2013

Comparisons of Cultural Identities in Relation to Poverty

Amanda A. Corea
Andrews University, corea@andrews.edu

John Nevins Andrews Scholars
Andrews University Honors Program

Honors Thesis

Comparisons of Cultural Identities in Relation to Poverty

Amanda A. Corea

April 1, 2013

Advisor: Dr. Herbert W. Helm, Jr.

Primary Advisor Signature:_____

Department of Behavioral Sciences

Thesis Abstract

This research focuses on how one's cultural identity relates to their attitudes towards those in poverty and what they attribute to be the causes of poverty. Correlation and difference tests were run on data collected from questionnaires completed by a convenient sample. Beliefs about poverty and patterns of attitudes demonstrated in various culture groups were analyzed. The hypothesis that cultural identity relates to attributions and attitudes toward poverty based on learned cultural attitudes was partially supported. Significant differences were found between different cultural identity groups for both attributions and attitudes.

Comparisons of Cultural Identities in Relation to Poverty

Amanda A. Corea

Andrews University

Author Note

Abstract

Does cultural identity relate to attributions given to poverty and attitudes shown towards poverty? This research focuses on the perception of poverty looking at how one's cultural identity relates to their attitudes towards those in poverty and what they attribute to be the causes of poverty. Correlation and difference tests were used to analyze data collected from questionnaires completed by a convenient, snowball sample. Items on the questionnaire included scales measuring attributions of poverty and patterns of attitudes. The hypothesis that the data collected in this study would show significant differences between various cultural identity groups and the attributions that they give to poverty, as well as significant differences in the attitudes of each cultural group towards poverty, was partially supported based on the results from 157 subjects. Significant differences were found between different cultural identity groups for both attributions and attitudes.

Keywords: cultural identity, attributions of poverty, attitudes towards poverty

Comparisons of Cultural Identities in Relation to Poverty

Does cultural identity relate to attributions given to poverty and attitudes shown towards poverty? Poverty has been a problem from the moment sin interrupted our perfect world, but as economic problems worsen, the realities of poverty are starting to become more apparent in today's society. Poverty does not discriminate - it affects people of all ages, occupations, ethnicities, and in all places.

As this epidemic worsens, people are choosing to get involved in the fight against poverty. But as more people get involved more controversy arises over whether or not the poverty situation should be helped and if so, how. Many religious and political groups are tied to various opinions, but whether or not cultural groups have specific views on the issue has not been studied in abundance (Hunt, 1996; Nilson, 1981).

This research focuses on how one's cultural identity relates to their attitudes towards those living in poverty and what one attributes to be the causes of poverty. Correlations between specific cultural groups and beliefs about poverty are analyzed, as well as the pattern of attitudes towards the problem of poverty demonstrated in those cultural groups. This study poses the possibility of providing a better understanding of the ideas and beliefs of various cultural groups.

Literature Review

The number of people affected by poverty all over the world is constantly changing (Joshi, 1979). As economies rise and fall so do the situations of the people living in them. Advances in technology in recent decades have made this problem more apparent by widening the gap between lower and middle classes. This has resulted in the creation of numerous non-governmental and non-profit organizations whose creators are attempting to get others involved in working for a cause (Chamlers, 2013).

Previous research has shown the differences in opinion of the explanations of poverty and attitudes formed towards those that live in poverty. Various attitudes about the issue of poverty and attitudes towards those affected by poverty are influenced by different factors (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson & Tagler, 2001; Schmidt & Weiner, 1988; Schwartz & Robinson, 1991; Wagstaff, 1983).

Many questions have been raised as to why attitudes towards this issue are so vast (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson & Tagler, 2001; Feagin, 1972; Hunt, 1996; Nilson, 1981; Schmidt & Weiner, 1988; Schwartz & Robinson, 1991; Wagstaff, 1983). It is commonly thought that attitudes about the issue of poverty are strictly based on perceived attributions of poverty, but in recent studies it was found that attitudes about poverty are a compilation of stereotypes, personal ideologies, past experiences and other feelings (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001). Other studies have found that attitudes towards the poor vary among different socio-demographic backgrounds (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson & Tagler, 2001; Feagin, 1972; Hunt, 1996; Schmidt & Weiner, 1988).

