

MIDDLE-CLASS STEREOTYPES OF  
LOW-INCOME GROUPS

By

CYNTHIA ANN FORD

//

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

Texas Christian University

Fort Worth, Texas

1971

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  
December, 1974

Thesis  
1974  
F 699m  
cop. 2

MAR 28 1975

MIDDLE-CLASS STEREOTYPES OF  
LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Thesis Approved:

*Florence W. Kinney*

Thesis Adviser

*H. Kay Stewart*

*Rich Stinnett*

*A. D. Durbin*

Dean of the Graduate College

903349

DEDICATION

To Mother and Daddy

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation and gratitude to the following people who contributed to the completion of this study:

To Dr. Florence McKinney, Professor and Head of the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics, for serving as thesis adviser and for giving guidance and assistance throughout the entire study,

To Dr. Kay Stewart, Professor in the Department of Housing and Interior Design, for serving on the thesis committee and for special assistance in the computer programming and the analysis of the data,

To Dr. Nick Stinnett, Professor in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development, for serving on the thesis committee and for guidance in the writing of the proposal,

To Mrs. Joan LeFebvre, Assistant Professor in the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics, for allowing the use of her class to pretest the questionnaire,

To the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics for granting the teaching assistantship that helped to make graduate study possible,

To the persons in Bridgeport, Texas, and in Fort Worth,

Texas, who took the time to complete the questionnaires,

To my parents for instilling in me the value of an education, for their sacrifices, and for their continuous support and encouragement,

To Brenda Phillips, my sister, for assisting in coding the questionnaires and for her encouragement, and

To my friends, especially Jacquie Roberts, for their unfailing support, understanding, and encouragement, and especially for their friendship.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Need for Research . . . . .	2
Significance and Background . . . . .	3
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	5
Hypotheses . . . . .	5
Procedure . . . . .	6
Assumptions . . . . .	7
Limitations . . . . .	7
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Format of the Thesis . . . . .	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	10
Historical Perspective . . . . .	10
Techniques of Stereotype Research . . . . .	11
The Dimensions of Stereotypes . . . . .	15
The Learning of Stereotypes . . . . .	18
Effects Stereotypes Have on Members of Stereotyped Groups . . . . .	20
Importance of Stereotype Research . . . . .	23
Summary . . . . .	24
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	27
Selection of the Population . . . . .	27
Selection of the Sample . . . . .	28
Development of the Questionnaire . . . . .	28
Data Collection and Preparation . . . . .	31
Statistical Treatment of the Data . . . . .	31
Summary . . . . .	35
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	37
Introduction . . . . .	37
Characteristics of the Subjects . . . . .	38
Characteristics of the Respondent's Contact with Low-Income Groups . . . . .	40
Scales for Low-Income Stereotypes . . . . .	42
Scale of the Adjective Checklist . . . . .	43
Scale of Laziness Among Low- Income Groups . . . . .	43

Chapter	Page
Scale of Values of Low-Income Groups . . . . .	45
Scale of Morals of Low-Income Groups . . . . .	47
Scale of Attitudes Among Low-Income Groups . . . . .	47
Scale of Society's Attitudes Toward Low-Income Groups . . . . .	49
Scale of Apathy Among Low-Income Groups . . . . .	50
Examination of the Hypotheses . . . . .	50
Age of the Respondent as an Independent Variable . . . . .	51
Respondent's Contact with Low- Income Persons as an Independent Variable . . . . .	55
Education of the Respondent as an Independent Variable . . . . .	67
Sex of the Respondent as an Independent Variable . . . . .	72
Respondent's Degree of Religious Orientation as an Independent Variable . . . . .	74
Respondent's Socioeconomic Status as an Independent Variable . . . . .	78
Summary . . . . .	80
 V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	 83
Summary . . . . .	83
Conclusions . . . . .	86
Recommendations . . . . .	91
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 93
 APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO COLLECT DATA . . . . .	 97
 APPENDIX B - MEAN SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME SITUATIONS . . . . .	 106



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects . . . . .	39
II. Respondent's Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	41
III. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale for the Adjective Checklist . . . . .	44
IV. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Laziness Among Low-Income Groups . . . . .	45
V. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Values of Low- Income Groups . . . . .	46
VI. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Morals of Low- Income Groups . . . . .	48
VII. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Attitudes Among Low-Income Groups . . . . .	48
VIII. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Society's Atti- tudes Toward Low-Income Groups . . . . .	49
IX. Correlation Matrix for Individual Items and the Total in the Scale of Apathy Among Low-Income Groups . . . . .	51
X. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Age . . . . .	52
XI. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Laziness According to Age . . . . .	54
XII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Society's Attitudes According to Age . . . . .	54

Table	Page
XIII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Apathy According to Age . . . . .	56
XIV. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Respondent's Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	58
XV. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Type of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	60
XVI. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Society's Attitudes According to Type of Contact with Low-Income Persons. . . . .	61
XVII. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	62
XVIII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for the Adjective Checklist According to Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	64
XIX. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Laziness According to Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	64
XX. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Values According to Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	65
XXI. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Morals According to Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	66
XXII. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Attending School with Low-Income Persons . . . . .	68
XXIII. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Education . . . . .	69

Table	Page
XXIV. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Society's Attitudes According to Education . . . . .	71
XXV. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Apathy According to Education. . . . .	71
XXVI. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Sex . . . . .	73
XXVII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Society's Attitudes According to Sex . . . . .	74
XXVIII. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Religious Orientation . . . . .	75
XXIX. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for the Adjective Checklist According to Religious Orientation . . . . .	77
XXX. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for Low-Income Attitudes According to Religious Orientation . . . . .	77
XXXI. Analysis of Variance Table for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Stereotype Scales According to Socio-economic Status . . . . .	79
XXXII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Mean Scale Scores for the Adjective Checklist According to Socio-economic Status . . . . .	80
XXXIII. Level of Significance Between Independent Variables and Adjective Checklist and Stereotype Scales . . . . .	90
XXXIV. Mean Scores for the Adjective Checklist and Low-Income Situations . . . . .	107

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

In recent years, increasing attention has been directed to "the lower class"--those existing at the economic and social margins of society.<sup>1</sup> However, this attention has been primarily focused on discussions of lower-class life and attempts to understand this segment of our society.

An area which has not been explored in much detail in relation to the lower class is how well a middle-class person can understand the lower-class and to what extent middle class values lead one in misinterpreting lower-class behavior. Hyman Rodman examined these two aspects and came to the conclusion that middle-class persons frequently are biased about the lower class, and they tend to hold many misconceptions about lower-class family life. Social scientists and professional practitioners may also share these biases. The existence of these biases has resulted in the stereotyped image many middle-class persons have of the lower-class. Some stereotypes that are held about the

---

<sup>1</sup>S. Miller, "The American Lower Classes: A Typological Approach," Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Worker (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964), p. 9.

lower-classes are that they are "immoral," "uncivilized," "promiscuous," "lazy," "obscene," "dirty," and "loud."<sup>2</sup>

These stereotypes reflect prejudicial attitudes, and ultimately such attitudes would have to be changed in order for persons to achieve better understanding of one another.

#### Need for Research

Rodman stated that additional research should help us to eliminate some of our biases about lower-class families.<sup>3</sup> He made this statement approximately ten years ago, and since that time research has been initiated in this area. Therefore, it would prove worthwhile to investigate how successful these attempts made by social scientists have been in removing the biased, stereotyped images which middle-class persons possess regarding the lower-class.

Barbara Wootton has stressed the importance of destroying the stereotyped, mythical images of lower-class families. She stated:

. . . the first result of a demand for evidence which will stand up to rigorous scientific examination is the destruction of myths, and such destructive activity is likely for sometime to come to be the main preoccupation of the social sciences.<sup>4</sup>

Another very important reason for research on middle-

---

<sup>2</sup>Hyman Rodman, "Middle-Class Misconceptions About Lower-Class Families," Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Worker (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964), p. 59.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 69.

<sup>4</sup>Barbara Wootton, Social Science and Social Pathology (London, 1959), p. 328.

class stereotypes of low-income groups is the fact that up until the present time no study has appeared in this particular area, although many stereotype studies exist in other areas. Even though writers refer to the stereotypes of lower-classes, research to determine if these stereotypes actually do exist is very limited.

### Significance and Background

American attitudes toward the poor have changed somewhat over the years. These attitudes and their changes are important because they reflect the feelings of Americans toward the lower-class; they also reflect the treatment of the American society toward the poor. If these attitudes are prejudicial then they also represent the stereotypes of the lower-class.

Early attitudes toward the poor in America were compounded by feelings of contempt, repugnance, and fatalism. For the most part, the affluent ignored the plight of the poor. In a society committed to success and achievement, the poor could only be viewed as an abnormality. Although this view was softened with time, it was still popular to assume that the roots of poverty were in individual laziness, thriftlessness, and immorality.

The post-Civil War period posed the problem of new poverty in the wake of industrialization, immigration, and urban growth. The new poor lived in the filth and squalor of the urban ghettos, which were only too visible. This

visibility forced the city dweller to recognize the existence of poor people and their problems. The proximity and interdependence of city life brought a new attention to poverty, its causes, and its cures. This period also marked the beginnings of the new philanthropy. The conscience of liberal reformers was awakened to the problems of poverty and a subtle shift of attitudes toward the poor occurred. Attention was focused on systemic and structural causes of poverty rather than on properties of the individual. The individual was viewed as a victim and not as a casual agent of poverty.

Public attitudes toward the poor today are a combination of past and present attitudes. The poor are viewed with some compassion, but they are also frequently seen as immoral, unmotivated, and childlike in their behavior. There is still a public lack of appreciation of the debilitating effects of poverty and the stresses that result from a lack of adequate resources. Hostility and racial prejudice may be directed toward some of the poor. History has widened the social distance between the poor and the affluent since life in suburbia makes it possible for the affluent to carry on day-to-day activities with little intimate awareness of the poor or their problems in the crowded urban ghettos.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber, Poverty in America (Ann Arbor, 1965), pp. xvi-xvii.

## Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to examine the degree of stereotypes middle class persons have of low-income groups.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. to develop an instrument to determine the degree of stereotypes indicative of low-income groups for the following: (a) an adjective checklist describing low-income persons, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, (e) the attitudes among low-income groups, (f) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (g) apathy among low-income groups.
2. to measure and compare low-income stereotypes between the different age groups; between the respondent's contacts with low-income persons; between different educational levels; between males and females; between different degrees of religious orientation; and between different socioeconomic backgrounds.

## Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were examined:

1. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between young adults, 18 to 25, and older adults, 26 and over.
2. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had contacts with



low-income persons and those who have not had contacts with low-income persons.

3. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had little education and those who have a college education.
4. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between males and females.
5. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who are very religious and those who are anti-religious.
6. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes among respondents from different socio-economic backgrounds.

#### Procedure

A questionnaire developed by the author was administered to a group of young adults at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas, and to older adults in Fort Worth, Texas and Bridgeport, Texas. The groups comprising the older adult portion of the sample were employees of a gasoline refinery, employees of a telephone company, and Lion Club members in Bridgeport, Texas. Also included in the older adult group were students in basic adult education courses in Fort Worth and high school teachers from Fort Worth, Texas.

### Assumptions

This study was planned on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. The sample of young adults, ages 18 to 25, selected for the study was representative of the population of Texas Christian University at Fort Worth, Texas in Tarrant County.
2. The sample of older adults, ages 26 and over, selected for the study was representative of the groups from which they were drawn.
3. Valid data was produced by the questionnaire.
4. The participants recorded fairly accurate information since the questionnaire was anonymous.

### Limitations

Since the instrument was an anonymous questionnaire, there was no way to remedy the problem if the respondents did not understand instructions or questions.

The conclusion of the study could be valid only for the population from which the sample was taken.

Since purposive sampling, a non-random type of sampling, was used for the study, limited inference can be made from the findings.

### Definition of Terms

The following words are defined as they were used in this particular study:

1. Stereotype--"A category that singles out an individual as sharing assumed characteristics on the basis of his group membership."<sup>6</sup>
2. Low-income groups or the poor--There are two aspects involved in this definition; the official economic definition developed by the federal government and the the definition utilized by the social scientist. In 1972, the income level separating the poor from the nonpoor, as defined by the federal government, was \$4,275 for a nonfarm family of four.<sup>7</sup> The social scientists' primary definition "is a condition of being in want of something that is needed, desired, or generally recognized as having value."<sup>8</sup> In this study low-income was not specifically defined, but was left to the interpretation of the respondents.
3. Socioeconomic status--The respondents were classified into five groups according to the McGuire-White Index of Social Status, which is based on the respondent's occupation, his primary source of income, and his educational attainment. The five socioeconomic groups are:  
(a) upper class, (b) upper middle class, (c) lower

---

<sup>6</sup>J. W. Vander Zanden, American Minority Relations: The Sociology of Racial and Ethnic Groups (New York, 1966), pp. 80-81.

<sup>7</sup>"Characteristics of the Low-Income Population: 1972," Current Population Reports--Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 88 (June, 1973), p. 1.

<sup>8</sup>Charles A. Valentine, Culture and Poverty (Chicago, 1968), p. 12.

middle class, (d) upper lower class, and (e) lower lower class.<sup>9</sup>

### Format of the Thesis

In this chapter the researcher has stated the problem to be studied, the significance and background of this problem, and the purposes of the study; also, included were the procedure, the assumptions and limitations, and the hypotheses to be tested.

