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Abstract

GHOLSON, MELISSA L., Ed.D., December 2015, Educational Administration

Rural Principal Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor

Director of Dissertation: Krisanna Machtimes

This study used Yun and Weaver’s (2010) Attitudes toward Poverty Short Form (ATP-SF) of twenty-one items on a Likert-type scale to determine the poverty attitudes of 309 principals in a rural Appalachian state in the United States. The study compared the poverty attitudes from the ATP-SF scaled score as a dependent variable to the following demographics which were used as independent variables: social class origin, political orientation, gender, age, ethnicity/race, religiosity, Appalachian identity, experience, poverty training, school socioeconomic status and locale. This study replicated the factor structure found by Yun & Weaver (2010) and achieved a Cronbach’s Alpha of .81. Three factors established for the scale were personal deficiency, stigma and structural perspective. The overall score poverty attitudes by respondents was 77.60 points which produced positive attitudes results on the interpretive scale.

The study used both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, including a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for significance testing of the independent variables. A stepwise regression was conducted to determine if any independent variables were predictive for poverty attitudes. Political orientation was identified as statistically significant at the $p \leq .001$. Liberal views were found to have more positive attitudes of poverty (versus conservative). Age was found to be statistically significant on the overall scale at $p \leq .001$ and achieved a $p \leq .001$ on the factor of stigma. Older respondents had
more positive poverty attitudes than younger. Educational researchers need a dependable scale to measure poverty attitudes. Findings from this study demonstrate the utility of using the ATP-SF scale as a tool for measuring poverty attitudes for a variety of research purposes. Results indicated characteristics of school administrator’s impact poverty attitudes. The results of the study identify areas for further study and implications for teacher and administrator training to offset the impact of poverty attitudes.
Dedication

“Only they would that we should remember the poor;

the same which I also was forward to do.”-Galatians 2:10
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The persistence of an achievement gap between students who are economically disadvantaged and their peers who are more privileged represents a challenge to education researchers to examine the dynamics and consequences of schooling in a class-based society; yet reluctance among education scholars to focus directly on issues of social class is evident (Berliner, 2005; Biddle, 2001). A number of researchers’ address issues related to the effect of poverty on educational inputs, processes, and outcomes (Anyon, 1997; Kozol, 2012; Oakes, 1985).

Sociology relates to social class as a major topic of concern (Weeden & Grusky, 2005a; Wright, 2005). Research conducted by sociologists has demonstrated class as a basis for the analysis of social phenomena and the potential explanation of circumstances and outcomes (e.g., Breen & Rottman, 1995; Ornstein, 2007; Willis, 1977). Such studies and subsequent social class analyses, provide insights about inequity in the distribution of wealth and income related to dynamics of privilege (marginalization) and power (powerlessness) (e.g., Duncan, 1996; Gaventa, 1980). Studies of social class dynamics within and across institutions have explored structural conditions that sustain and perpetuate inequities (Lemieux & Pratto, 2003; Liu, Soleck, Hopps, Dunston & Pickett, 2004; Ornstein, 2007; Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006).

Social psychological research has contributed to an understanding of class dynamics (Bourdieu, 1986; Fine & Burns, 2003; Hochschild, 2003). Studies of social class dynamics among individuals described the processes and effects of stereotyping (Henry, Reyna, & Weiner, 2004), marginalization (Shields, Bishop, & Mazawi, 2005),
prejudice (Lemieux & Pratto, 2003), discrimination (e.g., Bullock, 1995), and classism (Lott, 2002; Lott & Saxon, 2002).

Sociological and psychological literature investigated attitudes toward poverty (Atherton et al., 1993; Bullock, 2006; Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001; Feagin, 1972; Feather, 1974; Golding & Middleton, 1982; Lott & Maluso, 1995; MacDonald, 1971; 1972; Phillips, 1994; Rehner, Ishee, Salloum, & Velasques, 1997; Rosenthal, 1993; Smith & Stone, 1989; Weiner, 2010; Whalen, 2005; Yun & Weaver, 2010). The psychological research on poverty attitudes is supported by sociological theories of poverty and discriminatory behaviors and practices (Allport, 1985). Added to this research are studies showing the important influence of attitudes toward poverty on professional work in human service and commercial fields including psychology (Bullock & Waugh, 2005; Coryn, 2002; Zucker & Weiner, 1993), nursing (Kovarna, 2006; Reutter, Sword, Meagher-Stewart, & Rideout, 2004), health care and medicine (Chin, Monroe, & Fiscella, 2000; Crandall, Volk, & Cacy, 1997; Price, Desmond, Snyder & Kimmel, 1988; Willems, Swinnen, & De Maeseneer, 2005), counseling and social work (Macarov, 1981; Reingold & Liu, 2008; Rosenthal, 1993; Sturm, 2008; Whalen, 2005), and business (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Despite efforts in other professions to use research on the negative consequences of classism to inform a more inclusive form of practice (e.g., Adair, 2001; Cozzarelli et al., 2001), the prevailing (and more exclusionary) approach in education tends to draw on and promulgate an unsubstantiated deficit view (Boomer, Dworin, May, & Semingson, 2008).
Background of the Study

Educators often look to relevant sociological research due to an absence of studies that illuminate the relationship between attitudes toward the poor and schooling practices. Sociological research demonstrates the relationship between social institutions, including education systems, replicating prevailing class dynamics instead of supporting improved equity (e.g., Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Leistyna, 2002; Ornstein, 2007). As a result of the tendency to reproduce existing class relations, education systems often harm those they have purported to serve (Fine, Burns, Payne, & Torre, 2004; Nesbit, 2006). One way that such harm occurs is through institutional classism.

Bullock and Lott (2001) defined classism as the “network of attitudes, assumptions, beliefs, behaviors, and institutional practices that maintain and legitimize class based power difference which privileges middle and higher income groups at the expense of the poor and working class” (p. 154). Smith (2005) claimed institutional classism is a form of oppression. Institutional classism is sustained, in part, by stereotypes and beliefs that function to make the dynamics of privilege and deprivation appear legitimate (Anyon, 1981; Lott, 2002; Lott & Maluso, 1995). Arguably, with respect to the field of education, rhetoric that is focused on the deficiencies of the poor (e.g., Payne, 1998) support and sustain socially reproductive behaviors and practices.

As some sociologists and a few educational researchers have suggested, schools are among the social institutions that reproduce existing patterns of class stratification even though they purport to offer equal opportunities to all students regardless of social class (Anyon, 1981, 1997; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bullock, 1995; Hochschild, 2003;
Smith, 2005). In several studies, researchers have found the schooling practice in the United States systematically impede access to educational and economic opportunities for some children—especially children from economically deprived environments (Anyon, 1980; Delpit, 1996; Fine, 1991; Lareau, 2003; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1978; Lott, 2001; Oakes, 1985; Ostrove & Cole, 2003). According to many scholars, deep-rooted meritocratic beliefs (i.e., that class is an earned rather than ascribed status) and individualistic values contribute to widespread acceptance of structural arrangements in schools that reinforce classism and sustain prevailing economic and social inequities (Ballantine, 2001 Bowles & Gintis, 1976, 2002; Sacks, 2007).

Not all scholars examine school as a contribution to social reproduction; instead, some focus on impact of school on social mobility. Researchers have examined the contribution of postsecondary education to increased upward mobility (e.g., Haskins, Holzer, & Lerman, 2009; Haveman & Smeeding, 2006). A few studies demonstrated that early childhood education, especially through participation in early childhood intervention programs, had enduring effects into adulthood and improved the life chances of individuals from underprivileged social groups (Garces, Thomas, & Currie, 2002; Ou & Reynolds, 2006). Among these studies, Nores, Belfield, Barnett, and Schweinhart (2005) found that participation in preschool programs positively related to academic performance and educational attainment, with the potential to increase economic opportunities and outcomes. Garces et al. (2002) also found that Headstart and other preschool intervention programs were likely to improve outcomes for low income children and increase social mobility. In addition, many researchers reported direct
correlations between educational attainment and income (e.g., Blau & Duncan, 1967; Julian & Kominski, 2011).

Related lines of research support a long-standing American belief about the potential of education to improve the social and economic prospects of children from poor and minority backgrounds (Hochschild, 1995). Historically such educational beliefs like those of Horace Mann, the leader of the “common school” movement, were that the common school would promote equal educational opportunity and social harmony and enable individuals to develop to their full potential (Brick, 2005). Despite the hope that “common schools” would assist poor and marginalized students gain access to the economic and status benefits available in U.S. society, the performance of schools has actually been much less positive (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003). At the same time, public schooling has helped many impoverished students and minority groups rise into the middle class (Hardaway & McLoyd, 2009; Lacy, 2004).

The perspective that schooling can contribute to both social reproduction and social mobility can be characterized and understood by drawing on the Neo-Marxist concept of “contradiction” (Allman, 1999). An example of such a contradiction is when two forces appear to support opposing class interests, such as the dominant class interest in maintaining advantages and the working class interest in gaining access to economic benefits and political power (e.g., Sapon-Shevin, 2003; Swartz, 2003). Allman (2001) purports that educators can benefit by considering Marxist conceptualization of consciousness and philosophy for “self and social transformation” (p.51).
Prolific literature on school leadership has recognized that principals and superintendents work on behalf of social justice (e.g., Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Theoharis, 2007; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008). Few empirical studies demonstrate how principals work to create equity and promote social justice agendas (Kose, 2007; Theoharis, 2007). By contrast, many scholars provide evidence that school principals often act in ways that perpetuate the social class structure (Anyon, 1997; Demerath, Lynch, Milner, Peters, & Davidson, 2010; Lareau, 1987 Oakes, 1985; Rist, 1970; Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010). Viewed as a whole, the literature on the principal’s impact on social class relations suggested that the role is indeed contradictory—sometimes supporting social mobility and inclusiveness and sometimes sustaining oppressive and static class relations.

Situated within the literature on the contradictory role of schools as agents both of social reproduction and social mobility. Scheurich and Skrla (2003) recognized that school administrators are perfectly positioned to influence whether schools promote or deny equity for students. Delpit (1996) recognized educator attitude as an obstacle for providing equitable outcomes for children who were poor and disadvantaged. Acknowledging the contradictory role of principals with regard to social class relations, the proposed study will focus attention on the principals’ beliefs and attitudes.

Although beliefs and attitudes do not necessarily guide actions, some evidence suggests they often provide significant influence (Ajzen, 2001, 2005; Brown, 2004; Glasman & Albarracin, 2006). Research on educational leadership demonstrates principal attitudes and beliefs influence professional practices (Brown, 2004). Principals who hold
classist beliefs are more likely to support practices that promote social reproduction, whereas those who hold egalitarian beliefs are more likely to support practices that promote social justice (Theoharis, 2007).

Beliefs and attitudes toward the poor. Although limited research has explored the attitude of U.S. educators toward the poor, the available research showed that citizen’s attitudes toward people in poverty are generally negative (Atherton et al., 1993; Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli et al., 2001). Most Americans, even those who are poor, believe the poor are responsible for their own circumstances (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin, 1972; Gilens, 1999; Kluegel & Bobo, 2001; Ryan, 1971). Negative attitudes toward the poor have been associated with individualistic personal deficits rather than structural explanations of poverty (Bullock, 1995; Clawson & Trice, 2000; Gilens, 2003).

As early as 1972, Feagin studied beliefs about poverty and the tendency to reflect one of three general explanations: the individualistic attribution, which views the individual as responsible for creating his or her own poverty; the structural attribution, which sees economic and social conditions as the major cause of poverty; or the fatalistic attribution, which construes fate or bad luck as the most important cause of poverty. Additional research suggested that poverty attributions influence judgments about whether or not the poor deserve help (Appelbaum, 2001). Other research demonstrated associations between such judgments and levels of support for policies that respond to the needs of the poor (Adair, 2001; Bullock, 1995; Cook & Barrett, 1992; Katz, 1981). Research suggests attitudes toward the poor and poverty attributions have an influence on
the poor themselves by influencing how poverty is dealt with in both policy and practice (Cozzarelli et al., 2001).

The rural Appalachian context. Attitudes toward the poor may also be associated with location. Gruenewald (2003ab) argued place as a physical location both creates networks of relationships and attributes meaning to them. Not only does place contribute to the meanings created by insiders (i.e., those from the place), but it contributes to the attributes developed by outsiders (i.e., those from someplace else) (Haas & Nachtigal, 1998; Manzo, 2005; Porter, 2001). For example, rural dwellers ascribe particular circumstances to urban life and vice versa (Lichter & Brown, 2011). Analyses of these beliefs suggest that many Americans hold a dystopian view of rural places (Bales & Grady, 2005; Herzog & Pittman, 2003). Negative descriptions of these locations include backwards, poor, and even lawless (e.g., Cooke-Jackson & Hansen, 2008).

In the United States, perception of rural life differs in part on the basis of history (Berry, 2003; Williams, 1973; Williams, 1994; Woods, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2005). For example, people often see the Great Plains as the bastion of American values such as frugality, hard work, and moral righteousness (Cayton & Gray, 2001). American perspectives of Appalachia and the Delta region of Mississippi tend to be far more negative—focused on, poverty, ignorance, and violence (Billings & Blee, 2000; Billings, Norman, & Ledford, 2001; Duncan, 1999; Eller, 2008). In rural Appalachia, a “monolithic view” persists despite many scholarly attempts to address the diversity within the region (Billings & Walls, 1980, p. 248). Scholars on Appalachian culture have
captured the complexity of the region and the nuances of place regardless of location (Obermiller & Maloney, 2006; Fisher & Smith, 2013).

Appalachia has historical circumstances which created material conditions that lend credence to negative characterizations (Duncan, 1992; Towers, 2005). Notably, Appalachia is an impoverished region of the country and culture is less cosmopolitan than more urban places. Research has documented the way that historic traditions continue to dominate the way of life for many people in Appalachia (Fisher, 1993; Fisher & Smith, 2013; Obermiller & Maloney, 2006; Sarnoff, 2003; Sherman, 2009; Thompson, 2012). Although these circumstances are viewed as assets (DeYoung, 1995; Herzog & Pittman 2003; Howley & Howley, 1995; Haas & Nachitigal, 1998; Porter, 2001), they also have been characterized as deficits (Duncan, 1999; Gaventa, 1980; Hammer, 2001; Osborne, 2007). Scholars, reformers, and the media have perpetuated stereotypical and unsavory portraits of rural poverty in Appalachia (Clawson & Trice, 2000; Cook-Jackson & Hansen, 2008; Fraley, 2007b; Harrington, 1962; Weller, 1965). In addition to contributing to widespread misunderstandings of the region’s circumstances and the character of its people, stereotypes have, through a variety of economic and political mechanisms, served to marginalize Appalachians (Banks, Billings, & Tice, 1996; Duncan, 1992; 1999; Gaventa, 1980; Hammer, 2001; Herzog & Pittman, 2003; Osborne, 2007; Reid, 2005; Shapiro, 1978).

Appalachians and other rural people who live in communities with adequate resources can dismiss such stereotypes as unfair and irrelevant, citizens in impoverished rural communities, such as many in Appalachia, tend to internalize messages about
inferiority (Batteau, 1983, 1990; Billings, 1974; Billings & Blee, 2000; Billings et al., 1999; Fisher, 1983; Fraley, 2007a; Haas & Nachtigal, 1998; Reck & Reck, 1980; Towers, 2005). Research shows that Appalachians, ironically, also view those less fortunate than themselves in stereotypical ways and sanction social class stratification within their own communities (Bennett, 2008; Chisom, 2009; Duncan, 1999; Whisnant, 1980). Stereotypes contribute to stigmatization or “othering” which is associated with increased social exclusion, discrimination, and exploitation (e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Howley and Howley (2010) found that “Rural people in general – and also rural commitments, ideas, and practices – are ‘othered’ ” (p. 34). These beliefs are prevalent and have profound implications for many students within Appalachian schools (Duncan, 1999). Duncan’s case study of social class dynamics in a rural Appalachian region (1999) detailed the way educator negative stereotype about Appalachian families influenced schooling practices. Howley, Howley, Howley, and Howley (2006), Reck & Reck (1980), and Woodrum (2006) confirmed these findings in separate research studies.

Attitudes and the school context. As numerous studies show, beliefs and attitudes are moderate to strong predictors of behavior (e.g., Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Allport, 1935; Glasman & Albarracin, 2006). Therefore, educator attitudes impact social interaction. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson and Whalstrom (2004) that the connection between attitudes and beliefs, and actions has particularly insidious consequences for students who are poor and disadvantaged.