Many of these factors – stereotyping, the way that one understands and interprets concepts, personal ideologies, etc. – are closely related to one's worldview, which is defined as one's perception of the world. Because of this we can see how cultural identity would also be reflected in a person's worldview and their way of thinking and understanding (Driedger, 1975). Culture is a very influential determinant in our everyday lives and the extent to which it affects our decisions, actions and attitudes is many times not realized. Therefore, people claim certain cultural identities due to the amount of influence that they have had on a person's life as far as shaping their opinions and ideas (Hong, Chiu, Ip, Morris, & Menon, 2001).

There have been numerous studies on cultural identity. Those studies have correlated the diversity in practices and beliefs of people groups with their cultural differences and have

referred to cultural identity as the differentiating factor between subjects. Cultural identity has

been linked with such concepts as literacy behaviors (Ferdman, 1990), attitudes towards mental

health services (Atkinson & Gim, 1989), and the perceived importance of an individual's civic

responsibility within their society (Waldron, 2000). Another study was able to show how

cultural identity even contributes to the construction of self (Hong, Chiu, Ip, Morris, & Menon,

2001). These studies have found that cultural identity does make a difference in their

participants' perceptions and attitudes.

If cultural identity can affect attitudes in these areas, it could also affect attitudes about

poverty. This was exemplified in one study done by Matthew Hunt in 1996. His study showed

that the cultural identities of blacks, Latinos and whites in southern California were the defining

difference in their perceptions of poverty.

This study focuses on the differences between cultural identities and how they relate to

different perceptions of poverty and attitudes towards poverty. Previous research led to the

formation of two hypotheses based on the assumption that attitudes and perceptions are

impressed on individuals by their cultural identities:

> H1: There are significant differences between cultural identities and what each
>
> attributes to be the cause(s) of poverty.
>
> H2: There are significant differences between cultural identities and their attitudes
>
> towards to poverty.

Methodology

Does cultural identity relate to attributions given to poverty and attitudes shown towards

poverty? In this study, poverty is defined as a lack of resources needed to provide for basic

needs such as health and nutrition, basic hygiene, shelter, clothing and primary education.

Attitudes are feelings and ways of thinking that aid in the formation of opinions and may affect

people's reactions and empathy. *Cultural identity* is a term that can be defined in various ways

because of the different factors it encompasses (Driedger, 1975). For purposes of this study, it is

not defined as biological race or ethnicity. Rather, it is defined as the identity of an individual,

as far as that person believes himself or herself influenced by belonging to a people group or

culture group (i.e. self-worth, pride, tradition, beliefs, practices, interpretation of concepts, etc.).

Materials and Instruments

In order to effectively measure attitudes towards poverty and attributions given to poverty

it is important to gain this information in such a way that leads the participant to be honest about

their views. Participants were asked to anonymously complete a 50-item, on-line questionnaire

(see Appendix). This questionnaire gave the participants the opportunity to provide basic

demographic information, including educational level and religious affiliation, as well as a self-

classification of socioeconomic status based on personal opinion. It also included 12 items from

the Feagin Attribution to Poverty Scale (Hunt, 1996; Feagin, 1972) for both U.S. and

international poverty, and 14 items referring to attitudes and reactions to poverty. This

questionnaire was successful in addressing the specific aspects of the study, as well as additional

data analysis from the demographic and socioeconomic items.

Participants

The sample used in this study was a convenient, snowball sample. Participants were

recruited from Andrews University, Facebook and the researcher's personal email contact list.

All participants were required to be 18 years or older.

A total of 157 participants represented nine different cultural identities. Approximately

32% of the participants were male and 68% female, with 93% of the participants identifying

themselves as Christians (see Table 1). Thirteen percent responded to the question of self-

classification of socioeconomic status by classifying themselves as being of lower economic

class either during childhood or currently.