Chapter II contains a review of related literature on the techniques and dimensions of stereotype research. A historical perspective on stereotype research will be discussed along with the learning of stereotypes and the effects stereotypes have on members of stereotyped groups.

In Chapter III the methodology of the study is described. This includes the selection of the population, the selection of the sample, a description of the instrument used in the study, the data collection and preparation, and the statistical treatment of the data.

The analysis of data is described in Chapter IV. Pearson's Correlation was used to construct the scales and Analysis of Variance was used to test the null hypotheses.

Chapter V summarizes the analysis and the conclusions. It also includes recommendations by the researcher concerning further research in the area of low-income stereotypes.

---

<sup>9</sup>Carson McGuire and George White, "Measurement of Social Status," Research Paper in Human Development Number 3 (revised), Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas (March, 1965), p. 4.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Historical Perspective

Stereotypes have been a basic part of literature since Lippmann coined the term. Lippmann recognized stereotypes as part of a simplifying mechanism to handle the real environment. He felt the real environment was altogether too big, too complex, and too fleeting for direct acquaintance; therefore, a man's actions were not based on direct and certain knowledge, but on pictures made by himself or given to him. Thus, one reacts, not to the real world, but to his reconstruction of it--"the pictures in his head."<sup>1</sup>

In recent times stereotype has come to mean a "category that singles out an individual as sharing assumed characteristics on the basis of his group membership."<sup>2</sup> Although limited to responses to individuals, this use of stereotype retains Lippmann's original idea that we react to the stereotype of the object and not to the object itself.

Tajfel offers yet another description for the term

---

<sup>1</sup> W. Lippman, Public Opinion (New York, 1922), pp. 1, 16, and 25.

<sup>2</sup> Vander Zanden, pp. 80-81.

stereotypes--"sets of fixed ideas and beliefs held about human groups."<sup>3</sup> Many articles written on this subject refer to the above description. Some generalizations which emerge from these articles on stereotypes are:

(1) people show an extraordinary readiness to characterize vast human groups in terms of fairly crude traits; (2) these characteristics or stereotypes tend to remain fairly stable within a population and for fairly long periods of time; (3) they tend to change to some extent, but without always altering fundamentally, as functions of social, political, or economic changes; (4) they become much more pronounced when social tensions arise; (5) they are learned early and used by children before the emergence of clear ideas defining the groups to which they apply; and (6) they do not present much of a problem when little hostility is involved, but are extremely difficult to modify in a social climate of tension and conflict.<sup>4</sup>

These generalizations will emerge throughout this chapter when referred to in specific studies.

The purpose of stereotype research is to investigate the picture or cognitive structure that we act upon as if it were real, just as this study is doing. Although not necessarily real groups, stereotypes are part of the social reality with which one must deal.

#### Techniques of Stereotype Research

The majority of stereotype studies have used one of three techniques: the adjective checklist, ratings of

---

<sup>3</sup>Henri Tajfel, "Stereotypes," Race, Vol. 5 (October, 1963), p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 5.

photographs, or ratings of statements. This study will employ two of these three techniques--the adjective checklist and the ratings of statements.

Katz and Braly developed the adjective checklist as a measure of stereotype. This technique was created for a study on ethnic stereotypes and it has been replicated many times since it was first developed. Those words which best describe the group in question are selected from a list of 84 adjectives. After listing the descriptive adjectives, five traits "most characteristic" of each group are marked.<sup>5</sup> Despite its criticisms the adjective checklist as a technique is most often used in stereotype research, but the failure to update the list may reduce its effectiveness. Also, the list may be appropriate only to those groups catered to in the original Katz and Braly study.

Several techniques have been used to elicit information about the presence of stereotypes without arbitrarily limiting the description, as the adjective checklist does. Ehrlich and Rinehart used a free association technique asking traits which were characteristic of the group.<sup>6</sup> Lists have been derived from free responses to the names of ethnic

---

<sup>5</sup>D. Katz and K. W. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 28 (1933), pp. 280-290.

<sup>6</sup>H. J. Ehrlich and J. W. Rinehart, "A Brief Report on the Methodology of Stereotype Research," Social Forces, Vol. 43 (1965), pp. 564-575.

groups. McNeil used a sentence completion technique.<sup>7</sup> Bjerstedt asked children attending international youth camps to write stories involving four nationalities.<sup>8</sup> Personality inventories have also been used by Braun,<sup>9</sup> Chaplin,<sup>10</sup> and Gouth.<sup>11</sup>

The second major technique, photographs, has been used in three basic ways. In the first situation photographs were matched by the respondents with labels. Studies utilizing this method were done by Gahagan<sup>12</sup> and Litterer.<sup>13</sup> Second, photographs have been rated on a like-dislike scale by the respondents and then rated a second time with labels. Razran used this technique in his study on ethnic stereo-

---

<sup>7</sup>J. D. McNeil, "Changes in Ethnic Reaction Tendencies During High School," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 53 (1960), pp. 199-200.

<sup>8</sup>A. Bjerstedt, "Ego-involved World Mindedness, Nationality Images, and Methods of Research: A Methodological Note," Journal of Conflict Resolut., Vol. 4 (1960), pp. 185-192.

<sup>9</sup>J. R. Braun, "Stereotypes of the Scientist as seen with Gordon Personal Profile and Gordon Personal Inventory," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 53 (1962), pp. 453-455.

<sup>10</sup>C. Chaplin, "Social Class Stereotyping in the Strong Vocational Inventory," American Psychology, Vol. 4, (1949), p. 373.

<sup>11</sup>H. G. Gouth, "The Adjective Check List as a Personality Research Instrument," Psychological Reports, Vol. 6 (1960), pp. 107-122.

<sup>12</sup>L. Gahagan, "Judgments of Occupation from Printed Photographs," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4 (1933), pp. 128-134.

<sup>13</sup>O. F. Litterer, "Stereotypes," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4 (1933), pp. 56-59.



types.<sup>14</sup> In the third method, the photographs, usually identifiable as belonging to members of an ethnic group, were rated on a list of attributes. If the photographs of one group, such as Negroes, were rated as possessing a trait that the other group does not, such as dishonest, then dishonest can be considered as a stereotyped trait of that group. This technique has been used by Lindzey and Rogolsky,<sup>15</sup> Martin,<sup>16</sup> and Secord.<sup>17</sup> The use of photographs is the best because it allows the most latitude in determining the content of the stereotype.

The third major technique involves the rating of statements as to whether or not they are characteristic of the group. If sufficient numbers of agreements to a statement are found, then the statement is regarded as part of a stereotype. Ehrlich<sup>18</sup> and Richards<sup>19</sup> have used this

---

<sup>14</sup>G. Razran, "Ethnic Dislikes and Sterotypes: A Laboratory Study," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 45 (1950), pp. 7-27.

<sup>15</sup>G. Lindzey and S. Rogolsky, "Prejudice and Identification of Minority Group Membership," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 45 (1950), pp. 37-53.

<sup>16</sup>J. G. Martin, "Racial Ethnocentrism and Judgment of Beauty," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 63 (1964), pp. 59-63.

<sup>17</sup>P. F. Secord, "Stereotyping and Favorableness in the Perception of Negro Faces," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 59 (1959), pp. 309-314.

<sup>18</sup>H. J. Ehrlich, "Stereotyping and Negro-Jewish Stereotypes," Social Forces, Vol. 41 (1962), pp. 171-176.

<sup>19</sup>E. S. Richards, "Attitudes of College Students in the Southwest Toward Ethnic Groups in the United States," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 35 (1950), pp. 22-30.

technique in their studies of racial and ethnic stereotypes. Tuckman has also used this technique to study stereotypes about life adjustments.<sup>20</sup>

### The Dimensions of Stereotypes

The dimensions of stereotypes proposed by Edwards consist of four major areas. Edwards' four dimensions are: (1) content--the traits making up the stereotype, (2) uniformity--the agreement on the assignment of traits, (3) direction--the favorableness-unfavorableness of a stereotype, and (4) intensity--the degree of favorableness-unfavorableness of a response.<sup>21</sup>

Content is discovered best when checklists and lists of statements are used because the traits can be taken from them. However, content covers only the traits attributed to a specific group. The frequency with which a trait may be attributed to a group is not considered. Thus, it is possible that a trait may be considered very characteristic of a group at one time and less so at a later time, and be considered part of the stereotype content both times. The content of ethnic stereotypes has displayed a remarkable stability over a period of time. Katz and Braly did the first study on ethnic stereotypes using an adjective check-

---

<sup>20</sup>J. Tuckman, "Perceptual Stereotypes about Life Adjustments," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 43 (1956), pp. 239-245.

<sup>21</sup>A. L. Edwards, "Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 12 (1940), pp. 566-572.

list, and this study had been replicated up to the present time.<sup>22</sup> The findings have remained relatively unchanged among seven of the ten ethnic groups included in the study. The changes noted in the stereotypes of the Japanese, Germans, and the Chinese occurred mainly during World War II; therefore, these changes are attributed primarily to the war. Ehrlich and Rinehart discovered stereotypes very similar to those found by Katz and Braly, even though they used the free association technique and Katz and Braly used the adjective checklist.<sup>23</sup>

Uniformity has been measured in two ways. Katz and Braly's measure of uniformity covers the relatedness of the total cluster of traits.<sup>24</sup> The second measure of uniformity is the frequency of the individual traits assigned to a group. Most studies have used the frequency of the individual traits assigned to a group as the measure of uniformity. Uniformity is determined by cultural factors as indicated in Katz and Braly's study. They found that groups which were not familiar in the culture, such as the Turks, were not assigned a very uniform stereotype.<sup>25</sup> Edwards suggest uniformity is related to the homogeneity of attitudes toward the stereotyped group rather than to the homogeneity of the

---

<sup>22</sup>Katz and Braly, pp. 280-290.

<sup>23</sup>Ehrlich and Rinehart, pp. 564-575.

<sup>24</sup>Katz and Braly, pp. 280-290.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

group doing the stereotyping.<sup>26</sup>

The intensity of a stereotype is an individual factor rather than a cultural factor. Both the high- and low-prejudice individuals hold stereotypes, but the high-prejudice individuals are more likely to hold more intense stereotypes. Therefore, it seems that the intensity is a consequence of individual attitude, rather than an inherent characteristic of stereotypes themselves. Intensity was originally conceived by Edwards in terms of what groups are liked and disliked.<sup>27</sup> The intensity of a stereotype can be determined by a social desirability rating of the traits or by a favorability ranking for the stereotypes for each group included in the study.

The direction of a stereotype can be determined from the stereotype terms or from separate ratings of each stereotype group, just as intensity is determined. Studies of direction show that once an object is associated with a stereotype, the object is regarded as being in the same direction as the stereotype. An example of the direction of a stereotype is exhibited in a study by Stagner. He found the respondents would respond favorably to unlabeled Fascist principles, although they had responded in a categorically unfavorable direction to the principles when they were

---

<sup>26</sup>A. L. Edwards, "Studies of Stereotypes: I. The Directionality and Uniformity of Responses to Stereotypes," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 12 (1940), pp. 357-366.

<sup>27</sup>A. L. Edwards, "Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes," pp. 566-572.

labeled as Fascist.<sup>28</sup>

The functioning of a stereotype is best illustrated in the interrelations of the four dimensions previously discussed. Some examples of interrelationships of the four dimensions are uniformity to direction, content to direction, and uniformity to intensity. When a fifth variable, familiarity, is added the following interrelationships occur--familiarity to direction and uniformity to familiarity. These interrelations are important when studying stereotypes, but very little work has been done on the relationship of the dimensions of stereotypes.

#### The Learning of Stereotypes

Saenger and Flowerman suggest that we acquire our stereotypes through learning.<sup>29</sup> Rinehart takes this theory a step further and states--"stereotypes, like languages, are learned in interaction with others and undergo a developmental process."<sup>30</sup> While children in their early years can often distinguish between themselves and members of some minority groups, they are unable to apply descriptive labels to these groups. If a child does apply a label it

---

<sup>28</sup>R. Stagner, "Facist Attitudes: An Exploratory Study," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 7 (1936), pp. 309-319.

<sup>29</sup>Samuel Flowerman and Gerhart Saenger, "Stereotypes and Prejudicial Attitudes," Human Relations, Vol. 7 (1954), p. 230.

<sup>30</sup>James W. Rinehart, "The Meaning of Stereotypes," Theory into Practice, Vol. 2 (June, 1963), p. 140.

seldom coincides with labels applied to the same group by his peers. As the child advances in age and in school, his beliefs about minority-group members become more definite and more in agreement with the beliefs of others. A study by Blake and Dennis supports the above theory. They found, using a cross-section of school grades, that the traits in white children's stereotypes of Negroes changed with age until reaching a stable content similar to that of adult stereotypes by the 10th and 11th grades.<sup>31</sup> Other investigators of children's stereotypes have taken only samples from one age group rather than a cross-section; therefore, they have not added any information of the development of stereotypes.

Once it is realized that stereotypes are learned and undergo a process of development, it becomes important to know from whom they are learned. The answer to this can be found primarily in the child's network of interpersonal relations. Individuals responsible for the socialization of the child, such as parents, relatives, and educators, are basic sources of stereotype diffusion, along with siblings, classmates, and neighborhood play groups. Other potential sources are movies, television, magazines, and school textbooks. A study by Lambert and Klineberg revealed that approximately 15 per cent of the children's responses pointed to teachers, textbooks, and course work as the

---

<sup>31</sup>Robert Blake and Wayne Dennis, "The Development of Stereotypes Concerning the Negro," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 38 (October, 1943), pp. 525-531.

source of their stereotyped beliefs about others.<sup>32</sup>

### Effects Stereotypes Have on Members of Stereotyped Groups

Groups stereotype both themselves and others, and they usually accept the stereotype others give their group as characterizing their group, if not the self. The effects of this acceptance by minority groups have been detrimental.

