



Social dominance orientation, belief in a just world and intergroup contact as predictors of homeless stigmatisation

Rebecca Smith & Sofia Stathi

To cite this article: Rebecca Smith & Sofia Stathi (2021): Social dominance orientation, belief in a just world and intergroup contact as predictors of homeless stigmatisation, The Journal of Social Psychology, DOI: [10.1080/00224545.2021.1963204](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1963204)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1963204>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 14 Nov 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 10



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



This article has been awarded the Centre for Open Science 'Open Materials' badge.

Social dominance orientation, belief in a just world and intergroup contact as predictors of homeless stigmatisation

Rebecca Smith and Sofia Stathi

University of Greenwich

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore individual and situational predictors of homeless stigmatization. The aim was to test if individual differences in Belief in a Just World (BJW) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) moderate the effect of quantity and quality of contact on stigmatization of the homeless. One hundred and eighty-seven participants completed measures of BJW, SDO, quality, and quantity of contact, as well as a measure of homeless stigmatization. Results showed that BJW and SDO correlated positively with stigmatization, while both quantity and quality of contact were negatively correlated with stigmatization. SDO was found to moderate the relationship between quantity of contact and stigmatization; more contact with the homeless was related to lower stigmatization for participants with low and moderate SDO scores but not those with high SDO. BJW did not moderate the relationship between contact and stigmatization. Implications regarding the interaction between SDO and contact are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 3 July 2019
Accepted 22 July 2021

KEYWORDS

Homeless stigmatization;
intergroup contact; social
dominance orientation;
belief in a just world;
prejudice

Introduction

In the current paper, it is argued that individuals' view of inequality in society is particularly relevant to their views of homeless people and that it will affect how contact with homeless people impacts upon prejudice. Pulling together both individual and situational factors, we aim to better understand the stigmatization of the homeless.

There is considerable evidence that the homeless are stigmatized within western societies. Phelan et al. (1997) found that participants exhibited more negative attitudes toward a character in a vignette who was described as homeless compared to one described as poor but housed. Fiske et al. (2002) compared participants' stereotypes toward a range of different social groups and found that the homeless were judged negatively on the dimensions of warmth and competence. As such, homeless people can be characterized as an "extreme outgroup" and face severe stigmatization. Harris and Fiske (2006) provide evidence for this using fMRI to test participants' reactions to the homeless. Results showed that the reactions to the homeless were more akin to reactions to (disgusting) objects, suggesting the dehumanization of this category of people.

Belcher and DeForge (2012) argue that stigmatization of the homeless is inevitable within a capitalist society, which is inherently unequal. Rather than seeing homelessness as a consequence of an unfair system, the homeless themselves are blamed for their individual failings. This outlook justifies the system as well as the continued maltreatment of homeless people.

Kingree and Daves (1997) essentially class attitudes toward the homeless as positive or negative depending on the extent to which participants attribute causes of homelessness as structural or personal, respectively. It is argued that attitudes toward the homeless are inherently bound up with attitudes toward inequality in society. Individuals differ in their perspectives of societal inequalities,

often as a function of political ideologies. Social dominance orientation (SDO) and belief in a just world (BJW) are two key individual differences in the extent to which a person endorses a system justifying ideologies. Let us consider each in turn.

According to Lerner (1980) we are motivated to see the world as a just place and thus predictable and meaningful. Most central to BJW is the idea that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get. The unfortunate implication of such a view is that those who suffer misfortune can be blamed for their predicament (Hafer & Sutton, 2016). Research has shown that BJW is predictive of stigmatization of those with mental illness (Bizer et al., 2011), the obese, and those suffering from eating disorders (Ebner et al., 2011). Of particular interest to the current study is how BJW relates to poverty and homelessness. For example, Harper et al. (1990) demonstrated that participants high in BJW were more inclined to blame third world poverty on the poor themselves. More recently, Baumgartner et al. (2012) found that BJW correlated with more negative attitudes toward the homeless.

