Master's Theses   Theses and Dissertations

1993

Ageism and Intergenerational Programs: An Examination of Children's Motives for a Latch-Key Call in Program

Elizabeth Nebeker Szendre
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Szendre, Elizabeth Nebeker, "Ageism and Intergenerational Programs: An Examination of Children's Motives for a Latch-Key Call in Program" (1993). *Master's Theses*. 3943.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3943

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

AGEISM AND INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS:

AN EXAMINATION OF CHILDREN'S MOTIVES

FOR A LATCH-KEY CALL-IN PROGRAM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

ELIZABETH NEBEKER SZENDRE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Paul Jose, my thesis director, who has helped me through every step of this project. I also thank Dr. Jill Reich, my thesis reader, who has provided creative insights and helpful suggestions for this project. I appreciate the help of Monica Glaser, program director of "Grandma Please" at Uptown Hull House, for giving me access to program files and to participating schools. I thank the administration, teachers, and students of Beasley Academic Center for their patience and willingness to participate. Finally, I thank my husband, Loren Szendre, for his unfailing support and assistance throughout our graduate education experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

AGEISM AND INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS

Ageism

Research indicates that ageism, or the process of systematic stereotyping and discrimination against elderly people, is highly prevalent among American children (Harris & Fiedler, 1988; Lusczcz & Fitzgerald, 1986; Sorgman & Sorensen, 1984). These negative attitudes toward the elderly have been found in children ranging in age from preschool to high school (Fitzgerald, 1986, Harris & Fiedler, 1988; Lusczcz & Fitzgerald, 1986; Seefeldt, 1989; Sorgman & Sorensen, 1984). For example, research conducted on elementary school-age children has found that children know little about the aging process (Lusczcz & Fitzgerald, 1986), feel hostile toward the elderly, have little or no contact with the elderly, and view the physical characteristics of elderly people with intense dislike (Seefeldt, 1989). There are many reasons that may account for the prevalence of these ageist perceptions, including cultural values, the portrayal of elderly on television, and the reduced contact that many children have with the elderly.

Many researchers have theorized that current American cultural values have led to a decline in the status of the

old (Baker, 1983; Cole, 1984; Govaerts, 1980; Ishii-Kuntz & Lee, 1987; Pietropinto, 1985). American values such as self-reliance and economic independence often clash with the situation of many older Americans who suffer from a lack of financial resources, marginalization in the labor force, and less individual freedom (Govaerts, 1980). Studies have shown that American elderly are also seen as having lower levels of education and income, with the status of female elderly being lower than male elderly (Baker, 1983). Even more compelling research has shown that the elderly themselves devalue old age: for example, they may perceive children's attitudes toward themselves as even more negative than children's actual attitudes. (Nishi-Strattner & Myers, 1983). Even psychological research contains ageist language and can contribute to negative perceptions of the elderly (Schaie, 1993).

One factor that may contribute to ageism is reduced contact between children and the elderly. Because of demographic, economic, and social changes, children are often isolated from their grandparents and other elderly people (Crites, 1989). Because physical proximity to a grandparent is a significant predictor of children's interaction with the elderly (Krout, 1988), the increased mobility of the nuclear family leads to less interaction and can change feelings and perceptions between extended family members (Kulis, 1987).

Intergenerational Programs

Studies have assessed various intergenerational programs and their effects on children's attitudes toward the aged (e.g., Seefeldt, 1989). By increasing contact between the two groups, it was hypothesized that children's ageism would decrease. Unfortunately, however, these programs have had mixed results. Intergenerational programs have been found to both fail and succeed in improving children's perceptions of the elderly.

One experiment involving classroom instruction on death and dying reduced children's own fear of death but increased negative attitudes toward the aged (Seefeldt, 1989). Other studies with negative effects found that children's interaction with the institutionalized elderly can reinforce negative attitudes (Harris & Fiedler, 1988; Sorgman & Sorensen, 1984). These studies suggest that the mere amount of contact between the elderly and children is not correlated with more positive attitudes toward the elderly.

In contrast, several studies have found that intergenerational programs have had very positive effects on children's perceptions of the aged. Classroom instruction giving accurate information about aging has in some cases improved children's attitudes and behaviors toward the elderly (Seefeldt, 1989). Additionally, the Foster Grandparent Program has had resounding success in promoting children's positive contact with the elderly by matching

lower-income elderly to developmentally disabled children
(Saltz, 1989).

These mixed results with intergenerational programming
show that it is not only increased amount of contact, but
the quality of contact that may be important to promote
positive attitudes toward the elderly in children. As
previously explained, merely increasing intergenerational
contact through programs may or may not lead to improvement
in attitudes toward the elderly (Allred & Dobson, 1987;
Nishi-Strattner & Myers, 1983). Positive attitude change
seems to be associated with positive interactions with
healthy, functioning older persons (Dunn & Abel, 1983), and
with programs based within the child's environment
(Paquette, 1988). Programs based in the elder's environment
have shown only small positive shifts in attitudes toward
the elderly (Allred & Dobson, 1989; Sparling & Rogers,
1985). The present study will examine an intergenerational
program that occurs within the child's home environment.

Both the elderly and children can benefit from mutual
friendships, mentoring, and tutoring. Highly successful
programs such as "Adopt-A-Grandparent" and "Foster
Grandparents", intergenerational art, and tutoring or
mentoring programs all show the reciprocal beneficial
possibilities between the two groups (Crites, 1989;
Sparling, 1985). The elderly can help foster development in
children through such contact and reduce their own social

isolation (Crites, 1989). These two groups have shared needs and can provide socially meaningful roles for each other (Cherry, Beneet, & Gates, 1985). Intergenerational programs can provide the impetus to these important relationships (Seefeldt, 1989).

Latch-key Children

One group that may especially benefit from an after-school intergenerational program is the population of latch-key children, those children who spend time at home alone after school without adult supervision (Rodman, Pratto, & Nelson, 1988; Vandell & Corasaniti, 1988). As 75% of American mothers are in the out-of-home work force (Zigler & Hall, 1989), and 20% of working mothers report that their children are in self-care (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987), estimates of latch-key children currently within the United States range from 2 million to 15 million (Nichols & Schilit, 1988; Padilla & Landreth, 1989; Peterson & Magrab, 1989).

Regardless of the desirability of adult supervision of these children, self-care is often an economic necessity due to the lack of affordable day care or available after-school programs, especially for families in urban areas (Padilla & Landreth, 1989; Peterson & Magrab, 1989; Vandell & Ramanan, 1991; Zigler & Hall, 1989). In response to the large numbers of latch-key children, communities have organized various support programs to prepare children for self-care

and to provide adult telephone contact (Kliewer, Lepore, Broquet, & Zuba, 1990; Nichols & Schilit, 1988; Peterson, 1989). Studies concerning such intervention programs are just beginning to appear (e.g., Padilla & Landreth, 1989) and are crucial to understanding how communities, especially urban communities, support working families (Peterson & Magrab, 1989).

Call-in Programs

One form of community support services for latch-key children is the promotion of telephone "warm" lines (Alexander, 1986; Guerney, 1991; Kliewer et al., 1990; Nichols & Schilit, 1988; Padilla & Landreth, 1989; Peterson, 1989; Peterson & Magrab, 1989). These telephone lines benefit latch-key children by providing information, emotional support, assistance with homework, and referrals for emergency situations. Children in self-care miss opportunities to bring home problems that have occurred during the day and to talk about them with an adult (Peterson & Magrab, 1989). Therefore, when other social supports, adult guidance, or self-coping activities are unavailable, latch-key children may turn to a telephone line (Guerney, 1991). Although criticized by some as a "band-aid" approach to the problem of emotional security for latch-key children (Alexander, 1986), the sheer volume of calls to these community programs indicate that these help lines are a much understudied resource for latch-key

children (Kliewer et al., 1990).

These telephone lines give callers the opportunity to anonymously call in and talk about problems or concerns. Research has found that as anonymity seems assured, participants give less socially desirable responses and are more likely to state their true feelings (Lautenschleger & Flaherty, 1990). Telephone lines may be especially helpful when they are anonymous because children are able to experience a moderate degree of risk (by calling a number) without feeling a loss of personal control (they can always hang up; they are treated as people, not clients) (Buizerman, 1974).