Notably, an extensive body of literature showed educators make assumptions about the ability of children based upon a child’s economic and family circumstances,
race or ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and native language (Anyon, 1995; Delpit, 1996; Ensminger, Fothergill, Bornstein, & Bradley, 2003; Lareau, 1987, 2002; Oakes, 1985; Ogbu, 1978; Rist, 1978; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992). Research has demonstrated that assumptions can influence how school personnel behave toward disadvantaged students (Howley et al., 2006; Rhodes, 2011). Earlier studies on the impact of teacher expectations on student achievement, have illustrated that educators often hold lower expectations for the achievement of students who are disadvantaged than they do for the achievement of students more advantaged (Delpit, 1996; Lareau, 2003; Ogbu, 1978; Rist, 1970). This body of research indicated teachers often respond to lowered expectations for the academic performance of some students (Good, 1987; Rosenthal, 1993; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992). Lowered expectations and such conditions contribute to students’ lower levels of performance (Anyon, 2005; Rist, 1970).

Rosenthal and Jacobson’s seminal study (1992) of “Pygmalion effects” classically investigated of the influence of educator expectation on student performance. Rosenthal and Jacobson’s subsequent research (1992) confirmed earlier findings, showing that (1) educators often form expectations grounded by biased views of social class (see also Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2000; Rist, 1970, 2000); (2) educator expectations of students create a hidden curriculum in which low-status students are offered fewer opportunities and supports than high-status students (Anyon, 1980; Rist, 1978; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia & Nolly, 2004); and (3) educator expectations reinforce existing class, ethnic, and gender inequalities (Anyon, 1980; Brantlinger, 2003). Jussim and Harber (2005) review of the
literature on self-fulfilling prophecy showed that the research on educator expectations as an area of further research.

Attitude of school leaders. Research documenting “Pygmalion effects” has focused on the attitudes of teachers (Babad, 1993; Jussim & Harber, 2005; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992; Weinstein, Gregory, & Strambler, 2004). Attitudes of leaders including principals and other school administrators are also important (Leithwood & Steinbach, 2003; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992; Whiteley, Sy, & Johnson, 2012). A large body of research has suggested school administrators are the primary gatekeepers of their schools, with power to influence attitudes toward, educational practices used with, and ultimately the outcomes attained by children from different social classes (Bourdieu, 1984; Capper et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2009; Hanson, 2005; Oakes, 1985; Rist, 1970; Willis, 1977).

Various studies have shown attitudes, beliefs, and values of leaders have profound impact on efforts to improve self-awareness and school achievement (Bullock, 1999; Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris & Hopkins, 2006; Leithwood et al., 2004; MacBeath & Moos, 2004). The values and attitudes of school administrators also tend to influence interpretations of policy (Fullan, 2006; Furman & Shields, 2005; Shields, 2004). Research suggests that attitudes of principals also influence the extent to which certain beliefs and practices are accepted (e.g., classist beliefs and practices) within their school communities (Theoharis, 2007).
Rationale and Problem

Schools are communities influenced by informal social norms and values (Sarason, 1974). School administrators are a part of the culture of the organization and, by virtue of authority, have power to influence the norms and values within the school (Bolman & Deal, 2010). In other words, leaders model and establish the culture for organizations, setting the stage for beliefs, values, and practices that are acceptable and unacceptable (Dipboye & Halverson, 2004).

The influential role of principals and other school leaders, can account for the variability in the equity of school practices by attributing assumptions, beliefs, and values that a school leader holds and inevitably communicates. Krug, Ahadi, and Scott (1991) study demonstrated how beliefs impacted perception of principals and how they view and interact with others. Ross and Gray (2006) further found that principal beliefs affected teacher beliefs and practices by indirectly contributing to teacher efficacy.

Despite evidence of administrator’s influence on teachers, rarely can such dynamics be directly observed (Fine, 1991). Administrators convey beliefs and attitudes through unconscious signals that subtly communicate the status ascribed to other people in schools and districts (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Such dynamics are typically hidden and any effort to change them would require visibility. Principals can begin be made aware of their own tacit prejudices and be attuned to personal beliefs and attitudes. An extensive review of the literature revealed a dearth of studies that examine principal belief and attitudes toward students from different social classes. Few qualitative studies have demonstrated how some educators, including principals, view low-income students
and their families (Howley et al., 2006; Rhodes, 2011). This study sought to explore the 
Yun and Weaver (2010) scale as a reliable measurement of poverty attitudes in public 
educational contexts.

**Purpose**

The study had multiple purposes: (1) to replicate the Yun & Weaver (2010) scale; 
(2) determine Appalachian elementary school principals’ attitudes toward the poor; (3) examine personal characteristics of principals that may be associated with attitudes and 
(4) identify potential associations among school principals attitudes toward the poor and personal characteristics and school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale).

This study focused on the use of Yun & Weaver’s (2010) ATP scale with public school principals. The study examined the relationships between principals’ poverty attitude scores (dependent variable) and demographic characteristics (independent variables), which might impact poverty attitudes. A comparison of the Yun & Weaver’s results was conducted including descriptive statistics, reliability, inter-item correlations and an exploratory factor analysis.

**Research Objectives**

This research study sought to answer questions about personal characteristics and school demographics that are associated with principal attitudes toward the poor. The overarching research questions were: To what extent do, if any, do (1) principal personal characteristics (social class background, political affiliation, gender, age, race/ethnicity, religiosity, Appalachian values, administration experience, and previous participation in
“poverty training” contribute to predicting attitudes toward the poor and (2) school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale) contribute to predicting attitudes toward the poor? These questions will be answered using the following research objectives.

**Research objective one.** Describe West Virginia public school principals on the following demographic characteristics:

A. Social class origin  
B. Political orientation  
C. Gender  
D. Age  
E. Ethnicity/race  
F. Religiosity  
G. Appalachian identity  
H. Experience  
I. Poverty training  
J. School socioeconomic status ES (percent free and reduced lunch)  
K. School locale (rural, suburban, and urban)

**Research objective two.** Determine the attitudes of principals toward poverty as measured by the Attitudes toward Poverty (ATP) Short Form Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010).
**Research objective three.** Determine any relationship between attitudes of poverty and each independent variable:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Ethnicity/race
E. Religiosity
F. Appalachian identity
G. Poverty training
H. School locale

**Research objective four.** Determine if a model exists that can predict principals’ attitudes toward poverty.

**Justification for Each Independent Variable**

The discussion below examines research that supported the decision to include each independent variable in the regression model that will be used to answer the research questions. Notably, research suggests that the following personal characteristics may influence attitudes toward poverty: social class background, political affiliation, gender, age, race/ethnicity, religiosity and Appalachian identity (Bullock, 2006; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Elam, 2002; Feagin, 1975; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Ortner, 1991; Sturm, 2008). Due to the absence of studies related to principal attitudes toward poverty and personal characteristics, it is uncertain whether similar results would be found until the study is replicated.
Many principals have participated in professional development on students living in poverty (e.g., Beegle, 2003; Jensen, 2009; Payne, 2005). Of the professional development, some poverty training curriculum has been critiqued for having a deficit perspective and to further stereotype people who are economically disadvantaged (Boomer et al., 2008). Irrespective of other characteristics of principals or the characteristics of the communities in which they work, poverty training may influence the attitudes or beliefs toward the poor, either promoting more structural views or further perpetuating stereotypical perspectives that adversely impacts student achievement in schools.

Further exploration indicates that other factors might impact principal attitudes. Research has indicated that the region of residence may impact attitudes toward social programs designed to help the poor (Bradshaw, 2007). For example, the extent to which a resident believes they hold Appalachian regional values might influence attitudes toward the poor. A principal’s attitude may be impacted by the years of experience within education or as an administrator might also be a factor. Additionally, the context of school demographic characteristics may also influence attitudes. In order to account for a variety of influences, this study included school locale and level of socioeconomic status, using a combination of free and reduced lunch rates (Reck & Reck, 1980; Riehl, 2000).

Social class. Some research has suggested a principal’s social class is influential on attitudes toward the poor. Furnham (1990) reported that beliefs about the reasons for poverty (i.e., individualistic vs. structural reasons) correlated with social class. Thompson and Hickey (2005) argued that social class has a pervasive influence on almost all beliefs
and attitudes. In general, people who are upper and middle class tend to favor individualistic explanations, while people who are poor tend to favor structural explanation. By contrast, a personal experience of poverty increased a person’s likelihood of favoring structural explanations (Park, Phillips, & Robinson, 2007). Such findings correspond to research reported earlier by Bullock (1999), Feagin (1975) and Kluegel and Smith (1981). The following discussion explains how each independent variable may interact with attitudes toward poverty.

**Political affiliation.** Poverty attitudes research findings have been strongly associated with political affiliation (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Furnham & Gunter, 1984). Americans who affiliate themselves with liberal political parties or report having liberal political beliefs tend to hold more positive attitudes toward the poor and to attribute poverty to structural causes rather than to the individual failings of poor people (Weiner, Osborne, & Rudolph, 2011; Zucker & Weiner, 1993). Historically, conservatives maintain the status quo and resist social change; resulting in a more likely attribution of poverty to the inadequacies of people who are impoverished (Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004). Findings regarding the impact of political affiliation on attitudes fit with Altemeyer’s (1981) theory of Right Wing Authoritarianism that individuals with highly authoritarian personalities tend to hold extremely negative attitudes toward all people, including the poor, who do not fit with so-called middle-class norms.

**Gender.** American perspectives of poverty vary on the basis of gender (Bullock, 1999 Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Gasker & Vafeas, 2003). Notably, studies have shown that women are less likely than men to blame the poor for circumstances (Hunt, 2004; Reutter
In keeping with more positive attitudes, women were more likely than men to support the government’s provision of welfare and other social service programs designed to ameliorate the effects of poverty (Gilens, 1999).

**Age.** Age has been shown to impact/influence attitudes toward poverty. Older individuals have a more negative view as opposed to younger Americans (Feagin, 1975). Older individuals tended to have negative attitudes toward the poor (Cozzarelli, et al., 2001) and are found to be more conservative towards racial diversity (Kleugel, 1990), and offered more individualistic explanations of poverty (Hunt, 2004). One possible influence could be the experience or lack of experience with hardship or poverty (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Kluegel & Smith, 1986). Older people may have experienced poverty during their own upbringing and may be more likely to attribute it to structural circumstances. The younger an individual the more likely they are to subscribe to a just world perspective (Furnham, 2003) which leads towards a belief that poverty is an acceptable condition (Oppenheimer, 2006).

**Race and ethnicity.** Many studies of attitudes toward poverty investigated the perspective of non-Hispanic Whites (Kluegel & Bobo, 2001; Hunt, Jackson, Powell, & Steelman, 2000). Some studies compare the attitudes of African Americans and Whites, but few studies investigated the Attitudes toward Poverty held by people of Asian, Hispanic, or Native American origin. Kluegel and Smith (1986) compared the attitudes toward poverty held by African American and white adults and found Whites more likely to subscribe to explanations of poverty that were individualistic, whereas African
Americans more likely to offer structural explanations. Similar findings were confirmed in later studies (Gilens, 1999; Hunt, 2004).

Research about attitudes of individuals from minority groups suggested a complex perspective. According to Hughes and Tuch (1999), recognize that members of minority groups may hold both “individualistic and structural beliefs about the causes of poverty at the same time” which they call a ‘dual consciousness’, to define this complex and even contradictory stance” (p. 188). Another example of contradiction can be found in Hunt’s (2004) study that both African Americans and Latinos more likely to hold structural poverty beliefs, while believing that the poor themselves are responsible for their own impoverished circumstances. Hunt (2004) further reported that people who were foreign-born more frequently held individualistic attitudes about poverty. Findings about people in general seemed to be somewhat contradictory to a study about the attitude of educators in particular. Comparing elementary teacher expectations for the performance of poor children, Dotts (1978) found both African American and White teachers held equally low expectations for economically disadvantaged students.

**Religiosity.** Religiosity refers to the strength of religious belief irrespective of what that belief entails. In other words, people who belong to different religious groups can be equally religious even though beliefs differ. Interestingly, despite the fact that many religions ask followers to be tolerant and generous, people who identify themselves as strongly religious have more negative attitudes toward the poor than do less religious people (Hunt, 2002; Youdin & Cleaveland, 2006). Peplau and Tyler (1975) found that religiosity correlated with high scores on the Belief in a Just World scale and increased
levels of blaming the poor for their poverty. Poverty was an acceptable outcome because the behaviors of poor people were the cause of poverty. This perspective is akin to an individualistic explanation of poverty.

**Appalachian identity.** Controversy exists on whether the Appalachian region promotes a unique cultural perspective. This cultural perspective is capable of influencing Appalachians’ fundamental values, beliefs, and attitudes, including their attitudes towards poverty (Billings & Blee, 2000; Duncan, 2001). Despite the controversy, researchers have found Appalachian identity associated with particular attitudes (Cooper, Knotts & Elders, 2011; Gottlieb, 2001). Therefore, the inclusion of Appalachian identification will be included in the regression models used to answer the research questions addressed in this proposed study to delimit comparisons between school administrators who self-identify the degree to which they hold Appalachian values.

**Poverty training.** Poverty training includes any professional development that has been provided in an attempt to provide multi-cultural perspectives including that of class. A review of professional development support for educators might include college courses, book studies, district initiatives and poverty training developed by Ruby Payne (2005) has been popular in the Appalachian region. Professional development in the area of poverty studies contribute to the perspective of school administrators. Understanding regional and cultural context and the combined contributions of such training programs and individual demographics is just as important as understanding separate associations with attitudes toward poverty. Therefore, participation and supporting professional development as a poverty intervention will be considered as a variable worthy of study.
School level socioeconomic status (SES). Many studies report association between the socioeconomic status of schools and other variables such as student achievement (Hughes, 1999; Kozol, 2012), student behavior (Harding, 2003; Hopson & Lee, 2011), teacher turnover (Grissom, 2011; Hughes, 1999), and teacher quality (Murnane & Steele, 2007; Monk, 2007). Research indicates educators’ attitudes do vary according to the SES of schools. Torff and Sessions (2009) found teachers in poor schools held negative attitudes toward professional development. Research on the correlations between school SES and educator attitudes is limited. The current study will not assume directionality. Instead, the proposed research will be open to the possibility that school SES may relate to attitudes toward poverty.

Locale. Several researchers identify locale as a variable likely to be associated with a variety of educational processes and outcomes (Gruenwald, 2003b; Hummon, 1992). Gruenwald (2003b), for example, suggested that an understanding of place is “vital to understanding the nature of our relationships with each other and the world” (p. 622). Research has suggested that historically rural Americans are likely negative attitudes toward poverty than urban and suburban Americans due to religious and moral conservatism (Bullock, 1999; Gimpel & Karnes, 2006).

Sherman’s (2006) study of individuals living in rural settings identified conflicting attitudes toward the poor. According to Sherman, the adoption of local values is important to individual “moral capital” (p. 891). Even very poor individuals with high levels of “moral capital” are accepted in rural communities and given access to whatever
economic and social opportunity exists. Equally poor people with low levels of “moral capital” are judged harshly and offered little support in rural settings.

Appalachia has suffered from negative stereotyping (Billings & Blee, 2000). Despite implementation of welfare programs initiated since the Johnson administration in 1964, socioeconomic challenges, high unemployment rates, low academic achievement, and high school dropout rates continue to plague Appalachia (Johnson, Showalter, Klein, & Lester, 2014). The Appalachian region has higher poverty rates and wider gaps of income inequality than non-Appalachian regions (Joshi & Gebremedhin, 2012). The Appalachian region is a rural region which could influence poverty attitudes of principals.

Findings from studies of attitudes toward poverty support the inclusion of demographic variables as discussed in this section (Atherton et al., 1993; Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin 1972; Golding & Middleton, 1982; MacDonald, 1971, 1972; Parikh, Post, & Flowers, 2011; Rosenthal, 1993; Smith & Stone, 1989; Whalen, 2005; Yun & Weaver, 2010). The regression models used will evaluate the examination of the separate and combined associations between the independent variables and principals attitudes toward the poor.

Significance

Schooling in America reflects the stratification of the larger society, and the individuals who are most often disenfranchised by the educational system tend to be poor (Berliner, 2005; Biddle, 2001; Kozol, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Rothstein, 2008). As one way to address this stratification, policy makers search for ways to eliminate a
persistent achievement gap between lower- and higher-SES students; between students from racial and ethnic majorities; and those from marginalized racial and ethnic groups (Barton, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2005; Sirin 2005). Despite educational reforms proposed to close such gaps, many impoverished students still fail to achieve success in school (Reardon, 2011).

Researchers investigated school efforts to close achievement gaps and found efforts are often unsuccessful due because they failed to examine and change educators’ underlying assumptions about poor children (Garcia & Guerra, 2004). Some researchers found deficit perspectives negatively influence poor children (e.g., Shields et al., 2005; Valencia, 1997; Weiner, 2006). As a corollary, Kannapel, Clements, Taylor and Hibpshman (2005) found a shared belief that all students can learn is important to creating a positive school climate. Subsequently, positive climate is a condition necessary for improved achievement outcomes for students living in poverty (Hopson & Lee, 2011).