Procedure

All participants were contacted through the Internet including Andrews University

students who were recruited by means of the Department of Behavioral Sciences Research

Participation Pool. All other participants were sent emails or learned about the questionnaire

through postings made on Facebook. When contacted, they were asked to participate in the

study by completing the questionnaire. Participants were directed to an Internet link and

prompted to read a short statement of consent briefly explaining the study. Participants were

informed that the questionnaire would take approximately 20 minutes to complete and if the

subject consented to participation in the study, they were then directed to complete the online

survey. Once the questionnaire was complete the participant submitted it online.

Data Collection. As participants submitted the online survey, all responses were

automatically collected and organized into a Google Documents spreadsheet accessible only by a

secure Gmail account.

Data Analysis. After a four-week period, the link for the questionnaire was taken down.

Then the Google Document spreadsheet was downloaded in order to code the data and prepare it

for analysis.

Because of incomplete and invalid responses, out of the 161 completed surveys only 157

were analyzed. It was necessary to focus the study on the cultural identity groups with larger Ns,

instead of all cultural identities represented in the data. Nine different cultures were originally

reported but only six were chosen to focus on: African American, Asian (including Chinese,

Japanese and Korean), Hispanic, white American, European and Caribbean.

Feagin's Attribution to Poverty Scale (Hunt, 1996; Feagin, 1972) organizes the

attribution scores into three categories: individualistic, structural, and fatalistic. Individualistic

attribution places responsibility for poverty on the poor themselves. Structural attribution,

blames external social and economic forces. Fatalistic attribution, blames poverty on sickness

and bad luck (Hunt, 1996; Feagin, 1972). Feagin's scale consists of 12 statements of possible

reasons for poverty; an attribution score (what a participant attributes to be the cause of poverty)

is determined by the how each of the 12 items is rated on a scale from 1- "not at all important" as

a reason for poverty, to 4- "very important" as reason for poverty. On the questionnaire, the set

of 12 statements was asked for both United States poverty and international poverty.

Both correlation and difference tests (parametric and nonparametric) were run on the data

using statistical analysis software (SPSS) including: bivariate correlations, Mann-Whitney U

tests, Kruskal-Wallis tests, and one-way ANOVAs. These tests were done on the attributions of

poverty scores and attitudes towards poverty scores grouping them with the six different cultural

identities and different demographic categories (age groups, level of education, gender, etc.).

Results

Initial data analysis looked at differences between cultural identities in both attribution

scores and attitudes. One-way ANOVAs were done to analyze the attributions of U.S. poverty

and international poverty scores with cultural identity. The structural attribution scores and

individualistic attribution scores showed significant differences, but the fatalistic attribution

scores did not. Tukey HSD and Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used to find where the significant

differences occurred.

Post-hoc tests show that there are significant values for structural attribution scores ($F = $

3.119, $p = .011$) between Hispanics and white Americans; their mean ranks showing that

Hispanics ranked structural explanations as a significantly more important reason for poverty in

the United States ($p < .05$) than white Americans. An more liberal post-hoc test showed additional significant differences between Hispanics and Asians, Hispanics and Europeans, and between white Americans and African Americans, with Hispanics scoring structural attributions as more important than Asians and Europeans, and African Americans scoring it as more important than white Americans. However, the less stringent nature of this post-hoc test creates more possibility for type 1 error, showing something to be significant when it is actually not. For the individualistic attribution of poverty scores, significant values ($F = 2.654$, $p = .025$) were found between Hispanics and white Americans; white Americans rated this as a significantly less important reason for international poverty than Hispanics ($p < .001$).

Difference tests run on cultural identities and attitudes towards poverty also found significant differences. A Kruskal-Wallis test found significant differences between cultural identities for attitudes 1-4 on the questionnaire: poor people make me feel uncomfortable (Attitude 1, $p = .04$); I feel sorry for poor people (Attitude 2, $p = .001$); poor people shouldn't need to be helped (Attitude 3, $p = .027$); and people should only feel obligated to help the poor if they have a lot of money (Attitude 4, $p = .001$). Mann-Whitney U tests showed that Asians feel significantly more uncomfortable with poor people than African Americans and Hispanics (Attitude 1). Caribbeans scored significantly different than African Americans, Asians, Hispanics and white Americans in saying that Caribbeans feel more sorry for poor people (Attitude 2). Mann-Whitney tests also found that white Americans feel more strongly that the poor shouldn't need to be helped (Attitude 3), than do Hispanics and Caribbeans. Asians also agree significantly more with the idea that only those with more money should feel obligated to help the poor (Attitude 4), than do Hispanics, Europeans and Caribbeans.