Examinations of "warm" lines such as KIDLINE or PhoneFriend (Guerney, 1991; Nichols & Schilit, 1988) indicate that most callers are children between the ages of 8 and 11 (Padilla & Landreth, 1989; Peterson & Magrab, 1989). More girls tend to call than boys (Kliewer et al., 1990; Nichols & Schilit, 1988; Padilla & Landreth, 1989). Calls can be divided categorically by topic into such areas as: conversational/nonproblem, homework assistance, information seeking, peer difficulties, problems with parents/adults, sibling conflicts, loneliness, sadness, scared/worried, and social emotional concerns (Kliewer et al, 1990). Most calls from these studies (conducted in suburban areas) were "nonproblem" or "conversational" calls (Kliewer et al, 1990). Very little is known, however, about

the use of such a phone line within an urban, inner-city area or about phone lines that are "intergenerational" - phone lines that use elderly volunteers to answer the calls.

The Present Study

The aim of the present study is to examine an intergenerational program that is currently in operation. This program, called "Grandma Please", is a telephone help-line run by Hull House in Chicago for latch-key children. "Grandma Please" is similar to other community help lines for children such as KIDLINE or PhoneFriend (Guerney, 1991; Nichols & Schilit, 1988) in that "Grandma Please" targets children who are alone after school and who need to talk, who need help with homework, or who need emergency assistance. However, "Grandma Please" is a unique program because of the older volunteers who answer the phone lines. These volunteers, called "Grandmas" and "Grandpas", are trained to listen, give comfort, tell stories or jokes, and to provide friendship for the children who call "Grandma Please". The program is available for three hours after every school day, and every call is summarized by the Grandmas and Grandpas on report sheets that record the child's name, age, grade, and a description of the topics discussed during the call.

To study this program, data were collected from children attending the elementary school that had the highest participation rate in the program for 1991. Two groups of

students -- one group that had called "Grandma Please" and another group that had not called "Grandma Please"-- were matched on the basis of age, grade, sex, and race. Comparisons between these two groups examined both the underlying reasons why children call or do not call the phone line, and the nature of these children's attitudes toward the elderly.

Hypotheses and Rationale

The following hypotheses were based on the assumption that "Grandma Please" promotes positive interaction between children and the elderly.

Hypothesis 1: Across all ages, children who participate in "Grandma Please" will have less ageist attitudes than their peers who do not participate in the program.

This hypothesis follows from the discussion of intergenerational programs in the review of literature above. Because "Grandma Please" is based in the child's environment and initiated by the child, it is hypothesized that children who use "Grandma Please" will have more positive attitudes toward the elderly than a comparable sample of children who have not called "Grandma Please".

Hypothesis 2: Children who use "Grandma Please" will report higher levels of support for the program from parents and teachers than non-users of "Grandma Please".

This hypothesis is based on the assumption that children who are encouraged by many people to use "Grandma Please"

will call more than children who are not encouraged to call.
Specifically, children who report that their parents and
teachers are supportive of the program will use the phone
line.

Hypothesis 3: Children who use "Grandma Please" will
have a different network of support than non-users of
"Grandma Please" when asked whom they call when they need to
talk.

Hypothesis 3 assumes that children who call "Grandma
Please" will have a richer and wider telephone support
network. This assumption can be justified through the
following reasons: first, callers will have access to a
phone and to at least one number which they can call (non-
callers may not have phone access or a number that they can
use). Second, by using the phone as a means of support (by
calling "Grandma Please"), the child is encouraged to use
the phone when he or she needs to talk to someone and
therefore will call other people as well as "Grandma Please"
(non-callers may not be using the phone as a means of
support or will call fewer people).

Hypothesis 4: All children's reported liking for their
grandparents will be predicted by variables such as amount
of contact, amount of phone contact, and whether the
grandparent is a natural or stepgrandparent.

This hypothesis follows from the review of the
literature on ageist attitudes. With greater contact (by

seeing the grandparent, living close to the grandparent, and through talking on the phone), it is hypothesized that the children will report greater liking for their grandparents. In addition, natural grandparents are hypothesized to be liked more than stepgrandparents. This hypothesis is primarily for exploratory purposes since the underlying structure of variables within the child-grandparent relationship are not known.

Hypothesis 5: Non-callers of "Grandma Please" will report that they would only call "Grandma Please" if they did not have to give their last names. Callers will not care about this issue of confidentiality.

This assumption is based on the program format of "Grandma Please". One of the features of "Grandma Please" is that children remain largely anonymous - - only their first names and schools are given when they call. Uptown Hull House would like to know whether children would still call "Grandma Please" if they had to give their last names also. It is assumed that callers, since they are already using the phone line, will be less reluctant to identify themselves than non-callers.

METHOD

Participants

One hundred and eight children (currently in 4th-6th grades, age range of 9-11) from one elementary school were selected to participate in this study. Thirty-six children were interviewed from each of three grade levels.

Fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children were chosen as the sample for this study because an analysis of the "grandma logs" for the 1991-92 schoolyear indicated that children between the ages of nine and eleven were the most likely of all children to call the phone line (56% of the total number of calls to "Grandma Please") (See Appendix A). It was these children, who were now in fourth through sixth grade, whose perceptions were the focal interest of this study. All children selected to participate were interviewed in November and December, 1992.

Beasley Academic Center was chosen as the school from which the students would be interviewed. Because every child who calls "Grandma Please" must give the name of his or her school, Beasley Academic Center was found to be the school that had the most participants (117 total) in the program for the 1991-92 school year. Located on Chicago's South Side, Beasley Academic Center is a "magnet" school - a

school that has students who live throughout the city. Most of Beasley's students are African-American, and the school is widely known for its high academic standards. All students who were selected to participate in this study were African-American.

Matching Procedure

To recruit subjects for this study, after permission was obtained from school administrators, all fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students (461 students total) completed a one-page form under the direction of the researcher (See Appendix B). This form surveyed each student for demographic information including the child's name, grade, sex, homeroom teacher, and asked if the child had ever called "Grandma Please". The survey also asked for information about two "latch-key" variables: who, if anyone, was home when the child came home from school and the time when a parent came home.

After the surveys were collected, children who had called "Grandma Please" were matched on the basis of sex, age, race, and latch-key variables to children who had never called "Grandma Please". Matching was determined to be the appropriate procedure for this research project because the primary interest of this study is to examine comparable groups of children who have and have not used "Grandma Please". After the matching was completed, the researcher gave parental permission forms to all children qualified to

participate in the study. This permission form is found in
Appendix C. One hundred and seventy-six children were
distributed permission forms. More permission forms were
given to non-callers of "Grandma Please" than callers of
"Grandma Please" because in many cases, more than one non-
caller was an appropriate match for a caller. Additional
forms were therefore given to non-callers in the hope of
forming the greatest number of appropriate matches. One
hundred and twenty-nine of the students returned these
forms, yielding a return rate of 73.3%.

TABLE 1

PARTICIPANT RATE BY GRADE

	Agreed to Participate	Refused to Participate	Did not Return Form	Participation Rate
4th. . .	44	10	1	80.0%
5th. . .	46	21	2	66.7%
6th. . .	39	10	3	75.0%
Total	129	41	6	73.3%

This relatively high rate of return was achieved through
the recruitment procedure. The researcher visited homeroom
classrooms daily and reminded students to return the forms.
New forms were distributed to children who had lost their
permission forms and these daily reminders occurred until a
permission form was either returned or the student declined
to participate. Every child who returned a permission form
was interviewed.

<u>Final Selection</u>

Of the 129 students who returned the forms, 54 matched pairs (108 children) were included in the study; 18 pairs from each grade level (see Appendix D for the final matching variables of the 54 pairs). Twenty-one pairs were male, and thirty-three pairs were female. More females than males were included in the study because more females had called "Grandma Please". All children were African-American.