Principals play a major role in shaping school culture (Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Bolman & Deal, 2003; Cheney & Davis, 2011; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood et al., 2006; Lucas & Valentine, 2002). Principals’ attitudes toward the poor influenced the attitudes of the professionals with whom they work (Simone, 2012). Understanding attitudes and what variables influence those attitudes can help principals, school districts, principal preparation programs, and state policy makers take action to ensure all educators who are employed in high poverty schools, endorse and perpetuate beliefs that support positive outcomes for students.
Definitions

For the purpose of this study the following are key concepts.

Attitude: Attitude is defined as a “psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 1). According to Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962, p. 139) attitudes “are enduring systems of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to social objects”. Bickel (2013) further explains that Mead (1934) understood the concept of attitude as a repertoire of behaviors that give practical value to the environment” (p.359). This current study borrows from these conceptual definitions in that poverty attitudes are unconscious but expressed in either positive or negative directions and formed within a social context.

Culture: Culture is defined by Cooper and Leong (2008) as “customs, norms, practices, and social institutions, including psychological processes…[and] beliefs, values, and practices, including religious and spiritual traditions” (p. 133). This study will utilize the Cooper and Leong definition when referencing culture.

Poverty attributions: Poverty attributions are explanations of “why” particular individuals or groups are poor. Research studies have demonstrated a linkage between poverty attributions and attitudes toward poverty (Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin, 1972; Feather, 1974; Furnham; 1982b, 1987; Furnham & Lewis, 1986). Poverty attributions influence beliefs about whether poor are deserving of support (Cozzarelli et al., 2001) and whether the nation ought to provide programs such as welfare (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003).
Summary

The argument to support a study of principals’ attitudes toward poverty is described in this chapter. Emphasized is the principal’s role in shaping the beliefs held by and practices used by educators in schools. Also supported is the claim that teacher attitudes and practices influence expectations for the academic performance of students from different social classes. A robust line of inquiry demonstrated that expectations influenced instructional practices with students from different social classes and that these practices limit or enable students’ academic achievement.

The chapter also provided evidence supporting the inclusion of a set of independent variables for explaining variation in principal attitudes. These variables are: social class background, political affiliation, gender, age, race/ethnicity, religiosity, and Appalachian identity, years of experience, poverty training, school level socioeconomic status (SES), and locale. Figure 1 illustrates the applicable associations principal attitudes toward poverty may impact equitable outcomes for students:

![Figure 1- Relationship of Principal Poverty Attitudes on Student Outcomes](image-url)
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Chapter One provided a rationale for the study and presented research that supports the variables previously found to be associated with poverty attitudes. As discussed in Chapter One, empirical studies exist that examine how education professionals view the poor or treat children raised in impoverished families (Brown, 2004; Duncan, 1999; Howley et al., 2006). Specifically, researchers have examined education administrators’ beliefs or attitudes about poverty (Brown, 2004), and the variables associated with those beliefs and attitudes (Lee & Herner-Patnode, 2010; McCray, Wright, & Beachum, 2004; Parikh et al., 2011; Pohan & Mathison, 2007). This study explored the use of Yun & Weaver (2010) Attitudes toward Poverty (ATP) scale as a measurement tool for determining principals’ attitudes toward poverty, as well as possible interactions that specific demographic variables might influence or predict such attitudes.

This chapter summarizes the literature and situates the proposed study within the broader context of (1) social psychology and the attitude construct, (2) attitudes of poverty in the United States and specifically the rural Appalachian context, (3) review of research on attitudes toward the poor, and (4) attitudes toward poverty grounded within the context of school and the role of school leadership.

Social Psychology and the Attitude Construct

The field of social psychology has revealed extensive research and literature on the formation of attitude, the concept of attitude and how these constructs impact social
processes and human interactions. This chapter will summarize social psychology literature relevant as a theoretical construct anchoring this study’s ability to identify relationships between attitude and potential predictors of attitude formation and beliefs as related to poverty stereotypes and stigma.

The study of attitudes is an important and established concept in social psychology (Allport, 1935, 1954b; Bem, 1970; Campbell, 1950; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918; Tourangeau, 1992; Thurstone, 1931; Wilson, 1998). Social psychological research has historically refined the definition of attitudes and the attitude construct. Allport (1954b) defined the attitude construct as a way we “understand and explain how the thought, feeling and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other human beings” (p. 5). Krech et al., (1962: 139) further defined attitude as “enduring systems of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to social objects”. Kunst-Wilson, and Zajonc (1980) found that at the individual level, people are often unconscious and unaware of attitudes and make little connection to their beliefs about other humans. More recently, Eagly and Chaiken (1993) further conceptualized and defined attitude as “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (p. 1). Social psychologists widely use the attitude construct to study how unconscious attitudes impact individual belief systems.

Psychologists and researchers who study cognitive processes including the relationship between attitudes and belief formation seek to examine the relationship between attitude and belief (Forgas, 2001). Beliefs are internal assumptions that people
make about themselves, others and about how they themselves expect things to be in the world (Anderson, 2007; Furnham, 2003). Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) found that belief systems are powerful influences on attitudes, which in turn affect the behaviors and actions of those who hold them.

Aronson, Wilson and Akert (2010) define social cognition as the way that people think about other people. These theories support the idea that we are constantly internally making sense of our selves based upon prior experience and social interactions. Herbert Mead, in Mind, Self and Society (1934) purported that of all species only humans have the ability to take the role of the self and the other. Mead (1934) further described the processes in which humans are able to hold internal conversations within their own thinking processes and are able to interact socially by how they believe they are perceived by others. The understanding of the role of the other is explanatory in determining how attitudes can be changed by developing empathy. The ability to understand these processes is critical in an effort to produce change in beliefs. Mead’s theory established that “attitudes are socially acquired” (Bickel, 2013 p.328).

Attitudes are socially acquired and humans interact within groups. Individuals tend to adopt similar attitudes, behaviors and favor members of their in-group (Van Bavel & Cunningham, 2009). Social identity theory supports the idea that knowledge is gained form the groups to which we belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). According to Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell (1987), social categorization is an internal process that individuals do unconsciously by sorting the self and others into categories or groups. The
identification of one of two distinct groups unconsciously elicits preference for one group over another (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

An examination of how beliefs are related to attitudes can be seen by an examination of ways stereotypes are formed. Stereotypes are beliefs that a person holds about a particular group of people (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Tajfel, 1972) and is an unconscious process found to affect behavior (Greenwald & Banaji, 1994). Allport (1954a) emphasized that through repeated internal conversations within the mind there is the creation of an “exaggerated belief associated with a category” (p. 191). The categorizing into groups is what creates the formation of a stereotype. The repeated experiences of interaction predispose individuals to make repeated judgments (Gawronski, Hofmann, & Wilbur, 2006).

According to Katz and Braly (1933) “a stereotype is a fixed impression, which conforms little to the fact it pretends to represent” (p.281). Stereotypes tend to favor or disfavor individuals based upon the value of an attitude (Allport, 1954). Negative stereotype effects have been found to produce lowered academic expectations for students who are African American (Aronson et al., 1999; Steele & Aronson, 1995), Latino (Aronson, Quinn, & Spencer, 1998), socioeconomic status (Croizet & Claire, 1998), and female (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). Conversely positive stereotype effects have been reported for Asians and/or males in the area of math achievement (Mendoza-Denton, Kahn, & Chan, 2008; Smith & White 2002).

Stereotypes about the poor are reinforced by reasons or causes associated with poverty beliefs (Bullock, 1999; Lott, 2002). Beliefs about poverty influence interactions
with those who are disadvantaged and whether or not they support programs that benefit the poor (Bullock et al., 2003; Gans, 1995; Reutter, Harrison, & Neufeld, 2002; Shirazi & Biel, 2005). Poverty stereotypes have been found to be detrimental to those who are economically disadvantaged within the United States (Gans, 1995), especially within the region of Appalachia (Billings, 1974) and also within the educational system (Kozol, 2012; Lareau & Horvat, 1999).

**Poverty Explanations: Stigma**

Deeply entrenched poverty stereotypes contribute to the social stigma of poverty. Members of marginalized groups are at risk of being stigmatized (Major & O’Brien, 2005). In particular, outgroup members experience increased levels of prejudice and discrimination (Major & O’Brien, 2005). Crocker, Major and Steele (1998) found that members of disadvantaged groups evoke negative responses from others. Many individuals who are part of such outgroups also hold negative dispositions that further stigmatize others within their same outgroup (Shapiro & Neuberg, 2008). A relationship exists between stigma and discrimination (Baral, Karki & Newell, 2007). This relationship is important to perpetuation of a cycle of negative self-perception and apathy which further leads to lowered self-worth and avoidance behaviors.

Fiske (2010) recognized that individuals often make comparisons between high status and low status outgroups. Jost and Banaji (1994) found that individuals at higher levels of socioeconomic status often stigmatize those of lower status in order to maintain their position. Crandall, Eshleman and O’Brien (2002) found individuals with a high level of the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) are positively associated with prejudice against
certain outgroups. Stigmatization occurs when there is a conflict between values bought about these processes.

**Poverty Explanations: Structural**

Poverty attributions are the explanations for “why” particular individuals or groups are poor. Structural attributions include poverty explanations of poverty based on political, economic and institutional structures. Research findings indicate that poverty attributions have been strongly linked to attitudes toward poverty (Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin, 1972; Furnham, 1982b; Furnham & Lewis, 1986; Zucker & Weiner, 1993). Poverty attributions have been shown to influence beliefs about whether the poor are deserving of support (Cozzarelli et al., 2001). The causal attributions for poverty correlate to the causes associated with poverty (Bullock, 1999; Cozzarelli et al., 2001).

Attributions of poverty identified within the literature favors two major causal beliefs, structural or individual (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin 1972; Shirazi & Biel, 2005). Structural attributions of poverty are related to explanations of societal or external factors, such as the economy or institutions where certain groups are favored within those systems. Structural attributions have been linked to political liberalism (Kluegel & Smith, 1986). According to Royce (2008) disparities and inequalities exist for equity and access for quality education and opportunities jobs in the United States. Despite the realization that job shortages, low wages, and economic exploitation negatively impacts life chances for many poor Americans. Despite this knowledge explanation for individualistic explanations proliferate American culture.
Poverty Explanations: Personal Deficiency

Individual attributions of poverty are explanations thought to be caused by personal deficiencies which are inherent within the individual themselves. This kind of attribution is associated with an attitude Katz (1981) called “blaming the poor”. Poverty attributions and belief associations have suggested the more privileged an individual, the more likely that he/she is to support more individualistic explanations of poverty (Lee, Lewis, & Jones, 1992; Shirazi & Biel, 2005).

Poverty attributions have been strongly linked to attitudes toward poverty in the literature (Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli, et al., 2001; Feagin, 1972; Feather, 1974; Furnham, 1982a, b Furnham & Lewis, 1986). Other explanations of poverty such as fatalistic attributions of poverty related to bad luck or circumstance have been found in the literature but have less evidence supporting a correlation with poverty attitudes (Bullock et al., 2003; Cryns, 1977; Feagin, 1972).

Poverty in the United States

Within the United States ideas about inequality are justified by strong beliefs in individualism and meritocracy which have been found to contribute to “classism” or “prejudicial attitudes and stereotypes that derogate poor and working class people” (Bullock, 2006, p. 1). Contributing to empirical studies of attitudes about the poor are three predictive belief constructs that are particularly relevant within the United States: a Belief in a Just World, the Protestant Work Ethic, and Right Wing Authoritarianism (Furnham & Proctor, 1988; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Wagstaff, 1983; Zucker & Weiner, 1993). The three constructs identified have been used in studies of poverty attitudes, as
well as development of scales for such studies and are related to individualistic explanations of poverty (Bullock, 1999; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Hunt, 2004, Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Smith & Stone, 1989).

**Belief in a Just World.**

The “belief in a just world” concept has been the subject of substantial research, which has shed light on how people interpret and explain events as just or unjust (Lipkus & Siegler, 1993; Lerner, 1980). Belief in a just world provides construct for explaining why people tend to blame innocent victims (Karuza & Carey, 1984). The majority of research related to a just world concept has examined how people perceive others who have suffered unfairly (Lerner & Miller, 1978). Those who have strong beliefs in a just world see their world as controllable. According to Rubin and Peplau (1975), victim blaming is a way to maintain the belief in a just world (p. 83). The belief in a just world serves several psychological purposes by providing explanation for adversity (Lerner, 1980), engendering a sense of order and stability, and reducing feelings of guilt about what would otherwise be obvious injustices (Lerner & Miller, 1978).

The theoretical concept of “belief in a just world” deserves special attention in the present discussion of attitudes toward poverty in the United States for several reasons. Just world beliefs are deeply entrenched in the United States; are widely held, socialized at an early age (Furnham, 1985), and meet various psychological needs (e.g., Lerner, 1980; Lerner & Miller, 1978). Research findings indicate beliefs that the world is fair have been related to social justice issues, including those around poverty (Furnham & Gunter, 1984). Third, belief in a just world is related to poverty attitudes that directly
influence public opinion and levels of support for policies and programs that provide assistance to low-income families (Mudrack, 2005) and other disadvantaged people (Lipkus & Seigler, 1993).

Several scales assess individual beliefs regarding whether the world is fair (Furnham, 2003). The original Belief in a Just World (BJW) scale was developed by Rubin and Peplau in 1975. The BJW scale was revised by Furnham and Proctor (1988) and Lipkus (1991). Both scales resulted in a pattern documenting a correlation between just world belief and attitudes about the poor which held that beliefs in a just world were positively correlated for negative beliefs about the poor and blaming the poor (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Furnham & Gunter, 1984; Furnham, 1993; Wagstaff, 1983).

Whatley and Riggio (1992) found that men have stronger just world beliefs than women. Higher social status and age (younger) have been positively correlated with high levels of just world beliefs (Mudrack, 2005). Freeman (2006) found that jurors with high levels of just world orientation often assigned guilt to poor defendants’ dependent upon the socioeconomic status (SES) of defendants.

The strong belief in a just world is correlated to a sense of fairness and discriminatory acts. Tanaka (1999) used the Rubin and Peplau BJW survey (1975) with undergraduates and found heightened levels of fairness in individuals with strong beliefs in a just world. Lipkus and Siegler (1993) study found a strong belief in a just world was correlated to prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory practices. In general, individuals with higher just world beliefs are less likely to find it necessary to provide consider those who are poor, believe that the poor will not be able to benefit from such assistance and
that the poor have the same opportunities as others but do not take advantage of these opportunities (Appelbaum, Lennon & Lawrence, 2006; Dalbert, 2001; Lipkus & Siegler, 1993). In general, studies indicate a strong belief in a just world impacts individual perception of the poor (Cozzarelli et al., 2001).

**Protestant Work Ethic (PWE)**

The Protestant Work Ethic is described by Weber (1946) to recognize the relationship between religious beliefs that value a strong work ethic which has been found to be a relevant and predictive construct that contributes to the development of poverty attitudes (MacDonald, 1972; Mirels & Garrett, 1971). Furnham (1990) found that the Protestant Work Ethic links hard work and spiritual salvation, this represents a linkage consistent with just world hypotheses. Furnham’s earlier study (1982a) found that individuals who have a high PWE blame those who are unemployed as responsible for their situation, an individualistic attribution of poverty.

Wagstaff (1983) found that poverty attitudes correlated with religiosity and the Protestant Work Ethic. Tang and Tzeng’s study (1988) of university students used the Mirels and Garrett’s (1971) Protestant Work Ethic Scale. Results indicated “Republican party identification” and younger age correlated with high levels on the Protestant Work Ethic scale (p. 167). Lipkus and Siegler (1993) further extended these findings and identified two possible orientations, that individuals have either a justice or a caring orientation.
Right Wing Authoritarianism


Another tool developed and used to determine individual attitudes through a different lens was the Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale (Altemeyer, 1981, 1994, 2004). The RWA scale uses higher scores to indicate the religious values of an individual. Individuals who score higher are found to be more religious, hold more rigid views of morality that link to the Protestant Work Ethic, and support authority figures (Altemeyer, 1994). Altemeyer (2006) explained this attitudinal cluster in three concepts: “authoritarian submission, or regarding authority as good; authoritarian aggression, or general aggressiveness perceived as sanctioned by the established authorities; and conventionalism, or adherence to conventions perceived as endorsed by society” (p. 9).

In particular, authoritarianism and conservatism as political ideologies have explanatory power in relationship to attitudes about the poor. Jost and Burgess (2000) found that Belief in a Just World, the Protestant Work Ethic, and Right-Wing
Authoritarianism are explanations of poverty that are positively correlated toward individualistic attributions of poverty. These findings were later supported by Cozzarelli et al. (2001).