As well as victim blaming, Jost and Hunyady (2002) pointed out that BJW serves a system justifying function, as believing that the world is fair means there is no need to change it. Similarly, they argue that SDO also perpetuates the status quo, but in a different way. According to Pratto et al. (1994) individuals high in SDO are accepting of inequality and are generally in favor of the idea that some groups should dominate others. Essentially, the situation within a capitalist culture is that the rich dominate the poor. De Keersmaecker and Roets (2017) showed that BJW and SDO are correlated, along with Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), which concerns endorsement of traditional conservative values, and all these variables predict prejudice. There is a considerable amount of evidence that SDO correlates with a range of different forms of prejudice, including racism directed toward Black people (Pratto et al., 1994), generalized ethnic prejudice in New Zealand (Meeusen et al., 2017), sexism (Pratto et al., 1994), immigrant children and people with disabilities (Vezzali et al., 2018) as well as stigmatization of those with mental illness (Bizer et al., 2011; Kvaal & Haslam, 2016), cultural elitism (Pratto et al., 1994) and stigmatization on those living with HIV (Von Collani et al., 2010). As such, SDO legitimizes hierarchical power structures and inequality.

Oldmeadow and Fiske (2007) characterize BJW and SDO as forms of system justification ideologies that are particularly pertinent to inequality, and as such they argue that these variables will affect status stereotypes as a means of justifying inequality. In their studies, participants were shown two pictures of houses, one was rundown and “poor,” the other looked more expensive. They were then asked to make judgments about the inhabitants of each house. Participants judged the inhabitants of the poorer house as less competent than the richer house, while BJW (Study 1) and SDO (Study 2) moderated this effect. Such a finding suggests that poverty prejudice is driven by system justifying factors.

As well as researching how SDO is related to prejudice, more recently scholars have turned their attention to its role within prejudice reduction and intergroup contact. Following Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, ample research has been conducted on the generally positive role of contact on intergroup relations (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006 for meta-analysis; see also Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew et al., 2011; Vezzali & Stathi, 2017). Contact can be an effective means of prejudice reduction, but this rests on a number of qualifications; the contact should be co-operative (Koschate & van Dick, 2011), the contact partners should share common goals (Patchen, 1982), meet on an equal footing (Brewer & Kramer, 1985), and interactions should be personal and should be supported by authorities and institutional norms (Landis et al., 1984).

Falvo et al. (2015) have shown that a type of indirect intergroup contact, namely imagined contact (Crisp & Turner, 2009; Stathi & Crisp, 2008), can reduce dehumanization of the homeless. It must be pointed out, however, that imagined contact was in the case of Falvo et al. (2015) instructed to be positive. If contact is not perceived as positive, it can in fact increase prejudice (Barlow et al., 2012).

With respect to contact with homeless people, it is important to highlight that an individual's homeless status may be more often understood in stereotypical situations, such as rough sleeping and begging, involving interactions which bring inequality into stark relief. Such social exchanges are not particularly co-operative, and various policies (concerning loitering or begging) make clear that they

are not supported institutionally or by the law. Under these conditions, which fall short of the positive contact conditions, one may expect encounters with the homeless to increase prejudice and stigmatization.

Research in the United States has looked at the effects of contact on attitudes toward the homeless and suggests that even quite shallow encounters with homeless people may still predict more positive attitudes. A wide-scale survey conducted by Lee et al. (2004) broadened the concept of contact to include information about the homeless, observation of them, as well as interactions with them, thus their measure was more akin to “exposure to homeless people.” They found that the more contact participants had with the homeless, the less prejudiced their attitudes were. More recently, Tsai et al. (2018) also found that exposure to homeless people improves attitudes toward them. Aberson and McVean (2008) tested the nature of contact with homeless people in more detail and demonstrated that better quality and greater quantity of contact predicted more positive attitudes toward the homeless, but quality of contact was more closely related to attitudes, whereas quantity of contact only impacted attitudes indirectly via anxiety. Thus, both quantity and quality of contact may improve attitudes toward the homeless but in different ways.

The overall results that contact with homeless people is associated with more positive attitudes are encouraging but there may be important individual differences that need to be tested within this process. Tsai et al. (2018) found that women and Democrats tended to have more positive attitudes toward the homeless. SDO is lower for women than men and is generally associated with more left-leaning political ideologies (Pratto et al., 2011), and could underpin this relationship. Moreover, SDO has been found to moderate the effect of contact on prejudice (e.g., Asbrock et al., 2012; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009). Asbrock et al. (2012) pointed out that even in his original hypothesis, Allport acknowledged that “Contact, as a situational variable, cannot always overcome the personal variable in prejudice” (p. 280). Asbrock et al. (2012) argue that SDO (and RWA) are particularly relevant personality variables here and may moderate the effects of intergroup contact, though results are not consistent at this point.