TABLE 2

FINAL SELECTION OF STUDENTS BY CALLERS/NON-CALLERS

	Orig. Sample	Returned Form	Included in Study
Callers	72	55	54
Non-callers	104	74	54

To ensure that the groups were comparable in terms of SES (socio-economic status), children were asked during the interview for the occupations of their parents or primary care-givers to determine NAM-Powers scores (Miller, 1991). The averages across the two groups of children using NAM-Powers Inventory Scores (Miller, 1991) indicated no significant differences in the occupational situation (and arguably the economic position) of the two groups. The comparable averages of NAM-Powers ratings for both groups (i.e., 51.11 for callers and 48.13 for non-callers) suggest a sample of working-class parents (clerical workers, machine operators, craftsmen, mechanics, and repairmen). However, wide ranges in occupations occurred throughout both groups,

ranging from unemployed parents to doctors and lawyers.

The two groups were not as comparable, however, in terms of the people with whom the children lived. Forty-six percent of non-callers came from single-parent (mother-headed) families in comparison with 22% of callers of "Grandma Please". This difference in family structure between the two groups trended toward significance (χ^2 = 9.06, p < .10). In view of this finding, it is recognized that it was impossible to make the groups comparable on all significant variables.

TABLE 3

PATTERNS OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD FOR PARTICIPANTS

	Both Parent	Mother Only	Parent + Step	Mother + GPs	Mother + GM	Grand-Mother	both GPs
Callers	29	12	8	1	2	0	2
Non-callers	23	25	2	0	2	1	1

Instruments

Children's Perceptions of Aging and Elderly Inventory

The CPAE is a 20-item, 5-point, Likert-type scale developed to assess 3rd grade students' attitudes, values, and ideas about social, physical, and behavioral factors in aging (Rich, Myrick & Campbell, 1983); it has also been used with 4th grade students (Aday, Sims, & Evans, 1991). The CPAE was chosen for this study because it is short, easily understood, and provides a basis for assessing an overall attitude toward the elderly. The test-retest reliability

obtained on the original sample by Rich et al. was r = .73. They found that ten of the items on the CPAE were sensitive to changes in children's attitudes toward the elderly after participation in an intergenerational program. These ten items were used in this study to assess differences in attitudes between children who have and who have not called "Grandma Please." The CPAE was also modified for this study by using a numerical, Likert-type format ("strongly disagree" to "strongly agree") instead of the CPAE's use of smiling, neutral, and frowning faces (See Appendix E). This format was chosen to make the CPAE more age-appropriate for this study's participants.

Estimates of the CPAE's internal consistency were assessed for the 108 CPAE questionnaires from this study. Reliability coefficients of the ten study items were adequate, giving a Cronbach's alpha of .69 (standardized item alpha was also equal to .69). This alpha supports the assumption of internal consistency within the CPAE.

Test-retest correlations were also computed using a subsample of this study's participants. Twenty-four students (twelve callers, twelve non-callers, divided equally across grade and sex) were retested a second time three weeks after the original testing. The test-retest correlation coefficient obtained by this sample for the CPAE was r = .73 (p < .01). Given these findings, the CPAE was determined to be an appropriate measure for this study.

(More detailed test-retest information can be found in Appendix G.)

In addition to test-retest reliability, interrater reliability was also assessed for the coding of the CPAE. One third of all of the CPAE questionnaires were coded by an independent rater after the researcher had coded all of the questionnaires. One hundred percent agreement was found for the coding of the CPAE, indicating that the there were no detectable data coding errors for the CPAE.

"Grandma Please" Interview

This interview questionnaire was given to all children at the same time as the CPAE. This questionnaire, developed by the researcher, the thesis director, the thesis reader, and "Grandma Please" program directors, asks questions about children's reasons for using and not using the phone line and about their own interactions with the elderly and with their grandparents (see Appendix F). This measure was used to assess our particular research questions regarding the use of "Grandma Please". The questionnaire contains both quantitative and qualitative items and there are two versions: one for callers and one for non-callers of "Grandma Please". The callers' questionnaire contains 26 items asking information about the use of "Grandma Please", questions about how the child perceives the elderly, whom he or she calls for support, and questions about the amount of contact and how much liking he or she has for each natural

or step-grandparent. The non-callers' questionnaire contains 17 items that are essentially the same as the callers' questionnaire except non-callers are asked why they have not called "Grandma Please". Based on 24 students who were retested with the "Grandma Please" questionnaire three weeks later, test-retest reliability was assessed for the grandparent questions, quantitative questions, and for the qualitative questions on the questionnaire. Correlation coefficients (r) and phi (measure of association) were used for quantitative questions; contingency coefficients (cc) were used for qualitative questions when more than a 2 x 2 crosstabulation table was generated.

The "Grandma Please" questionnaire was found to have excellent test-retest reliability for the grandparent questions (r = .70 to .84, p < .01; phi = .89 to .92, p < .001). However, one problem occurred during retesting of the grandparent questions. Nine of the 24 children who were retested added more grandparents than when originally tested. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that all of the grandparents were reported (especially step-grandparents) when the children were initially interviewed. More important, however, the ratings of those grandparents who were reported at the initial testing remained fairly stable over time; therefore it can be assumed that these ratings consistently represent children's feelings toward the grandparents whom they see most often and feel closest to.

The "Grandma Please" questionnaire was found to have adequate reliability for the quantitative questions (r = .67, p < .05; phi = .34 to 1.0; p < .10 to p < .001) (See Appendix G for more detailed test-retest reliability information).

In addition to test-retest reliability, interrater reliability was also assessed for the "Grandma Please" questionnaire. One third of all of the questionnaires, randomly selected and equally represented across grade and across caller/non-caller questionnaires, were independently coded by a second rater after the researcher had coded all of the questionnaires. For the quantitative items on the questionnaire, interrater reliability indicated 99.3% agreement (the difference from 100% was due to a few coding errors by the first rater). For the qualitative questions, the second rater placed statements of the children into categories that had been formulated by the researcher. For the nine qualitative questions, the observed percentage of interrater agreement ranged from 90% to 97% with Cohen's kappas ranging from .83 to .96 (see Appendix H for more information on inter-rater reliability). These high rates of agreement indicate that the reliability of data coding was sufficient for analysis of qualitative responses.

Procedure

After parental consent was obtained (through the signed permission form - Appendix C), the researcher obtained the

teachers' permission to take each child from class to interview him or her in a quiet room. Face-to-face interviews were given due to the complexity of the measures and to avoid partial return of forms due to illiteracy or lack of interest. The researcher read the forms to the children and wrote down the children's responses to each question. Interviews took from ten to fifteen minutes each (callers of "Grandma Please" took slightly longer because of the longer version of the "Grandma Please" questionnaire). The presentation of the CPAE and the "Grandma Please" questionnaire was ordered randomly (sometimes the CPAE came first, other times the "Grandma Please" questionnaire came first) to avoid biasing respondents. After the interview, children received either a mechanical pencil or stickers for their participation. These small rewards were given to encourage participation in the study. Students were then returned to their classes. Three weeks later, 24 students were retested using the same procedure and the same two measures. Test-retest reliability was assessed, and data coding and statistical analyses comparing the two groups were completed.

Data Analyses

CPAE

To compare scores directly between the two groups, t-test analyses were completed. Independent t-tests were not used because the sample was not randomly selected. Instead,

because the participants were matched, overall t-tests were based on the differences between the scores of members of each pair. Paired t-tests were computed for each of the 10 items on the CPAE, as well as for an overall scale score. One-tailed probabilities were computed because callers were hypothesized to have higher scores (higher scores gave more positive ratings of the elderly). Analyses using SPSS were performed on both the CPAE and "Grandma Please" Questionnaire data (Norusis, 1992).

"Grandma Please" Questionnaire - Grandparent Data

Questionnaire data given by all children about their grandparents were used for this analysis (and not divided by callers and non-callers). In order to predict children's liking for their grandparents, an exploratory step-wise multiple regression was computed using predictor variables of phone contact (how often the child talked to the grandparent on the phone), contact (how often the child saw the grandparent), natural/step (whether the grandparent was a natural or a stepgrandparent), and in/out state (whether the grandparents lived relatively close to the child, or not). Data from each grandparent mentioned in the interview was included in the analysis (335 grandparents total) except for grandparents about whom children knew very little. Grandparent data was excluded when children could not indicate the names of the grandparents, where the grandparents lived, and could not assess how much they liked

them. An additional step-wise regression was run in order
to predict phone contact with grandparents - a highly
salient variable for this sample.