**Cultural Attributions**

Oscar Lewis’s culture of poverty theory (1966) sought to provide explanations for generational poverty. Critics of the theory of generational poverty claim that it ignores and provides a myopic view of poverty and ignores systemic causes and blames the values of those who are poor (Lamont & Small, 2008). Prolonged contact with the poor is likely to produce structural attributions of poverty (Nasser, 2007).

Most importantly, the explanations of, causes of, or attributions for poverty both constitute and reflect personal attitudes toward the poor (MacDonald, 1972; Kluegel & Smith, 1986). These beliefs operate within a social context which has direct implications on social capital and the opportunity structure of individuals within communities. Explanations of poverty that are influenced by cultural attributions can affect whether someone is more likely to subscribe to individualistic or structural poverty attributions (Bullock et al., 2003). Cultural theory claims that the worldview of the poor is different from that of the middle class and that the poor are deficient (Royce, 2008, (p.54). Some researchers on poverty attitudes have explored culture as a factor (Cozzarelli et al., 2001).

**Poverty and culture in Appalachia.** Literature on the Appalachian region is especially rich in regards to cultural views of poverty. As an example, media images have contributed to negative stereotyping of this region (Billings et al., 1999). Duncan’s study (1999) illustrated how the social interactions between the haves and have-nots in an
Appalachian mining town negatively affected people who were poor and illuminated how social capital was limited to those with power. The rural Appalachian context is specifically relevant to an examination of poverty attitudes based upon negative stereotyping and historically documented poverty (Billings & Blee, 2000).

In Appalachia, high rates of poverty (16.1% average, with rural being 20% or greater) far above the national average (14.3%) have existed from 2007-2011 (Pollard & Jacobsen, 2013). Poverty rates correlate with educational attainment; for example, 27% percent of Appalachians have a high school diploma versus 85% across the United States (Pollard & Jacobsen, 2013, p. 22, 31). Despite programs aimed at assisting the poor, these trends continue. Geographic isolation, disproportionate social and economic distress is the reality for many students in Appalachia and represents challenges for school leaders.

**Context of School Leadership**

In 2011 within the United States “twenty-two percent” of all children were living in poverty in (Coley & Baker, 2013, p. 7. According to Lott (2002), poor people are devalued and experience discrimination, especially in school. One outcome of social justice and diversity objectives in educational administration should consider how inclusion of poverty attitudes and evaluation of professional development programs ensuring re having the most positive outcomes for educators. Educators, comparable to social work professionals, work with impoverished populations and have direct impact on how the poor are served. Poverty attitudes impact the equity of education received by disadvantaged students within the context of school by school professionals. Evidence of the transmission of negative poverty attitudes may be found in Valencia’s work (1997) on
deficit thinking. Valencia (1997) specifically identified how low and different expectations negatively impact children who are economically disadvantaged. Valencia (2010) further examines how these biases maintain the achievement gap and promote social reproduction.

Attitudes toward poverty are important within the context of school and education within society. Most education research about class has focused on how schools, but not educational leaders per se, contribute to social reproduction and the production of inequality (Sergiovanni, 1987; 2006). The philosophy of Bourdieu (1973) is relevant to any discussion of ways that educational systems reproduce social inequities. Bourdieu’s theory is useful in understanding the practices of a school leadership (Eacott, 2013; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Bourdieu’s theory is especially relevant to the habitus of school administration within the field of the school. The use of Bourdieu’s concept of habitus enables researchers to talk about education leaders in ways that include relationships within the structures of schools.

Understanding these theories and concepts is helpful in understanding the role of leadership and how a poverty attitude might promote or hinder opportunities for poor students. The idea of “field” embodies the social space which includes the school and the context of economics, power, and politics and how these fit within the larger structure of the community (Bourdieu, 1990). The school is a field (structured social space) that contains people who dominate (i.e., administrators and teachers) and people who are dominated (i.e., the students). The relative power of the principal defines the principal’s
position in the field and thus defines the principal’s possible strategies for influencing the field and others within it (Wright, 2000).

Schools are institutions where authority and power influence are intertwined (Lenski, 1966). School principals’ beliefs and attitudes about poverty and its causes are of interest because principals’ play an important role in either perpetuating social class stratification or promoting social mobility. Principals have a direct impact on school climate and what happens in classrooms and communities (Sergiovanni, 2001). There is robust evidence of how social reproduction occurs in schools (Bourdieu, 1986).

Especially relevant to the discussion of how principals’ attitudes toward poverty affect social class dynamics in schools is the established concept of deficit theories in education. The deficit view posits that students fail because of some inherent internal deficit (Valencia, 1997). Educators who hold a deficit view may believe that parents do not value education, that they send their children to school unprepared and unmotivated to learn and behave properly. A deficit view model of thinking believes that students fail because of “internal deficits or deficiencies” and are believed to be unlikely to succeed (Valencia, 1997, p. 2). Educators lower their expectations for children they believe are not capable of performing (Darling-Hammond, 1999). Lowered expectations affect how educators treat students and can result in some students coming to see themselves as less intelligent and less deserving than others.

Teachers and administrators hold significant power and authority over the students they serve. How they employ the gaze impacts the social dynamics within the school. Foucault (1977, p. 155) recognized the “power of the gaze” for the purpose of
controlling behavior. For example, if teacher behaviors in low-income schools are not scrutinized, the teachers may feel they can treat students who are economically disadvantaged in ways that would not be tolerated in middle or high income schools. This dynamic allows for a norming of the behavior of the teachers, and use of their own “gaze” to influence others to hold similar views. Zou and Trueba (2002) believe the gaze is the reference through which people construct their identities (privileged and powerless) and is dominated by those in internalized positional power (p. 69). Positional power is related to the positioning of perspective based on in groups and outgroup dynamics.

The ideology of “blaming the victim” has been used to justify discrimination and is a form of scapegoating (Furnham, 1993; Ryan, 1971). Such behaviors are reinforced through what King (1991) identifies as “an uncritical habit of mind (including perceptions, attitudes, assumptions and beliefs) that justifies inequity” (p. 135). McKenzie and Scheurich (2004) further explain that such inequities are “reinforced among administrators and teachers through formal and informal communication, assumptions and beliefs” (p. 601-602). These unconscious patterns of thought are impacted by poverty attitudes and provide a vehicle to contributing to social reproduction.

Educators should examine and reflect on their own beliefs and explore possible conscious and unconscious reasons for not acknowledging attitudes (Hackman, 2005). Changing negative and destructive patterns and educating all children to achieve at high levels may require schools to alter the expectations they hold for all students but in particular for children who are economically disadvantaged (Ladson-Billings, , 2000). A
Deficit view is the default for many educator attitudes towards poverty (Gorski, 2008; Valencia, 1999). Deficit thinking is often ignored because of an inability to break outside of established ways of thinking which may have unintended outcomes that are negative for the poor. The need to examine such attitudes is a matter of empowerment or possible harm to those who are poor (Krummer-Nevo, Weiss-Gal, & Monnickendam, 2009). Within Appalachia, such a perspective is situated within a cultural context of resistance and victim blaming complicating any analysis of the intersection of poverty, race, rurality, and class (Dempsey, 2007).

Although no specific empirical research could be found precisely on the attitudes of school principals toward the poor; the poverty attitudes of school counselors have been examined (Parikh et al., 2011). Parikh et al. (2011) study of school counselors described attitudes towards students impacted by strong belief in a just word and political ideology. The study recommended training and professional development of school counselors should be emphasized in pre-service programs.

The role of school leadership in part is to advocate for poorly served students (Lugg & Shoho, 2006). Capper et al., (2006) argue leadership for social justice includes objectively reviewing practices and policies that marginalize students. Multicultural training in educational programs often fails to recognize the need to include social class within topics about diversity and fail to prepare educational administrators in the area of social justice (Shields, 2004).
Measuring Poverty Attitudes

A large body of social science research about poverty has been limited to measuring poverty rates, describing the effects of poverty, or describing the poor themselves. A review of the literature found several empirical studies measuring poverty attitudes across a variety of disciplines: social workers (Clark, 2007; Gasker & Vafeas, 2003; Krummer-Nevo & Lev-Wiesel, 2005; Landmane & Renge, 2010; Perry, 2003; Rehner et al., 1997; Rosenthal, 1993; Sun, 2001; Weaver & Nackerud, 2005; Weiss, 2006), nurses (Reutter et al., 2004), medicine (Price et al., 1988), law (Bertrand, Mullainathan, & Shafir, 2004), and psychology (Cozzarelli et al., 2001). Findings from these existing studies support poverty attitudes have been correlated to political orientation, socioeconomic status, age, gender, race, and ethnicity. The existing social science research on poverty attitudes has a lot to offer the field of education where a gap in the literature exists.

Scales that measure poverty attitudes were developed from items on established scales used to measure predictors of poverty attitudes (Belief in a Just World, Protestant Work Ethic, and Right Wing Authoritarianism) (Furnham, 2003). Research studies on the development of attitudes toward the poor are found as early as MacDonald’s (1971) study. The Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor (ATP) scale was created by Atherton et al., 1993).

Atherton et al. (1993) is a landmark study that developed a now widely used scale for measuring poverty attitudes. The Atherton scale was developed for the field of social work. The instrument was developed by a review of the literature around poverty
attitudes and the known relationships between the developments of poverty attitudes in the United States. The Atherton et al. (1993) ATP scale has been used to measure poverty attitudes and predictors of poverty attitudes in many fields including business, sociology, psychology, nursing, medicine and law. Through a search on EBSCO of poverty, attitudes, scales and program evaluation within social and psychology research and educational journals across a variety of field such as business, medical including nursing and counseling, no study was found to address poverty attitudes of educators, specifically using the ATP scale as a measurement tool or for program evaluation.

The original ATP was a thirty-seven item, five point Likert-type scale, higher score indicates more positive views of poverty and lower scores indicate more negative attitudes toward poverty. The scale demonstrated construct validity with a Cronbach’s alpha of .93, and a split-half reliability of .87 (Atherton et al., 1993). Atherton et al. (1993) encouraged broader use of the scale and gave permission for any future researcher to use the instrument. The ATP (1993) has been used as a measurement tool in a variety of studies and report scientifically sound results (Coryn, 2002; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Gasker & Vafeas, 2003; Kovarna, 2006; Menzel, Wilson & Doolen, 2014; Phillips, 1994; Proctor et al., 2010; Sword, Reutter, Meagher-Stewart, & Rideout, 2004; Whalen, 2005).

Reutter et al. (2004) study used the Atherton et al. (1993) ATP scale and found nursing students subscribed to structural explanations of poverty. Most specifically in the study by Reutter et al. (2004), those who had the most positive attitudes toward the poor were generally older, had more frequent contact with the poor, and had experienced a greater exposure to poverty. Kovarna (2006) also examined nursing students’ attitudes
toward the poor and found them to be generally neutral, with one-third of the respondents who indicated more positive attitudes.

Whalen’s study of master’s level social worker students (2005) found attitudes toward the poor were strongly correlated with liberal/conservative worldviews and religion. Generally, the findings from poverty attitudes studies found that older professionals and those who have had greater exposure to poverty seem to have the most positive attitudes toward the poor. Collectively, research on attitudes toward the poor shows that those entering different professions hold a range of attitudes and beliefs about poverty.

Yun and Weaver (2010) developed the ATP Shortened Form (ATP-SF) from the Atherton et al. ATP (1993) scale. The Yun and Weaver (2010) short form has twenty-one Likert-type items retained from the original ATP which contained thirty-seven items. The short form has been used when it is more likely to generate higher survey returns. Internal consistency of the short form ranged from .87 to .89 which is within acceptable levels but, was lower than the original ATP scale (which produced ranges .87 to .93.) The ATP SF includes three factors: personal deficiency, stigma and structural perspective. Yun and Weaver’s scale (2010) has been used in other fields of social work, nursing and counseling in evaluation of poverty simulations (Crumly, 2013; Menzel et al., 2014; Noone, Sideras, Gubrud-Howe, Voss, & Matthews, 2012; Patterson & Hulton, 2011; Ricks, 2014; Vliem, 2015; Wittenhauer, Ludwick, Baughman, & Fishbein, 2015). This instrument has been successfully used for assessing pre/post interventions evaluating the change in poverty attitudes (Menzel et al., 2014; Vliem, 2015).
Researchers and practitioners interested in measuring poverty interventions or tracking poverty attitudes longitudinally should consider these findings when a goal is to improve or evaluate attitudes toward the poor. Most importantly, the availability of a shortened version of the scale means it can be administered more quickly and yet retain the validity of the scale, making it easier to administer across multiple settings. This shortened version has much to offer education in the area of poverty attitudes and in particular the use of school principals adds to the discussion on a generalizability of the scale. The Yun and Weaver ATP scale (2010) may provide further exploratory assertions about attitudes toward poverty, as well as provide future investigators with an instrument that may prove useful within educational settings.

In recent years both scales, the Atherton et al. (1993) (e.g., Stafford, 2014) and the Yun & Weaver (2010) (e.g., Crumley, 2013; Ricks, 2014; Wittenhauer et al., 2015) have both been successfully used to measure attitudes toward poverty. These scales have also been used in studies of evaluation of professional development programs to measure outcomes for interventions aimed at improving poverty attitudes. Menzel et al. (2014) conducted a recent study to measure nursing students’ attitudes toward poverty using a pre and posttest method to compare poverty attitudes before and after a simulation intervention. Menzel et al. (2014) used the Atherton et al. (1993) scale and compared their findings to items selected by Yun and Weaver’s (2010) shortened form. While the study suffered from an inadequate sample size and no significance was found in regards to the intervention, the findings indicated that both forms had comparable reliability.
Both the original 1993 ATP and the ATP-SF have been used in recent years for program evaluation. Weaver and Yun (2011), researchers who developed the ATP-SF in 2010, used the original Atherton et al. ATP (1993) to measure the impact of social work courses to the poverty attitudes of undergraduate students. They found a significant structural poverty attitudes increase which suggests that education influences poverty attitudes. Patterson and Hulton (2012) successfully used Yun and Weaver’s (2010) revised ATP-SF as an evaluation tool to measure changes in poverty attitudes of graduate students who participated in poverty service trips. Measuring poverty attitudes using a pre and posttest design for a poverty simulation intervention was found to produce improvement on one factor of stigma.

Blair, Brown, Schoepflin, and Taylor (2014) have expanded by adding items to Atherton et al. (1993) developed the Undergraduate Perceptions of Poverty Tracking Survey (UPPST) contains 39 items that include an emphasis on concepts of social empathy and cognitive distancing. Blair et al. (2014) critiqued Yun and Weavers Short Form based on limited findings by Patterson and Hulton’s (2011) study of 43 nursing students as one reason they chose not to use the ATP-SF. A review of the literature found one study that has used UPPST (McAuliff, 2012). Yun and Weaver (2010) and Atherton et al. (1993), have been used more extensively to evaluate poverty interventions, simulations, course work, and materials.

One important use of the ATP tool would be to measure poverty attitudes across time and a tool to evaluate professional development poverty interventions. For example, Boomer et al. (2008) critique a popular professional development intervention, A
Framework for Understanding Poverty (1998, 2005) as an example of deficit thinking. Their study analyzed the claims set by Payne which support the teaching of middle class values (1998; 2005) and identify lack of evidence to support Payne’s theories. Grounded in an individualistic explanations of poverty, is a training program frequently used and adopted by school districts to assist teachers who work with students from low-income families (Bohn, 2007; Boomer et al., 2008; Osei-Kofi, 2005; Smiley & Helfenbein, 2006; Valencia, 2010).

This nationally known poverty program relies on the assumption that multi-generational conditions contribute to a “culture of poverty” and fosters the explicit teaching of middle class values, norms, and practices. The program has been criticized by a number of scholars (Gorski, 2008; Ng & Rury, 2006; Osei-Kofi, 2005; Valencia, 2010). Moreover, these values are communicated to children and interfere with success in school (Gorski, 2008; Kunjufu, 2006). Some researchers have argued that poverty training is likely to contribute to educators’ negative attitudes toward the poor (Gorski, 2006a, b; Howley et al., 2006; Rhodes, 2011; Smiley & Helfenbein, 2006).

The criticism of the culture of poverty philosophy as published by Ruby Payne (2005) identified those who lack middle class beliefs and values as families who perpetuate unproductive beliefs, values, norms, and practices from one generation to the next. The culture of poverty perspective identifies individuals and families as devoid of the values, norms, and practices of people living in poverty in comparison to that of middle class. Payne (2005) advocates the explicit teaching of middle-class values, norms,
and practices as a corrective to the “culture of poverty” and ignores any possible negative educational and social consequences (Gorski, 2008; Howley et al., 2006). Despite the popularity of the Payne’s theory and related training materials, research does not substantiate Lewis’ “culture of poverty” (1966).