Bayton found in a study of Negro college students that their stereotype of themselves was more favorable than their stereotype of the Negro. When asked to give the traits of Negroes, the Negro college students responded with the usual stereotype, but when asked for the traits of the typical Negro college student on their campus, they responded with intelligent, talkative, happy-go-lucky, sportsman-like, and jovial. The stereotype of the usual Negro given by these college students suggests that they have accepted the stereotype of Negroes as given by the larger white culture, but they have not accepted that stereotype to describe themselves.<sup>33</sup>

The effect of accepting the stereotype held by the majority culture can be seen in its effects of Negro

---

<sup>32</sup>W. E. Lambert and Otto Klineberg, "A Pilot Study of the Origin and Development of National Stereotypes," International Social Science Journal, Vol. 2 (1959), pp. 221-228.

<sup>33</sup>J. A. Bayton, "The Racial Stereotype of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 36 (1941), pp. 97-102.

children's attitudes toward each other. Seeman found that Negro school children preferred children with lighter colored skin, judged darker skinned children as having more negative personality traits, and regarded themselves as being lighter colored than did an adult observer. Each of these three areas was strongly influenced by the stereotype as a basis for behavioral judgment of their peers.<sup>34</sup>

In the process of gaining self-attitudes the individual's experiences with others, particularly significant others, and his experiences with the ways in which others define his roles are very important. In the process of acquiring self-attitudes, the individual may receive negative as well as positive self-definitions. Petroni suggests these self-attitudes may help to explain the processes by which members of racial and cultural minorities come to share some of the same stereotypes of themselves that are held by members of the larger society. By acquiring these stereotypes, the members of minority groups may help to perpetuate their inferior position in society.<sup>35</sup>

Steinberg also feels that the stereotypes placed on minority groups adds to their problems and definitely has

---

<sup>34</sup>M. Seeman, "Skin Color Values in Three All Negro School Classes," American Sociological Review, Vol. 11 (1946), pp. 315-321.

<sup>35</sup>Frank Petroni, "'Uncle Toms': White Stereotypes in the Black Movement," Human Organization, Vol. 29 (Winter, 1970), pp. 260-266.



an effect on them. He states, "For members of victimized groups, the result is diminished self-esteem and a defensive withdrawal within one's self or one's own group."<sup>36</sup> Not only does Steinberg believe stereotypes have a detrimental effect on minority groups; he also feels stereotyping affects society as a whole--the result being intense social conflict and loss of civic unity. Steinberg sums up his feelings on this subject by saying, "Like other kinds of verbal abuse, the language of prejudice carries a heavy price."<sup>37</sup>

Stereotypes have also had a negative effect on the educational system in America today. Cuban feels that too many teachers are stereotypers and because of this many students have been cheated of a quality education.<sup>38</sup> Authors Silberman<sup>39</sup> and Clark<sup>40</sup> confirm this assertion. They regard negative stereotyping on the part of teachers as a kind of educational inequity that depresses expectations and consequently denies lower-status and minority children access to high-caliber teaching. Both men lay the responsibility for poor student achievement in inner-city schools

---

<sup>36</sup>Stephen Steinberg, "The Language of Prejudice," Today's Education, Vol. 60 (February, 1971), p. 14.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>L. Cuban, "What's the Real Story?" Social Studies, Vol. 56 (January, 1965), p. 23.

<sup>39</sup>C. E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York, 1964), p. 72.

<sup>40</sup>K. B. Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York, 1964), p. 14.

directly at the feet of teachers and administrators who deliberately and/or inadvertently engage in such negative stereotyping. A study by Mazer supports this viewpoint. He found that teachers who classed students as disadvantaged or deprived exhibited a definite pattern of behaviors and attributes that distinguished lower-status and middle-class students. According to the teachers' ratings, lower-class students tended to be linguistically inept, undependable, unkempt, unattractive, unmotivated, and uncooperative, while their middle-class counterparts were expected to exhibit tendencies in precisely the opposite directions.<sup>41</sup>

#### Importance of Stereotype Research

Stereotypes are a key variable in any attempt to develop a general theory of prejudice. The study of stereotypes is also essential to the development of a general theory of intergroup behavior. Ehrlich emphasizes the importance of stereotype research in the following passage:

To the social psychologist, stereotypes, as the language of prejudice, are thought to provide a vocabulary of motives both for individual and concerted action of prejudiced persons. They signal the socially approved and accessible targets for the release of hostility and aggression, and they provide the rationalizations for prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior. In providing a common language of discourse for prejudiced persons, stereotypes function as any special language to reinforce the beliefs of its users,

---

<sup>41</sup>Gilbert E. Mazer, "Effects of Social-Class Stereotyping on Teacher Expectation," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 8 (October, 1971), p. 377.

and to furnish the basis for the development and maintenance of solidarity among the prejudices.<sup>42</sup>

Harvard Child Psychiatrist Robert Coles has done much work in the area of stereotypes. However, his efforts have been primarily in attempts to alleviate the stereotypes most Americans have of certain groups. Coles states:

We categorize people, call them names like 'culturally disadvantaged' or 'white racists,' names that say something all right but not enough--because those declared 'culturally disadvantaged' so often are at the same time shrewd, sensitive, and in possession of their own culture, just as those called 'white racists' have other sides to themselves, can be generous and decent, can take note of and be responsive to the black man's situation.<sup>43</sup>

Coles states that somehow we all must learn to know one another, and he stresses the point that we cannot help people until we understand them, and we cannot understand them without discarding stereotypes.<sup>44</sup>

#### Summary

As indicated through the review of literature in this chapter, many studies have been conducted and much has been written in relation to stereotypes. However, the majority of this work has centered around ethnic stereotypes.

The three primary techniques used in stereotype

---

<sup>42</sup>H. J. Ehrlich, P. 172.

<sup>43</sup>"Breaking the American Stereotypes," Time, Vol. 99 (February 14, 1972), p. 36.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

research are: (1) the adjective checklist, (2) ratings of photographs, and (3) ratings of statements. The adjective checklist and the ratings of statements are used most often even though the use of photographs is considered to be the best method because of the latitude it allows in determining the content of the stereotype.

Content, uniformity, direction, and intensity comprise the dimensions of stereotypes. The functioning of a stereotype is best illustrated in the interrelations of these four dimensions, and the literature has suggested more work be done in this area.

Stereotypes are learned through interaction with others, and the learning of stereotypes undergoes a developmental process. The child learns his stereotypes primarily from his parents, relatives, and educators; however, the child's stereotypes change as they grow older and they eventually reach a stable content similar to adult stereotypes before they complete high school.

Society's stereotypes are usually accepted by the groups on which the stereotypes are placed. This has proved detrimental for minority groups because it has helped to perpetuate their inferior position in society and has caused diminished self-esteem and withdrawal for minority group members. The effects of teachers stereotyping their low-status, disadvantaged students has also proved detrimental because it has cheated these students from receiving a quality education.

Stereotype research aids in uncovering the present stereotypes, and through this research it becomes possible to determine if efforts have been successful in removing stereotyped, prejudicial attitudes. Knowing existing stereotypes also aids in the development of a general theory of prejudice and of intergroup behavior.

There are no studies in the area of low-income stereotypes even though these stereotypes are referred to in literature. Therefore, it would prove interesting to compare the low-income stereotypes referred to in literature and the actual stereotypes of low-income groups existing today.

Chapter III describes the methodology employed in this study.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study, as indicated in Chapter I, was to examine the degree of stereotypes middle class persons have of low-income groups. A questionnaire was designed to determine if low-income stereotypes exist.

The development of the questionnaire is described in this chapter along with the selection of the population and the selection of the sample. The collection of the data and the statistical procedure for data analysis are also discussed in this chapter.

#### Selection of the Population

The counties of Tarrant and Wise in the state of Texas were chosen for the location of this study. This location was chosen because this area is not "overtested," as is the Stillwater, Oklahoma, area; therefore, persons living in this area would be more responsive to filling out a questionnaire than persons in an area that is subject to frequent questionnaires.

Another reason for choosing this location was that it is "home territory" for the author. The author felt this factor would be helpful in gaining the cooperation of groups

chosen to fill out the questionnaires.

### Selection of the Sample

Purposive sampling was used to obtain the two groups included in the study. The first group, composed of young adults ages 18 to 25, was selected from students at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas. The second group, composed of older adults ages 26 to 71 or over, was chosen from the Lion's Club, employees of a gasoline refinery, and employees of a telephone company in Bridgeport, Texas. Also included in the second group were students in basic adult education courses at Fort Worth and high school teachers in Fort Worth, Texas. One hundred questionnaires were obtained from each group, giving a total sample size of 200.

### Development of the Questionnaire

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire developed by the author. The questionnaire examined the degree of stereotypes which middle-class persons have of low-income groups. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: (1) general information, (2) an adjective checklist, and (3) a low-income situation inventory.

The first portion of the questionnaire, general information, consisted of questions designed to obtain the following background information: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) place of residence, (d) educational attainment, (e) degree of reli-

gious orientation, and (f) socioeconomic status of the respondents. The McGuire-White Index of Social Status, which uses source of income, occupation, and education as an indicator of social status, was utilized to measure the socioeconomic status of the subjects.<sup>1</sup> Also included in the general information section of the questionnaire were questions concerning the respondent's contact with low-income persons, the areas of contact, the quality of contact, and if the respondent had attended school with low-income persons.

The second portion of the questionnaire, the adjective checklist, consisted of a total of 22 adjectives. Two adjectives were placed on a continuum. At one end of the continuum was a positive adjective and at the other end a negative adjective. The respondent was asked to circle the number--ranging from 1 to 10--he felt best described low-income groups. The purpose of the adjective checklist was to obtain a description of low-income groups from the viewpoint of the middle-class respondents.

The third portion of the questionnaire, the low-income situation inventory, was made up of four situations chosen by the author from literature. Following each low-income situation was a series of statements which referred back to the situation. These statements were designed to measure the respondent's level of agreement-disagreement on a scale

---

<sup>1</sup>Carson McGuire and George White, p. 4.



from 1 to 10. The respondent's level of agreement-disagreement indicated if he had a negative or positive stereotype of low-income groups. The stereotypes which were being examined in the situations were: (1) situation about Mrs. Jones--the poor are immoral, promiscuous, and shiftless, (2) situation about three boys--the poor are lazy and are victims of the time, (3) situation about Applachian man--the poor are lazy, apathetic, and do not want to work, and (4) situation about welfare--examines the respondent's attitudes about the poor receiving help. Statements were also included throughout the four situations about the values of the poor, the attitudes of low-income persons, and society's attitudes toward low-income persons.

Prior to administering the questionnaire to the sample, it was administered to a selected home management class at Oklahoma State University in April, 1974. This class was made up of 10 senior and graduate students in Home Management 4850--Community Based Home Management Experiences. The group was asked to follow the directions, fill out the questionnaire, and write down comments relating to improvements they felt could be made in either content or structure of the questionnaire. In an oral discussion following the completion of the questionnaires, verbal suggestions for improvement were given to the author. Both written and oral comments and suggestions were then evaluated and revisions were made in the questionnaire.

### Data Collection and Preparation

The revised questionnaire was administered to groups in Tarrant County--Fort Worth, Texas, and to groups in Wise County--Bridgeport, Texas, during the month of May, 1974. Contact was made either in person or through a phone call requesting the group's participation in the study prior to the distribution of the questionnaire. The author distributed the questionnaires in person at the previously arranged time for each group. In some cases the groups filled out the questionnaires and returned them immediately; however, in other cases this was not possible. Therefore, plans were made for the author to pick up the questionnaires at a later date when they were completed.

After receiving the completed questionnaires, the author coded the answers for ease of tabulating the data. Following the completion of coding the questionnaires, the information was keypunched onto computer cards for the analysis of data.

### Statistical Treatment of the Data

In the preliminary analysis frequency distribution and percentages were computed for all the items included in the questionnaire. The mean, median, and the mode were also computed for those items which used the 10-point scale.

The next step utilized in analyzing the data was to develop scales for the adjective checklist and for the low-income situation inventory. The author and her committee

members chose statements from the four situations which theoretically measured the following: (a) the poor are lazy and do not want to work, (b) the values of the poor, (c) the poor are immoral, (d) attitudes among low-income groups, (e) society's attitudes toward the poor, and (f) the poor are apathetic. The adjective checklist plus each of the categories (a) through (f) formed a separate scale. Data analysis was performed using Pearson's coefficient of correlation to test whether the items within each scale were alike enough to be summed into a single scale value. The steps involved in this correlation technique were as follows:

1. Responses for each item in the scale had equal weight.
2. Responses to all items in each scale were summed for each respondent.
3. Each item was correlated with each of the other items and with the total.
4. Items with low correlations were removed from the scale.
5. All items that correlated at .20 or above remained in the scale.<sup>2</sup>

The formula used for calculating Pearson's coefficient of correlation is shown in equation (1).

$$r = \frac{\sum XY - \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Y)}{N}}{\sqrt{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N} \quad \sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{N}}} \quad (1)$$

where r denotes Pearson's coefficient of correlation test

---

<sup>2</sup>Allan Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York, 1957), p. 155.

statistic,

where  $\Sigma$  denotes add,

X denotes any variable,

Y denotes any other variable,

N denotes the number of cases or observations studied.<sup>3</sup>

After developing the scales, an analysis of variance, a parametric test statistic, was utilized. The analysis of variance statistical test was chosen because the data consisted of both nominal and ordinal scales. The analysis of variance was used to examine the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between young adults, 18 to 25, and older adults, 26 and over.
2. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had contacts with low-income persons and those who have not had contacts with low-income persons.
3. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had little education and those who have a college education.
4. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between males and females.
5. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who are very religious and

---

<sup>3</sup>Linton C. Freeman, Elementary Applied Statistics (New York, 1965), pp. 85 and 102.

those who are anti-religious.