"Grandma Please" Questionnaire - Quantitative Items

To compare answers between the groups, interval
questions (coded from 1 to 4) were analyzed using paired t-
tests. Questions coded "yes" or "no" were compared between
the two groups using phi coefficients, a more accurate χ^2
based measure of association than χ^2 itself (Norusis, 1992),
especially when used in 2 x 2 crosstabulations (group by
yes/no answer).

"Grandma Please" Questionnaire - Qualitative

To compare open-ended questions between the groups,
children's responses were coded using categories formulated
by the researcher. To create categories, the researcher
listed all children's answers from each open-ended question
and then looked for common themes throughout the responses.
From these common themes, mutually exclusive and exhaustive
categories were formed for each open-ended question. This
procedure, condensing verbal statements to interpretable
data, is commonly used in qualitative research (Patton,
1987; Tesch, 1990). The number of statements in these
categories were compared across the two groups using both χ^2
and contingency coefficients (a more sensitive χ^2-based
measure of association for multiple categories). These
measures of association were used to assess the relationship

between group membership and the pattern of responses to each open-ended question.

"Grandma Please" Questionnaire - Specific Questions

Some of the questions in the questionnaire were specifically formulated for one of the two groups. These questions were for descriptive purposes only and were not intended to be used to compare the two groups. (For example, callers received the question, "How many times have you called "Grandma Please"?) For these questions, frequencies and percentages of different responses were calculated for each question.

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

Hypothesis 1

Children who participated in "Grandma Please" were hypothesized to have less ageist attitudes than their peers who had not participated. Attitudes toward the elderly as measured by the CPAE showed few differences between the two groups. The overall score for callers on the CPAE was not significantly different than for non-callers ($\underline{t}$ = .50, n.s.). Only two out of the ten items of the CPAE showed significant differences between the two groups (#8 - "Old people don't like to be with children": $\underline{t}$ = 1.77, $\underline{p}$ < .05; #10 - "Old people get mad easily": $\underline{t}$ = 2.47, $\underline{p}$ < .01). These findings, however, were in the expected direction, with callers of "Grandma Please" giving less ageist responses than non-callers. Table 4 below summarizes the

results of the CPAE.

TABLE 4
RESULTS OF THE CPAE: COMPARISON OF GROUPS

QUESTION - "OLD PEOPLE"	t	df	sig.
1 Like to visit	-.22	53	n.s.
2 Fun to talk with	-.39	53	n.s.
3 Never want to be old	-.64	53	n.s.
4 Have happy life	-.36	53	n.s.
5 Are not smart	0.00	53	n.s.
6 Are friendly	0.00	53	n.s.
7 Are mean	.68	53	n.s.
8 Don't like children	1.77	53	.05
9 Don't do much	-.33	53	n.s.
10 Get mad easily	2.47	53	.01
OVERALL SCORE	.50	53	n.s.

Attitudes toward the elderly as measured by questions on the "Grandma Please" questionnaire also showed few differences between the groups. Callers of "Grandma Please" did not report that they talked to elderly persons significantly more than non-callers (t =.64, n.s.), nor that they liked to talk to elderly persons more than non-callers (phi = .06, n.s.). When asked "What makes a person old?", non-callers and callers gave a similar pattern of responses - with no significant differences between the numbers of positive, negative, or neutral statements about the elderly (χ^2 = .05, cc = .01, n.s.) and no significant differences between the two responses when put into categories (physical, psychological, mental, emotional, and social characteristics of aging) (χ^2 = 9.15, cc = .16, n.s.). To further complicate the issue of expected differences in ageism, when the children were asked why they

did or did not like to talk to elderly people, there was a significantly different pattern of responses that emerged (χ^2 = 11.69, $\underline{cc}$ = .20; $\underline{p}$ < .05), but that favored non-callers. Even though chi-squared based measures of association are difficult to interpret (Norusis, 1992), it appears that non-callers had significantly less ageist reasons for talking to elderly people than callers. Non-callers more than callers reported that they wanted to talk to elderly, that old people were better than young people, and that elderly people told interesting stories. Non-callers reported less often than callers that they felt that they <u>had</u> to talk to the elderly, or that they didn't want to talk to them, or that elderly people were good to talk to because they gave money or candy (see Table 5 below).

TABLE 5
TOTAL RESPONSES TO "WHY DO YOU TALK TO THE ELDERLY"

	Have to talk w/	Want to talk w/	Don't want to	Old are better	Give things	Past, stories
Callers	22(17%)	82(57%)	10(7%)	5 (4%)	7 (5%)	18 (13%)
Noncallers	8 (6%)	92(65%)	6(4%)	9 (6%)	3 (2%)	24 (17%)

Total Responses: Callers 144; Non-callers 142.

In spite of this unexpected finding, however, when callers were asked if they liked elderly people <u>more</u> after calling "Grandma Please", 68.5% of callers said "yes". Therefore, some positive effects on children's attitudes toward the elderly seem to be occurring through the use of the phone line, but exactly how pervasive these effects are

is unknown. Overall, then, Hypothesis 1 was only partially
and equivocally supported.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that children who use "Grandma
Please" would report higher levels of support for the
program from parents and teachers than non-users of "Grandma
Please". To test this hypothesis, children were asked "Are
there people who want you to use "Grandma Please?" Callers
significantly responded "yes" more than noncallers (phi =
.39, $\underline{p}$ < .0001). When children were asked who wanted them
to use the program, callers listed 69 people (mostly
parents, friends, grandparents, and teachers), while non-
callers mentioned 31 people (mostly parents and friends).
Children were also asked "Are there people who <u>don't</u> want
you to use "Grandma Please"? There were no significant
differences between the groups for this question (phi = .14,
n.s.). Callers listed nine people (mostly friends, parents,
and grandparents), while noncallers listed four people
(mostly parents). In summary, then, this hypothesis was
supported - callers significantly reported more support for
their use of "Grandma Please".

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that children who use "Grandma
Please" would have a different network of support when asked
whom they call when they need to talk than non-callers. To
test this hypothesis, all children were asked, "Who do you

call when you need to talk?" Callers did report a significantly different support network than non-callers (χ^2 = 20.58, cc = .27; p < .001), supporting the hypothesis. Callers were more likely to report that they called grandparents and "Grandma Please" than non-callers. Non-callers were more likely to call relatives or friends than callers. Every caller reported at least one person whom they would call; but some noncallers (9.25%) reported that they would not call anybody. Hypothesis 3 was thus supported, indicating that callers had a richer telephone support network than non-callers (see Table 6 below).

TABLE 6
TELEPHONE SUPPORT BY GROUPS

People contacted	Callers	Non-callers
Friend	32 (22%)	31 (25%)
Parent	27 (19%)	32 (26%)
Grandparent.	34 (23%)	22 (18%)
Relative	18 (12%)	7 (5%)
Brother/sister	7 (5%)	10 (8%)
"Grandma Please" . . .	25 (17%)	3 (2%)
Misc	2 (1%)	2 (2%)
Total.	145 people	125 people

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that liking for grandparents would be predicted by the variables of personal contact, phone contact, whether grandparents were natural or stepgrandparents, and whether grandparents lived in or out of state. This hypothesis was examined by recording data about each grandparent named by the children in the study.

Three hundred and thirty-five grandparents were included (139 male grandparents and 196 female grandparents), and the breakdown by grandparents' maternal/paternal relation is given below.

TABLE 7
GRANDPARENT VARIABLES

	Paternal	Maternal	Step-Paternal*	Step-Maternal
Totals	140(41.8%)	146(43.6%)	22(6.6%)	27(8.1%)

*Note: Step-paternal indicates stepfather's parents or father's stepparents. Step-maternal indicates stepmother's parents or mother's stepparents.

In the "Grandma Please" questionnaire, children were asked for the names of their grandparents and if they were natural or stepgrandparents. Children were also asked where the grandparents lived (coded as in or out of state), how often they saw them (amount of contact), how often they talked to them on the phone (phone contact), and how much they liked them. These variables were moderately correlated (see Table 8 below).