After analysis of cultural identities was complete, further analysis was done on the demographic variables in relation to attribution scores and attitudes in U.S. and international

poverty. From this analysis, significances were found between gender groups, age groups, education levels, and political identities. Males and females scored significantly different on structural attributions of US poverty ($p = .005$) and fatalistic attributions of international poverty ($p = .052$) according to a Mann-Whitney U test. Mean scores suggest that females tend to score both of these attributions as more relevant causes of poverty than males. Males and females also have significant score differences on attitudes. Mean scores show that males, more than females, feel uncomfortable with poor people (Attitude 1, $p = .021$), believe that poor people shouldn't need to be helped (Attitude 3, $p = .029$), and feel strongly that help for the poor should only come from those who have large amounts of money (Attitude 4, $p = .000$).

Age groups shown no statistical significances between them for attribution scores, but significances were found for attitudes towards those in poverty. The difference in scoring shows that between the age groups of 18-30 year olds and 31-55 year olds, 18-30 year olds feel more sorry for poor people than 31-55 year olds (Attitude 2), but 31-55 year olds are more willing to donate (Attitude 8). There were no statistical significances for the 55+ age group in comparison to the other two age groups.

There were also significant differences between various education levels of the participants and their attribution of individualistic explanations to both US and international poverty and whether or not poor people should be helped (attitude three). Post-hoc tests showed these significant differences between those with Graduate or Professional degrees and those who had only completed lower levels of education including high school and undergraduate degrees. Mean scores show that those with high school diplomas believe individualistic attributions to be a more important reason for poverty than those with a completed graduate or professional degree. But in contrast, those with completed graduate, professional and undergraduate degrees scored

higher that poor people should not need to be helped (Attitude 3) more than those with partially completed undergraduate and graduate degrees.

No statistical significances for attribution of poverty scores were found between different political identities, but there were statistical significances for attitudes towards poverty scores. Post hoc tests of a one-way ANOVA show that Republicans agreed that children born into poverty should be brought out of poverty by their parents (Attitude 6, $p = .006$) more than Democrats and Independents. Republicans and Independents scored very similar but significantly higher than Democrats saying that poverty would cure itself if people would get jobs (Attitude 12, $p = .043$).

There were no significant differences between socioeconomic groups, income levels, or religious affiliations.

Significant correlations (Pearson's r) were also found between many of the attributions to poverty and attitudes towards poverty (see Table 2). Some attributions of poverty show negative correlations with different attitudes of poverty, while other attributions have positive correlations with different attitudes of poverty. Structural attributions for both U.S. and international poverty show negative correlations with multiple attitudes: poor people shouldn't need to be helped (Attitude 3, $p < .01$), helping those in poverty hurts them more than it helps them (Attitude 11, $p <. 05$), and poverty would cure itself if people would just get jobs (Attitude 12, $p < .01$). Individualistic attributions for both U.S. and international poverty show positive correlations with the attitude that poverty would cure itself if people would get jobs (Attitude 12, $p <. 05$).

Discussion

The hypotheses that there would be significant differences between different cultural identity groups and the attributions that they give to poverty, as well as significant differences in the attitudes of each cultural group towards poverty, were partially supported.

The form in which the questionnaire was distributed poses a bias in the data because participants completed the questionnaire voluntarily, creating the possibility of self-selection bias. Additionally, because a portion of the questionnaire was theory-driven, the questions could have been another source of bias. A number of participants commented on the quality of the questions saying things like "you need better questions", "the questions are too transparent", and "your questions are too general", or that the questions were all black and white and that there needed to be "more room for the gray". These comments show that the intentions and purpose of the questionnaire may have been misinterpreted by a number of people, with the possibility of affecting data. The questionnaire may have also yielded better results from further incorporation of other attitudinal scales (Atherton et al, 1993).

The data could have also been analyzed by different methods including a two-way ANOVA to see if any other significance appeared between different variables or different combinations of variables.