6. There will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes among respondents from different socio-economic backgrounds.

The three steps involved in calculating Fisher's analysis of variance, often referred to as the F-test, are as follows:

Step I--Calculate  $n^2$  according to equation (2).

$$n^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k n_j (\bar{Y}_j - \bar{Y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2} \quad (2)$$

where  $n_j$  denotes the number of observations in an X subgroup,

$\bar{Y}_j$  denotes the mean of a subgroup,

$\bar{Y}$  denotes the grand mean,

$k$  denotes the number of subgroups,

$Y_i$  denotes a score on the interval scale,

$N$  denotes the total number of observations.

Step II--Determine F according to equation (3).

$$F = \left( \frac{n^2}{1 - n^2} \right) \left( \frac{N - k}{k - 1} \right) \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  denotes the number of cases in the total sample,

$k$  denotes the number of samples,

$n$  denotes the correlation ratio.

Step III--Calculate the two values for degrees of freedom according to equation (4) and according to equation (5).

$$df_B = k - 1 \quad (4)$$

where  $k$  denotes the number of samples.

$$df_W = N - k \quad (5)$$

where  $N$  denotes the number of cases in the total sample,

$k$  denotes the number of samples.

After finding the two values for degrees of freedom the calculated  $F$  is compared to the tabled value at the .05 level of significance. If the calculated  $F$ -test statistic value exceeds the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$ , then the null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that the data present sufficient evidence to indicate that the null hypothesis is not true. If the calculated  $F$ -test statistic value is less than the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$ , then the null hypothesis is not rejected, it is accepted, and it is concluded that the data do not present sufficient evidence to indicate that the null hypothesis is not true.<sup>4</sup>

#### Summary

This chapter has included the procedure undertaken throughout this study. The author chose Tarrant and Wise Counties in the state of Texas for the population to be studied. Next, the sample was selected for the study, and it was broken down into two groups--young adults and older adults. The older adult sample consisted of a civic group and employees of a telephone company and a gasoline refinery in Bridgeport, Texas; it also consisted of students in basic adult education courses and teachers in Fort Worth, Texas. The younger adult sample was composed of students attending

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, pp. 206-209.

Texas Christian University during the summer semester, 1974.

A questionnaire devised to examine the degree of stereotypes middle-class persons have of low-income groups had three parts--(1) general information, (2) an adjective checklist, and (3) a low-income situation inventory. The questionnaire was pretested and the revised questionnaire was then administered to the sample.

The questionnaire was given to the groups included in the sample during the month of May, 1974, by the author. After collecting 200 questionnaires, 100 for each group in the sample, the questionnaires were coded and then keypunched for use in the computer.

The data analysis included four different steps. In the preliminary analysis the frequency distribution and percentages were computed for each item in the questionnaire. The mean, median, and the mode were computed for each item in the questionnaire which used the 10-point scale. Next, the scales were developed for the adjective checklist and six subject areas in the low-income situation inventory using Pearson's coefficient of correlation. The final step in analyzing the data was to test the null hypotheses. The null hypotheses were tested using Fisher's analysis of variance, a parametric test statistic.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the degree of stereotypes which middle-class persons have of low-income groups and to determine if there was any difference in these stereotypes between the respondents and the selected independent variables. The data presented in this chapter examined the relationship between one dependent variable-- low-income stereotypes and six selected independent variables:

- (1) the age of the respondent,
- (2) the respondent's contact with low-income persons,
- (3) the education of the respondent,
- (4) the sex of the respondent,
- (5) the respondent's degree of religious orientation,  
and
- (6) the respondent's socioeconomic status.

Each section in Chapter IV contributes to the investigation of low-income stereotypes and their relationship with the above independent variables.



### Characteristics of the Subjects

Table I presents a detailed description of the 200 persons who served as subjects for this study. There were seven categories for the respondent's age, however, none of the respondent's were in the 71 or over category. The greatest proportion of the respondents were in the age category 18-25 (50%). This age group constituted the young adult group in the study. The other age categories comprised the older adult group in the study. The age category 41-50 made up the largest portion of the older adult sample (16.0%), but the 31-40 year old category followed close behind (14.5%). The next age category, 26-30, was reported by 22 of the respondents (11.0%), while 15 respondents fell into the 51-60 age category (7.5%). The age category 61-70 was recorded by only 2 respondents (1.0%).

The largest portion of the sample was female (63.8%), while the males represented 36.2% of the sample. One respondent failed to indicate sex.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents had attended college and an additional 14.5% had graduated from high school. Only one respondent had not completed the eighth grade (0.5%) and 4 respondents did not graduate from high school (2.0%). Nine per cent of the sample had graduated from a four year college, but it should be noted that many of the respondents in the young adult portion of the study would soon be graduating from a four year college which would make this category increase. Eight respondents had

TABLE I  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variables	Classification	Number Responding	Percent
Age		(N = 200)	
	18-25	100	50.0
	26-30	22	11.0
	31-40	29	14.5
	41-50	32	16.0
	51-60	15	7.5
	61-70	2	1.0
	71 or over	0	0
Sex		(N = 199)	
	Female	127	63.8
	Male	72	36.2
Educational Level		(N = 200)	
	Less than 8th grade	1	0.5
	Attended high school, but did not graduate	4	2.0
	Graduated from high school	29	14.5
	Attended college	130	65.0
	Graduated from 4 yr. college	18	9.0
	Attended graduate school	8	4.0
	Completed graduate work for profession	10	5.0
Degree of Religious Orientation		(N = 200)	
	Very religious	30	15.0
	Religious	150	75.0
	Non-religious	17	8.5
	Anti-religious	3	1.5
Socio-economic Status		(N = 200)	
	Upper Class	14	7.0
	Upper-Middle Class	82	41.0
	Lower-Middle Class	64	32.0
	Upper-Lower Class	37	18.5
	Lower-Lower Class	3	1.5

attend graduate school (4.0%), while ten respondents had completed graduate work for a profession (5.0%).

A large percentage of the respondents reported they were either very religious (15.0%) or religious (75.0%). Seventeen respondents stated they were non-religious (8.5%) and only 3 respondents indicated they were anti-religious (1.5%).

Fourteen of the respondents were in the upper class (7.0%). The majority of the sample was either upper-middle class (41.0%) or lower-middle class (32.0%). Thirty-seven respondents fell into the upper-lower class (18.5%), while only 1.5% of the sample was lower-lower class.

#### Characteristics of the Respondent's

##### Contact with Low-Income Persons

Table II presents the findings concerning the respondent's contact with low-income persons. A large portion of the sample indicated that they had some type of contact with low-income persons (80.5%), while 19.5% stated they had never had any contacts with low-income persons.

The largest percentage of the sample reported that their contact with low-income persons had been voluntary (56.0%), while 16.5% recorded their contact as being involuntary. Eight per cent of the respondents stated their contact with low-income persons had been both voluntary and involuntary.

Fifty-one per cent of the respondents indicated their contact with low-income persons had been through their occupation. Thirty-eight respondents reported casual contacts (19.0%), while 17.0% stated they had recreational contact

TABLE II  
 RESPONDENT'S CONTACT WITH  
 LOW-INCOME PERSONS

Variable	Classification	Number Responding	Percent
Contact with Low-Income Persons		(N = 200)	
	Yes	161	80.5
	No	39	19.5
Type of Contact		(N = 200)	
	Voluntary	112	56.0
	Involuntary	33	16.5
	Both	16	8.0
	None	39	19.5
Areas of Contact *(Respondent could answer more than once)		(N = 245)*	
	Casual	38	19.0
	Residential	21	10.5
	Recreational	34	17.0
	Occupational	102	51.0
	Religious	22	11.0
	Civic & Fraternal	8	4.0
	Political	4	2.0
	Goodwill Intergroup Activities	16	8.0
Quality of Contact		(N = 200)	
	None	39	19.5
	Good	136	68.0
	Bad	6	3.0
	Both	14	7.0
	Indifferent	5	2.5
Attend School with Low-Income		(N = 200)	
	Yes	149	74.5
	No	51	25.5

with low-income persons. Small percentages were reported by the sample in the following areas of contact: religious--11.0%, residential--10.5%, goodwill intergroup activities--8.0%, civic and fraternal--4.0%, and political--2.0%.

A large portion of the sample reported their contact with low-income persons had been good (68.0%). Three percent indicated their contact had been bad, while 7.0% reported having both good and bad contact with low-income persons.

A large percentage of the respondents stated they had attended school with low-income persons (74.5%), while only 51 respondents reported they had not attended school with low-income persons (25.5%).

#### Scales for Low-Income Stereotypes

Items in the questionnaire were used to form seven scales which served as indicators of low-income stereotypes. The responses to each item included in a scale were coded from 1 to 10 with lower scores indicating a more negative stereotype and higher scores indicating a more positive stereotype, with the exception of the adjective checklist which was vice versa. Pearson's coefficient of correlation was used to determine if the items in each scale were alike enough to be summed into a single scale. Each item in a scale was correlated with each of the other items and with the sum for all items in the scale.<sup>1</sup>

This section identifies the items included in each

---

<sup>1</sup>Allan Edwards, p. 155.

scale and presents the correlation matrices for the seven scales. For ease in handling the data, the items in the scales are referred to by number.

#### Scale of the Adjective Checklist

The adjective pairs included in the "adjective checklist scale" were:

Var022: Industrious-Lazy

Var024: Ambitious-Shiftless

Var026: Moral-Immoral

Var027: Conservative-Radical

Var028: Kind-Cruel

Var029: Imaginative-Stupid

Var031: Polite-Rude

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table III shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

#### Scale of Laziness Among Low-Income Groups

The items included in the scale of "laziness among low-income groups" were:

Var032: It was not a matter of timing that caused the two boys in this situation to fail; they just did not try hard enough to succeed.

Var035: The poor people who say they have tried to pull themselves out of poverty but have never had the right

TABLE III  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE FOR  
THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST

	Var024	Var026	Var027	Var028	Var029	Var031	Total
Var022	.73	.48	.30	.46	.49	.29	.21
Var024		.54	.32	.44	.59	.31	.21
Var026			.50	.51	.35	.46	.48
Var027				.45	.14*	.38	.51
Var028					.31	.62	.54
Var029						.27	.49
Var031							.47

\*This was accepted below .20 correlation because the variable was correlated with the total.

opportunities are just using this as an excuse for their laziness.

Var039: If the two boys had been willing to work and to stay in school they would have been successful too.

Var040: This man did not look around enough for jobs, if he really wanted a job he could have found one.

Var042: People are poor because they do not want to work.

Var043: This man was lazy and not really interested in working.

Var049: People are poor because they are shiftless.

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table IV shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed

total for the scale.

TABLE IV  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
LAZINESS AMONG LOW-INCOME  
GROUPS

	Var035	Var039	Var040	Var042	Var043	Var049	Total
Var032	.52	.54	.42	.44	.38	.37	.37
Var035		.54	.42	.52	.33	.42	.30
Var039			.34	.40	.33	.32	.31
Var040				.36	.39	.31	.37
Var042					.40	.54	.61
Var043						.36	.39
Var049							.36

Scale of Values of Low-Income Groups

The following items were included in the scale of "values of low-income groups:"

Var046: If the limitations of being poor were removed, low-income families would exhibit values similar to the middle class.

Var051: The marriage relationship is not important to low-income people.

Var052: The poor are interested in satisfying their immediate desires for a physical relationship and do not think of future consequences.



Var053: The fact that the poor do not feel it is wrong to have illegitimate children encourages low-income women to be immoral.

Var063: If heads of low-income families didn't think they had to have "big cars" and "good times," the families would be "alright."

Var064: Poor people don't know how to spend their money wisely so they just continue to be on welfare.

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table V shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

TABLE V  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
VALUES OF LOW-INCOME GROUPS

	Var051	Var052	Var053	Var063	Var064	Total
Var046	.02*	.25	.20	.22	.21	.19*
Var051		.41	.44	.16*	.27	.45
Var052			.52	.31	.43	.45
Var053				.47	.36	.55
Var063					.37	.24
Var064						.28

\*Var046 was accepted below .20 correlation because the statement dealt directly with low-income values. The correlation of Var051 with Var063 was accepted below .20 correlation because Var051 was correlated with the other variables and with the total.

### Scale of Morals of Low-Income Groups

The scale of "morals of low-income groups" included the following items:

Var047: The woman in the above situation is typical of the poor in that she has many children and no husband.

Var048: Being poor encourages women to have illegitimate children.

Var051: The marriage relationship is not important to low-income people.

Var052: The poor are interested in satisfying their immediate desires for a physical relationship and do not think of future consequences.

Var053: The fact that the poor do not feel it is wrong to have illegitimate children encourages low-income women to be immoral.