Hodson (2008) investigated the effects of interracial contact in a prison context and found that white prisoners who were high in SDO were less racist the more contact they had with Black prisoners. This led Hodson (2011) to argue that contact may be most beneficial to the people who most need it. Hodson did acknowledge that in a prison environment, group hierarchy is potentially more of an issue than in other settings. Nevertheless, the moderating effect of SDO on the contact effect was also reported by Dhont and Van Hiel (2009) in a non-prison sample in a study on attitudes toward immigrants.

Asbrock et al. (2012) conducted a longitudinal study testing whether contact and SDO predicted prejudice. This study failed to find a moderating effect of SDO (though RWA did moderate the effect of contact on prejudice). The authors argue that this is because a competitive threat, rather than a social threat, underlies SDO. Asbrock et al. (2013), replicated this RWA effect, however they report the opposite moderating effect of SDO on prejudice in that high levels of SDO inhibited prejudice reduction following contact (in Study 1).

The purpose of the current study is to explore the interaction between individual and situational factors, which may predict stigmatization of the homeless. Since homeless stigmatization is so closely bound up with ideology about inequality, it is argued that SDO and BJW as system justifying factors that legitimize inequality and blame for misfortune will be positively related to homeless stigmatization.

Contact with homeless people is expected to reduce homeless stigmatization. In line with Aberson and McVean (2008) quality and quantity of contact with homeless people will be tested separately rather than as a composite measure. This is particularly pertinent when testing attitudes toward the homeless as researchers have looked at exposure to homeless people as a measure of quantity of contact (Lee et al., 2004; Tsai et al., 2018), but we acknowledge that the quality of interactions with the homeless is also key when investigating intergroup attitudes. Moreover, in the UK, homelessness has increased by 132% since 2010 (Fitzpatrick et al., 2017). Arguably, quantity of

contact with homeless people that individuals experience is high, but not necessarily the quality of that contact in the context of austerity, a right-wing government, and policies restricting loitering and begging. The moderating effect of SDO will be tested in order to shed light on the discrepancy in results reported by Hodson (2008), Dhont and Van Hiel (2009), and Asbrock et al. (2012). In line with system justification theory, it is predicted that SDO will limit the effect of contact on prejudiced attitudes. BJW is also expected to limit the effect of contact on prejudice, in both cases, BJW and SDO are expected to interrupt the beneficial effects of contact because they undermine social equality, thus legitimizing plight of the homeless. To our knowledge, this is the first time these hypotheses have been simultaneously tested.

Method

Participants and design

One hundred and eighty-seven participants were recruited to take part in the study as part of a psychology laboratory class, 146 were female, 35 male, and 6 preferred not to disclose their sex. Participants' ages ranged from 19 to 49 ($M = 23.54$, $SD = 6.89$). Participants' scores on scales measuring belief in a just world, social dominance orientation, and quantity and quality of contact with homeless people were tested as predictors of stigmatization of the homeless.

Materials

The Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) 16-item scale (Pratto et al., 1994) was used. This scale included items such as "If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems," and "We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally" (reversed item). Participants were required to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each item on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The scale had a good reliability, $\alpha = 0.87$.

To measure belief in a just world (BJW), a short global scale adapted from Lipkus (1991) was used. This had six items including, "I am confident that justice always prevails over injustice" and "I believe that by and large people get what they deserve." Again, participants were required to indicate their agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This scale had acceptable reliability, $\alpha = 0.69$.

To measure both quality and quantity of contact with homeless people, Voci and Hewstone's (2003) scale was adapted. This scale was originally developed to measure contact with African immigrants and contained general items as well as items about student life. Whilst it is possible for a student to be homeless, there are safeguarding policies in place, which mean that should a student become homeless, other students would be unlikely to know about it and for this reason only the general items from the scales were used. A single item asked participants about the frequency of contact they had with homeless people, on a scale of 1 (never) to 7 (very frequently). Three items asked participants about the quality of contact they have with homeless people. Specifically, participants were asked to express agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) with statements about how pleasant, co-operative, and superficial (reversed) their interactions with the homeless were. This subscale also had a quite poor reliability, $\alpha = 0.62$, but could be improved to 0.86 by dropping the item about superficial contact. It was decided to use this more reliable two-item scale in the analysis.