TABLE 8
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GRANDPARENT VARIABLES

	In/out State	Phone Contact	See Contact	Liking
Nat/Step	-.006	.242	.269	.249
In/Out State		.257	.400	-.012
Phone Contact			.533	.285
See Contact				.249

An exploratory stepwise regression was run predicting children's liking (an interval variable) for grandparents

from the variables natural/step, in/out of state (both categorical variables), phone contact and "see" contact (both interval variables).

Only two variables accounted for a significant percentage of variance in children's reported "liking": phone contact and natural/step grandparents ($F(1, 318) = 28.20$, $p < .001$; $F(2, 317) = 20.77$, $p < .001$). These two variables indicated that the more phone contact a child has with a grandparent, the more a child likes the grandparent. In addition, children reported more liking for their natural grandparents. See Table 9 below.

TABLE 9
STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTING "LIKING"

STEP AND VARIABLE	R	R²	F	sig.
Step 1: Phone	.2854	.0814	28.192	.001
Step 2: Nat/Step	.3404	.1159	20.770	.001

Only 11.6% of the variance was accounted for, however, indicating that much of the variance in these children's reported liking of grandparents remains unknown.

Because this study is interested in phone contact with elderly people, another exploratory stepwise regression was run, predicting the variable "phone contact". Again, only two variables accounted for a significant proportion of variance - "seeing" and "liking". Children who both saw their grandparents often and liked them tended to call them often. Likewise, children who did not see their

grandparents or like them very much tended not to talk to them on the phone very often. See Table 10 below.

TABLE 10
PREDICTING PHONE CONTACT FOR GRANDPARENTS

STEP AND VARIABLE	R	R^2	F	sig.
Step 1: "Seeing"	.5328	.2839	126.047	.001
Step 2: Liking	.5556	.3087	70.766	.001

In this multiple regression, 31% of the variance in phone contact was accounted for, still leaving 69% of the variance still unexplained. There may be other variables that explain more variance, but at least some significant predictors of children's liking and amount of phone contact with their grandparents were found.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that non-callers would report that they would only call "Grandma Please" if they didn't have to give their last names. To test this final hypothesis, both callers and noncallers were asked if they would call "Grandma Please" if they had to give their last name. 89% of callers said that they would still call "Grandma Please", 83% of non-callers said that they would also still call "Grandma Please" (phi = .08, n.s.). Most children reported that they would call regardless of whether they had to give their last name, and therefore this hypothesis was not supported.

Other Findings: Callers Only

Thirty-four (63%) of callers reported that they had called "Grandma Please" more than once. Of these repeat callers, most reported that they had called between two and five times. Forty-nine (91%) of the children reported that they had called "Grandma Please" within the previous year. Finally, although only 9 (17%) of the callers could be classified as "latch-key" children (routinely home after school without adult supervision), 23 (43%) of the callers said that they usually called "Grandma Please" when they were alone. Therefore, although most of these children were not typically "latch-key" children on a daily basis, many of these children called the phone line when they were alone at home.

When asked why they called "Grandma Please", most of the reasons that children mentioned included that they had been bored (27.8% of the responses) or needed homework help (23.7%), or had been alone and needed someone to talk to (19.6%). See Table 11 below.

TABLE 11
REASONS FOR CALLING "GRANDMA PLEASE"

REASONS	N	%
1. Bored	27	27.8
2. Family problems, advice	5	5.2
3. Homework help	23	23.7
4. Alone, afraid	19	19.6
5. Fun, interesting	10	10.3
6. Curiosity about "G.P."	11	11.3
7. Enjoy talking w/ elderly	2	2.1
Total	97	100.0

When asked what they had talked about, most children reported that the grandmas and grandpas at "Grandma Please" had asked them questions about themselves (their age, school, birthday, etc.) (56.2%) or that they had talked about homework (21.5%) (See Table 12 below). When asked how they felt after they talked to the grandparents at "Grandma Please", only 16.25% of the 130 responses were "the same" (OK, all right, the same) and no responses indicated that a child felt worse after calling "Grandma Please". The majority of responses indicated that it had either been a fun, good experience for the children (46.25% of responses), a helpful homework experience (22.5%), or that the child felt comforted and loved (15%). Only 7 of the 54 callers could think of things that they did not like about "Grandma Please"--these included not being able to get through to the grandparents, and that the children felt that the phone line should be open past 6:00 p.m. When asked what they liked about "Grandma Please", most children (58.1% of the 155 responses) mentioned qualities of the grandmas and grandpas who answer the phones ("she really helps me", "she's nice", "he understands me", "she really cares"), or the children mentioned qualities about the program itself (22.5% of responses). Some typical responses were "you can pick the grandma", "it's open every day", and "you can call if you need someone to talk to."

TABLE 12
TOPICS THAT CHILDREN REPORT TALKING ABOUT WITH "G.P."

TOPICS REPORTED	N	%
1. Child-directed information, ?s	73	56.2
2. GM-directed information, ?s	7	5.4
3. Homework	28	21.5
4. Advice, family problems	3	2.3
5. Scared, needed comfort	1	.8
6. Stories, games, riddles	5	3.8
7. Information about "G.P."	6	4.6
TOTAL	130	100.0

Callers also overwhelmingly rated the grandparents at "Grandma Please" as "very friendly" (49 out of 54; 90.7%) and that they liked them "a lot" (45 out of 54, 83.3%). Sixty-nine percent of callers also reported that they liked the elderly more after calling "Grandma Please".

Non-callers Only

When asked why they had never called "Grandma Please", most non-callers responded that they did not know about the program or had lost the phone number (40%) or that they had other people at home to talk to (25.6%) (see Table 13 below). When asked what good things or bad things that they would want to talk about with the grandmas at "Grandma Please", the top three responses were: if alone and needed to talk (20.3%), if they needed help with homework or school (19.5%), and if a very happy event had occurred (18.75%) (see Table 14 below).

TABLE 13
REASONS NON-CALLERS GIVE FOR NOT CALLING "G.P."

REASONS FOR NOT CALLING	N	%
1. Busy, no time to call	10	11.1
2. Can't call or use phone	6	6.7
3. Don't need homework help	10	11.1
4. Have people at home to talk to	23	25.6
5. Scared to call	2	2.2
6. Don't know about, lost number	36	40.0
7. Thought there was a phone charge	3	3.3
TOTAL	90	100.0

TABLE 14
TOPICS NON-CALLERS WOULD WANT TO TALK ABOUT

GOOD/BAD THINGS TO DISCUSS	N	%
1. Bored	6	4.7
2. Family problems, advice	8	6.25
3. Homework, school	25	19.5
4. Alone, need to talk	26	20.3
5. Happy events	24	18.75
6. Stressful events	22	17.2
7. Ask about the Grandmas	4	3.1
8. Wouldn't call	8	6.25
9. Other	5	3.9
TOTAL	128	100.0

One interesting point that can be seen is that actual callers and noncallers report different underlying reasons why they would use the phone line. The top reason for callers to call was because of boredom, or needing something to do, whereas noncallers reported that they would call primarily for loneliness. Although callers may be using boredom as a socially acceptable response (instead of admitting that they needed personal contact or support), this data indicate that callers may view the phone line as more of an every day, usual activity; non-callers may view

the phone line as not to be used unless something is really

needed.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The results of this study indicated that the two groups did not have conclusive differences in their attitudes toward the elderly. Both groups appeared to have a lot of contact with elderly people - most children reported that they had and liked their grandparents, that they talked to elderly people sometimes or "a lot", and that they liked to talk to the elderly. The groups also responded similarly when asked for the characteristics of aging with similar responses of negative, neutral, and positive statements.

Several possibilities exist which might explain this discrepancy between expected and actual findings. There may be a ceiling effect with the measures - for example, on the CPAE, out of 50 possible points (higher score indicating more favorable attitudes toward the elderly), all children obtained a score of 32 or more, with most children scoring in the 40s. Therefore, the measures may not have been sensitive enough to detect any differences in attitudes between the groups.