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table VI shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

### Scale of Attitudes Among Low-Income Groups

The scale of "attitudes among low-income groups" included two items:

Var059: The poor do not appreciate the help they receive.

Var062: Poor people expect society to help them.

TABLE VI  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
MORALS OF LOW-INCOME GROUPS

	Var048	Var051	Var052	Var053	Total
Var047	.36	.30	.40	.41	.38
Var048		.29	.28	.42	.54
Var051			.41	.44	.45
Var052				.52	.36
Var053					.52

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table VII shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

TABLE VII  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
ATTITUDES AMONG LOW-INCOME  
GROUPS

	Var062	Total
Var059	.50	.39
Var062		.86

Scale of Society's Attitudes Toward  
Low-Income Groups

A scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups" included the following:

Var032: It was not a matter of timing that caused the two boys in this situation to fail; they just did not try hard enough to succeed.

Var045: Poor people do not progress in their occupation because of barriers in our society.

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table VIII shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

TABLE VIII  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
SOCIETY'S ATTITUDES TOWARD  
LOW-INCOME GROUPS

	Var045	Total
Var032	.31	.51
Var045		.79

### Scale of Apathy Among Low-Income Groups

A scale of "apathy among low-income groups" was formed from the following items:

Var033: The success of one boy was due to his determination rather than when he was born.

Var039. If the two boys had been willing to work and to stay in school they would have been successful too.

Var040: This man did not look around enough for jobs, if he really wanted a job he could have found one.

Var062: Poor people expect society to help them.

Total: Sum of the above variables.

Table IX shows Pearson's correlation for each individual item with each of the other items and with the summed total for the scale.

### Examination of the Hypotheses

The analysis of variance test was utilized to determine if there was a significant difference between the dependent variable--low-income stereotypes and six selected independent variables: (1) age of the respondent, (2) respondent's contact with low-income persons, (3) education of the respondent, (4) sex of the respondent, (5) respondent's degree of religious orientation, and (6) respondent's socioeconomic status. The following discussion will examine the relationship between low-income stereotypes and each of these independent variables.

TABLE IX  
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS  
AND THE TOTAL IN THE SCALE OF  
APATHY AMONG LOW-INCOME  
GROUPS

	Var039	Var040	Var062	Total
Var033	.40	.41	.18*	.33
Var039		.34	.35	.47
Var040			.14*	.19*
Var062				.32

\*The correlation of Var033 with Var062 was accepted below .20 because both variables correlated with the total at an acceptable level. Var040 was accepted below .20 correlation because it was such an important component in this scale.

Age of the Respondent as an  
Independent Variable

Table X shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist scale and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the respondent's age. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) the values of low-income groups, (c) the morals of low-income groups, and (d) attitudes among low-income groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for the above four scales because the data did not present sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the age groups. This finding may be compared to a study on some of the variables influencing

TABLE X  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING  
TO AGE\*

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Adjective Checklist					
Between Groups	714.55	5	142.91	1.53	
Within Groups	16705.23	180	92.80		n.s.
Total	17419.78	185			
Laziness					
Between Groups	3419.54	5	683.90	4.53	
Within Groups	27149.08	180	150.82		0.0009
Total	30568.62	185			
Values					
Between Groups	666.51	5	133.30	1.18	
Within Groups	20266.95	180	112.59		n.s.
Total	20933.46	185			
Morals					
Between Groups	253.92	5	50.78	0.30	
Within Groups	30150.36	180	167.50		n.s.
Total	30404.28	185			
Low-Income Attitudes					
Between Groups	131.72	5	26.34	1.46	
Within Groups	3242.90	180	18.01		n.s.
Total	3374.62	185			
Society's Attitudes					
Between Groups	557.81	5	111.56	6.70	
Within Groups	2994.92	180	16.63		0.0001
Total	3552.73	185			
Apathy					
Between Groups	1358.86	5	271.77	6.26	
Within Groups	7803.89	180	43.35		0.0001
Total	9162.75	185			

\* N in this table and the following tables will vary because some respondents failed to answer certain items.

stereotypes in interpersonal perception by Sheikh and Miller. They found that increasing age did not affect stereotypes in interpersonal perception.<sup>3</sup> The acceptance of this hypothesis for these four scales may also be related to a generalization made by Tajfel about stereotypes--". . . these characteristics tend to remain fairly stable within a population and for fairly long periods of time."<sup>4</sup>

However, there was a significant difference at the  $\alpha=.05$  or below for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups (b) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (c) apathy among low-income groups. The null hypothesis was rejected for the above three scales. The data presented sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the age groups for these scales.

Table XI shows that an F score of 4.53 for the scale of "laziness among low-income groups." This indicated that the difference between the age groups was significant at the 0.0009 level. The mean scores decreased as the age increased which reflected that the older adults had a more negative stereotype of laziness among low-income groups.

Table XII shows an F score of 6.70 for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups," which indi-

---

<sup>3</sup>Anees A. Sheikh and Patrick A. Miller, "Investigation of Some Variables Influencing Stereotype in Interpersonal Perception," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 78 (1971), pp. 213-216.

<sup>4</sup>Tajfel, p. 5.



TABLE XI  
 F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN  
 MEAN SCALE SCORES FOR LAZINESS  
 ACCORDING TO AGE (N = 185)

Age Groups	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
18-25	95	46.85		
26-30	21	40.14		
31-40	28	37.28		
41-50	29	38.13	4.53	0.0009
51-60	10	39.60		
61-70	2	34.50		
71 or over	0	--		

TABLE XII  
 F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN  
 MEAN SCALE SCORES FOR SOCIETY'S  
 ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO  
 AGE (N = 185)

Age Groups	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
18-25	95	13.33		
26-30	21	10.23		
31-40	28	9.17		
41-50	29	10.51	6.70	0.0001
51-60	10	10.70		
61-70	2	8.00		
71 or over	0	--		

cated that the difference between the age groups was significant at the 0.001 level. Young adults, ages 18 to 25, received a higher mean score for this scale than did the other age groups. This indicated that young adults had a more positive attitude toward low-income groups. The finding for this scale also revealed that as age increased a more negative stereotype appeared.

Table XIII indicates an F score of 6.26 for the scale of "apathy among low-income groups," which revealed a significant difference between the age groups at the 0.0001 level. The young adults, ages 18-25, received the highest mean score, while the oldest group of adults ages 61-70, received the lowest mean score. This showed that the stereotype of apathy among low-income groups was more negative among older adults than it was among the young adults in the sample.

The findings from the scales on "laziness and apathy among low-income groups" and for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups" all indicated that as age increased the stereotype became more negative.

#### Respondent's Contact with Low-Income Persons as an Independent Variable

There were four factors which were considered when investigating if the respondent's contact with low-income persons influenced the respondent's stereotype of low-income groups. These four factors were: (1) whether or not the respondent had contact with low-income persons, (2) the type of contact the respondent had with low-income persons,

TABLE XIII  
 F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
 SCALE SCORES FOR APATHY ACCORDING  
 TO AGE (N = 185)

Age Groups	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
18-25	95	20.91		
26-30	21	16.38		
31-40	28	14.71		
41-50	29	15.44	6.26	0.0001
51-60	10	18.80		
61-70	2	14.00		
71 or over	0	--		

(3) the quality of the respondent's contact with low-income persons, and (4) whether or not the respondent had attended school with low-income persons. Each of these four factors are discussed in this section.

Table XIV shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to whether or not the respondent had contact with low-income persons. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the adjective checklist nor for any of the low-income situations. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. The data did not present evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who had contacts with low-income persons and those who had not had contacts with low-income persons. The acceptance of this null hypothesis can be compared to the findings of a study done by Sykes. He found that contact in itself did not prevent prejudice.<sup>5</sup> Saenger and Flowerman suggested that contact was a major weapon in the reduction of stereotypes which were unrealistic, but that contact had to be accompanied by education aiming at tolerance for cultural differences.<sup>6</sup> This explanation could suggest why there was no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the respondents who had

---

<sup>5</sup>A. J. M. Sykes, "A Study in Changing the Attitudes and Stereotypes of Industrial Workers," Human Relations, Vol. 17 (1964), pp. 143-154.

<sup>6</sup>Flowerman and Saenger, p. 237.

TABLE XIV  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
 ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
 STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING  
 TO RESPONDENT'S CONTACT  
 WITH LOW-INCOME PERSONS

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	19.15	1	19.15	0.20	
Within Groups	17400.63	184	94.56		n.s.
Total	17419.78	185			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	16.52	1	16.52	0.09	
Within Groups	30552.10	184	166.04		n.s.
Total	30568.62	185			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	120.16	1	120.16	1.06	
Within Groups	20813.30	184	113.11		n.s.
Total	20933.46	185			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	0.01	1	0.01	0.00007	
Within Groups	30404.27	184	165.24		n.s.
Total	30404.28	185			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	9.84	1	9.84	0.53	
Within Groups	3364.78	184	18.28		n.s.
Total	3374.62	185			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	4.67	1	4.67	0.24	
Within Groups	3548.06	184	19.28		n.s.
Total	3552.73	185			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	20.64	1	20.64	0.41	
Within Groups	9142.11	184	49.68		n.s.
Total	9162.75	185			

contacts with low-income persons and those who had not had contacts with low-income persons for this particular study.

Table XV shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and for the six low-income stereotype scales according to the type of contact the respondent had with low-income persons (i.e. whether the respondent stated the contact was voluntary, involuntary, both, or none). The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, (e) attitudes among low-income groups, and (f) apathy among low-income groups. Therefore, the type of contact did not influence the stereotypes of low-income groups for the above scales.

However, as Table XVI shows an F score of 2.38 was obtained for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups." This indicated a significant difference at the 0.05 level for society's attitudes toward low-income groups according to the type of contact the respondent had with low-income persons. The mean scores were the same for respondents who had come in contact with low-income persons voluntarily as they were for those who had no contact with low-income persons. The mean scores for these two groups showed that they had a more positive stereotype for this scale than did those respondents who had involuntary contact with low-income persons.

TABLE XV  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING TO  
TYPE OF CONTACT WITH LOW-  
INCOME PERSONS

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	135.89	4	33.97	0.35	
Within Groups	17283.89	181	95.49		n. s.
Total	17419.78	185			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	280.97	4	70.24	0.41	
Within Groups	30287.65	181	167.35		n. s.
Total	30568.62	185			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	299.70	4	74.92	0.65	
Within Groups	20633.76	181	113.99		n. s.
Total	20933.46	185			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	342.43	4	85.60	0.51	
Within Groups	30061.85	181	166.08		n. s.
Total	30404.28	185			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	40.24	4	10.05	0.54	
Within Groups	3334.38	181	18.42		n. s.
Total	3374.62	185			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	177.90	4	44.47	2.38	
Within Groups	3374.83	181	18.64		0.05
Total	3552.73	185			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	63.67	4	15.91	0.31	
Within Groups	9099.08	181	50.27		n. s.
Total	9162.75	185			

TABLE XVI

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN  
MEAN SCALE SCORES FOR SOCIETY'S  
ATTITUDES ACCORDING TO TYPE OF  
CONTACT WITH LOW-INCOME  
PERSONS (N = 183)

Type of Contact	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Voluntary	103	12.11		
Involuntary	31	10.58		
Both	14	10.57	2.38	0.05
None	35	12.08		

Table XVII shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the quality of the respondent's contact with low-income persons (i.e. whether the respondent evaluated the contact as good, bad, both, or indifferent). The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following low-income situations scales: (a) attitudes among low-income groups, (b) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (c) apathy among low-income groups. Therefore, the quality of the respondent's contact with low-income persons did not influence the stereotypes of low-income groups for these scales.

However, there was a significant difference at  $\alpha=.05$  or below for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) values of low-



TABLE XVII  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
 ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
 STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING TO  
 QUALITY OF CONTACT WITH LOW-  
 INCOME PERSONS

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	2339.88	5	467.97	5.55	
Within Groups	15000.98	178	84.27		0.0002
Total	17340.86	183			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	2025.30	5	405.06	2.53	
Within Groups	28430.00	178	159.71		0.02
Total	30455.30	183			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	2021.95	5	404.38	3.85	
Within Groups	18661.50	178	104.83		0.002
Total	20683.45	183			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	1600.77	5	320.15	3.85	
Within Groups	14800.68	178	83.14		0.002
Total	16401.45	183			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	163.02	5	32.60	1.81	
Within Groups	3191.84	178	17.93		n.s.
Total	3354.86	183			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	166.99	5	166.98	1.77	
Within Groups	3343.09	178	3343.09		n.s.
Total	3510.08	183			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	517.05	5	103.41	2.14	
Within Groups	8588.16	178	48.24		n.s.
Total	9105.21	183			

income groups, and (d) morals of low-income groups. This indicated that the respondent's quality of contact with low-income persons was an important factor in determining stereotypes of low-income groups for these scales.

Table XVIII indicates an F score of 5.55 for the "adjective checklist scale" according to the quality of the respondent's contact with low-income persons. The higher the score on the adjective checklist the more negative was the stereotype. The mean scores showed that those respondents who had good contact with low-income persons had a more positive stereotype; whereas, those who had bad contacts had a more negative stereotype.

Table XIX shows an F score of 2.53 for the scale of "laziness among low-income groups." This indicated that the quality of the respondents contact was significant at the 0.02 level. The respondents mean scores signified that those who had good contacts had a more positive stereotype of laziness among low-income groups, while those who had bad contacts had a more negative stereotype for this scale.