The stigmatization scale used in this study was designed by Crisp et al. (2005) to measure stigma directed toward people with mental illness. It comprises eight statements, which were altered to assess attitudes toward homeless people. Items included "Homeless people are a danger to others," and "Homeless people are unpredictable." Participants are asked to indicate their agreement with on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scale had a good reliability, $\alpha = 0.83$.

Ethics

The proposed study underwent an ethical peer review prior to data collection. Participation was anonymous and voluntary. Participants were provided with information and consent forms prior to the study and a debrief afterward. They were free to withdraw their data at any time during the study and up to a week afterward.

Analysis

Data were analyzed using the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2018) to test two models of double moderation (Model 2), in which contact was considered the predictor variable, stigmatization of the homeless was the outcome variable, and SDO and BJW were the moderators. This model was run twice so as to test this for the effects of quantity and quality of contact separately. The analysis used the mean center for constructing products.

Results

This is the first instance of the use of Crisp et al. (2005) stigma scale as a means of exploring homeless stigmatization. Thus, we provide the average scores on each item in Table 1. Scores are relatively low (all below the midpoint of the scale, i.e., three), indicating that on the whole this sample was not particularly prejudiced toward the homeless. Most highly endorsed was the statement that the homeless were unpredictable, and the item participants responded with least agreement was the statement that homeless people can never recover.

Predictor variables were tested for correlation with homeless stigmatization. Table 2 illustrates the results of this analysis. All predictors significantly correlated with homeless stigmatization.

Quantity of contact

This model tested the quantity of contact effect on stigmatization with SDO and BJW as moderators of stigmatization of homeless people, again using Model 2 in PROCESS with mean centering and 5,000 iterations with bootstrapping. The overall model was significant; $F(5, 181) = 14.95, p < .001$ and accounted for 29% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.29$). All the main effects within this model were significant; the quantity of contact significantly negatively predicted stigmatization; $b = -0.11, t(181) = 3.23$,

Table 1. Mean item scores for homeless stigmatization.

Stigma Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Homeless people are a danger to others	1.91	0.92
Homeless people are unpredictable	2.58	1.26
Homeless people are hard to talk to	2.26	1.10
Homeless people are different	2.47	1.24
Homeless people have themselves to blame	2.10	1.10
Homeless people should pull themselves together	2.42	1.43
Homeless people wouldn't improve if helped	1.71	0.94
Homeless people will never recover	1.59	0.74

Table 2. Correlation matrix for each predictor variable with homeless stigmatization.

Variable	Mean (S.D.)	1. BJW	2. SDO	3. Quantity contact	4. Quality contact
(1) BJW	3.55 (1.01)				
(1) SDO	2.28 (0.90)	0.13			
(1) Quantity Contact	2.96 (1.47)	-0.08	-0.14		
(1) Quality contact	4.28 (1.21)	-0.05	-0.23**	0.35**	
(1) Stigma	2.13 (0.75)	0.23**	0.42**	-0.27**	-0.45**



Figure 1. Slopes depicting the moderation of SDO on the effect of quantity of contact with homeless stigmatization.

$p = .002$ confidence intervals between -0.17 and -0.04 . SDO significantly predicted stigmatization, $b = 0.29$, $t(181) = 5.44$, $p < .001$, confidence intervals between 0.19 and 0.40 . BJW also significantly predicted stigmatization, $b = 0.12$, $t(181) = 2.52$, $p = .01$ confidence intervals between 0.03 and 0.21 . When the initial interaction was significant, SDO moderated the effect of quantity of contact on stigmatization; $b = 0.13$, $t(181) = 3.34$, $p < .001$, confidence intervals between 0.05 and 0.21 . BJW did not moderate the effect between quantity of contact and stigmatization; $b = -0.03$, $t(181) = -1.04$, $p = .30$, confidence intervals between -0.10 and 0.03 . The simple slopes for SDO showed that at low levels the more contact the less stigmatizing attitudes, $b = -0.22$, $t = -4.63$, $p < .001$, this was also apparent at mid-levels of SDO $b = -0.11$, $t = 3.23$, $p < .01$; however, at high levels of SDO there was no effect, $b = 0.01$, $t = -0.26$, $p > .05$. **Figure 1** illustrates the moderation effect of SDO at one standard deviation above and below the centralized mean. As BJW was not a significant moderator value are given at the central level of BJW. Please see Appendix A for a summary table of bootstrap results for this model.