Although a number of researchers have sharply criticized the Ruby Payne poverty training program as based on a deficit perspective of poverty (Boomer et al., 2008; Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009; Gorski, 2006, 2008; Howley et al., 2006; Kunjufu, 2006; Ng-Rury, 2006, 2009; Osei-Kofi, 2005; Rhodes, 2011; Sato & Lensmire, 2009; Smiley & Helfenbein, 2006, 2011; Valencia, 2010; Weiderspan & Danziger, 2009) none of these actually have conducted an evaluation of the training as a poverty intervention to determine if there is an impact on poverty attitudes. Negative poverty attitudes have been documented within schools and are impacted by stereotypes about the poor (Howley et al., 2006). However, it remains to be seen what impact poverty training has on poverty attitudes of school principals.

**Summary and Implications of the Literature**

The widening achievement gap between the rich and poor urges early intervention to reduce achievement gaps (Reardon, 2011). Creating equitable school is far more difficult than “one bullet” or one size fits all. An empirical study of poverty attitudes within the field of education is important to assist educators in addressing potential biases which may impact/impede progress in equitable access for students. School climate research provides evidence that principals are critical to positive school climate and success. From a social justice perspective educational leaders determine if attitudes are
supporting or impeding progress at schools. Without a tool to measure attitudes toward poverty, educators fail to have evidence that any poverty interventions or professional development is actually having a desired outcome. Effective evaluation is critical for determining what is working or not working in schools. A measurement tool for poverty attitudes provides insight into why some schools provide more equitable opportunity structures than others.

This chapter reviewed theoretical and empirical studies of poverty attitudes and the way that those attitudes are relevant and manifest in schools. The proposed study will determine what attitudes participating principals hold in regards to poverty. Chapter three will describe the methods for the study.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Research Design

This study had multiple purposes: (1) to replicate the Yun and Weaver (2010) scale; (2) determine Appalachian elementary school principals’ attitudes toward the poor; (3) examine personal characteristics of principals that may be associated with attitudes and (4) identify potential associations among school principal attitudes toward the poor and personal characteristics and school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale).

Setting and Population

The population for this study was West Virginia public school principals who supervise elementary (K-8) schools. As the official administrator with executive authority for the school, each principal was contacted for this study. Assistant principals, school counselors, district administrators or curriculum directors were not included due to differences in responsibilities and role. For the purposes of this study, a public school was defined as any school supported by public funds. Participants were selected from the 2014-2015 principal database. E-mail addresses for principals are publicly available from the state k-12 website.

Sampling

Principals were filtered by selecting only schools of a pre-kindergarten through eighth grade configuration from the Common Core of Data on the Institute of Education Sciences (NCES) website for the 2013-2014 school year. The search identified 567 schools based on the criteria of only regular schools (no charter or alternative schools
were included in the search). The researcher used an online calculator at Raosoft to calculate the sample size that accounted for a fifty percent return rate and a 5% margin of error. A minimum of 306 respondents would need to complete the survey to garner the 99% confidence level. Determining a sample size sufficient for the exploratory factor analysis mirrored the procedure used in original Yun & Weaver scale and determined the critical value for a normal distribution.

**Ethical Considerations**

Prior to recruitment and data collection, an application was submitted to the Ohio University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participants were assured anonymity as only grouped data will be released for analysis and future publication purposes. No individual data will be released or made public to any individual or institution. Participants had the option to decline the survey. Participants were provided with the study contact information on the informed consent page. The Ohio University IRB approved the research (15X115). See Appendix A for a copy of the Ohio University Online Consent Form.

**Instrumentation**

To evaluate the relationship between variables, Yun and Weaver’s (2010) scale was used to examine the relationships between principal poverty attitude scores (dependent variable) and demographic characteristics (independent variables), which might impact poverty attitudes. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted and examined to see if the study was able to replicate the factor structure of the Yun and Weaver’s (2010) study. The online study used items from Yun and Weaver (2010) ATP
SF scale to determine poverty attitudes. The results were reviewed including descriptive statistics, reliability, inter-item correlations and exploratory factor analysis. The use of this scale was determined after a full literature review explored various instruments used in conducting studies measuring poverty attitudes.

Studies using Yun and Weaver’s scale (2010) demonstrated successful measurement of poverty attitudes for assessment of attitudes in pre/post interventions program evaluation in the fields of social work, nursing, and counseling. Researchers interested in measuring poverty interventions, tracking poverty attitudes longitudinally and conducting program evaluation might find the scale useful. Most importantly, the availability of Yun and Weaver’s ATP shortened version of the scale means it can be administered more quickly and retain similar levels of reliability. Additionally, administration is shorter and easier to manage fewer pieces of data. The utility of the shortened version has much to offer education in the area of studying poverty attitudes. This study investigated the use of the ATP-SF as a useful measurement tool for the field of education.

The Yun and Weaver ATP SF scale (2010) contains 21 items that used a Likert-type response scale utilizing ratings of (1) strong agreement to (5) strong disagreement to report on the three previously identified three factors: personal deficit, stigma, and structural perspective. Yun and Weaver (2010) established “validity through correlational analyses and independent samples t-tests” and had an internal consistency demonstrated by an overall Cronbach’s alpha of (.87) (p. 174). The ATP SF scale (2010) contains 21 Likert-type items that report on three factors: structural attributions (positive), individual
attributions (negative) and stigma (negative). The Yun and Weaver scale (2010) uses ratings from (1) strong agreement to (5) strong disagreement. Higher ratings on the scale indicate more favorable attitudes toward the poor, lower ratings – less favorable attitudes. Subscales on three factors contain varying numbers of items: personal deficiency, stigma and structural attributions. The authors established “validity through correlational analyses and independent samples t-tests” and had an internal consistency demonstrated by an overall Cronbach’s alpha of (.87) (p. 174). Factor three items, structural perspective of poverty, were all reverse scored. The attitudes toward poverty overall scale score was used as the dependent variable.

Three additional survey items were created by the researcher and added based on review of the literature. These items were developed to measure and contextualize poverty attitudes related to examples of deficit thinking (Valencia, 1997). These new items include: 1. Students who are poor learn differently than students who are not poor; 2. Students who are poor cannot achieve at the same level of students who are not poor; 3. Parents of poor children do not care about education. These items used the same rating scale as Yun and Weaver’s (2010) scale. The new items function as independent variables, with separate analyses for each item and an exploratory factor analysis was conducted for the established items and three additional items.

The survey instrument requested demographic information about the characteristics about the principals themselves and served as independent variables:

A. Social class origin

B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Age
E. Ethnicity/race
F. Religiosity
G. Appalachian identity
H. Experience
I. Poverty training
J. School SES
K. School locale

School demographics for school level socioeconomic status was an independent variable determined by the overall free and reduced lunch percentages obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) 2013-2014 data set. This variable was calculated by adding both free and reduced lunch counts and divided by the total number of students enrolled for each school to produce the percentage.

School demographics included locale as an independent variable. Locale codes are a measure of geographic status on an urban continuum that ranges from “large city” to “rural remote.” New locale codes incorporate changes in the way rural areas are defined, in agreement with geographic standards used in the 2000 Census. The codes established by U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Science National Center for Educational Statistics NCES (2013) are defined as:

Code 11 - City, Large - Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population of 250,000 or more.
Code 12 - City, Midsize-Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000.

Code 13 - City, Small -Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population less than 100,000.

Code 21 - Suburb, Large-Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population of 250,000 or more.

Code 22 - Suburb, Midsize-Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000.

Code 23 - Suburb, Small-Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population less than 100,000.

Code 31 - Town, Fringe-Territory inside an urban cluster that is less than or equal to 10 miles from an urbanized area.

Code 32 - Town, Distant-Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 10 miles and less than or equal to 35 miles from an urbanized area.

Code 33 - Town, Remote-Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 35 miles from an urbanized area.

Code 41 - Rural, Fringe-Census-defined rural territory that is less than or equal to 5 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is less than or equal to 2.5 miles from an urban cluster.
Code 42 - Rural, Distant-Census-defined rural territory that is more than 5 miles but less than or equal to 25 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is more than 2.5 miles but less than or equal to 10 miles from an urban cluster.

Code 43 - Rural, Remote-Census-defined rural territory that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and is also more than 10 miles from an urban cluster. (NCES, 2013)

For the purpose of this study only the first classification of rural by NCES was used, rather than secondary classifications of fringe, distant and remote categories. The collapsing of the codes was necessary during data analysis to make two different categories of rural (codes 41, 42 and 43) and other (codes 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33). A regression for category code outside of rural did not produce enough respondents and a regression for all codes was not logical.

Validity and Reliability

The survey instrument was piloted using a panel of educational administration experts. Mortality was explored as an internal validity threat for this study. There is no way to guard against incomplete items (missing data) or the loss of subjects as they complete the survey. Missing or incomplete data was replaced with the mean. This survey used the Qualtrics tool to measure and display progress completion for respondents taking the survey. Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability of the survey data.
Internal validity is impacted by limitations of the instrument. No instrument can account for every variable that may have relevancy in a study. The set of variables included in this study provide a limitation for this study. The researcher will be unable to include unlimited variables. For example, other variables were considered for this study, such as the differences impacting current socioeconomic statuses such as married, single, with or without dependents. Lengthy surveys often have poor returns. This study considered the length of the survey and during the piloting determined to keep the survey limited to less than five minutes was critical. Consideration of these other possible variables could be explored within future study and were deemed less important in answering the research questions for this particular study. Study participants who are identified as meeting the operational definition of principal may have previously worked in other school configurations which could impact attitudes. This was not examined in this study.

External validity outlines problems that could threaten the researcher’s ability to draw inferences from the sample to other people, places, and situations (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Assumptions for this study included the expectation that participants answered the questions truthfully even though the information is personal and often sensitive. The study acknowledged variety within the participant population. Principals completing the survey have varying age, experience, gender, political affiliation, race/ethnicity, religiosity, a range of Appalachian values, and social class origins. Investigation of principal’s attitudes of poverty within the educational community using the Yun and Weaver SF scale had not previously been conducted. Utilizing the survey
method provided sufficient information to identify initial findings and validate the need for further investigation.

**Data Collection**

Data was collected through a survey link emailed to elementary school principals through Qualtrics, (Qualtrics, Provo, UT), a web based survey dissemination and management tool. Each survey contains an online informed consent that respondents must agree to before moving onto the survey items. The estimated time to complete the survey was four to five minutes. All survey protocols were matched by e-mail addresses and corresponding National Center Educational Statistics data for corresponding locale and free and reduced lunch percentages. The school e-mail list was used to identify needed follow up e-mails.

During the piloting of the survey, the researcher sent out emails to verify that the recipients were not whitelisted by the Qualtrics server. Prior to the initiation of the study, e-mails were sent to all potential participants to ensure technological compatibility with the survey tool. Any issues or concerns following the technology test were resolved by the researcher. In addition, individuals completed the survey and let the researcher know that the survey link was working correctly and establish the amount of time for answering the survey. This information assisted the researcher in making decisions about the survey.

For the survey participants e-mail addresses were uploaded into Qualtrics. Participants were notified in a brief email the opportunity to participate in the study, a copy of the approved informed consent form (see Appendix A) was provided. The initial communication contained information about a chance to win a $100.00 VISA gift card
which was provided as an incentive for survey completion. The gift cards were awarded to one respondent for every one hundred responses. After the initial notification, two days later the e-mail containing the survey link was sent out. The researcher sent out a reminder each week until the number of responses met the study criteria. By the fourth week, the response criteria had been met. Qualtrics automatically sent out a thank you to all respondents once they submitted their surveys. The incentive drawings occurred at the end of the survey. The winners received their incentives by mail.

Data Analysis

The study used a survey design to obtain school and principal demographic information which served as independent variables which will be compared to poverty attitudes (dependent variable) as determined by the Attitudes Toward Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010). A secondary data set from NCES (2013) provided the independent variables of school socioeconomic status (free/reduced lunch) and school locale (rural, suburban and urban). The three items of this study that were newly developed were analyzed separately and an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine if there were any underlying factors based on the connections between the variables. The analyses of the data was conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software (Version 21).

Research Objectives

Research objective one. The first research objective described the principals based on the following demographic variables:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Age
E. Ethnicity/race
F. Religiosity
G. Appalachian identity
H. Experience
I. Poverty training
J. School SES
K. School locale

Objective One was analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. Demographic information gathered from respondents is presented in chapter four. The nominal variables – school demographics free and reduced lunch rates and locales of rural, urban and suburban are presented by frequencies and percentages. Coding data numerically was a necessary step because all nominal data must be converted in order to be utilized in a regression analyses. The variables of age, years’ experience are interval variables and were summarized by frequency counts, calculation of means and standard deviations. A data dictionary was created to provide a set of instructions to link a field of data to specific variables.

Research objective two. The purpose of objective two was to determine the poverty attitudes of principals measured by the Attitudes toward Poverty Short Form scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010). An exploratory factor analysis determined the three factor
loadings remain consistent with that of the original scale. The factor analysis explored the possibility that any other factors were identified. The researcher explored eigenvalues greater than one as recommended by Kaiser (1974).

Poverty attitudes were determined by a summation of scores on the overall scale score of the combined three factors identified by Yun and Weaver. The objective was descriptive in nature and analyzed through the following factor loadings of personal deficiency, stigma, and structural perspective. The overall mean attitudes of poverty were calculated and the data analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as a mean, variance, standard deviation, and range. Lower scores on the ATP-SF indicate more negative poverty attitudes, while higher scores indicate more positive attitudes. On items of poverty, social desirability bias created a positive skew at the top the distribution.

**Research objective three.** The purpose of objective three was to determine if there is a relationship between poverty attitudes and each of the following independent variables:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Ethnicity/race
E. Religiosity
F. Appalachian identity
G. Poverty training
H. School locale
This objective was analyzed through statistical analysis using independent t-tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The factor analyses provided subsets for the scores for each factor. All of the factors created the sum of the overall score. The dependent variable, attitudes toward poverty, was examined in each inferential analyses to determine predictive relationships based on each independent variable. The relationship between each predictor and the dependent variable were examined independently. The data was screened for missing and extreme values. Missing values were replaced with the mean score and extreme values were eliminated if they were determined to be outliers. Prior to conducting the regression analysis, descriptive statistics, frequencies, means, standard deviations, and calculations of $F$ tests and significance were compiled for each of these items.

**Research objective four.** The purpose of objective four was to determine whether a model exists that predicts attitudes toward poverty. The overall ATP scale score represents the dependent variable. Through a stepwise regression procedure, all independent variables were loaded to determine if the model is predictive of poverty attitudes. The strengths of certain variables are based upon the literature review to have more predictive value. The independent variables were entered stepwise into the equation. The variables loaded for the regression included:

A. Social class origin

B. Political orientation

C. Gender
D. Age
E. Ethnicity/race
F. Religiosity
G. Appalachian identity
H. Experience
I. Poverty training
J. School SES
K. School locale

The null hypothesis is that no relationship will exist between independent and dependent variables. Descriptive statistics include mean, standard deviations, and significance testing.

Limitations and Delimitations

The following factors may limit the reliability of the study findings:

1. Findings may not be generalized beyond the group of public K-8 school principals within WV during a specific time.

2. Poverty related items could have made administrators uncomfortable. The study relied on candid responses of the subjects surveyed on a topic that is sensitive in nature.

3. The study relied upon the conceptual disconnect between official definitions of poverty (those set by governmental agencies) and individual definitions (those embraced by school administrators).
Summary

The purpose of the study was to identify the poverty attitudes of principals and examine the relationship of poverty attitudes to personal and school demographics. The Yun and Weaver ATP scale (2010) provided exploratory assertions about educational principal’s attitudes toward poverty as well as provide future investigators with an instrument that could be useful within educational settings. Chapter One introduced the topic and established the reasons why this study is relevant. Chapter Two provided a literature review from which this study is theoretically grounded. This chapter outlined the proposed method for this research study and procedures for data collection and analysis, which include statistical analysis (descriptive, inferential statistics, and a stepwise multiple regression to test for assumptions). The next chapter reports the findings of the study. The final chapter presents an overall analysis of the results and recommendations based on the findings of this study.
Chapter 4: Findings

The multiple purposes of the study were to: (1) replicate the Yun and Weaver (2010) scale with a different population; (2) determine school principal attitudes toward the poor; (3) examine personal characteristics of principals that may be associated with attitudes and (4) identify potential associations among school principals attitudes toward the poor including personal characteristics and school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale).

The replication of Yun and Weaver’s (2010) ATP scale with public school principals in grades K-8 was compared with Yun and Weaver’s results including descriptive statistics, reliability, inter-item correlations and an exploratory factor analysis. The study examined the relationships between principal poverty attitude scores (dependent variable) and demographic characteristics (independent variables), which might impact poverty attitudes.