Because of a lack of time and resources, the majority of the participants were Christians: Seventh-Day Adventists and members of other denominations. Christians believe in and follow the Biblical teachings of Jesus to care for the widows, children, and poor (Matt. 19:21; 25:35); it is possible that these beliefs may have affected the data. A different balance of participants with another or no religious affiliation or identity may have produced different results.

Regardless of these biases and imbalances, significant differences were still present between cultural identity groups, which supports the original hypotheses. While there were significant differences found between Hispanics and white Americans on their view of structural and individualistic attributions of poverty, more significant differences were expected between other cultural groups on other attributions to support the hypothesis more strongly. More significant scores and differences may have been obtainable if there were a greater amount of all

cultural identity groups identified, giving each cultural identity group a bigger N and balancing them out with each other.

Significant differences between cultural identities were found in four out of the fourteen attitudes on the questionnaire. Even though the majority of attitudes did not yield significant differences between cultural identities, the data found for the four attitudes that did, support the hypothesis.

It is possible that significant scoring differences between culture groups could be due to their histories. Those that identified themselves as Asian come from one of two scenarios: their families have recently immigrated here to the United States suggesting that they have higher economic status, affecting their interaction with people of lower economic status; or their families have lived here for several generations. Coming from a wealthier background might affect the results.

Traditionally, Latin American countries are known for the extreme poverty of their people. It is highly probable that those identifying themselves as Hispanic, still have family members living in their country of origin, or recently emigrated out of Latin America, and have therefore interacted with the impoverished communities in their countries. Coming from a history of poverty could be a possible reason for the scores of Hispanics.

Also shown were significant differences between genders and age groups. The differences between gender groups could be related to stereotypical traits of females being more sympathetic than males. The differences in age groups could have also been due to maturity, understanding, worldview, and economic stability.

Correlations between attributions and attitudes were shown (Table 2), but a greater quantity of correlations that were significant, was expected. Additionally, that no discrepancies

were found between socioeconomic status and certain attitudes or attributions was very surprising, due to psychological theory that experience plays a role in how we perceive things.

Conclusion

This research study was a learning process and there are many things to be changed and improved but over all I was pleased with the outcome of this study.

Poverty is an epidemic that affects all people groups, ethnicities, and countries. Because the victims of poverty are so diverse and widespread, it proves complicated to help improve the poverty problem from a singular perspective. In order to effectively help this problem, it is important that we gain a better understanding of how different ethnic groups perceive the problem of poverty.

Implications of Research

The hypotheses may not have been fully supported but this information is still useful to the overall understanding of cultural identity and poverty. More participants and a revision of methodology have the potential to provide more significant findings in the future.

I believe that properly analyzed information gathered in this area of study can be used as a tool to help those who wish to help the poor, by helping them gain a better understanding of how poverty is viewed in different cultural settings.

References

Atherton, C., Gemmel, R., Haagenstad, S., Holt, D., Jensen, L., O'Hara D., & Rehner, T. (1993).

Measuring attitudes toward poverty: A new scale. *Social Work Research & Abstracts*; 29

(4), 28-31

Atkinson, D.R., & Gim, R. (1989). Asian-American cultural identity and attitudes toward mental

health services. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36* (2), 202-212.

Chamlers, M. (2013, February). Nonprofits grow in numbers despite long odds. *USAToday.com*.

Retrieved March 27, 2013 from

http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/02/02/nonprofits-grow-in-

numbers/1886317/.

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A., & Tagler, M. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions

for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues, 57* (2), 207-227.

Driedger, L. (1975). In search of cultural identity factors: A comparison of ethnic students.

Canadian Review of Sociology, 12 (2), 150-162.

Feagin, J. (1972). Poverty: We still believe that god helps those who help themselves.

Psychology Today, 6, pp.101-129.

Ferdman, B.M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 6* (2), 181-

204.

Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Ip, G., Morris, M., & Menon, T. (2001). Cultural identity and dynamic

construction of the self: Collective duties and individual rights in Chinese and American

cultures. *Social Cognition, 19* (3), 251-268.

Hunt, M. (1996). The individual, society, or both? a comparison of black, latino and white

beliefs about the causes of poverty. *Social Forces*, *75*, 293-322.