An F score of 3.85 was obtained for "values of low-income groups," which indicated the respondent's quality of contact was significant at the 0.002 level. The mean scores in Table XX showed that those respondents who had bad contacts with low-income persons had a more negative stereotype of the values of low-income groups. However, those respondents who had good contacts with low-income persons had a more positive stereotype for this scale.

TABLE XVIII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE  
CHECKLIST ACCORDING TO QUALITY  
OF CONTACT WITH LOW-INCOME  
PERSONS (N = 182)

Quality of Contact	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Good	125	36.72		
Bad	6	53.50		
Both	13	39.46	5.55	0.0002
Indifferent	3	46.33		
None	35	40.05		

TABLE XIX

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR LAZINESS ACCORDING TO  
QUALITY OF CONTACT WITH LOW-INCOME  
PERSONS (N = 182)

Quality of Contact	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Good	125	43.87		
Bad	6	30.33		
Both	13	39.38	2.53	0.02
Indifferent	3	33.66		
None	35	43.97		

TABLE XX

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR VALUES ACCORDING TO  
QUALITY OF CONTACT WITH LOW-INCOME  
PERSONS (N = 182)

Quality of Contact	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Good	125	36.76		
Bad	6	25.16		
Both	13	27.23	3.85	0.002
Indifferent	3	28.66		
None	35	34.60		

Table XXI indicates an F score of 3.85 for the scale of "morals of low-income groups." This revealed that the quality of the respondent's contact was significant at the 0.002 for this scale. The respondents who had good contacts with low-income persons had more positive stereotypes of the morals of low-income groups. Those respondents who signified they had bad contacts had more negative stereotypes for this scale.

The quality of the respondent's contact with low-income persons was significant for four scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) values of low-income groups, and (d) morals of low-income groups. In all of these four scales the stereotype was more positive for those respondents who indicated they had good contacts with low-income persons; whereas, those respondents who

TABLE XXI

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR MORALS ACCORDING TO  
QUALITY OF CONTACT WITH LOW-INCOME  
PERSONS (N = 182)

Quality of Contact	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Good	125	33.03		
Bad	6	24.00		
Both	13	24.07	3.85	0.002
Indifferent	3	23.00		
None	35	30.65		

indicated they had bad contacts with low-income persons had more negative stereotypes for these scales. However, in each of these scales there was a slight difference between the respondents who had good contacts and those who had no contact at all. In two scales, "morals of low-income groups" and "values of low-income groups," the stereotype improved slightly when the respondents had good contacts rather than no contact at all. In the "adjective checklist scale" the stereotype became more negative when good contacts occurred rather than no contact. There was no change in mean scores for the "scale of laziness" according to good contact or no contact. These findings indicated that the difference between good contact and no contact with low-income persons was not consistent and it did not play an important role in alleviating the stereotypes of low-income groups.

Table XXII shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to whether or not the respondent had attended school with low-income persons. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the adjective checklist nor for any of the low-income stereotype scales. Therefore, low-income stereotypes were not influenced according to whether or not the respondents had attended school with low-income persons for any of the scales. This could be due to the fact that the majority of persons stay within their own social groups and have only superficial contacts with groups different from their own.

Education of the Respondent as an  
Independent Variable

Table XXIII shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the education of the respondent. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, and (e) attitudes among low-income groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for the above five scales. The data did not present sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who had little education and those who had a

TABLE XXII  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
 ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
 STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING TO  
 ATTENDING SCHOOL WITH LOW-  
 INCOME PERSONS

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	6.77	1	6.77	0.07	
Within Groups	17334.09	182	95.24		n.s.
Total	17340.86	183			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	167.72	1	167.72	1.00	
Within Groups	30287.58	182	166.41		n.s.
Total	30455.30	183			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	65.87	1	65.87	0.58	
Within Groups	20617.58	182	113.02		n.s.
Total	20683.45	183			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	21.55	1	21.55	0.23	
Within Groups	16379.90	182	89.99		n.s.
Total	16401.45	183			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	27.74	1	27.74	1.51	
Within Groups	3327.12	182	18.28		n.s.
Total	3354.86	183			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	6.02	1	6.02	0.31	
Within Groups	3504.06	182	19.25		n.s.
Total	3510.08	183			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	105.87	1	105.87	2.14	
Within Groups	8999.34	182	49.44		n.s.
Total	9105.21	183			

TABLE XXIII  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING  
TO EDUCATION

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	401.45	6	66.90	0.70	
Within Groups	17018.33	179	95.07		n.s.
Total	17419.78	185			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	1094.57	6	182.42	1.10	
Within Groups	29474.05	179	164.65		n.s.
Total	30568.62	185			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	935.51	6	155.91	1.39	
Within Groups	19997.95	179	111.72		n.s.
Total	20933.46	185			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	1141.60	6	190.26	1.16	
Within Groups	29262.68	179	163.47		n.s.
Total	30404.28	185			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	114.54	6	19.08	1.04	
Within Groups	3260.08	179	18.21		n.s.
Total	3374.62	185			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	298.70	6	49.78	2.73	
Within Groups	3254.03	179	18.17		0.01
Total	3552.73	185			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	595.56	6	99.26	2.07	
Within Groups	8567.19	179	47.86		0.05
Total	9162.75	185			



college education. This finding is comparable to a study done by Sheikh and Miller. In their study on stereotype in interpersonal perception they found that increasing education did not appear to affect the respondent's stereotypes.<sup>7</sup>

However, there was a significant difference at the  $\alpha=.05$  or below for the following scales: (a) society's attitudes toward low-income groups and (b) apathy among low-income groups. The null hypothesis was rejected for the above two scales. The data presented sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the different educational levels for these two scales.

Table XXIV illustrates an F score of 2.73 for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups," which indicated the difference between the educational levels was significant at the 0.01 level. The mean scores for this scale indicated that the higher the educational level, the more positive were the respondents attitudes for this scale.

Table XXV indicates an F score of 2.07 for the scale of "apathy among low-income groups." This revealed a significant difference between the educational levels at the 0.05 level. The mean scores for this scale also indicated that the higher the educational level, the more positive was the respondent's stereotype of apathy among low-income groups.

The findings from the adjective checklist and the six

---

<sup>7</sup>Sheikh and Miller, p. 215.

TABLE XXIV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR SOCIETY'S ATTITUDES  
ACCORDING TO EDUCATION (N = 184)

Educational Level	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Less than 8th grade	1	10.00		
Attended high school, but did not graduate	3	7.33		
Graduated from high school	25	9.08		
Attended college	122	12.42	2.73	0.01
Graduated from 4-yr. college	17	11.29		
Attended graduate school	7	11.28		
Completed graduate work for profession	9	11.44		

TABLE XXV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR APATHY ACCORDING TO  
EDUCATION (N = 184)

Educational Level	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Less than 8th grade	1	19.00		
Attended high school, but did not graduate	3	11.33		
Graduated from high school	25	15.28		
Attended college	122	19.56	2.07	0.05
Graduated from 4-yr. college	17	16.64		
Attended graduate school	7	18.14		
Completed graduate work for profession	9	17.77		

low-income stereotype scales suggest that general education in and of itself probably does not greatly influence the degree of low-income stereotypes.

Sex of the Respondent as an  
Independent Variable

Table XXVI shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the sex of the respondent. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, (e) attitudes among low-income groups, and (f) apathy among low-income groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for the above six scales. The data did not present sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between males and females.

However, there was a significant difference at the  $\alpha=0.003$  for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups." The null hypothesis was rejected for this scale because the data presented sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between males and females for this scale. Table XXVII indicates an F score of 9.03, signifying a significant difference between males and females at the  $\alpha=0.003$  for this scale. The mean scores showed that the

TABLE XXVI  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING  
TO SEX

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Adjective Checklist					
Between Groups	35.21	1	35.21	0.37	
Within Groups	17305.65	182	95.08		n.s.
Total	17340.86	183			
Laziness					
Between Groups	355.42	1	355.42	2.14	
Within Groups	30099.88	182	165.38		n.s.
Total	30455.30	183			
Values					
Between Groups	83.40	1	83.40	0.73	
Within Groups	20600.05	182	113.18		n.s.
Total	20683.45	183			
Morals					
Between Groups	153.43	1	153.43	1.71	
Within Groups	16248.02	182	89.27		n.s.
Total	16401.45	183			
Low-Income Attitudes					
Between Groups	37.25	1	37.25	2.04	
Within Groups	3317.61	182	18.22		n.s.
Total	3354.86	183			
Society's Attitudes					
Between Groups	166.06	1	166.06	9.03	
Within Groups	3344.02	182	18.37		0.003
Total	3510.08	183			
Apathy					
Between Groups	73.29	1	73.29	1.47	
Within Groups	9031.92	182	49.62		n.s.
Total	9105.21	183			

TABLE XXVII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR SOCIETY'S ATTITUDES  
ACCORDING TO SEX (N = 184)

Sex	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Female	118	12.38	9.03	0.003
Male	66	10.40		

females had more positive attitudes in relation to how society views low-income groups than did the males.

Respondent's Degree of Religious  
Orientation as an Independent  
Variable

The level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the respondent's degree of religious orientation is shown in Table XXVIII. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups, (b) the values of low-income groups, (c) the morals of low-income groups, (d) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (e) apathy among low-income groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for the above five scales. The data did not present sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the respondents who were

TABLE XXVIII  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING TO  
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	1010.24	3	336.74	3.73	0.01
Within Groups	16409.54	182	90.16		
Total	17419.78	185			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	337.56	3	112.52	0.67	n.s.
Within Groups	30231.06	182	166.10		
Total	30568.62	185			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	206.76	3	68.92	0.60	n.s.
Within Groups	20726.70	182	113.88		
Total	20933.46	185			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	292.70	3	97.56	0.58	n.s.
Within Groups	30111.58	182	165.44		
Total	30404.28	185			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	162.45	3	54.14	3.06	0.02
Within Groups	3212.17	182	17.64		
Total	3374.62	185			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	13.54	3	4.51	0.23	n.s.
Within Groups	3539.19	182	19.44		
Total	3552.73	185			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	131.63	3	43.87	0.88	n.s.
Within Groups	9031.12	182	49.62		
Total	9162.75	185			

very religious and those who were anti-religious.

However, there was a significant difference at the  $\alpha=.05$  or below for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist scale and (b) attitudes among low-income groups. The null hypothesis was rejected for the above two scales. The data presented sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the degrees of religious orientation for these scales.

An F score of 3.73 was obtained for the "adjective checklist scale." indicating that the difference between the degrees of religious orientation was significant at the 0.01 level. Table XXIX shows that the anti-religious group scored a lower mean score, which indicated more positive stereotypes for the adjective checklist; whereas, the other three groups had more negative stereotypes for this scale. However, it should be noted there were only two respondents in the anti-religious group suggesting that this group may not have been adequately represented.

Table XXX shows an F score of 3.06 for the scale of "low-income attitudes." This indicated a significant difference at the 0.02 level between the anti-religious group and the other three groups. The mean score showed that the anti-religious group had a more positive stereotype of low-income attitudes than did the other three groups. However, again it should be noted there were only two respondents in the anti-religious group suggesting that this group may not have

TABLE XXIX

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE  
CHECKLIST ACCORDING TO  
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION  
(N = 184)

Religious Orientation	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Very religious	27	36.33		
Religious	139	38.36	3.73	0.01
Non-religious	16	41.50		
Anti-religious	2	19.00		

TABLE XXX

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR LOW-INCOME ATTITUDES  
ACCORDING TO RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION  
(N = 184)

Religious Orientation	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Very religious	27	9.29		
Religious	139	9.09	3.06	0.02
Non-religious	16	9.75		
Anti-religious	2	18.00		



been adequately represented. Thus it can be concluded that religion had very little effect on low-income stereotypes.

Respondent's Socioeconomic Status  
as an Independent Variable

Table XXXI shows the level of significance for the adjective checklist and the six low-income stereotype scales according to the socioeconomic status of the respondent. The calculated F did not exceed the tabled value at the  $\alpha=.05$  for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups, (b) the values of low-income group, (c) the morals of low-income groups, (d) attitudes among low-income groups, (e) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (f) apathy among low-income groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for the above six scales. The data did not present sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the different socioeconomic classes.

However, there was a significant difference for the "adjective checklist scale" according to socioeconomic status. Table XXXII shows an F score of 2.71, which indicated socioeconomic status was significant at the 0.03 level for this scale. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for the adjective checklist scale. The data presented sufficient evidence to indicate that there was a significant difference in low-income stereotypes between the different socioeconomic classes. The mean scores

TABLE XXXI  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR THE  
 ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
 STEREOTYPE SCALES ACCORDING TO  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Description	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Level of Significance
<b>Adjective Checklist</b>					
Between Groups	990.91	4	247.72	2.71	0.03
Within Groups	16349.95	179	91.34		
Total	17340.86	183			
<b>Laziness</b>					
Between Groups	601.64	4	150.41	0.90	n.s.
Within Groups	29853.66	179	166.78		
Total	30455.30	183			
<b>Values</b>					
Between Groups	341.67	4	85.41	0.75	n.s.
Within Groups	20341.78	179	113.64		
Total	20683.45	183			
<b>Morals</b>					
Between Groups	573.75	4	143.43	1.62	n.s.
Within Groups	15827.70	179	88.42		
Total	16401.45	183			
<b>Low-Income Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	67.53	4	16.88	0.91	n.s.
Within Groups	3287.33	179	18.36		
Total	3354.86	183			
<b>Society's Attitudes</b>					
Between Groups	31.62	4	7.90	0.40	n.s.
Within Groups	3478.46	179	19.43		
Total	3510.08	183			
<b>Apathy</b>					
Between Groups	102.05	4	25.51	0.50	n.s.
Within Groups	9003.16	179	50.29		
Total	9105.21	183			

TABLE XXXII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN MEAN  
SCALE SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE  
CHECKLIST ACCORDING TO SOCIO-  
ECONOMIC STATUS (N = 184)

Socio-economic Status	No.	$\bar{X}$	F Score	Level of Significance
Upper Class	14	41.64		
Upper Middle Class	78	39.80		
Lower Middle Class	58	37.24	2.71	0.03
Upper Lower Class	32	34.00		
Lower Middle Class	2	40.00		

indicated that the upper class and the upper middle class had more negative stereotypes for the adjective checklist than did the lower middle class and the upper lower class. The lower lower class had only two respondents, therefore it was not adequately represented.

