = 1, political affiliation was coded as Republican = 0, Democrat = 1, and other = 2, Education was coded as college graduate = 0 & non-college graduate =1, Income level was coded as <$25,000 = 1, $25,000-$49,999 =2, $50,000-$99,999 = 3, and $100,000+ = 4. Type of Volunteer was coded as 0 = Continuous & 1 = Episodic.
*p < .05, **p < .01

APPENDIX I

DETAILED STATISTICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Research Question 1:

Societal Causes. The assumptions for multiple regression in which societal causes was regressed on religion and political affiliation were tested. A search for outliers was conducted as well and findings demonstrated that there was evidence of an outlier, but after examining the maximum Cooks distance statistic (.14), it was determined the case was not exerting influence as the statistic was well below the value of 1.0 and this not cause for concern (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). The Centered Leverage value (.08) was assessed as well and was determined to be well under the value of concern, .50. The assumption of independence cannot be reasonably assumed due to the non-experimental nature of the data. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was assessed by examining the difference in variance between Republican/Democrat and Republican/Other. The results indicated the assumption has been met. The assumption of linearity cannot be evaluated as the religion and political affiliation are not continuous variables. Normality was assessed by examining the histogram and the graph indicated evidence of some normality. For each variable, skewness and kurtosis statistics were examined. The results were within reasonable range of the ±2.0 rule. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance statistics were assessed to test the assumption of multicollinearity. The results demonstrated the statistics for VIF were well under 10 and the tolerance statistics were well about .10. Based on these results, the assumptions were deemed to have been met.

Childhood Causes. A test for outliers as well as the assumptions for simple regression was conducted. The search for outliers concluded there were no outliers. The maximum Cooks distance (.06) and Centered Leverage value (.01) suggest there were no cases exerting undue influence. Independence cannot be assumed due to the non-experimental nature of the study. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met (F (1,120) = .227, p = .63). Linearity cannot be assumed as the variable was categorical in nature. Normality was assessed via the examination the histogram as well as skewness (-.39) and kurtosis (-1.88). Based on these values, there is evidence of normality.

Research Question 5:

Societal Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test the combined effect of political affiliation and religion as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and length of volunteering. The assumptions for multiple regression in which societal causes was regressed on religion and political affiliation were tested. A test for outliers was also assessed. An examination of the maximum Cooks distance statistic (.46) as well as the Centered Leverage value (.36) indicated there was no concern for cases exerting undue influence. The assumption of independence cannot be reasonably assumed due to the survey nature of the study. However, an examination of the scatterplot among the Studentized residuals as well unstandardized predicted values indicated the points fell randomly and within the ±2.0 band. The Studentized residuals were plotted against each independent variable and no patterns were found. Homogeneity of variance was tested through the examination of the scatterplots of the Studentized residuals with each independent variable and the spread of residuals was appeared fairly constant. To test for linearity, an examination of the scatterplot was conducted and a relative positive linear trend was determined. To test for normality, an examination of the histogram was conducted. The graph showed a relative normal curve with a slight negative skew. Skewness and kurtosis statistics were also assessed and appeared to be within range with the exception of the length of time variable: skewness (3.37) and kurtosis (12.11). Multicollinearity was assessed through the VIF (ranging from 1.01-1.02) and tolerance (.98) statistics and they were well within range (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Based on these findings, the assumptions have been met.

Childhood Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test gender as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and length of volunteering. Outliers and the assumptions for multiple regression were assessed. The maximum Cooks Distance (.21) and the Centered Leverage Value (.34) were examined and the results indicated that there were no cases exerting undue influence. The assumption of independence cannot be reasonably assumed due to the non-experimental nature of the study; however, after examining the scatterplot of the Studentized residuals and unstandardized predicted value, the points appeared randomly plotted and fell relatively within the ±2.0. The Studentized residuals

103

were plotted with each independent variable and no patterns were found. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was tested through the examination of the scatterplots of the Studentized residuals with each independent variable and the spread of residuals looked as if they were relatively constant. Levenes test was used to test homogeneity of variance among the categorical variable: gender ($F (1,120) = .227$, $p = .63$). To test for linearity, an examination of the scatterplot was conducted and a relative positive linear trend was determined. The normality assumption was reviewed through the examination of the histogram. The graph showed a relatively normal curve suggesting some normality. Skewness (ranging from -2.09 to 3.37) and kurtosis (-1.88 to 12.11) statistics were also assessed and appeared to be within range with the exception of the length of volunteering: skewness (3.37) and kurtosis (12.11) and the CSAS variable skewness (-2.09) and kurtosis (8.06). Multicollinearity was assessed through the VIF (ranging from 1.00 to 1.05) and tolerance (ranging from .95 to .99) statistics and they were well within range (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Based on these findings, most of the assumptions have been relatively met.