Joshi, P.C., (1979, February). *Perspectives on poverty and social change: The emergence of the*

poor as a class. Retrieved February 8, 2011, from JSTOR:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/4367355.

Nilson, L. (1981). Reconsidering ideological lines: Beliefs about poverty in America. *The*

Sociological Quarterly, 22, 531-548.

Schmidt, G., & Weiner, B. (1988) An attribution-effect-action theory of behavior: Replications

of judgments of help-giving. *Personality and Social Bulletin 14,* 610-621.

Schwartz, S., & Robinson, M. (1991). Attitudes toward poverty during undergraduate education.

Journal of Social Work Education, 27 (3), 290-297.

Wagstaff, G.F. (1983). Attitudes to poverty, the protestant ethic, and political affiliation: A

preliminary investigation. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 11*

(1), 45-47.

Waldron, J. (2000). Cultural identity and civic responsibility. *Citizenship in Diverse Societies,*

155-175.

Appendix

Poverty Survey

POVERTY SURVEY

Andrews
University

Please fill out the following survey to the best of your knowledge. This survey focuses on poverty and the causes of it. The survey should take about 20 minutes to complete. If you have any concerns or questions please feel free to contact Amanda Corea at corea@andrews.edu.

General Information
Please check the one choice in each category that applies to you.

Gender:
____ Male   ____ Female

Age:
____ 18-30 years
____ 31-55 years
____ 55 + years

Race: (your biological origin)
____ African American, Black
____ American Indian, Alaska Native
____ Chinese
____ Filipino
____ Hispanic, Latino, Spanish
____ Indian
____ Japanese
____ Korean
____ Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian
____ White/Caucasian
____ Multiracial: specify:_____
____ Other, please specify:_____

Cultural Background: (the culture that you and/or your family adhere to in the home)
____ African American   ____ Caribbean, Islander
____ Filipino   ____ Indian
____ African   ____ Asian
____ Hispanic, Latino   ____ American Indian
____ White American   ____ European
____ Other, please specify:_____

Religious Identity/Association:
____ Catholic   ____ Protestant Christian
____ Jewish   (please specify)
____ Muslim   ____ SDA
____ None   ____ Other
____ Other, please specify:_____

Education Completed (please specify highest completed):
____ Some Elementary   ____ Completed Elementary
____ Some Middle School   ____ Completed Middle school
____ Some Secondary/High school, no diploma
____ Completed Secondary/High School
____ Some College, no degree
____ Undergraduate degree
____ Some Graduate School
____ Graduate or Professional degree

Approximate Household Income (annual):
____ under $10,000
____ between $10,000 and $19,999
____ between $20,000 and $29,999
____ between $30,000 and $39,999
____ between $40,000 and $49,999
____ between $50,000 and $74,999
____ between $75,000 and 99,999
____ between $100,000 and $150,000
____ over $150,000

Self-Classification of Socioeconomic Status:
    Currently: **Childhood:**
____ Lower Class   ____ Lower Class
____ Lower Mid Class   ____ Lower Mid Class
____ Middle Class   ____ Middle Class
____ Upper Mid Class   ____ Upper Mid Class
____ Upper Class   ____ Upper Class

Political Identity:
____ Republican
____ Democrat
____ Independent or Other

Explanation of Poverty

The following statements refer to possible reasons for poverty in the _United States_. For each of the reasons please check whether you think it is *(4) very important; (3) somewhat important; (2) not very important;* or *(1) not at all important* as a reason for poverty.

Possible Reasons	Rating 1 — Not At All Important	2 — Not Very Important	3 — Somewhat Important	4 — Very Important
Personal irresponsibility, lack of discipline among those who are poor.				
Lack of thrift and proper money management by poor people.				
Lack of effort by those who are poor.				
Lack of ability and talent among poor people.				
Loose morals and drunkenness.				
Low wages in some businesses and industries.				
Failure of society to provide good schools for many people.				
Prejudice and discrimination.				
Failure of private and public industry to provide enough jobs.				
Sickness and physical handicaps.				
Being taken advantage of by rich people.				
Bad luck.				