Another possibility is that the expressed attitudes of the children were subject to social influences. Very few of the children admitted that they liked their grandparents "not at all". The vast majority of children reported that

they liked their grandparents "a lot" (even when they hardly knew them!). Likewise, when children reported how likely they were to call "Grandma Please" in the future, no child reported "I don't intend to call" but instead listed "I might call" or "I probably will call" or "I'll definitely call." Since responding negatively in this interview situation may not have been socially desirable for these children, their true attitudes may have been distorted when they were expressed, creating artificially high scores.

A third possibility, and one which the researcher favors, is that when children were asked general, abstract questions about elderly people (as measured by the CPAE and by open-ended questions asking for descriptions of elderly people), their answers were not predictive of attitudes toward specific elderly individuals (such as grandparents or "Grandma Please" personnel). Both groups of children mentioned approximately equal numbers of negative and neutral characteristics of aging and also did not differ significantly on the CPAE, which has questions about "old people" - a general term. However, when children were asked specific questions about elderly people (for example, their own grandparents or the grandmas and grandpas at "Grandma Please", the ratings were overwhelmingly positive. One reason for this finding could be that children may not see their own grandparents as "elderly," particularly if their grandparents are in their mid-life years. And children who

responded to open-ended questions (and most children gave more negative and neutral statements about the process of aging than positive statements) did not seem to associate their grandparents or "Grandma Please" personnel with these negative, general descriptions. Clearly, then, the children gave dramatically different responses depending on whether the questions were about abstract properties of elderly people or about specific elderly individuals, and whether the questions were in a test format or open-ended. Future researchers examining intergenerational programs should include measures that try to pinpoint differences between abstract and concrete qualities of elderly people, as well as include open-ended questions to try to see how children really feel about elderly people in general and elderly individuals that they interact with. To promote less ageism, researchers and educators could try to break down children's stereotypes of elderly people by training children to associate "elderly" with many specific individuals, rather than into abstract generalities.

Another result of this study indicated that callers of "Grandma Please" had people who encouraged them to use the phone line much more than non-callers. Perhaps one way to increase the use of this community resource would be to inform parents, teachers, and grandparents about this service. Callers also had a richer and wider telephone support network to call when they needed to talk. For all

children, and especially with this sample (inner-city African-American children), the value of telephone support should not be underestimated. Telephone contact can be instant, comforting, fun, helpful, and possibly a safer way of seeking support than other means.

Another interesting finding of this study was that of the children who call "Grandma Please", very few appeared to be latch-key children on a daily basis. Only 32% of callers said that they were usually without adult supervision after school (17% reported being alone, 15% reported being with non-adult siblings, cousins, or friends). But when callers reported the people who were with them when they actually called the phone line, however, 63% of the children reported that they did not have an adult present with them (43% reported being alone; 20% reported being with a non-adult sibling, cousin, or friend). Therefore, it appears that for this sample of children, latch-key children do not constitute the main body of callers. Instead, callers are usually without supervision on an occasional basis or call the phone line while an adult is present.

"Grandma Please" is a program that specifically targets latch-key children who are alone, and only 17% of this study's callers fit into that category. The population of children actually being served by the program appears to be different than originally was formulated by Hull House. Since most callers appear to be alone only on an occasional

basis, perhaps when children are informed about the
availability of the phone line, Hull House recruitment
personnel could emphasize that the phone line is for all
children who would like to talk to someone after school.

Since children who call appear to have wide ranges of
the level of adult supervision at home and family
constellations, this information could influence the
questions that the "Grandmas" ask during conversations. For
example, "Tell me who's home right now" could be asked
instead of "Are you alone?". In fact, from the very few
negative comments that children did give about "Grandma
Please", directive, scripted questions asked by the
"Grandmas" or "Grandpas" did not appear to meet the needs of
the children. Children especially appreciated when
"Grandparents" listened, paused, and asked open-ended
questions. The training of future "Grandparents" could
focus on these issues.

Another finding of this study, similar to other phone
line studies, is that the top reason for callers to call
"Grandma Please" was "boredom" - children claimed that they
felt that they had nothing to do or just wanted to talk. It
is possible that children use "I'm bored" as a socially
acceptable label for "I need social support". These
children may have been asking for interaction, attention,
and quality time with caring adults. In this study, many of
the children's parents or caretakers were working or were

too busy or otherwise unavailable to spend time with these children, or help them with their homework at the time that children called "Grandma Please". "Grandma Please" is a tremendous support for these children because they can reach a caring person and have some positive interaction. One implication of this social support hypothesis is an impact on training future "Grandmas" or "Grandpas". When a child says that he or she is "bored", the "Grandparents" could be told to be supportively listening for signals that the child may be sending. They could be taught to determine what the child is really calling about - either that the child really has nothing else to do, or that the child needs some loving attention.

Of interest to grandparent-grandchild relations, findings indicated that children who talk often to their grandparents on the telephone tend to like those grandparents more - more than they would if they only saw them often or lived close to them. This finding is highly relevant for "Grandma Please" because the only contact that these elderly "grandparents" have with the children who call is through phone contact.

The issue of anonymity did not seem to be of particular importance to this selected sample of children. Very few children seemed to care about whether their phone call would be confidential and most reported that they would still call "Grandma Please" regardless of whether they had to give

their last name or not. These children may not have understood issues of anonymity and therefore (through implication), informed consent. Since children are routinely asked personal questions (at school, medical facilities, etc.), perhaps children do not realize that they can refuse to answer questions, refuse to participate, or refuse to give personal information about themselves.

Some other implications for future research need to mentioned. First, this sample is not necessarily representative of the typical callers of "Grandma Please". Only one school was surveyed, and only those children who agreed to be in the study were included in the final sample. Future researchers should try to obtain a wider range of children. Additionally, more research is needed to examine both successful intergenerational programs as well as other phone lines for children. As "Grandma Please" has shown, the elderly within a community can be a vital resource for community programs and should be accessed more fully.

REFERENCES

Aday, R. H., Sims, C. R., & Evans, E. (1991). Youth's
    attitudes toward the elderly: The impact of
    intergenerational partners. Journal of Applied
    Gerontology, 10, 372-384.

Allred, G. B., & Dobson, J. E. (1984). Remotivation group
    interaction: Increasing children's contact with the
    elderly. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 21,
    216-220.

Alexander, N. P. (1986). School-age child care: Concerns and
    challenges. Young Children, 42, 3-10.

Baker, P. M. (1983). Ageism, sex, and age: A factorial
    survey approach. Canadian Journal on Aging, 2, 177-184.

Buizerman, M. (1974). Toward analysis of the relations among
    the youth counterculture, telephone hotlines, and
    anonymity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 3, 293-306.

Cherry, D. L., Beneet, F. R., & Gates, B. (1985).
    Intergenerational service programs: Meeting shared needs
    of young and old. Gerontologist, 25, 126-129.

Cole, T. R. (1984). Aging, meaning, and well-being: Musing
    of a cultural historian. International Journal of Aging
    and Human Development, 19, 329-336.

Crites, M. S. (1989). Child development and
    intergenerational programs. Journal of Children in
    Contemporary Society, 20, 33-43.

Dunn, B., & Abel, E. (1983). Focus on wellness. Geriatric
    Nursing, 4, 11-12.

Govaerts, F. (1980). Liberty and socialization: Means of
    existence, age and poverty. International Review of
    Sociology, 16, 159-168.

Guerney, L. F. (1991). Supports of self-care children.
    Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25, 243-254.

Harris, J., & Fiedler, C. M. (1988). Preadolescent
    attitudes toward the elderly: An analysis of race,

gender, and contact variables. Adolescence, 23, 335-340.

Ishii-Kuntz, M., & Lee, G. R. (1987). Status of the elderly: An extension of the theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 413-420.

Jantz, R. R., Seefeldt, C., & Serock, K. (1977). Children's attitudes toward the elderly: Educational implication. Educational Gerontology, 2, 301-310.

Kliewer, W., Lepore, S., Broquet, A., & Zuba, L. (1990). Developmental and gender differences in anonymous support-seeking: Analysis of data from a community help line for children. American Journal of Community Psychology, 18, 333-339.

Krout, J. A. (1988). Rural versus urban differences in elderly parents' contact with their children. Gerontologist, 28, 198-203.

Kulis, S. (1987). Socially mobile daughters and sons of the elderly: Mobility effects within the family revisited. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 421-433.