Research Question 6:

Societal Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test the combined effect of political affiliation and religion as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and type of volunteering. A test for outliers as well as a test of the assumptions was conducted. To test for outliers, the maximum Cooks Distance (.40) as well as the maximum Centered Leverage Value (.34) were assessed. These values were well within range and indicated there were no cases exerting undue influence. Due to the non-experimental nature of this study, independence cannot be reasonably assumed; however, examination of the scatterplot of Studentized residuals and unstandardized predicted values indicated a random spread of points. The points well mostly within the ±2.0 range. Additionally, scatterplots with the Studentized residuals and the continuous independent variables revealed the spread of residuals were constant throughout the graph. This indicated the assumption of homogeneity of variance had been met. Linearity was assessed through the same scatterplots and there appeared to be a linear trend. Review of the histogram as well as the skewness (ranging from -2.09 to 2.08) and kurtosis (-

1.78 to 3.13) statistics indicated the normality assumption had been reasonably met with the exception of the kurtosis statistic (8.06) on the CSAS variable. The assumption of multicollinearity was assessed through the review of the VIF (ranging from1.01 to 1.02) and tolerance (ranging from .98 to .99) statistics. The statistics do not suggest multicollinearity among the variables. Based on these findings, the assumptions have been reasonably met.

Childhood Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test gender as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, and type of volunteering. The statistical assumptions were tested and a scan of outliers was completed. To examine for outliers, the maximum Cooks Distance statistic (.17) as well as the maximum Centered Leverage Value (.33) were assessed. It was decided there were no cases exerting undue influence as the statistics was well below the values of concern (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). The assumption of independence cannot be reasonably assumed due to the non-experimental nature of the study. Although, after reviewing the scatterplot of the Studentized residuals and unstandardized predicted values, the plotted points indicated a random spread mostly within the ±2.0 range. Homogeneity of variance was assessed through scatterplots of the Studentized residuals and the independent variables, and showed a relatively constant spread throughout the graph. To test homogeneity of variance, Levenes test was conducted for the categorical variables: gender (F (1,120) = .227, p = .63) and type (F (1,121) = .227, p = .65). Linearity was assessed through an examination of the same scatterplots, and based on this the assumption has been reasonably met. Normality was assessed through the review of a histogram as well as the skewness (ranging from -2.09 to -.39) and kurtosis (-1.88 to 3.13) statistics. All of the statistics were reasonably within range with the exception of the CSAS kurtosis statistic (8.06). Multicollinearity was assessed by examining the VIF (ranging from 1.00 to 1.06) and tolerance (ranging from .94 to 1.00) statistics. Based on these results, the assumptions have been reasonably met.

Research Question 7:

Societal Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test the combined effect of political affiliation and religion as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, length and type of volunteering, and capacity of volunteering. The assumptions were tested and a scan for outliers was completed. In order to scan for outliers, a review of the maximum Cooks Distance (.37) as well as the maximum Centered Leverage value (.38) was done. It was determined there were no problems with cases exerting undue influence. Due to the survey-research nature of this study, it is difficult to assume that independence has been met; however, a review of the scatterplot of Studentized residuals as well as unstandardized predicted values indicated a random spread of points that mostly fell within the ±2.0 band. A review of the scatterplots with Studentized residuals and the continuous independent variables demonstrated a constant spread of residuals revealing the assumption of homogeneity had been met. Levenes test was conducted to test homogeneity of variance among categorical variables: type (F (1,121) = .208, p = .65), capacity/pantry compared to as needed: (F (1,121) = .409, p = .52), capacity/grocery compared to as needed: (F (1,121) = .023, p = .88), and capacity/food line as compared to as needed: (F (1,121) = .537, p = .47). Linearity was also evaluated utilizing the scatterplots of the Studentized residuals and the continuous independent variables. The assumption of linearity was reasonably met. The assumption of normality was tested through examining the histogram as well the skewness (-2.09 to 3.68) and kurtosis (-1.78 to 3.13) statistics. The histogram indicated a relatively normal curve and the skewness and kurtosis statistics were mostly in range with the exceptions of CSAS (kurtosis: 8.06), Capacity: grocery compared to as needed (kurtosis: 11.69), and length of time (kurtosis: 12.11). The assumption of multicollinearity was assessed through an examination of the VIF (1.01 to 1.20) and tolerance (.83 to .99) statistics. Both statistics were well within range. Based on these findings, the assumptions have been reasonably met.