#### Summary

Before investigating the relationship between low-income stereotypes, the dependent variable, and the six selected independent variables employed in this study, scales were constructed using Pearson's coefficient of correlation. Seven scales were developed as measures of the following: (1) stereotypes indicated by an adjective checklist, (2) laziness among low-income groups, (3) values of low-income groups, (4) morals of low-income groups, (5)

attitudes among low-income groups, (6) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (7) apathy among low-income groups.

After the scales were developed analysis of variance was utilized to test the null hypotheses. An F score was obtained for each of the seven scales to show the level of significance between each scale and the six independent variables. When a significant relationship was found between a scale and an independent variable the mean scores were examined in order to determine the direction of the relationship. The null hypotheses were rejected for some of the scales as they related to the independent variables. The independent variable, age, was found to be significantly related to the scales of laziness, society's attitudes, and apathy among low-income groups. The type of contact with low-income persons as an independent variable was significantly related to the scale of society's attitudes toward low-income groups. The quality of contact with low-income persons was significantly related to the adjective checklist scale and to the scales of laziness, values, and morals of low-income groups. Education was related to the scales of society's attitudes and apathy among low-income groups. Sex was related to the scale of society's attitudes toward low-income groups. The degree of religious orientation was found to be significantly associated with the adjective checklist scale and the scale of attitudes among low-income groups. Socioeconomic status significantly influenced only

the adjective checklist scale.

Chapter V contains the implications of this study.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

Stereotypes have been a basic part of literature since Lippmann coined the term in 1922. Today the term stereotype has come to mean the process of singling out an individual as sharing assumed characteristics on the basis of his group membership. Stereotypes are learned through interaction with others, and they can be accepted as an inevitable consequence of social learning. Taking this learning process into consideration, it would therefore appear there is nothing inherently "bad" in stereotyping because it helps to simplify our complex world. However, when an individual relies on negative stereotypes for groups of people to the point that he refuses to accept factual information disputing those stereotypes, then the process of stereotyping becomes detrimental. Walter Lippman gave a bit of wise advice about handling stereotypes. He stated:

What matters is the character of the stereotypes and the gullibility with which we employ them. And these in the end depend upon those inclusive patterns which constitute our philosophy of life. If . . . we assume that the world is codified according to a code which we possess, we are likely to make our reports of what is going on describe a world run by our code. But if our philosophy tells us that each man is only a small part

of the world, that his intelligence catches at best only phases and aspects in a course net of ideas, then, when we use our stereotypes, we tend to know that they are only stereotypes, to hold them lightly, to modify them gladly.<sup>1</sup>

These guidelines can protect us against our own mental shorthand--our stereotypes.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the degree of stereotypes middle class persons have of low-income groups. This purpose was carried out through a questionnaire using an adjective checklist and a low-income situation inventory.

A questionnaire was developed by the author to examine the degree of stereotypes middle-class persons have of low-income groups. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: (1) general information, (2) an adjective checklist, and (3) a low-income situation inventory. The first portion of the questionnaire obtained background information about the respondent. The second portion, an adjective checklist, consisted of polar adjectives placed on a continuum with numbers ranging from 1 to 10. Number 1 represented a positive stereotype, while number 10 represented a negative stereotype about low-income groups. The purpose of this adjective checklist was to obtain a description of low-income groups from the viewpoint of the middle-class respondents. The third portion of the questionnaire, a low-income situation inventory, was developed from cases presented in

---

<sup>1</sup>Lippmann, p. 45.

literature. Four low-income situations were presented. Each low-income situation was followed by a series of statements to which the participant responded on a continuum of 1 to 10. Number 1 represented a negative stereotype, while number 10 represented a positive stereotype about low-income groups. The statements were considered to be indicative of low-income stereotypes.

Questionnaires were administered to groups of people in Tarrant and Wise Counties in the state of Texas. The sample consisted of two groups--young adults and older adults. The young adult group, ages 18 to 25, was composed of students attending Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Texas, during the summer semester, 1974. The older adult group, ages 26 to 71 or over, consisted of a civic group and employees of a telephone company and a gasoline refinery in Bridgeport, Texas; it also consisted of students in basic adult education courses and teachers in Fort Worth, Texas. A total of 200 questionnaires were obtained--100 from each group.

Seven scales measuring stereotypes of low-income groups were developed using Pearson's coefficient of correlation. Then, Fisher's analysis of variance was utilized to test the null hypotheses. When a significance level of  $\alpha=.05$  or below was found between an independent variable and a scale the mean scores were examined for the groups comprising that particular variable. This examination revealed the direction of the relationship.



## Conclusions

Six null hypotheses were tested to examine the content and the degree of low-income stereotypes.

Hypothesis 1 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between young adults, 18 to 25, and older adults, 26 and over. This hypothesis was accepted for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) the values of low-income groups, (c) the morals of low-income groups, and (d) attitudes among low-income groups. However, this hypothesis was rejected at the significance level of  $\alpha = .05$  or below for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups, (b) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (c) apathy among low-income groups. These three scales indicated that the young adults had more positive stereotypes than did the older adults; therefore, as age increased the stereotype became more negative.

Hypothesis 2 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had contacts with low-income persons and those who have not had contacts with low-income persons. Four factors were considered when investigating this hypothesis--whether or not the respondent had contact with low-income persons, the type of contact the respondent had with low-income persons (i.e. whether the respondent stated the contact was voluntary, involuntary, both, or none), the quality of the respondent's contact (i.e. whether the respondent evaluated the contact

as good, bad, both, or indifferent), and whether or not the respondent had attended school with low-income persons. This null hypothesis was accepted for two of these factors--whether or not the respondent had contact with low-income persons and whether or not the respondent had attended school with low-income persons. However, this hypothesis was rejected for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups" according to the type of contact. In this scale those respondents who had voluntary contacts with low-income persons had more positive stereotypes than did those who had involuntary contacts at the  $\alpha=.05$ . This hypothesis was also rejected for the following scales according to the quality of the respondent's contact: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, and (d) the morals of low-income groups. For these scales, a more positive stereotype was revealed when the respondent had good contact with low-income persons, whereas, those who had bad contact with low-income persons had more negative stereotypes.

Hypothesis 3 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who have had little education and those who have had a college education. This hypothesis was accepted for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, and (e) attitudes among

low-income groups. However, this hypothesis was rejected for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups" and for the scale of "apathy among low-income groups" at the  $\alpha=.05$  or below. These two scales indicated that as education increased the stereotypes became more positive.

Hypothesis 4 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between males and females. This hypothesis was accepted for the following scales: (a) the adjective checklist, (b) laziness among low-income groups, (c) the values of low-income groups, (d) the morals of low-income groups, (e) attitudes among low-income groups, and (f) apathy among low-income groups. However, there was a significant difference at the 0.003 level for the scale of "society's attitudes toward low-income groups" between the males and the females; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for this scale. The females had more positive stereotypes about society's attitudes toward low-income groups than did the males.

Hypothesis 5 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes between those who are very religious and those who are anti-religious (i.e. whether the respondent evaluated his degree of religious orientation as very religious or anti-religious). This hypothesis was accepted for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups, (b) the values of low-income groups, (c) the morals of low-income groups, (d) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (e) apathy among low-income groups.

However, there was a significant difference for the "adjective checklist scale" and for the scale of "attitudes among low-income groups" at the  $\alpha=.05$  or below; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for these scales. The anti-religious group had more positive stereotypes for these two scales than did the very religious group. However, it should be noted there were only two respondents in the anti-religious group, suggesting that this group may not have been adequately represented.

Hypothesis 6 was that there will be no significant difference in low-income stereotypes among respondents from different socioeconomic backgrounds. This hypothesis was accepted for the following scales: (a) laziness among low-income groups, (b) the values of low-income groups, (c) the morals of low-income groups, (d) attitudes among low-income groups, (e) society's attitudes toward low-income groups, and (f) apathy among low-income groups. However, the null hypothesis was rejected for the "adjective checklist scale" at the 0.03 significance level. The upper class and the upper middle class had more negative stereotypes than did the lower middle class and the upper lower class for this particular scale.

Table XXXIII summarizes the level of significance between each independent variable and the adjective checklist scale and the six stereotype scales. The null hypotheses were rejected for these scales in the following independent variables: (1) age--the scales of laziness, society's

TABLE XXXIII

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN INDEPENDENT  
VARIABLES AND ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST AND  
STEREOTYPE SCALES

Independent Variable	Adjective Checklist	Laziness Among Low-Income Groups	Values of Low-Income Groups	Morals of Low-Income Groups	Attitudes Among Low-Income Groups	Society's Attitudes Toward Low-Income Groups	Apathy Among Low-Income Groups
Age of the Respondent	n.s.	0.0009	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.0001	0.0001
Contact with Low-Income Persons	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Type of Contact with Low-Income Persons	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.05	n.s.
Quality of Contact with Low-Income Persons	0.0002	0.02	0.002	0.002	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Attend School with Low-Income Persons	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Education of the Respondent	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.01	0.05
Sex of the Respondent	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.003	n.s.
Respondent's Degree of Religious Orientation	0.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.02	n.s.	n.s.
Respondent's Socio-economic Status	0.03	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

attitudes, and apathy among low-income groups; (2) contact with low-income persons--the scale of society's attitudes toward low-income groups for the type of contact with low-income persons and for the quality of contact the adjective checklist scale and the scales of laziness, values, and morals of low-income groups; (3) education--the scales of society's attitudes and apathy among low-income groups; (4) sex--the scale of society's attitudes toward low-income groups; (5) degree of religious orientation--the adjective checklist and the scale of attitudes among low-income groups; and (6) socioeconomic status--the adjective checklist scale.

#### Recommendations

A study, similar to this one, might be conducted in other regions of the United States to determine the content and the degree of low-income stereotypes in those regions. Then it would be possible to compare low-income stereotypes among the various regions to determine if geographical differences were important in determining low-income stereotypes.

Measuring and scaling attitudes and feelings in relation to low-income stereotypes is difficult to do without being biased. It is therefore recommended that the instrument used in this study be refined so that low-income stereotypes could be measured more precisely.

It was shown in this study that increased education

was a significant variable in improving the respondent's stereotypes of low-income groups. Therefore, the author suggests that educational programs be carefully constructed to counteract specific aspects of bias which are particularly widespread or particularly intense. It would not be possible to completely alleviate stereotyping because of our complex world; but programs should help to create neutral categories, within which each human being is evaluated in terms of specific information about oneself, and not in terms of what a stereotype says he should be because he is a member of a specific group. Steinberg made a comment on the school's responsibility in combatting prejudicial stereotypes which is particularly relevant to the above recommendation. He stated:

. . . it is not the fault of the schools that students mirror the prejudices found elsewhere in society. But it is the schools' responsibility to alter that situation by seeing that their graduates have the intellectual and moral sophistication to reject vulgar prejudices and other such retrograde belief systems. The nation's legal and political institutions can do a great deal to combat discrimination and remedy some of the tragic social conditions that result. But the schools are practically the only institutions in our society equipped to counteract prejudices in our culture.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Steinberg, p. 17.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayton, J. A. "The Racial Stereotype of Negro College Students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 36 (1941), pp. 97-102.
- Bjerstedt, A. "Ego-involved World Mindedness, Nationality Images, and Methods of Research: A Methodological Note." Journal of Conflict Resolut., Vol. 4 (1960), pp. 185-192.
- Blake, Robert and Wayne Dennis. "The Development of Stereotypes Concerning the Negro." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 38 (October, 1943), pp. 525-531.
- Braun, J. R. "Stereotypes of the Scientist as seen with Gordon Personal Profile and Gordon Personal Inventory." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 53 (1962), pp. 453-455.
- "Breaking the American Stereotypes." Time, Vol. 99 (February 14, 1972), pp. 36-42.
- Chaplin, C. "Social Class Stereotyping in the Strong Vocational Inventory." American Psychology, Vol. 4 (1949), p. 373.
- "Characteristics of the Low-Income Population: 1972." Current Population Reports--Consumer Income. Series P-60, No. 88, June, 1973, p. 1-10.
- Clark, K. B. Dark Ghetto. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Cuban, L. "What's the Real Story?" Social Studies, Vol. 56, (January, 1965), pp. 21-26.
- Edwards, A. L. "Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 35 (1940), pp. 566-572.
- Edwards, A. L. "Studies of Stereotypes: I. The Directionality and Uniformity of Responses to Stereotypes." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 12 (1940), pp. 357-366.
- Edwards, Allan L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1957.