Lautenschleger, G.J., & Flaherty, V.L. (1990). Computer administration of questions: More desirable or more social desirability? Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 310-314.

Lusczcz, M., & Fitzgerald, K. (1986). Understanding cohort differences in cross-generational, self, and peer perceptions. Journal of Gerontology, 41, 234-240.

Miller, D. C. (1991). Handbook of research design and social measurement (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nichols, A. W., & Schilit, R. (1988). Telephone support for latchkey children. Child Welfare, 67, 49-59.

Nishi-Strattner, M., & Myers, J. E. (1983). Attitudes toward the elderly: An intergenerational examination. Educational Gerontology, 9, 389-397.

Norusis, M. J. (1992). SPSS [Computer program]. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc., Marketing Department.

Padilla, M. L, & Landreth, G. L. (1989). Latchkey children: A review of the literature. Child Welfare, 68, 445-454.

Paquette, H., & Viens, J. D. (1988). The elderly and integration into an innovative school setting. Revue Quebecoise de Psychologie, 9, 142-163.

Patton, M.Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peterson, L. (1989). Latchkey children's preparation for self-care: Overestimated, underrehearsed, and unsafe. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18, 36-43.

Peterson, L., & Magrab, P. (1989). Introduction to the special section: Children on their own. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18, 2-7.

Pietropinto, A. (1985). "Grandparents": Commentary. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 19,85-92.

Rich, P., Myrick, R., & Campbell, C. (1983). Changing children's perceptions of the elderly. Educational Gerontology, 9, 483-491.

Rodman, H., Pratto, D. I., & Nelson, R. S. (1988). Toward a definition of self-care children: A commentary on Steinberg. Developmental Psychology, 24, 292-294.

Saltz, R. (1989). Research evaluation of a foster grandparent program. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 20, 205-216.

Schaie, K. W. (1993). Ageist language in psychological research. American Psychologist, 48, 49-51.

Seefeldt, C. (1989). Intergenerational programs: Impact on attitudes. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 20, 185-194.

Sorgman, M. I., & Sorensen, M. (1984). Ageism: A course of study. Theory into Practice, 23, 117-123.

Sparling, J.W., & Rogers, J. C. (1985). Intergenerational intervention: A reciprocal service delivery system for preschoolers, adolescents, and older persons. Educational Gerontology, 11, 41-55.

Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software. New York: Falmer Press.

United States Bureau of the Census (1987). After-school care of school-age children: December 1984. Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 149. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vandell, D. L., & Corasaniti, M. A. (1988). The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning. Child Development,

<u>59</u>, 868-975.

Vandell, D. L., & Ramanan, J. (1991). Children of the national longitudinal survey of youth: Choices in after-school care and child development. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, <u>27</u>, 637-643.

Zandi, T., Mirle, J., & Jarvis, P. (1990). Children's attitudes toward elderly individuals: A comparison of two ethnic groups. <u>International Journal of Aging and Human Development</u>, <u>30</u>, 161-174.

Zigler, E., & Hall, N. W. (1989). Day care and its effect on children: An overview for pediatric health professionals. <u>Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry and Child Development</u>, 543-560.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Summary of Calls: Sept '91 - Aug '92

Age:

Month:	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Sept.	12	14	22	31	36	66	63	60	18	10	4
Oct.	12	12	28	20	74	112	89	59	30	8	16
Nov.	13	6	35	39	69	84	87	46	39	16	12
Dec.	9	7	13	17	57	57	47	35	27	7	10
Jan.	17	10	26	32	63	68	57	60	26	9	7
Feb.	18	22	19	29	48	88	78	51	28	9	7
Mar.	11	13	33	57	111	119	75	56	20	6	8
Apr.	8	29	28	45	98	100	112	89	32	8	4
May	6	15	29	47	82	93	90	59	23	13	16
June	5	5	30	37	37	95	92	55	14	4	8
July	8	9	9	22	32	30	58	17	10	6	2
Aug.	2	1	1	3	1	0	6	3	3	1	0
Totals:	121	143	273	379	703	912	854	590	270	97	94

1991-1992 primary callers: 9-11 year olds

"Grandma Please" Survey

Name _____

Male or Female   Grade _____   Age_____

Race/Nationality_____

School _____

Teacher _____   Room _____

1. Have you ever heard of "Grandma Please?" Yes or No

2. If you have heard of "Grandma Please," how did you find out about it?

_____

_____.

3. Have you used "Grandma Please?" Yes or No

4. When you come home from school, who's usually there?

by yourself_____   brother/sister_____ age:_____.

parent_____   grandparent_____

friend_____   other_____ who? _____

5. At your house, when does a parent or adult usually come home?

_____.

APPENDIX C

Parent Permission Form: "Grandma Please"

Thank you for letting your son or daughter participate in this project.

As you may have heard, Hull House has a free after-school hotline for kids called "Grandma Please." This program is for kids who want to talk to someone after school. Because the program has been so successful, Hull House would like to serve more children by finding out why some kids call and other kids don't call.

Your child has been chosen to be interviewed about what he or she knows about "Grandma Please" and also to be asked questions about elderly people. A qualified researcher from Loyola University will interview your child after receiving your permission. The interview is short, and your son or daughter will receive a sticker for participation. Your child's participation in this study will help us learn more about how children and the elderly interact.

Your son or daughter's answers will be confidential. No one will know what answers your child has given or see any forms except for the researcher. If you or your child decide at any point to stop participation in this project, for any reason, you are free to withdraw from the study.

Most children enjoy this research session. We appreciate your participation in this important study. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to ask. (Researcher's number - call Liz at (312) 465-7969).

Parent Permission

_____Yes, my child _____ may participate in this study. I understand that my child may withdraw from the study at any time and that all information will be held in strict confidence.

_____   _____
Parent Signature   Date

APPENDIX D

Final Pairing of Subjects

KEY: Y = Yes   B = Black   F = Friend
     N = No   A = Adult home   N/A= Not
     M = Male   B = Brother/Sister home   Applicable
     F = Female   C = Child home alone

Pair #	Caller of G.P	M/F	Grade	Age	Race	Who's there	Time Adult Comes Home
1	Y	M	6	11	B	C	4:30
1	N	M	6	11	B	C	4:30
2	Y	M	6	11	B	C	6:00
2	N	M	6	11	B	C	5:30
3	Y	M	6	11	B	A	N/A
3	N	M	6	11	B	A	N/A
4	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
4	N	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
5	Y	F	6	10	B	A	N/A
5	N	F	6	10	B	A	N/A
6	Y	F	6	11	B	B	3:00
6	N	F	6	11	B	C	6:30
7	Y	F	6	11	B	B	3:00
7	N	F	6	11	B	B	3:30
8	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
8	N	F	6	11	B	A, B	N/A
9	Y	F	6	11	B	B	3:00
9	N	F	6	11	B	C	3:00
10	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
10	N	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
11	Y	F	6	11	B	C	----
11	N	F	6	11	B	C	4:30

Pair	Caller	M/F	Grade	Age	Race	Who	What time
12	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
12	N	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
13	Y	F	6	11	B	B	4:30
13	N	F	6	11	B	C	5:00
14	Y	F	6	11	B	A, B	N/A
14	N	F	6	11	B	A, B	N/A
15	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
15	N	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
16	Y	F	6	11	B	C	4:00
16	N	F	6	11	B	C	5:00
17	Y	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
17	N	F	6	11	B	A	N/A
18	Y	F	6	11	B	C	3:30
18	N	F	6	11	B	C	3:00
19	Y	M	5	10	B	A, B	N/A
19	N	M	5	10	B	A, B	N/A
20	Y	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
20	N	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
21	Y	M	5	10	B	F	6:00
21	N	M	5	10	B	F	4:30
22	Y	M	5	10	B	C	----
22	N	M	5	10	B	C	6:30
23	Y	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
23	N	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
24	Y	M	5	10	B	A, B	N/A
24	N	M	5	10	B	A, B	N/A
25	Y	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
25	N	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
26	Y	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
26	N	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
27	Y	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
27	N	M	5	10	B	A	N/A
28	Y	M	5	10	B	B	5:00
28	N	M	5	10	B	B	4:30