The overarching research question were: To what extent do (1) principal personal characteristics (social class background, political affiliation, gender, age, race/ethnicity, religiosity, Appalachian values, administration experience, and previous participation in “poverty training”) contribute to predicting attitudes toward the poor and (2) school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale) contribute to predicting attitudes toward the poor.

The survey instrument was e-mailed to 567 of principals in June 2015. There was a total of 315 returned usable surveys for a return rate of fifty-six percent. The survey took the respondents between 4 to 6 minutes to complete. The highest return rates were
between 8:00-10:00 a.m. in the morning. Fifty-one percent of those who responded answered the survey within the first two weeks of the survey start date. Of those who agreed to participate in the study ninety-eight percent completed the survey. A total of six survey responses were excluded in the data analysis following the review of submissions for blank responses, a principal who was relocated to a high school, and two respondents who declined participation. The total number of survey respondents (315 of 567) reflected a response rate of 55%, meeting the goal of the study.

**Research Objective One**

The purpose of objective one was to describe the following demographic variables of principals working in West Virginia public schools with a configuration that includes kindergarten through grade eight:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Age
E. Ethnicity/race
F. Religiosity
G. Appalachian identity
H. Experience
I. Poverty training
J. School socioeconomic status SES (percent free and reduced lunch)
K. School locale (rural, suburban, and urban)
**Social class origin.** Participants were asked to describe their social class when growing up on a scale of 1- very poor to 6-upper class. Of the 309 returned surveys, 308 principals responded to this item. The largest number of respondents were working class II \((n = 125)\) and middle class \((n = 108)\). Together, they represent 75% of the total respondents. This indicates that the majority of respondents are representative of by social class origins of the working and middle class respectively. The largest group of principals \((n = 125, 40.5\%)\) who responded to the survey identified themselves as growing up working class II. The second largest group of principals \((n = 108, 35\%)\) identified themselves as growing up middle class. One principal did not answer this item. Table 1 illustrates the principals’ response to this item.

*Table 1*

**Social Class Origin of Principals as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Poor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class II</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Political orientation.** Principals were asked to describe their political views using a scale of 1-being very conservative to 6-being very liberal. Of the number of principals (N=309) who returned the survey, 308 responded to this item. The data from the respondents were: 31-very conservative; 85-conservative, 89-somewhat conservative; 71-somewhat liberal; 26-liberal; 6-very liberal. The largest group of principals (n = 89, 28.8%) who responded as somewhat conservative and the second largest group of principals (n = 85, 27.5%) responded as conservative. One person did not respond to this item. Table 2 illustrates the principal responses to this item.

**Table 2**

*Political Views of Principals as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Views</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very conservative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat conservative</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat liberal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very liberal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* One respondent did not respond to this question.

**Gender.** Principals were asked to identify their gender by checking one of the three categories: Female, Male, Prefer not to say. A total of 308 principals responded to this item, 217 (70.5 %) were female, 91 (29.5%) were male. One principal did not respond to the item.
Age. Principals were asked to identify their age by responding to the following question: “What was your age at your last birthday.” The age of respondents in this study ranged in age from 29-72 years old. The mean age of the responding principals was 48.52 years old and the standard deviation was 8.74.

Ethnicity. The survey asked principals to indicate their ethnicity by choosing one of the three categories: Hispanic or Latino, Not Hispanic or Latino, Prefer not to respond. Three principals responded as Hispanic or Latino; 295 responded Non-Hispanic; 10 principals preferred not to respond; and 1 principal failed to respond to this item. Nearly all respondents were Non-Hispanic (n=295). Table 3 illustrates the ethnicity of principals who responded to this item on the survey.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One respondent chose not to respond to this item.

Race. Principals were asked to identify their race from the following categories: 1) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 2) Asian; 3) Black or African American; 4) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 5) White; 6) Two or more races; 7) Prefer not
to say. The white category was selected by 298 principals, two principals selected two or more races, five principals selected Black-African American and six principals chose not to respond. Table 4 illustrates the principal’s response for the category of race.

Table 4

Race of Principals as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One respondent chose not to respond to this item.

Religiosity. Principals were asked to describe their relationship to religion on a scale of 1 - very religious, 2 – religious, 3 – somewhat religious, 4 – somewhat not religious, 5 – not religious, 6 not at all religious. The category with the largest response was 2 - religious (n = 149, 48.4%). The second largest response was 1- very religious (n = 76, 24.7%). One person did not respond to this item. Table 5 illustrates principal’s responses to this item.
Table 5

*Religiosity of Principals as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very religious</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat religious</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* One respondent chose not to respond to this item.

**Appalachian identity.** Principals were asked to describe their Appalachian values or connection to the region on a scale of 1 to 6. The categories that the respondents could choose were: 1- not at all Appalachia, 2 – Not Appalachian, 3 – Somewhat Not Appalachian, 4 – Somewhat Appalachian, 5 – Appalachian, 6 – Very Appalachian. The largest group of principals (n= 105, 34%) responded as “Somewhat Appalachian”. The second largest group (n=100, 32.4%) indicated themselves as “Appalachian”. Three individuals did not respond to this item. Table 6 below illustrates the responses for this item of the survey.
Table 6

Principals Appalachia Identity as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appalachian Identity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Appalachian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appalachian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not Appalachian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Appalachian</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Appalachian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two respondents chose not to respond to this category.

Experience. The survey asked participants how many years they have completed as a principal. The data from principals who responded to this item ranged from six months to 42 years of experience. The average number of years’ experience produced a $M = 8.44$ years and $SD = 6.66$.

Poverty training. Principals were asked to respond to the following question: what kind of training about poverty have you attended. Principals were asked to select from these six categories and they were able to select more than one category: 1) Ruby Payne Training, 2) College Coursework, 3) Independent Study, 4) School or district support training not prescriptive and 5) Other Professional Development (this category could be selected and if desired they could described the type of training they had received). The category most commonly selected was Ruby Payne ($n = 243$). See table 7 for data collected on type of poverty training attended.
Table 7

*Poverty Training as Reported by Principals Responding to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentageb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Payne</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Course</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Studies</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or District</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Poverty Training *</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A total of 309 participants completed this item.

*b Percentage* of participants that have experienced training on poverty. Total percentage does not equal 100% due to multiple choice response.

* Other poverty training responses include: book study (*n* = 2); conferences not specified (*n* = 4); Eric Jensen, *Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind* (*n* = 12); Donna Beegle, *Breaking the Iron Cage of Poverty* (*n* = 2); School, District or State training (*n* = 3); mission into impoverished communities (*n* = 1); curriculum training (*n* = 1). This does not equal 100% because (*n* = 12) did not respond in detail.

**School socioeconomic status SES (percent free and reduced lunch).** The school level socioeconomic status is reflected by the schools percentage of free and reduced lunch rates as reported by NCES. The researcher matched the school location to each principal respondent which were located in 305 schools. The free and reduced lunch rates ranged from 19.36% to 88.47%. Table 8 illustrates the percent of free and reduced lunch based the school location of each principal respondent.
Table 8

Free and Reduced Lunch Grouped into Categories by School Location of the Respondent to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-(19-29%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-(30-39)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-(40-49)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-(50-59)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-(60-69)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-(70-79)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-(80-89)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School locale (rural, suburban, and urban). NCES data was obtained for school locale for each principal respondent. NCES codes for this item produced the following categories: 48 city small, 37 suburb midsize, 14 suburb small, 9 town fringe, 24 town distant, 20 town remote, 57 rural fringe, 80 rural distant and 13 rural remote and 8 were missing. The largest group of responses came from principals in the rural distant category (n = 80). The second largest group was rural fringe (n = 57). Table 9 illustrates this data.
Table 9

Locale as Determined by NCES Data Matched to Principals Who Responded to the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City small</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb, midsize</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb, small</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, fringe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, distant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, remote</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, fringe</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, distant</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, remote</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.983</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Objective Two**

The purpose of objective two was to establish the use of the ATP Short form (Yun and Weaver, 2010) to measure the poverty attitudes of principals. The 21 items were scored on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from 1=strongly agree, 2 = agree 3 = neutral, 4 = disagree, 5=strongly disagree. The six items measuring the structural factor are all reverse scored. The overall scale measures poverty attitudes that produce a score from 21 to 105 with higher scores representing a more positive attitudes toward poverty and lower scores representing lower poverty attitude. The overall mean score on the survey for the respondents were 77.60 and the standard deviation was 8.14.
Means and standard deviations for each of the responses were calculated for each of the twenty-one items based on all cases with valid data. Missing values were replaced by the mean during analyses. The higher the score in the mean, the more positive the poverty attitude. The item that received the highest level of agreement from respondents was item 5, “Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything” ($M=4.65$) ($SD=.481$). The item that received the second highest agreement from respondents was item 2 “poor people are dishonest” ($M=4.52$) ($SD=.505$). Both of these items reflected “very positive” attitudes toward poverty.

Using the interpretive scale (developed by the researcher) the majority of items fell in the “disagree” range which indicate “positive” attitudes of poverty. The item with the lowest level of agreement was item 17, “I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people” ($M=2.47$) ($SD=1.181$). This item reflects a negative attitudes toward poverty score, reverse scoring means this is a “disagree” on the interpretive score. Overall, the response to items fell within the “positive range” or strongly disagree of the interpretive scale which indicated positive attitudes of poverty. Items 16-21 were reverse scored. Table 10 provides the descriptive statistics including the mean scores and standard deviation for each item.
Table 10

Description of the Level of Agreement of the Principals Who Responded to 21 Items from the Yun and Weaver (2010) Scale on Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATP Short Form Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor people are different from the rest of society.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Poor people are dishonest.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Poor people are dirty.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Poor people act differently.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Poor people generally have lower intelligence than non-poor people.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Some “poor” people live better than I do, considering all their benefits.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Poor people think they deserve to be supported.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Welfare mothers have more babies to get more money.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-An able-bodied person collecting welfare is ripping off the system.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Welfare makes people lazy.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Society has the responsibility to help poor people.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Poor people are discriminated against.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data were misplaced with the variable mean. Higher mean scores indicate more positive views of poverty. Items 16-21 were reverse scored and interpretive scores are also reversed.

Interpretive scale: 1-1.76 = Strongly Agree, 1.77-2.57 = Agree, 2.58-3.38 = Neutral, 3.39-4.19 = Disagree, 4.20-5 = Strongly Disagree
Factor analyses procedures were conducted to examine the correlation structure of the study variables. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was .83. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was conducted and found the Chi-Square of 153.248; \( df=210; \ p \leq .001 \). A confirmatory factor analyses with Principal Axis Factoring extraction with a Promax rotation with Kaiser Normalization was conducted to determine if the data would load on the factor structures previously identified by Yun and Weaver (2010). The determination of the underlying factors used the Kaiser Criteria of eigenvalue greater than 1, percentage of total variance criterion extracted by successive factors >5% and the Cattell Scree plot examination.

A confirmatory factor analyses was conducted to examine if the items were able to be loaded similarly to the factor structure of that found by Yun and Weaver (2010). Three factors met the Kaiser Criteria of eigenvalues greater than 1. See table 11 for initial Eigenvalues, extraction sums of squared loadings and rotations.

**Table 11**

*Explanation of Variance and Eigenvalues to Examine the Factor Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadingsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>12.734</td>
<td>35.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>6.948</td>
<td>42.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
A review of the exploratory factor analysis results found the following structure matrix loadings. A total of 7 items loaded on Factor One with values ranging from .487 to .713. On factor two 8 items with values ranging from .455 to .688. On factor three structural 6 items with ranges from .277 to .663. Item 17, “I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people” was cross loaded on factor 2, stigma (.469) as well as factor 3 structural (.369). This item was reviewed and it was determined this item should be considered for the factor of structural. The three factor model was retained owing to its structure and interpretability. The three factors are labeled “personal deficit”, “stigma” and “structural”. Figure 2 below shows the Cattell Scree Plot for an illustration of the confirmed factor analysis used for interpretation. Tables 12, 13 and 14 illustrate the factor, pattern, and structure matrix.

![Scree Plot](image)

*Figure 2: Attitudes toward Poverty Three-Factor Solution Scree Plot*
Table 12

Variables and Factor loadings for Items Representing the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor for the Rotated Three Factor Solution Using Principle Axis Factoring with Promax Rotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix*</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP Short Form Items</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Poor people are different than the rest of society.</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Poor people are dishonest.</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Poor people are dirty.</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Poor people act differently.</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything.</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people.</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Poor people generally have lower intelligence than non-poor people.</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients.</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Some “poor” people live better than I do, considering all their benefits.</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Poor people think they deserve to be supported.</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Welfare mothers have more babies to get more money.</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-An able-bodied person collecting welfare is ripping off the system.</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder.</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Welfare makes people lazy.</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget.</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control.</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people.</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits.</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune.</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Society has the responsibility to help poor people.</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Poor people are discriminated against.</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

a. 3 factors extracted. 7 iterations required.
Table 13

Variables and Factor loadings for Items Representing the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor people are different from the rest of society.</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Poor people are dishonest.</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Poor people are dirty.</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Poor people act differently.</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything.</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people.</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Poor people generally have lower intelligence than non-poor people.</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients.</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Some “poor” people live better than I do, considering all their benefits.</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>-.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Poor people think they deserve to be supported.</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Welfare mothers have more babies to get more money.</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-An able-bodied person collecting welfare is ripping off the system.</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder.</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Welfare makes people lazy.</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget.</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control.</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people.</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits.</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune.</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Society has the responsibility to help poor people.</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Poor people are discriminated against.</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
Table 14

Variables and Factor loadings for Items Representing the Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Matrix</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor people are different from the rest of society.</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Poor people are dishonest.</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Poor people are dirty.</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Poor people act differently.</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything.</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people.</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Poor people generally have lower intelligence than non-poor people.</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients.</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Some “poor” people live better than I do, considering all their benefits.</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Poor people think they deserve to be supported.</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Welfare mothers have more babies to get more money.</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-An able-bodied person collecting welfare is ripping off the system.</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder.</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Welfare makes people lazy.</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget.</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control.</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people.</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits.</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune.</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Society has the responsibility to help poor people.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Poor people are discriminated against.</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
The reliability of the overall scale was based on $n=270$ cases (87.4%), with 39 excluded cases (12.6%). Reliability statistics produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .81. The Cronbach’s alpha based on standardized items was .83 for $n=21$ items. The item cases used to establish overall scale scores and establish reliability were based on 270 valid cases with 39 cases which were excluded. The Yun and Weaver (2010) study reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .87.

Reliability for each factor was calculated using a listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure. Factor One included a total of 309 available cases. An $n=294$ (95.1%) cases were included as valid and an $n=15$ (4.9%) cases were excluded. A Cronbach’s alpha .78 was obtained. (Yun & Weaver’s data yield a Cronbach alpha of .82.) This was based on a .79 standardized items based on 7 items. Reliability for Factor Two was conducted from a total of 309 cases. A total of 293 (94.8%) cases were deemed valid, 16 (5.2%) cases were excluded. Cronbach’s alpha of .77 was obtained. (Yun & Weaver obtained a .75). This was based on a .78 standardized items based on 8 items. Reliability for Factor Three was conducted from a total of 309 cases of which 291 (94.2%) cases were deemed valid, 18 (5.8%) cases were excluded. A Cronbach’s alpha of .69 was obtained for 6 items. (Yun and Weaver obtained a .67). All of the subscales exceeded a minimum acceptance of internal consistency between .65 -.80 (Vaske, 2008).

Statistics for the overall scale were calculated. Statistics were based on 307 valid cases, two cases were missing and the values were replaced with mean ($M=3.6934$). The mean fell in the more positive range of the interpretive scale. The minimum overall scale
score obtained was 2.86 and the highest score was 4.71 with a $SD = .38915$ for the overall scale.

**Deficit thinking items.** Three new items were piloted in this study to determine if these measure deficit thinking and if additional items might enhance the scale. The new items situated the context of the study within the school setting. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted with three additional items. A total of 309 responses, $n = 291$ of which, (94.2%) were valid cases, and 18 (5.8%) cases were excluded. All three items were found to load on factor one, personal deficit. A Cronbach’s alpha of .33 was obtained (Cronbach’s alpha based on Standardized items .502 for 10 items). This would not meet the criteria below the minimum of .65 -.80 (Vaske, 2008). A review of the three items failed to identify any item that would raise the reliability significantly.