Childhood Causes. Hierarchical Regression analysis was used to test gender as well as sympathy, attitudes toward community service, length and type of volunteering, and capacity of volunteering. The assumptions were tested and an examination for outliers was completed. Cooks Distance statistic (.14)

and the Centered Leverage value (.36) were reviewed and it was determined there were no problems with cases exerting undue influence. Although independence cannot be reasonably assumed due to the nature of the study, a scatterplot of Studentized residuals and unstandardized predicted values was reviewed and the points seemed to be randomly plotted and mostly within the ±2.0 band. Scatterplots with Studentized residuals and the continuous independent variables demonstrated a constant spread of residuals revealing the assumption of homogeneity had been met. To examine homogeneity of variance Levenes test was conducted among the categorical variables: gender $(F(1,120) = .227, p = .63)$, type $(F(1,121) = .208, p = .65)$, capacity/pantry compared to as needed: $(F(1,121) = .409, p = .52)$, capacity/grocery compared to as needed: $(F(1,121) = .023, p = .88)$, and capacity /food line as compared to as needed: $(F(1,121) = .537, p = .47)$. Based on these findings, homogeneity of variance has been met. Linearity was also evaluated utilizing the scatterplots of the Studentized residuals and the continuous independent variables. The assumption of linearity was reasonably met. The assumption of normality was tested through examining the histogram as well the skewness (-2.09 to 3.68) and kurtosis (-1.78 to 3.13) statistics. The histogram indicated a relatively normal curve with a slight negative skew, and the skewness and kurtosis statistics were mostly in range with the exceptions of CSAS (kurtosis: 8.06), Capacity/grocery compared to as needed (kurtosis: 11.69), and length of time (kurtosis: 12.11). Multicollinearity was assessed through an examination of the VIF (1.00 to 1.07) and tolerance (.93 to 1.00) statistics. Both statistics were within range. Based on these findings, the assumptions have been reasonably met.

VITA

Heather Chancellor

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: VOLUNTEER ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMELESSNESS – A TEST OF
CONTACT HYPOTHESIS

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Biographical:

   Education:

   Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Educational
   Psychology at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2014.

   Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology at Oklahoma
   State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May 2010.

Experience:

Project Coordinator: University of Oklahoma, Center for Clinical and Translational
Research. Design and conduct research studies, analyze data found in research studies,
demonstrate findings to various stakeholders, search for grant opportunities, grant
writing, implement health and wellness programming to high-risk uninsured patients,
generate reports regarding patient data, connect patients with community resources,
collaborate with community partners.

Abstracts:

   1. Thomas, J.R., Mushtaq, N., **Chancellor, H.**, Fox, M.D. Disparities in Blood
      Pressure Screening in Pediatric Patients: An Analysis of NAMCS data. Pediatric
      Academic Society, Spring 2013.
   2. Baxter, M., Wallace, N., Passmore, S., Hemming, E., **Chancellor, H.**, Hellman,
      C. Adverse Childhood Experiences and Hope among Caregivers Seeking
      Investigation for Their Child's Abuse. Pediatric Academic Society, Spring 2014.
   3. Passmore, S., Hellman, C., **Chancellor, H.**, Hemming, E. An Investigation of the
      Relationship Between Secondary Trauma and Burnout Among Child Abuse
      Pediatricians. The Ray E. Helfer Society Annual Meeting. Spring, 2014.