Quality of contact

Three participants did not complete the quality of contact measure and were not included in the following analysis; as a consequence, the predictive effects of SDO and BJW on stigmatization of homeless people are slightly different from those observed in the model above testing the quantity of contact. This model tested the quality of contact effect on stigmatization with SDO and BJW as moderators of stigmatization of homeless people, again using Model 2 in PROCESS with mean centering and 5,000 iterations with bootstrapping. The model was significant; $F(5,179) = 18.41$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 34% of the variance. All three main effects were significant; for quality of contact on stigmatization $b = -0.22$, $t(179) = -5.72$, $p < .001$, confidence intervals between -0.30 and -0.15 , for SDO $b = 0.27$, $t(179) = 5.08$, $p < .001$, confidence intervals between 0.17 and 0.38 , and BJW $b = 0.12$, $t(179) = 2.71$, $p = .007$, confidence intervals between 0.03 and 0.21 . The interactive effects were not significant for either SDO ($b = 0.04$, $t(179) = 0.95$, $p = .34$, confidence intervals between -0.05 and 0.14), or BJW ($b = -0.04$, $t(179) = -0.99$, $p = .32$, confidence intervals between -0.11 and 0.04). Please see Appendix B for a summary table of bootstrap results for this model.

Discussion

The aim of the current study was to explore individual and situational predictors of homeless stigmatization. We focused on social ideological variables related to legitimizing group hierarchies - SDO and BJW - as well as intergroup contact. As predicted, SDO and BJW were positively correlated with stigmatization and contact with homeless people (both quality of contact and quantity of contact) was negatively correlated with stigmatization. Quality of contact was more strongly correlated with stigmatization than the quantity of contact but in both cases the models accounted for around one-third of the variance. Our findings are in line with past research. Increased contact serving to reduce homeless stigmatization is consistent with the findings of Lee (2001), Tsai et al. (2018), and Aberson and McVean (2008). SDO positively predicting homeless stigmatization is consistent with the findings of Oldmeadow and Fiske (2007) and De Keersmaecker and Roets (2017). This finding adds to the wider trend of SDO as predictive of prejudice across a range of stigmatized groups such as those with mental illness (Kraale & Haslam, 2014), those living with HIV (Von Collani et al., 2010) as well as immigrants and disabled people (Vezzali et al., 2018). The positive relationship between BJW and stigmatization of the homeless was smaller but was also significant, and is consistent with Harper et al. (1990), Oldmeadow and Fiske (2007), and Baumgartner et al. (2012).

The moderation analysis allowed us to better understand how these factors interact with one another, revealing that SDO moderated the beneficial effects of quantity of contact; for those with low and medium levels of SDO more contact meant less stigmatization, but such benefits were not apparent for those high in SDO. Whilst a moderating effect of SDO on prejudice has been reported by Hodson (2008), and Dhont and Van Heil (2008), the interaction was in the opposite direction and does not support Hodson's (2011) assertion that contact may be most beneficial to those with intolerant attitudes. The findings reported in the current study are more consistent with research on imagined contact interventions, which have reported high levels of SDO as a barrier to prejudice reduction (Asbrock et al., 2013). It is unclear whether this apparent inconsistency is because the current study separated quality and quantity of contact, because it used stigmatization and thus relatively extreme prejudice measures, or because it focused on attitudes toward the homeless as a target outgroup. Future research would be needed in order to conclude this; however, it is argued that in a case of extreme inequality as is that between the homeless and the housed, which is supported by societal systems, it would be logical to infer that those individuals who are prone to inequality legitimizing attitudes (such as SDO) would not benefit from mere exposure to the target group, but could benefit from good-quality contact. We argue that this beneficial role of quality of contact with the homeless because no interaction was observed here, suggesting that SDO does not limit the effect of quality of contact on stigmatization; however, we must be cautious in interpreting a null effect. The finding that the quality of contact was not moderated by either SDO or BJW is also interesting and adds to the findings of Aberson and McVean (2008) that quantity and quality of contact may impact attitudes in different ways, however without further research we cannot be sure quite how different they are.