These item were also reviewed as independent variables for analysis. For that reason, consider whether these items served as anchor items within the context of school in future studies versus as an addition to the existing scale. Of particular not the item regarding “students who are poor learn differently than students who are not poor” which is neutral on the poverty attitudes scale and interpretive guide. Table 15 indicates the frequency and statistical data for the additional three items.
Table 15

Deficit Thinking Items Developed by the Research for Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher Developed Deficit Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who are poor learn differently than students who are not poor.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who are poor cannot be expected to achieve at the same rate of students who are not poor.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of poor children do not care about education.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data were misplaced with the variable mean. Higher mean scores indicate more positive views of poverty. All three items were reverse scored and interpretive scores are also reversed Interpretive scale: 1-1.76 = Strongly Agree, 1.77-2.57 = Agree, 2.58-3.38 = Neutral, 3.39-4.19 = Disagree, 4.20-5 = Strongly Disagree

Research Objective Three

The purpose of objective three was to determine if differences exist in attitudes of poverty as measured by the ATP Short Scale on the following variables:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Ethnicity/race
E. Religiosity
F. Appalachian identity
G. Poverty training
H. School locale
Social class origin. Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty score were examined by social class origin ($N = 306$). The respondents who identified their social class origin as “Very Poor” reported the highest overall mean ($M = 3.72$). The sample sizes and overall Attitudes toward Poverty item means and standard deviations reported by social class origin are illustrated in table 16.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Orientation</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Poor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class II</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences in Attitudes toward Poverty overall scale score for the variable social class origin. The Levenes Test of Homogeneity of Variance indicated that the variances were equal ($F_{5,300} = 1.89, p = .095$). The findings illustrated in table 17 indicates no significant differences in the overall Attitudes toward Poverty within the groups based on the social class origin.
Table 17

One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>46.194</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.292</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> One Way Analysis of Variance

<sup>b</sup> .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant

**Political orientation.** Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were examined by political orientation. The respondents who identified their political orientation as “Very Liberal” had the highest mean score ($M = 4.13$). The sample sizes and overall Attitudes toward Poverty score item means and standard deviations reported by political orientation are reported in table 18. A comparison of the overall attitudes toward poverty scale score by political orientation was calculated through a one way of analysis of variance.
Table 18

**Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations by Political Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Conservation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Conservation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Liberal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance indicated that the variances were equivalent ($F_{5, 300} = 1.115, p = .352$). The one-way ANOVA was highly statistically significant for political orientation as illustrated in table 19 ($F_{5, 300} = 5.66, p \leq .001$). Post hoc tests were conducted to determine where the differences occurred. The Tukey’s post hoc test indicated that those individuals who are very liberal ($M = 4.13$, Very Liberal) differed statistically significantly from all other political orientation ($p = .05$).

Table 19

**One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Political Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>5.668</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42.155</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.137</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gender.** There was no statistically significant difference in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were found between gender ($t_{304} = -1.18, p = .238$). The respondents who identified their gender as females had the highest mean score ($M = 3.70$). The sample size, overall Attitudes toward Poverty score item means and standard deviation reported by the respondents are illustrated in table 20.

*Table 20*

**Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.6514</td>
<td>.38307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3.7091</td>
<td>.39122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity/race.** Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were examined by the variable ethnicity which had originally three categories: Hispanic or Latino, Not Hispanic or Latino, Prefer not to respond. The category of “Prefer not to respond” was not included in the analysis. The respondents who chose the category “not Hispanic or Latino” has the highest mean score ($M = 3.69$). The group size and overall Attitudes toward Poverty score item means and standard deviations by ethnicity are reported in table 21.
Table 21

*Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 22 indicates no significant differences within the groups based on ethnicity ($F_{1, 294} = .125, p = .724$). Equality of variance was not an issue as indicated by the Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($F_{1, 294} = 2.106, p = .148$).

Table 22

*One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
<th>$p^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44.920</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ One Way Analysis of Variance  

$^b$.05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant

**Religiosity.** Differences in attitudes toward poverty scores were also examined by the independent variable religiosity. The category with the highest mean was “somewhat not religious” with a mean of 3.81. The sample sizes, overall Attitudes toward
Poverty score item means and standard deviations reported by religiosity are illustrated in table 23.

Table 23

*Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Religiosity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very religious</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat religious</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Levene’s Homogeneity of Variance test illustrated that the variances were equal ($F_{5, 301} = .881, p = .494$). There was no significant difference between the groups based on religiosity groups as illustrated in table 24 ($F_{5, 301} = .573, p = .721$).

Table 24

*One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Religiosity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F$^a$</th>
<th>P$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.902</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.339</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ One Way Analysis of Variance  
$^b$ .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant
Appalachian identity. Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were examined by Appalachian identity. The Appalachian Identity category with the highest mean score was “not at all Appalachian” with a mean value of 3.93. The sample sizes and the overall Attitudes toward Poverty score item means and standard deviations reported by Appalachian identity are shown in table 25.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appalachian Identity</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Appalachian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appalachian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not Appalachian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Appalachian</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Appalachian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Levenes Test of Homogeneity of Variance illustrated that the variances were equal ($F_{5,299} = .079, p = .995$) and table 26 illustrates that there was no statistically significant differences between the means on different Appalachian identity ($F_{5,299} = .986, p = .427$).
Table 26

One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Appalachian Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.30</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> One Way Analysis of Variance

<sup>b</sup>.05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant

Poverty training. Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were also examined by the type of poverty training that the respondent had attended. The first type of poverty training that was examined for the effect on the overall Attitudes toward Poverty was the Ruby Payne training. The respondents that had attended Ruby Payne Training had the highest mean score with a mean of 3.70 (Table 27).

Table 27

Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations by Participating in Ruby Payne Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruby Payne Training</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28 findings illustrate that there were no significant differences in the overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores with in the groups based whether or not they had attended Ruby Payne Training ($F_{1,305} = 1.79, p = .182$). Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance revealed equal variances ($F_{1,305} = .350, p = .555$).

**Table 28**

*One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Participation in Ruby Payne Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
<th>$P^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.33</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ One Way Analysis of Variance  
$^b$.05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant

The second type of poverty training examined was the variable of college courses on poverty. The respondents who had not attended college courses on poverty training had the highest mean score with a score of 3.70 (Table 29).

**Table 29**

*Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations by Participating in College Courses focused on Poverty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruby Payne Training</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no statistically significant differences between the respondents that took college courses focused on poverty versus those that did not as illustrated in Table 30 ($F_{1,305} = .215, p = .643$)

Table 30

*One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Participation in College Courses focused on Poverty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
<th>$P^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>46.30</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.33</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* One Way Analysis of Variance  
*b* .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant

**School locale.** Differences in overall Attitudes toward Poverty scores were examined by school locales. The following NCES code were used: city small, suburb midsize, suburb small, town fringe, town distant, town remote. All of these categories were recoded as non-rural for statistical analyses. Responses for rural categories included: rural fringe, rural distant and rural remote. All rural categories were recoded as rural. See table 31 for the sample sizes and the overall Attitudes toward Poverty score item means and standard deviations reported by rural or non-rural location.
Table 31

*Group Size, Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Item Mean Scores, and Standard Deviations by Rural or Non-Rural Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Rural</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were placed in categories (rural or non-rural) depending on their school location. An examination of the differences between the groups on their Attitudes toward Poverty survey indicated that there was no statistically significant difference as illustrated in table 32. The Levene Test of Homogeneity of Variance illustrated that the variances were equal ($F_{1,298} = 1.54, p = .216$).

Table 32

*One Way Analysis of Variance Illustrating Differences in Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Based on Rural or Non-Rural Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
<th>$p^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.371</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.635</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a One Way Analysis of Variance

b .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significant
Research Objective Four

The purpose of objective four was to determine whether a model exists that can predict principals’ attitudes toward poverty as measured by the overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor item mean score and the demographic variables of gender, age, political origin, age of the principal, location of the principle’s school, race/ethnicity. The overall attitudes toward poverty scale score represented the dependent variable. For the categorical independent variables dummy coding was required in order for the variables to enter into the regression. For example, race and ethnicity was changed to White/Non-White categories. The following variables were entered into the model as interval variables: gender, age of the principal, and political origin. Figure 3 illustrates the histogram of the plotted standardized residuals for the dependent variable. This histogram shows normality and thus normality is assumed for this analysis.

![Histogram](image)

**Figure 3: Histogram Illustrating Standardized Residuals for the Dependent Variable**

Overall Mean
A stepwise regression was conducted and the first model used the following independent variables. Each variable was entered, examined and removed during the process: age, year’s principal, gender.

A bivariate Pearson’s correlation was produced for the attitudes toward poverty (dependent variable) and the independent variables (demographics). The least significant variables were dropped from analysis. Independent variables were entered into the stepwise regression analysis with overall scale score from the attitudes toward poverty. Multiple diagnostic checks for collinearity were undertaken. An examination of the correlation matrix did not reveal any high correlations. The variance inflation factor (VIF) and the tolerance values did not indicate problems with collinearity. The examination of the correlation matrix for following independent variables: gender, age and years’ experience and political view.

Once modeling was completed the independent variable, political view was found to be statistically significant at the $p \leq .001$ level; and age was significant at the $p \leq .001$ on the overall scale score. The regression equation with the two independent variables were found to be significant in predicating the overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor scale score ($F_{2, 296} = 12.448, p \leq .001$).

The two variables retained in the equation and explained approximately ($R^2 = .078$) of the variance in the overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor score. Table 33 illustrates the data produced at each stage of the stepwise regression.
Table 33

*Significance of the Regression Equation Employing Two Independent Variables in Predicting Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(^a)</th>
<th>P(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.388</td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>12.448</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>40.281</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>43.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R(^2)</th>
<th>R(^2) Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>8.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) One Way Analysis of Variance

\(^b\) .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significance

The coefficient values, t values and corresponding significance levels for the independent variables retained in the regression equation predicting overall readiness for lifelong learning scores are presented in Table 34.
Table 34

Coefficient Values, Standard Errors, Standardized Coefficient Values, T Values, and Significance Levels for Independent Variables Retained in the Regression Equation Predicting Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p^a )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.926</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political recoded</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significance

The variables excluded from the regression equation and their corresponding t values and significance levels are illustrated in Table 35.

Table 35

Excluded Variables, Standardized Coefficients, T Values, Significance Levels, and Partial Correlations for the Regression Equation Predicting Overall Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Principal</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) .05 Alpha Level for the Two-Tailed Test of Significance
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

This chapter is divided into three sections: a discussion of the results based on the purposes and objectives of the study; implications for educational research; and study limitations and suggestions for future research.

The purposes of this study were: (1) to replicate the Yun and Weaver (2010) scale with a different population; (2) determine Appalachian elementary school principals' attitudes toward the poor; (3) examine personal characteristics of principals that may be associated with attitudes and (4) identify potential associations among school principals' attitudes toward the poor and personal and school demographics (in particular, socioeconomic status and locale).

A comparison of the Yun and Weaver’s (2010) results was conducted including descriptive statistics, reliability, inter-item correlations and an exploratory factor analysis. The study examined the relationships between principal poverty attitude scores (dependent variable) and demographic characteristics (independent variables), which might impact poverty attitudes. Research objectives were conducted and analyzed to meet the purposes of the study.

Analysis Results

Research objective one. This objective described the following principal demographic variables:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Age
E. Ethnicity/race
F. Religiosity
G. Appalachian identity
H. Experience
I. Poverty training
J. School socioeconomic status ES (percent free and reduced lunch)
K. School locale (rural, suburban, and urban)

**Research objective two.** This objective determined the poverty attitudes of principals (dependent variable) measured by the Attitudes toward Poverty Short Form scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine if the three factor loadings remain consistent with that of the original scale.

**Research objective three.** This objective determined if a relationship existed between poverty attitudes and each of the following independent variables:

A. Social class origin
B. Political orientation
C. Gender
D. Ethnicity/race
E. Religiosity
F. Appalachian identity
G. Poverty training
H. School locale
**Research objective four.** This objective determined whether a model exists that predicts attitudes toward poverty. The overall scale score of ATP represented the dependent variable. Through stepwise regression procedures, independent variables were loaded and eliminated to determine if the model was predictive of poverty attitudes.

**Summary of Findings**

**Social class.** The majority of respondents represented social class origins of the working class II and middle class respectively. Thompson and Hickey (2005) purported that social class position is critical to attitude, behavior, and impacts every aspect of our lives. Although this study did not produce any statistically significant findings, social class origin is important to any study of poverty attitudes. Previous studies, described in chapter two, have provided important evidence of how educator social class attitudes have impacted students who are economically disadvantaged (Anyon, 1981; Howley, et al., 2006; Rhodes, 2011).

This study found principals had an overall positive poverty attitude. Conversely, Crumley (2013) in his study of counseling students found socioeconomic status an important variable, where those of higher socioeconomic status had more negative correlations with poverty attitudes. While this study did not find a statistical significance of social class perhaps that is because the respondents of this study were older than those from Crumley’s study. By extension, the participants in the current study were more mature and had already completed an advanced degree/certification. Further studies of poverty attitudes should continue to investigate the relationship between age of the
educator and attitudes toward poverty. The current study was limited by the way social
class as a variable was measured. In future studies, the inclusion of additional social class
measures should consider items that influence current socioeconomic status such as,
number of people living in their home and marital status, which might influence the
financial stability of respondents and influence poverty attitudes.

**Political orientation.** The political orientation of the respondents was
conservative. Conservative political orientation was found to be correlated with less
positive overall attitudes toward poverty scale scores. Differences in overall Attitudes
toward Poverty scale score by political orientation was found to be statistically significant
at the $p \leq .001$. Political orientation as a significant predictor of poverty attitudes was
measured. Respondents with liberal views had more positive attitudes towards poverty
scores versus respondents with more conservative views who had more negative attitudes
of poverty. Findings of political orientation represent a statistically significant result that
is consistent with previous attitudes toward poverty research (Atherton, et al., 1993;
Rehner et al., 1997; Whalen, 2005; Yun & Weaver, 2010).

**Gender.** The majority of respondents in this study were female. Gender was not
found to be significant. Studies of poverty attitudes have found women to have more
positive attitudes toward poverty (Crumley, 2013); and men, to have less positive
attitudes toward poverty (Randall, 2009). It is important to note that this study was
confined to configurations of grades K-8, which in the state of West Virginia is
dominated by female principals. If this study would have included high school principals
as part of the population, gender demographics may have been more equally represented.
Therefore, having a largely female respondent group could have positively skewed the overall scale scores attained for this study. Any future replication should consider the benefits of having more equal groups and/or larger numbers to study effect as an area to further explore.

**Age.** The age of respondents in this study ranged in age from 29-72 years old. Statistical analyses were conducted for age against the overall ATP scale score and produced a Pearson Correlation $p \leq .001$ on the total corrected scale score. A Pearson Correlation $p \leq .001$ was obtained on factor two, stigma. Inferential statistics found age was a statistically significant factor in predicting poverty attitudes; older respondents had significantly higher scores on the overall attitudes toward poverty scale. Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward poverty.

Determining age as a variable is a significant finding for studies of poverty attitudes. Cozzarelli et. al. (2001) found age as a variable mostly overlooked in most poverty attitudes research. Many poverty attitudes studies have used samples of convenience from colleges and universities, which have populations of younger ages and limited age-range restrictions (Kovarna, 2006; Yun & Weaver, 2010). Furnham (2003) found that younger individuals are likely to subscribe to just world beliefs. Just world beliefs have been associated with negative attitudes towards poverty and deservingness and often impedes working with those who are poor (Appelbaum, Lennon, & Aber, 2006). This study admittedly did not include educational personnel such as, teachers or pre-service education majors, who are likely much younger than those who participated.
in this study. It logical that more research on this variable should be explored in the field of education to determine how younger ages might impact poverty attitudes.

**Ethnicity/race.** This study did not produce a diversity of respondents to measure this variable as intended and was recoded as White/Nonwhite for analysis. This would be an important line of inquiry for future researchers to explore attitudes toward poverty in more diverse populations and regions.

**Religiosity.** Respondents in this study were largely religious with two thirds of respondents identifying themselves as mostly religious. Despite the findings that most of the principals were religious no statistically significant relationship was identified with poverty attitudes. These findings are contrary to Youdin and Cleveland’s (2006) research which found that religious views of mostly white Protestants are correlated to lower attitudes toward the poor and more individualistic attributions of poverty.

**Appalachian identity.** Although not statistically significant as a predictor for attitudes toward poverty, it is important to note that the majority of respondents (231) identified their values as “Appalachian”. Appalachian identity has been associated with connection to place and in particular to attitudes related to growth and development policies (Cooper et al., 2011) which impact poverty attitudes. Moreover, the importance of culture as a predictor for poverty attitudes has been previously explored by other researchers (Cozzarelli et. al., 2001). Specific exploration of how regional identities impact poverty attitudes of principals would be an interesting line of inquiry for future studies.
Experience. Years of experience was not found to be statistically significant to the model. Wittenhauer et al. (2015) study of registered nurses found experience an important factor in predicting poverty attitudes. Future study should include way to explore better definitions of experience. This variable was confounded with age which in the stepwise regression determined that age was more of a predictor.