- Ehrlich, H. J. and J. W. Rinehart. "A Brief Report on the Methodology of Stereotype Research." Social Forces, Vol. 43 (1965), pp. 564-575.
- Ehrlich, H. J. "Stereotyping and Negro-Jewish Stereotypes." Social Forces, Vol. 41 (1962) pp. 171-176.
- Ferman, Louis, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber. Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Flowerman, Samuel and Gerhart Saenger. "Stereotypes and Prejudicial Attitudes." Human Relations, Vol. 7 (1954), pp. 217-238.
- Freeman, Linton C. Elementary Applied Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Gahagan, L. "Judgments of Occupation from Printed Photographs." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4 (1933), pp. 128-134.
- Gough, H. G. "The Adjective Check List as a Personality Research Instrument." Psychological Reports, Vol. 6 (1960), pp. 107-122.
- Katz, D. and K. W. Braly. "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 28 (1933), pp. 280-290.
- Lambert, W. E. and Otto Klineberg. "A Pilot Study of the Origin and Development of National Stereotypes." International Social Science Journal, Vol. 2, (1959), pp. 221-228.
- Lindzey, G. and S. Rogolsky. "Prejudice and Identification of Minority Group Membership." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 45 (1950), pp. 37-53.
- Lippman, W. Public Opinion. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1922.
- Litterer, O. F. "Stereotypes." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4 (1933), pp. 56-59.
- Martin, J. G. "Racial Ethnocentrism and Judgment of Beauty." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 63 (1964), pp. 59-63.
- Mazer, Gilbert E. "Effects of Social-Class Stereotyping on Teacher Expectation." Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 8, (October, 1971), pp. 373-378.

- McGuire, Carson and George White. "Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development Number 3 (revised). Austin, Texas, Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas; March, 1965.
- McNeil, J. D. "Changes in Ethnic Reaction Tendencies During High School." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 53 (1960), pp. 199-200.
- Miller, S. M. "The American Lower Classes: A Typological Approach." Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Worker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, pp. 9-23.
- Petroni, Frank. "'Uncle Toms': White Stereotypes in the Black Movement." Human Organization, Vol. 29, 4 (Winter, 1970), pp. 260-266.
- Razran, G. "Ethnic Dislikes and Stereotypes: A Laboratory Study." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 45 (1950), pp. 7-27.
- Richards, E. S. "Attitudes of College Students in the Southwest Toward Ethnic Groups in the United States." Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 35 (1950), pp. 22-30.
- Rinehart, James W. "The Meaning of Stereotypes." Theory into Practice, Vol. 2, 3 (June, 1963), pp. 136-143.
- Rodman, Hyman. "Middle-Class Misconceptions About Lower-Class Families." Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Worker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, pp. 59-69.
- Secord, P. F. "Stereotyping and Favorableness in the Perception of Negro Faces." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 59 (1959), pp. 309-314.
- Seeman, M. "Skin Color Values in Three All Negro School Classes." American Sociological Review, Vol. 11 (1946), pp. 315-321.
- Sheikh, Anees A. and Patrick A. Miller. "Investigation of Some Variables Influencing Stereotype in Interpersonal Perception." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 78 (1971), pp. 213-216.
- Silberman, C. E. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Stagner R. "Facist Attitudes: An Exploratory Study." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 7 (1936), pp. 309-319.

- Steinberg, Stephen. "The Language of Prejudice." Today's Education, Vol. 60 (February, 1971), pp. 14-17.
- Sykes, A. J. M. "A Study in Changing the Attitudes and Stereotypes of Industrial Workers." Human Relations, Vol. 17, 2 (1964), pp. 143-154.
- Tajfel, Henri. "Stereotypes." Race, Vol. 5, 2 (October, 1963), pp. 3-14.
- Tuckman, J. "Perceptual Stereotypes about Life Adjustments." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 43 (1956), pp. 239-245.
- Wootton, Barbara. Social Science and Social Pathology. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959.
- Valentine, Charles A. Culture and Poverty. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Vander Zanden, J. W. American Minority Relations: The Sociology of Racial and Ethnic Groups. New York: Ronald, 1966.

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO  
COLLECT DATA

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Please answer the items below as frankly as possible. The absence of your name from the information assures anonymity. Check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question.

1. Age:    \_\_\_ 18-25           \_\_\_ 41-50           \_\_\_ 71 or over  
          \_\_\_ 26-30           \_\_\_ 51-60  
          \_\_\_ 31-40           \_\_\_ 61-70
2. Sex:    \_\_\_ Female       \_\_\_ Male
3. Place of residence: \_\_\_\_\_ (City & State)  
How long have you resided in this city? \_\_\_\_\_  
Where did you live before moving to this city? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Educational level which you have completed:  
\_\_\_ Less than 8th grade  
\_\_\_ Attended high school, but didn't graduate  
\_\_\_ Graduated from high school  
\_\_\_ Attended college  
\_\_\_ Graduated from 4-year college  
\_\_\_ Attended graduate school  
\_\_\_ Completed graduate work for profession
5. Indicate below your degree of religious orientation:  
\_\_\_ Very religious  
\_\_\_ Religious  
\_\_\_ Non-religious  
\_\_\_ Anti-religious
6. Have you ever worked with or had any contact with low-income persons?  
\_\_\_ Yes       \_\_\_ No

If your answer was yes, please briefly describe the type of contact you had and then answer the following questions.

1. Was the contact voluntary or involuntary? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What was the length of your contact? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Was there a superordinate or subordinate role relation involved--e.g., employer-employee, teacher-pupil? \_\_\_\_\_ (Specify type if answer was yes) \_\_\_\_\_

4. What was the area of contact? (Circle answer)
- |                 |                                   |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. Casual       | e. Religious                      |
| b. Residential  | f. Civic and fraternal            |
| c. Occupational | g. Political                      |
| d. Recreational | h. Goodwill intergroup activities |
5. In general, has your contact with low-income persons been good or bad? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Did you attend school with any low-income persons?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If you are a student the following three questions pertain to your parents.

8. What is the primary source of your family's income?
- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| _____ 1. | inherited savings and investments              |
| _____ 2. | earned wealth, transferable investments        |
| _____ 3. | profits, royalties, fees                       |
| _____ 4. | salary, commissions (regular, monthly, yearly) |
| _____ 5. | hourly wages, weekly checks                    |
| _____ 6. | odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity       |
| _____ 7. | public relief or charity                       |
9. Occupation of head of family? \_\_\_\_\_
10. What is the highest educational attainment of the principal earner of your family?
- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| _____ 7. | less than grade 8   |
| _____ 6. | completed grade 8 but did not attend beyond 9                 |
| _____ 5. | attended high school, completed grade 9, but did not graduate |
| _____ 4. | graduated from high school                                    |
| _____ 3. | attended college or university two or more years              |
| _____ 2. | graduated from four year college                              |
| _____ 1. | completed graduate work for profession                        |

## ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

Listed below are adjectives on a scale from 1 to 10. Please circle the number which you feel best describes low-income persons. Note the numbers always extend from one extreme definition to its opposite definition.

Intelligent										Dumb
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Industrious										Lazy
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Honest										Deceitful
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Ambitious										Shiftless
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Quiet										Loud
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Moral										Immoral
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Conservative										Radical
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Kind										Cruel
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Imaginative										Stupid
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Witty										Dull
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
Polite										Rude
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10

LOW-INCOME SITUATION INVENTORY  
AGREE-DISAGREE RATING SCALE

Directions: Read the situations and the statements after each situation on the following pages. For each statement please circle the number that represents your feeling about the statement. Since you are answering anonymously, please be as honest as possible in evaluating your own attitude.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT.

For scoring, use the 1 to 10 point scale below each statement. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of agreement or disagreement. Keep in mind that 1 represents your strongest level of agreement and 10 represents your strongest level of disagreement.

PLEASE REMEMBER EACH STATEMENT IS REFERRING BACK TO A SITUATION AND EACH SITUATION IS ABOUT A LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUAL OR FAMILY.



## SITUATION ABOUT THREE BOYS

They say we're lazy and we don't pay much attention to the law, and sure enough I have two boys to prove it and one to disprove it, so it's two to one against us in this family. But I'd like to tell people why I think my two boys went bad.

I preached and hollered at all three the same. Those older boys were good boys just like the little one, and I remember when they wanted to study and be somebody, just like him. But they never had a chance. They were born too soon.

Now at least one is going to be O.K. And I'll tell you, it's because he was born at the right time. I know it in my bones that he would have turned out just like the others except for what's happening now, with all the programs for the poor.

STRONGLY  
AGREESTRONGLY  
DISAGREE

The success or failure of low-income persons has nothing to do with when they are born.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

It was not a matter of timing that caused the two boys in this situation to fail; they just did not try hard enough to succeed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The success of one boy was due to his determination rather than when he was born.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Poor social environment means higher rates of crime, immorality, and promiscuity.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The poor people who say they have tried to pull themselves out of poverty but have never had the right opportunities are just using this as an excuse for their laziness.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

A feeling of apathy exists among the poor because they have attempted to get out of poverty and failed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The two boys who failed to succeed were held back by the physical environment in which they lived.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The one boy was the exception, the two boys followed the usual pattern.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

If the two boys had been willing to work and to stay in school they would have been successful too.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

SITUATION ABOUT APPLACHIAN MAN

Preface: The man in the below situation had come from the Appalachians to the city seeking employment. He made the following comment:

"If you have strong arms, it's no good. I can build a house, but I didn't have the references they wanted. There are problems with unskilled jobs too. They'll say you spend too many minutes trying to be perfect. I had a job washing cars, but the man said I cleaned each car like it was my own."

STRONGLY  
AGREE

STRONGLY  
DISAGREE

This man did not look around enough for jobs, if he really wanted a job he could have found one.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

It is not fair if one is qualified for a job but does not receive the job because he does not have the proper references.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

People are poor because they do not want to work.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

This man was lazy and not really interested in working.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

This man took pride in his work and this was more important to him than how fast he worked.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

Poor people do not progress in their occupation because of barriers in our society.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

If the limitations of being poor were removed, low-income families would exhibit values similar to the middle class.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

## SITUATION ABOUT MRS. JONES

Mrs. Jones was a real nice woman, a kind woman, but sometimes the way she looked at me I could tell she thought I was shiftless, having so many kids with no man to help out. Maybe if I'd tried to explain she would have understood, but I still hadn't learned that most people want to help you if you give them a chance to really know what you're like, and I just let her go on thinking what she wanted. We spent a lot of time in the same house, but I really didn't understand about her, and she didn't understand about me . . . and that's what has to be different some day, if we're gonna be able to live together, like most decent folks hope we can.

STRONGLY  
AGREESTRONGLY  
DISAGREE

The woman in the above situation is typical of the poor in that she has many children and no husband.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

It's all right to have lots of illegitimate children if you are employed and can afford the necessities of life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Being poor encourages women to have illegitimate children.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

People are poor because they are shiftless.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

In working with the poor it would be better to spend time understanding them as people rather than criticizing their way of life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The marriage relationship is not important to low-income people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The poor are interested in satisfying their immediate desires for a physical relationship and do not think of future consequences.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The fact that the poor do not feel it is wrong to have illegitimate children encourages low-income women to be immoral.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

## SITUATION ABOUT WELFARE

Here we go again, man,  
 I'm locked in the outsides of the rich man's world  
 I hear them saying "We can work it out."  
 Yeah, they can work it out.  
 By giving us welfare and fixing the slums.  
 Of course, baby, how else  
 Listen to them laughing and declaring  
 "Give the poor people some money."  
 "Give them a shack to live in  
 And they'll be alright."

STRONGLY  
 AGREE

STRONGLY  
 DISAGREE

The poor do not appreciate the help they receive.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The help given to the poor makes them loose their  
 self-esteem because society looks down on those  
 receiving welfare.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Those receiving welfare or living in government  
 housing projects are scorned by society.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

There is nothing wrong with receiving help finan-  
 cially if one is not able to make it on his own.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Poor people expect society to help them.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

If heads of low-income families didn't think they  
 had to have "big cars" and "good times," the  
 families would be "alright."  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Poor people don't know how to spend their money  
 wisely so they just continue to be on welfare.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Poor people can be taught to take care of their  
 houses so more slums will not develop.  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

APPENDIX B

MEAN SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE  
CHECKLIST AND LOW-INCOME  
SITUATIONS

TABLE XXIV

MEAN SCORES FOR THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST  
AND LOW-INCOME SITUATIONS

Scale	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean
Adjective Checklist	7	70	38.15
Laziness	7	70	42.75
Values	6	60	34.94
Morals	5	50	32.34
Low-Income Attitudes	2	20	9.27
Society's Attitudes	2	20	11.70
Apathy	4	40	18.40

VITA

Cynthia Ann Ford

Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: MIDDLE-CLASS STEREOTYPES OF LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Major Field: Home Management, Equipment, and Family  
Economics

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Wichita Falls, Texas, January  
16, 1950, the daughter of Charlie Ishmael and  
Billie Doris Ford.

Education: Graduated from Bridgeport High School,  
Bridgeport, Texas, May, 1968; received the  
Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics  
Education from Texas Christian University in Fort  
Worth, Texas, August, 1971.

Professional Experience: Home Economics teacher,  
Trimble Technical High School, Fort Worth Inde-  
pendent School District, Fort Worth, Texas, 1971-  
1973; Graduate Teaching Assistant in Home Manage-  
ment, Equipment, and Family Economics Department,  
Division of Home Economics, Oklahoma State  
University, 1973-1974.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics  
Association, Texas Home Economics Association,  
Phi Upsilon Omicron, American Council on Consumer  
Interests.