At this point, it is worth considering the specifics of prejudice toward the homeless; it can be argued that homelessness as a phenomenon is caused by societal inequality and as such, measures such as SDO which are essentially about this very issue may be particularly pertinent. Exploring participants' reactions to policies that attempt to help the homeless via increased taxation may be a fruitful way of testing these ideas. One might expect a movement toward greater equality to be perceived as a threat by those high in SDO.

BJW was not found to interact with the relationship between either quantity or quality of contact and homeless stigmatization. This may be due to limitations with the BJW scale. This was a shorter adapted scale (with acceptable but not good reliability) which measured the global BJW. Researchers in this field have argued there is a distinction between belief in a just world for the self and belief in a just world for others and that it is the latter which is related to victim blaming (Hayes et al., 2013). Since our argument was that the victim blaming role of BJW was crucial to the system justifying

element of prejudice toward the homeless, future research could test this idea using a scale that distinguishes between self and other BJW. Limitations to the scale may also explain why we did not observe a significant relationship between SDO and BJW, which has been reported in prejudice research elsewhere (Bizer et al., 2012).

There were a number of other limitations in the current study which future research in this area may consider addressing. The study was realized with a modest in size, student sample, in which women are overrepresented. This limits the generalizability of the findings that require replication by future research.

Scales used in the study could also be improved in future research; whilst both the homeless stigmatization scale and quality of contact with homeless people had good internal reliability, they were adapted from scales designed to measure attitudes toward different target groups. A larger scale study could use a bespoke homeless stigma and homeless contact scale. Researchers may also consider using a broader operationalization of contact as was used in Lee's research (2004) to better assess exposure to homeless people. It would be useful to expand the quality of contact measure too. In the current study, we addressed how pleasant and co-operative the contact experience was but Aberson and McVean (2008) also included measures of perceived equality and the voluntary or involuntary nature of the contact, which more fully map on to elements of contact found to increase its positive effect (Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Koschate & van Dick, 2011). It may also be beneficial to test participants' perception of the extent to which contact is supported by authorities in line with Landis et al. (1984).

Research by Asbrock et al. (2011, Asbrock et al., 2013) has shown that RWA is another crucial individual difference that can be considered to be system justifying in moderating the effect of contact on prejudice. This variable could also be explored in relation to homeless stigmatization.

We also acknowledge some conceptual issues concerning the nature of BJW and SDO. In the literature, and indeed within this paper, these factors are referred to as personality variables, social orientations, and reflecting ideology. This issue is not merely one of semantics, there are implications for the stability of these characteristics within the individual. Dambrun et al. (2009) have shown that SDO can be reduced over time; in a sample of psychology students, this effect was mediated by a reduction in endorsement of "geneticism," essentially a greater appreciation of the role of nurture over nature. Perhaps, a greater understanding of the environmental impact on behavior and character would also reduce homeless stigmatization.

It is also important to acknowledge that the levels of SDO were quite low in our sample. In particular, Hodson (2008) points out that his prison sample would likely have higher than average SDO since much of prison life is about dominance. Future research on non-psychology student samples would be beneficial. This may explain why we observe different patterns of results in our study compared to the research by Hodson (2008, see also Hodson, Turner & Choma, 2017).

A final critical point to consider concerns the direction of causality inferred within the current model, in which contact with the homeless is characterized as the predictor and stigmatization as the outcome. Binder et al. (2009) have shown that whilst contact does reduce prejudice, prejudice can also reduce contact. In fact, Vezzali et al. (2018) included SDO as an outcome measure of contact. This is of particular relevance in our study as we measured participants' existing levels of contact (rather than manipulating contact). However, in answer to this, the research by Falvo et al. (2015) should be recalled, in which an imagined contact intervention was found to reduce the dehumanization of the homeless. Nevertheless, future research comparing high and low prejudice participants' (intended and actual) contact with the homeless would be illuminating on this point.