Poverty training. Principals were asked to identify which type of poverty training they had attended. Although no statistical significance was achieved in this study, findings from this study support the usability of this scale as a measurement tool for program evaluation. This study did not include any pre-post comparisons for poverty attitudes. This was not a goal for this study; however, the utility of using this tool for education has been established. Future replication should be conducted to establish whether results are comparable in a variety of educational arenas. The Yun and Weaver (2010) scale has been used as a tool for measuring poverty attitudes (Crumley, 2013; Ricks, 2014; Wittenhauer et al., 2015) and more recently, program evaluation. For example, several researchers used the scale as part of a pre/post program evaluation to measure poverty attitudes after course evaluations for nursing students (Vliem, 2015), as well as poverty interventions and simulations (Menzel et al., 2014; Noone et al., 2012; Patterson & Hulton, 2011). The importance of establishing a baseline of poverty attitudes is critical for any long term investigation of poverty attitudes across time which is nearly as important as identifying any possible effects of a specific poverty intervention.

The need for a reliable measurement tool for poverty attitudes in education is evident. In this study, more than two thirds of the respondents indicated they had
participated in poverty training. As such, poverty training then represents a large
investment into an area of professional development where program evaluation and
outcomes of training should be considered critical. Training aimed at improving poverty
attitudes in education have suffered from a lack of program evaluation. In chapter two,
several researchers identified poverty training as a professional development intervention
and criticized the merits of such training. For example, many scholars have criticized
Ruby Payne poverty training as a “deficit” model (Boomer et al., 2008; Gorski, 2006b,
2008; Ng & Rury, 2009). Despite scholarly criticism of such poverty training models,
most scholars have ignored the important role of program evaluation. Program evaluation
is a tool to measure training related to poverty attitudes. According to Chen (2005) the
identification of goals, measurable outcomes, cost and time benefits for such
interventions are all necessary components of any good program evaluation plan.

School socioeconomic status (SES). The data for school level socioeconomic
status was reflected by the percentage of free and reduced lunch rates. Principals in this
study who responded were located in schools with free and reduced lunch rates that
ranged from 19.36% to 88.47%. Statistical analyses did not reveal any significant results.
Although the Appalachian region has higher poverty rates and wider gaps of income
inequality than non-Appalachian regions (Joshi & Gebremedhin, 2012), this did not
impact poverty attitudes in this study.

School locale (rural, suburban, and urban). The majority of locales were rural.
No statistical differences were found between attitudes of poverty and different locales.
Analyses and findings do not find rural as a factor for poverty attitudes. This finding does
not support Sherman’s (2006) findings that living in rural settings supports conflicting attitudes toward the poor.

**Attitudes toward poverty findings.** The overall findings of poverty attitudes were positive on the interpretive scale. The Yun and Weaver (2010) Attitudes Toward Poverty Short Form has twenty-one items that were scored on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. The overall scale measures poverty attitudes that produce a score from 21 to 105, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes toward poverty, and lower scores representing having lower poverty attitudes. The average for this study achieved an overall total average point score of 77.60. This study has established this score as a baseline for future studies and comparisons. This score has utility for the practitioner who might be interested in self-reflection. The study found poverty attitudes on the structural factor were lower than those of the overall scale. This indicates poverty attitudes are relatively more negative in regards to structural explanations of poverty.

**Exploratory factor analysis.** Yun and Weaver (2010) identified three factors as: personal deficiency (7 items), stigma (8 items), and structural perspective (6 items). Analysis of all three factors separately was conducted and presented in chapter four. The overall scale score was used for the inferential statistics. The Yun and Weaver scale had a high level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha =.87). All of their subscales exceeded the level of internal consistency between 0.65 and 0.80 as adequate (Vaske, 2008). This study established that item results loaded on three factors and retained a similar internal consistency demonstrated by a Cronbach’s alpha = .81.
Three new items were piloted to represent deficit views of poverty (Valencia, 1997), and to contextualize poverty attitudes within an educational framework. A factor analysis was conducted, all three items loaded on factor one, personal deficit. The items were useful in this study to determine if deficit thinking was evidenced as a poverty attitude. Although not statistically significant, a majority of principals agreed that poor students learn differently. This was surprising given the overall positive attitudes on the overall scale and should be an area for further study.

**Implications for Education**

Overall the findings of this study support the use of Yun and Weaver’s ATP Short Form (2010) as a reliable tool for measuring principal attitudes of poverty and achieved a reliability of .81. An exploratory factor analysis established the three factors (personal deficit, stigma and structural) by Yun and Weaver (2010) were supported by this study. Of these three factors structural scale scores were lower than the other two factors (personal deficit and stigma). One implication for this might be to explore the coursework and training of pre-service and leadership coursework around understanding how structural explanations of poverty interact with poverty attitudes. Moreover, it is important to explore what knowledge exists in relationship to identifying and understanding structural factors of poverty that may be outside of the experiences of those who work in education.

This study established a baseline of poverty attitudes for principals in one state. This is an important step for future studies of poverty attitudes, including program evaluation or longitudinal studies. This study confirmed previous research (Cozzarelli et
al., 2001; Rehner et al., 1997) that poverty attitudes are significantly and positively correlated to liberal (versus conservative) political views. This study found this to be the highest predictor of poverty attitudes with significant results at $p \leq .001$. Age was another variable found to be statistically significant ($p \leq .001$). Older respondents had significantly higher poverty attitudes than younger respondents. Many previous studies of poverty attitudes using convenience samples of university students have not been able to determine this as an important variable regarding poverty attitudes.

Educators, both active and pre-service should challenge their assumptions and attitudes regarding poverty, including deficit thinking. Poverty attitudes should be explored because such attitudes could be negatively impacting the equitable opportunities for students who are economically disadvantaged (Shields et al., 2005). Multicultural education coursework is important in the mission to address poverty attitudes and forms of classism which negatively impact the lives of students. The ability to empathize and identify ways stereotypes harm economically disadvantage students and recognize ways that systems are structured to advantage or disadvantage certain students is important to broadening understanding of current leaders and future educators.

This study found that principals and educators have been provided poverty professional development to improve to poverty attitudes (Beegle, 2003; Jensen, 2009; Payne, 2005). The current study found poverty attitudes for structural explanations were less positive (M=2.96) than those of the overall scale and the other two factors (1, personal deficit- M=4.28 and 2, stigma-M=3.69 and the overall scale M=3.69). The findings of the current study support the position of Gasker and Vafeas (2003) who proposed the benefits of focusing on structural understandings of poverty for social justice education. This study has
implications for multicultural coursework to focus more on structural explanations of poverty for educators.

Colleges and universities may consider using the ATP for measuring poverty attitudes in pre-service programs. Multicultural courses often focus on personal deficit and stigma, but should consider emphasis on a structural perspective which includes explicitly identifying economic, political and social structures that impact poverty attitudes and perceptions of deservingness. The important distinction is that this scale offers a way to determine poverty explanations an establish baselines for courses in a pre and post format to determine effective outcomes. One line of inquiry that demonstrates how this instrument could be used is a review of curriculum and content for multicultural courses. For example, an examination of student’s poverty attitudes could assist in the creation and selection of content for multicultural coursework or other programs where social justice is a desirable outcome.

Evidence based scientific research practice has been emphasized since the *No Child Left Behind Act*, [http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html) (2001) was enacted. The funding for many educational programs and interventions should include program evaluation. In the area of research on poverty attitudes, in order to conduct such studies, it is important to provide the field with a measurement tool. The Yun and Weaver (2010) scale is a tool to measure poverty attitudes around a variety of program outcomes. The scale could be used for individual reflection of poverty attitudes, as a formal program evaluation using the tool for measurement in a pre-posttest evaluation model, or for maintaining longitudinal data of poverty attitudes. The use of any dependable scales to evaluate or determine effective outcomes includes inputs, outputs
and represents the importance of measurement of poverty attitudes for program evaluation (Chen, 2005).

A recent “Google” search of the words “poverty training” produced over 139,000,000 million results (9-14-15). Of the investigated websites, many offered to provide poverty training. Various offerings included poverty toolkits from five hundred dollars to five thousand dollars for three days of training, some offered certificates. None of the websites offered any formal evaluation for their training and none of the training was free. Obviously poverty training as a professional development is big business. The lack of a formal program evaluation has serious implications if districts are using federal funds to provide such trainings that lack a scientifically sound research base or provide any form of program evaluation. The Yun and Weaver ATP scale is free tool to evaluate and quantify poverty attitudes.

**Limitations and Recommendations**

This study reports the first time K-8 principals have been studies about poverty attitudes using a structured tool. Therefore, no generalizations can be made based on these results. Further replication of the Yun and Weaver (2010) Attitudes Toward Poverty Short Form should be used with other education populations, including teachers, pre-service educators, high school principals, superintendents, and other educational service providers the scale to establish scale scores for other populations. Researchers should consider further studies in other regions with greater diversity of educators, such as the rural south.
The 21 items used by Yun & Weaver (2010) and in this study originated from the Atherton et al. (1993) scale with 37 items. Future studies might consider the use of the Atherton et al. (1993) scale for educators and other professions to analyze the factor structure when time is not an important consideration. Most importantly, future studies are needed to replicate the Yun and Weaver scale to establish the reliability of the instrument across diverse populations. Many of the items from these scales are constructed using absolute statements. Future research should consider creating scale response items that are worded in more positive language. Negative wording of the items are framed in language that supports a deficit perspective. Future scale development should consider creating more positive statements.

Poverty attitudes impact all aspects of our educational system and the measurement of such attitudes and how they might interact in the context of school and outcomes for students is important work. Further exploration using this tool for exploring poverty attitudes should be conducted within university and colleges of teacher education and leadership programs. This would be especially warranted for the development of multicultural programs which emphasize structural explanations of poverty and how attitudes impact equitable opportunities. Future investigations of poverty attitudes should further examine structural explanations of poverty as an area of important study in relationship to educator efficacy in impacting poverty.

The Yun and Weaver (2010) Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor scale would be useful for a variety of purposes including self-study, program evaluation of effectiveness of professional training in meeting poverty objectives/outcomes in
education and for measurement of poverty attitudes longitudinally to assure social justice outcomes are met. A limitation of the ATP scale is the lack of differentiation between individual and groups, treating the “poor” in a one dimensional framework rather than a socioeconomic state. For example, poverty attitudes around the homeless could be significantly different than poverty attitudes of sickness, disability, length of condition including temporary conditions versus long term, degrees of economic inequality, etc.

Clearly, it is time to embrace measurement tools that enable our society be mindful about social justice. Although this study is situated within the context of school, future research should be inclusive of varied local stakeholders with diverse perspectives regarding how poverty attitudes, beliefs and dispositions impact equity and economic opportunity in the broader community. The economic realities of poverty and the impact of classism do not begin and end at the doorsteps of schools but are reflective of the greater and more troubling realities of the widening economic disparity of societal wealth and income. Perhaps the ongoing and uncomfortable silence around issues of class is a result of the growing fear that by acknowledging the elephant in the room, we might all realize how close we are to finding ourselves as vulnerable as those in poverty.
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Appendix A: IRB Online Consent Form

Ohio University Online Consent Form

Title of Research: Rural Principals Attitudes toward Poverty and the Poor

Researchers: Melissa Gholson, Investigator & Krisanna Machtmes, Ph.D., Chair

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You may print a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study

This study is being done because poverty is a relevant social problem. This study will examine principal and school demographics in relationship to social class attitudes.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey.

You should not participate in this study if you are not a school principal.

Your participation in the study will last approximately five to six minutes.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated

Benefits

This study is important to science/society because a better understanding attitudes will assist educators in providing good outcomes for students. You may not benefit personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records

Your study information will be kept confidential by a secure browser which will record your responses. The research data will be reported as aggregate group data and no individual responses or individual school data will be shared. All e-mail information will be deleted once the award is distributed. All individual and school data will be kept secure and identifiers eliminated once analyzed for this study.
For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer. Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;
* Advisor of Dissertation, who will oversee the project.

**Compensation**

As compensation for your time/effort, you will receive an opportunity to enter to receive a drawing of five one hundred dollar VISA gift cards. The odds of winning is 1 in 116.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator, Melissa Gholson, mw120102@ohio.edu, 740-532-5127 or the advisor Krisanna Machtmes, Ph.D., machtmes@ohio.edu, 740-597-1323.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.

By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Version Date: [insert 04/29/2015]
Appendix B: Survey Instrument

School Demographics

NCES school code identifiers are used to obtain locale and free and reduced lunch rates.
E-mail data and school code data will be used to match the NCES data and will be stripped once the study is completed. At no time will participants in the study or their schools be made public, only group data will be shared.

Principal Demographics

Age: What was your age at your last birthday? 0-100
Experience: How many years have you completed as a principal? 0-50
Gender: Check the appropriate box. Female, male, prefer not to say
Race/ Ethnicity: (use NCES category codes)
What is your ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino Not- Hispanic or Latino?
What is your race: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; White; Two or more races, Prefer not to say.
Political Affiliation: On a scale of 1-Very conservative to 6 very liberal how would you rate your political view?
Social class origin: How would you describe your social class when you were growing up? Very poor (received government assistance), Somewhat poor (difficult making ends meet), Working class (intermittent unemployment), Working class II (stable employment), Middle class (Professional work) or Upper class (more resources than most people)
Religiosity: On a scale of 1- being very religious to 6- Not at all religious how would you rate your relationship with religion? 1- Very Religious, 2- Religious, 3- Somewhat Religious, 4- Somewhat Not Religious, 5- Not Religious, 6- Not at all religious

Appalachian identity: How would you rate your Appalachian values (connection to the region) on a scale of 1-6 with 1- not at all Appalachian to 6- very Appalachian? 1- Not at all Appalachian, 2- Not Appalachian, 3- Somewhat Not Appalachian, 4- Somewhat Appalachian, 5- Appalachian, 6- Very Appalachian

Poverty Training: What kind of training about poverty have you attended? (Select all that apply) Ruby Payne Training, College Coursework, Independent study, School or district training not prescriptive, other and fill in blank.

Deficit Thinking Items

Students who are poor learn differently than students who are not poor.

SD D A SA N

Students who are poor cannot be expected to achieve at the same level of students who are not poor.

SD D A SA N

Parents of poor children do not care about education.

SD D A SA N
**Yun and Weaver (2010) ATP Short Form Items**

Please select your level of agreement to the following statements using the following scale: If you strongly Disagree select 1= SD, If you disagree select 2=D, If you agree select 3 =SA, If you strongly agree select 4=A, If you are neutral select 0= N.

1. Poor people are different than the rest of society.
   
   SD D A SA N

2. Poor people are dishonest.
   
   SD D A SA N

3. Most poor people are dirty.
   
   SD D A SA N

4. Poor people act differently.
   
   SD D A SA N

5. Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything.
   
   SD D A SA N

6. I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people.
   
   SD D A SA N

7. Poor people generally have lower intelligence than non-poor people.
   
   SD D A SA N

8. There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients.
   
   SD D A SA N

9. Some “poor” people live better than I do, considering all their benefits.
   
   SD D A SA N
10. Poor people think they deserve to be supported.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

11. Welfare mothers have babies to get more money.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

12. An able-bodied person collecting welfare is ripping off the system.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

13. Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

   SD   D   A   SA   N

15. Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

16. People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

17. I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs
    for poor people.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

18. If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits.
   SD   D   A   SA   N

19. People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune.
   SD   D   A   SA   N
20. Society has the responsibility to help poor people.

   SD   D   A   SA   N

21. Poor people are discriminated against.

   SD   D   A   SA   N
Appendix C: Permission to Use the Instrument

Subject: PW: ATP short form

From: Sung Hyun Yun [mailto:yhyun@uwindsor.ca]
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2012 3:03 PM
To: Melissa Gholson
Subject: Re: ATP short form

Yes,

I give you permission for using the short form.

Sung Hyun Yun, Ph.D., MSW
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Avenue
Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4
(519) 253-3000 ext. 3076
yhyun@uwindsor.ca

The information in this email is directed in confidence solely to the person(s) named above and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. This information shall not otherwise be distributed, copied or disclosed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately via return email and destroy the original message. Thank you.

From: Melissa Gholson <mgholson@access.k12.wv.us>
To: yhyun@uwindsor.ca
Date: 11/12/2012 02:23 PM
Subject: ATP short form

Good Afternoon Dr. Yun and Weaver,

I am working on my dissertation in Educational Administration and are interested in using the shortened form of the ATP scale from your study Development and Validation of a Short Form of the Attitude Toward Poverty Scale (2010). I had been planning on using Alherton et al (1993) but the opportunity to have a reduced number of items is appealing. Fewer items would be easier to administer and collect and perhaps provide me an opportunity for a higher return rate on my survey. I appreciate your work and would like your permission to use the shortened form. Please let me know if this meets with your approval.

Respectfully,

Melissa Gholson