The following statements refer to possible reasons for poverty in _underdeveloped countries_. For each of the reasons please check whether you think it is *(4) very important; (3) somewhat important; (2) not very important;* or *(1) not at all important* as a reason for poverty.

Possible Reasons	Rating 1 — Not At All Important	2 — Not Very Important	3 — Somewhat Important	4 — Very Important
Personal irresponsibility, lack of discipline among those who are poor.				
Lack of thrift and proper money management by poor people.				
Lack of effort by those who are poor.				
Lack of ability and talent among poor people.				
Loose morals and drunkenness.				
Low wages in some businesses and industries.				
Failure of society to provide good schools for many people.				
Prejudice and discrimination.				
Failure of private and public industry to provide enough jobs.				
Sickness and physical handicaps.				
Being taken advantage of by rich people.				
Bad luck.				

Please rate the following ideas from 1 to 5, with 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Poor people make me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel sorry for poor people.	1	2	3	4	5
Poor people shouldn't need to be helped.	1	2	3	4	5
We should only feel obligated to help poor people if we have a lot of money.	1	2	3	4	5
I am more willing to help a poor woman than a poor man.	1	2	3	4	5
Children born into poverty should be brought out of poverty by their parents.	1	2	3	4	5
All of the homeless shelters and organizations that aid the poor aren't really making a difference.	1	2	3	4	5
I donate to agencies and organizations that help those in poverty.	1	2	3	4	5
Poor people in other countries need more help than poor people in the United States.	1	2	3	4	5
I am more willing to volunteer, donate or help the cause of poverty around the holidays.	1	2	3	4	5
Helping those in poverty hurts them more than helps them.	1	2	3	4	5
Poverty would cure itself if people would just get jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
Poor children are unable to help themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
I am more willing to help a poor person on the street in my town, than donate money to an organization that helps poor people.	1	2	3	4	5
Not every poor person is deserving of help.	1	2	3	4	5
Those that help poor people do it out of guilt, not just because they're nice.	1	2	3	4	5
I am more willing to donate and/or help the cause of poverty if I receive something in return.	1	2	3	4	5
Men have a better chance at getting out of poverty than women.	1	2	3	4	5

Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments, opinions or questions that you may have.

Table 1

Poverty Survey Participants

	N	% Of Sample
Sex		
Male	52	32%
Female	109	68%
Age		
18-30 yrs.	99	61.5%
31-55 yrs.	50	31%
55+ yrs.	12	7.5%
Cultural Identity/Practiced		
African American	9	5.7%
American Indian	1	0.6%
Asian	12	7.6%
Filipino	2	1.3%
Hispanic	26	16.6%
Indian	2	1.3%
Caribbean, Islander	16	10.2%
White American	78	49.7%
African	1	0.6%
European	10	6.4%
Religious Identity		
Protestant Christian	150	93.1%
Other	1	0.6%
None	10	6.2%
Education Completed		
Some Elementary	2	1.2%
Some High School	1	0.6%
Completed High School	31	19.3%
Some College Courses	63	39.1%
Undergraduate Degree	30	18.6%
Some Graduate Courses	8	5%
Graduate/Professional Degree	26	16.1%
Political Identity		
Democrat	47	29.2%
Republican	45	28%
Independent/Other	69	42.9%
Total Valid	**157**	

Table 2

Significant Correlations between Attributions and Solutions

		Attributions of Poverty				
		US Individualistic	US Structural	US Fatalistic	Intl Individualistic	Intl Structural
Attitudes of Poverty	1			.165*		
	3		-.286**			-.160**
	8	-.248**				
	9	.190*				
	11		-.198*			-.189*
	12	.195*	-.245**		.255**	-.227**
	13					.166*

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

    ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

    Attitude 1 – Poor people make me feel uncomfortable.

    Attitude 3 – Poor people shouldn't need to be helped.

    Attitude 8 – I donate to agencies and organizations that help those in poverty.

    Attitude 9 – Poor people in other countries need more help than poor people in the U. S.

    Attitude 11 – Helping those in poverty hurts them more than it helps them.

    Attitude 12 – Poverty would cure itself if people would just get jobs.

    Attitude 13 – Poor children are unable to help themselves.