In the future, researchers may also consider targeted interventions involving contact, such as extended (Wright et al., 1997), vicarious (Mazziotta et al., 2011) and imagined contact (Crisp & Turner, 2009) as a means of testing how contact, SDO, and prejudice toward the homeless interact. Such a study may compare the effects on different target groups as it may be the "extreme outgroup" status of the homeless (Harris & Fiske, 2006) which alters the nature of this relationship, in comparison to interethnic prejudice as studied by Hodson (2008), Dhont and Van Heil (2008), and Ashbrock et al. (2011).

In conclusion, this study provides further evidence about the relationship between SDO and intergroup contact on prejudice. SDO limits the effect of quantity of contact on homeless stigmatization but not quality of contact. By focusing on the stigmatization of homeless people, this research broadens the scope of this relationship whilst underlining the importance of addressing both individual and situational factors in understanding prejudice and dimensions of inequality.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data availability statement

The data described in this article are openly available in the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/ru6q2/>.

Open scholarship



This article has earned the Center for Open Science badge for Open Materials. The materials are openly accessible at <https://osf.io/ru6q2/>.

References

- Aberson, C. L., & McVean, A. D. W. (2008). Contact and anxiety as predictors of bias toward the homeless. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(12), 3009–3035. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00423.x>
- Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Asbrock, F., Christ, O., Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). Differential effects of intergroup contact for authoritarians and social dominators: A dual process model perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(4), 477–490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211429747>
- Asbrock, F., Gutenbrunner, L., & Wagner, U. (2013). Unwilling, but not unaffected—Imagined contact effects for authoritarians and social dominators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(5), 404–412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1956>
- Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(12), 1629–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212457953>
- Baumgartner, B. J., Bauer, L. M., & Bui, K. T. (2012). Reactions to homelessness: Social, cultural, and psychological sources of discrimination. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 17*(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.24839/2164-8204.JN17.1.26>
- Belcher, J. R., & DeForge, B. R. (2012). Social stigma and homelessness: The limits of social change. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 22*(8), 929–946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2012.707941>
- Bizer, G. Y., Hart, J., & Jekogian, A. M. (2012). Belief in a just world and social dominance orientation: Evidence for a mediational pathway predicting negative attitudes and discrimination against individuals with mental illness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*(3), 428–432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.002>
- Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 36*(1), 219–243. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.36.020185.001251>
- Crisp, A., Gelder, M., Goddard, E., & Meltzer, H. (2005). Stigmatization of people with mental illnesses: A follow-up study within the Changing Minds campaign of the Royal College of Psychiatrists. *World Psychiatry, 4*, 106–113.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*(4), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014718>
- Dambrun, M., Kamiejski, R., Haddadi, N., & Duarte, S. (2009). Why does social dominance orientation decrease with university exposure to the social sciences? The impact of institutional socialization and the mediating role of “geneticism.” *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(1), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.498>
- De Keersmaecker, J., & Roets, A. (2017). All victims are equally innocent, but some are more innocent than others: The role of group membership on victim blaming. *Current Psychology, 1*–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9763-9>
- Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2009). We must not be enemies: Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice among authoritarians. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*(2), 172–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.09.022>

- Ebneter, D., Latner, J., & O'Brien, K. (2011). Just world beliefs, causal beliefs, and acquaintance: Associations with stigma towards eating disorders and obesity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 618–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.029>
- Falvo, R., Capozza, D., Di Bernardo, G. A., & Pagani, A. (2015). Can imagined contact favor the “humanization” of the homeless? *TPM Test Psychometric Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 22, 23–30.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P. S., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Hafer, C. L., & Sutton, R. M. (2016). Belief in a just world. In C. Sabbagh & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice theory and research* (pp. 145–160). Springer.
- Harper, D., Wagstaff, G., Newton, J., & Harrison, K. (1990). Lay causal perceptions of third world poverty and the just world theory. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 18(2), 235–238. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1990.18.2.235>
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: Neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. *Psychological Science*, 17(10), 847–853. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01793.x>
- Hayes, R. M., Lorenze, K., & Bell, K. A. (2013). Victim blaming others: Rape myth acceptance and the just world belief. *Feminist Criminology*, 8(3), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085113484788>
- Hodson, G. (2008). Interracial prison contact: The pros for (socially dominant) cons. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(2), 325–351. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X231109>
- Hodson, G. (2011). Do ideologically intolerant people benefit from intergroup contact? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(3), 154–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411409025>
- Hodson, G., & Hewstone, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Advances in intergroup contact*. Psychology Press.
- Hodson, G., Turner, R. N., & Choma, B. L. (2017). Individual differences in intergroup contact propensity and prejudice reduction. In L. Vezzali & S. Stathi (Eds.), *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and future directions (Series: Current issues in social psychology)* (pp. 8–30). Routledge.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280240000046>
- Kingree, J. B., & Daves, W. F. (1997). Preliminary validation of the attitudes toward homelessness inventory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25(3), 265–288. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6629\(199705\)25:3<265::aid-jcop4>3.0.CO;2-V](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199705)25:3<265::aid-jcop4>3.0.CO;2-V)
- Koschate, M., & van Dick, R. (2011). A multilevel test of Allport's contact conditions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(6), 769–787. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211399602>
- Kvaal, E. P., & Haslam, N. (2016). Motivational orientations and psychiatric stigma: Social motives influence how causal explanations relate to stigmatizing attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.044>
- Landis, D., Hope, R. O., & Day, H. R. (1984). Training for desegregation in the military. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 257–278). Academic Press.
- Lee, B. A., Farrell, C. R., & Link, B. G. (2004). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The case of public exposure to homelessness. *American Sociological Review*, 69(1), 40–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900104>
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York.
- Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(11), 1171–1178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(91\)90081-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90081-L)
- Mazziotta, A., Mummendey, A., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Vicarious intergroup contact effects: Applying social-cognitive theory to intergroup contact research. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210390533>
- Meeusen, C., Barlow, F. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). Generalized and specific components of prejudice: The decomposition of intergroup context effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2252>
- Oldmeadow, J., & Fiske, S. T. (2007). System-justifying ideologies moderate status = competence stereotypes: Roles for belief in a just world and social dominance orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1135–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.428>
- Patchen, M. (1982). *Black-White contact in schools: Its social and academic effects*. Purdue University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(3), 271–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001>
- Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., Moore, R. E., & Stueve, A. (1997). The stigma of homelessness: The impact of the label “homeless” on attitudes toward poor persons. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(4), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2787093>
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741–763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>

- Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining intergroup contact promotes projection to outgroups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*(4), 943–957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.003>
- Tsai, J., Lee, C. Y. S., Shen, J., Southwick, S. M., & Pieterzak, R. H. (2018). Public exposure and attitudes about homelessness. *Journal of Community Psychology, 47*(1), 76–92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22100>
- Vezzali, L., Di Bernardo, G. A., Stathi, S., Cadamuro, A., Láštiová, B., & Andraščíková, S. (2018). Secondary transfer effect among children: The role of social dominance orientation and outgroup attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 57*(3), 547–566. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12248>
- Vezzali, L., & Stathi, S. (Eds). (2017). *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and future directions (Series: Current issues in social psychology)*. Routledge.
- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430203006001011>
- Von Collani, G., Grumm, M., & Streicher, K. (2010). An investigation of the determinants of stigmatization and prejudice toward people living with HIV/AIDS. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(7), 1747–1766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00638.x>
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73>

Appendices

Appendix. Summarizing bootstrap results for the quantity of contact as a predictor of homeless stigmatization moderated by SDO and BJW.

	Coefficient	Boot strap mean	Boot strap SE	Lower confidence interval	Upper confidence interval
Constant	2.15	2.15	0.05	2.05	2.24
Quantity of contact	−0.11	−0.11	0.03	−0.17	−0.04
SDO	0.29	0.29	0.06	0.18	0.42
Quantity of contact X SDO	0.13	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.21
BJW	0.12	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.21
Quantity of contact X BJW	−0.03	−0.03	0.03	−0.09	0.04

Appendix. Summarizing bootstrap results for the quality of contact as a predictor of homeless stigmatization moderated by SDO and BJW.

	Coefficient	Boot strap mean	Boot strap SE	Lower confidence interval	Upper confidence interval
Constant	2.13	2.13	0.05	2.03	2.23
Quality of contact	−0.22	−0.22	0.04	−0.30	−0.14
SDO	0.27	0.27	0.06	0.16	0.39
Quality of contact X SDO	0.04	0.05	0.05	−0.04	0.15
BJW	0.12	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.22
Quality of contact X BJW	−0.04	−0.04	0.04	−0.11	0.03