Pair	Caller	M/F	Grade	Age	Race	Who		What time
29	Y	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
29	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
30	Y	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
30	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
31	Y	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
31	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
32	Y	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
32	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
33	Y	F	5	10	B	B		6:30
33	N	F	5	10	B	C		7:30
34	Y	F	5	10	B	A,	B	N/A
34	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
35	Y	F	5	10	B	B		6:30
35	N	F	5	11	B	C		5:30
36	Y	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
36	N	F	5	10	B	A		N/A
37	Y	M	4	9	B	A		N/A
37	N	M	4	9	B	A		N/A
38	Y	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
38	N	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
39	Y	M	4	9	B	C		7:30
39	N	M	4	9	B	C		5:30
40	Y	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
40	N	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
41	Y	M	4	10	B	C		5:00
41	N	M	4	10	B	C		4:00
42	Y	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
42	N	M	4	9	B	A		N/A
43	Y	M	4	10	B	A,	B	N/A
43	N	M	4	10	B	A,	B	N/A
44	Y	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
44	N	M	4	9	B	A,	B	N/A
45	Y	F	4	9	B	C		3:00
45	N	F	4	9	B	C		3:30

Pair	Caller	M/F	Grade	Age	Race	Who	What time
46	Y	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
46	N	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
47	Y	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
47	N	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
48	Y	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
48	N	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
49	Y	F	4	9	B	A	N/A
49	N	F	4	9	B	A	N/A
50	Y	F	4	9	B	B	4:30
50	N	F	4	9	B	B	----
51	Y	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
51	N	F	4	9	B	A, B	N/A
52	Y	F	4	10	B	A	N/A
52	N	F	4	10	B	A	N/A
53	Y	F	4	10	B	A	N/A
53	N	F	4	10	B	A	N/A
54	Y	F	4	10	B	A	N/A
54	N	F	4	10	B	A	N/A

APPENDIX E

Children's Perception of Aging and Elderly Inventory
(adapted from Rich, Myrick & Campbell, 1983)

1. I like visiting old people.

    1---------2---------3---------4---------5

    Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

2. It is fun to talk with old people.

    1---------2---------3---------4---------5

    Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

3. I never want to grow old.

    1---------2---------3---------4---------5

    Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

4. Old people have a happy life.

    1---------2---------3---------4---------5

    Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

5. Old people are not very smart.

    1---------2---------3---------4---------5

    Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
    Disagree   Agree

6. Old people are friendly.

   1---------2---------3---------4---------5

   Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
   Disagree   Agree

7. Old people are mean.

   1---------2---------3---------4---------5

   Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
   Disagree   Agree

8. Old people don't like to be with children.

   1---------2---------3---------4---------5

   Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
   Disagree   Agree

9. Old people don't do much.

   1---------2---------3---------4---------5

   Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
   Disagree   Agree

10. Old people get mad easily.

   1---------2---------3---------4---------5

   Strongly   Disagree Neutral   Agree   Strongly
   Disagree   Agree

APPENDIX F

"Grandma Please" Questionnaires

Interview #1: Called "Grandma Please".

1. Have you called "Grandma Please" more than once?
    Yes or No

2. How many times have you called?
    _____ 0 times   _____ 1 time
    _____ 2 times   _____ 3-5 times
    _____ 6-9 times _____ 10 or more times

3. When was the last time that you called?
    _____ within the last week
    _____ within the last month
    _____ within the last six months
    _____ within the last year
    _____ over a year ago

4. When you typically call, are you alone? _____
        with parents? _____ with a friend? _____
        with brothers/sisters? _____
        with others? _____   who? _____

5. Why have you called "Grandma Please"?
    _____.

6. What did you talk about? (list three or four things.)
    _____

    _____.

7. How do you feel after you've talked to a Grandma or
Grandpa from "Grandma, Please"?
    _____.

8. Tell us all the things you <u>like</u> about "Grandma, Please"
and the things that you <u>don't like</u> about "Grandma, Please."

Things I <u>**LIKE**</u> about "Grandma, Please."
    _____

    _____.

[58]

_____

_____ .

9. How often do you talk to people who are old (other than
the Grandmas and Grandpas at "Grandma, Please")?
       _____ not at all   _____ a little
       _____ sometimes _____ a lot

10. What makes a person old?

_____

_____ .

11. Do you like to talk to people who are old (other than
the Grandmas and Grandpas at "Grandma, Please")? Yes or No
Why or why not?

_____

_____ .

12. If you have only called "Grandma, Please" once, why
haven't you called back?

_____

_____ .

13. How friendly are the grandmas or grandpas who you've
talked to at "Grandma, Please?"
       _____ not at all friendly _____ a little friendly
       _____ somewhat friendly   _____ very friendly

14. How much did you like the grandmas or grandpas who
     you've talked to?

_____ I liked them not at all _____ I liked them a little
_____ I liked them somewhat   _____ I liked them a lot

15. Are there people who want you to use "Grandma Please?"
     Yes or No?
       _____ parents   _____ teachers
       _____ friends   _____ principal
       _____ others   who? _____ .

16. Are there people who <u>don't</u> want you to use "Grandma
     Please?" Yes or No
     If yes, who? _____

17. How likely is it that you will call "Grandma, Please"
in the future?
_____ I don't intend to call
_____ I might call
_____ It's likely that I'll call
_____ I'll definitely call

18. Kids who call "Grandma, Please" only have to give their
first name (like Mark), their age, and their school.
Would you call "Grandma Please" if you had to give your
last name, too (like Mark Smith)? Yes or No

19. Do you have any REAL Grandpas or Grandmas? Yes or No

20. List your grandparents that are living.

Mother's parents   Father's parents
grandfather   grandmother   grandfather   grandmother

_____   _____   _____   _____

21. Where do they live?

_____   _____   _____   _____

22. How often do you talk to them on the phone?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____   _____   _____   _____

23. How often do you see them?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____   _____   _____   _____

24. How much do you like them?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____   _____   _____   _____

25. When you need to talk to someone, who do you call?

_____.

26. After calling "Grandma, Please" do you like people who
are old more than you did before using "Grandma, Please"?
Yes or No?

Mother's occupation_____ Father's occupation_____

Interview #2: Haven't called

1. What are your reasons for <u>not</u> using "Grandma, Please?"

_____

_____

_____.

2. Are there people who want you to use "Grandma, Please?"
   Yes or No
   _____ parents   _____ teachers
   _____ friends   _____ principal
   _____ others   who? _____.

3. Are there people who do not want you to use "Grandma,
   Please?" Yes or No If yes, who?_____.

4. How likely is it that you will call "Grandma, Please" in
   the future?
   _____ I don't intend to call
   _____ I might call
   _____ It's likely that I'll call
   _____ I'll definitely call

5. Kids who call "Grandma, Please" only give their first
   name (like Mark), their age, and their school. Would you
   call "Grandma, Please" if you had to give your last name,
   too (like Mark Smith)? Yes or No

6. How often do you talk to people who are old?
   _____ not at all
   _____ a little
   _____ sometimes
   _____ a lot

7. Do you like to talk to people who are old? Yes or No
   Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____.

8. What makes a person old?

_____.

9. Do you have any REAL Grandmas or Grandpas? Yes or No

Haven't called - 2

10. List your grandparents that are living.

Mother's parents   Father's parents
grandfather   grandmother   grandfather   grandmother

_____ _____   _____ _____

11. Where do they live?

_____ _____   _____ _____

12. How often do you talk to them on the phone?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____ _____   _____ _____

13. How often do you see them?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____ _____   _____ _____

14. How much do you like them?
(not at all, a little, sometimes, a lot)

_____ _____   _____ _____

15. When you need to talk to someone, who do you call?

_____

_____.

16. What should be changed about "Grandma Please" before
you would decide to call?

_____

_____

_____.

17. What kinds of good things or bad things would make you
want to call "Grandma Please"?

_____

_____.

Mother's occupation_____ Father's occupation _____.

Retest Data

CPAE:

Item	Corr. Coeff.(r)	Item	Corr. Coeff (r)
#1	.7863	#6	.0387
#2	.5934	#7	.0532
#3	.5835	#8	.2612
#4	.3116	#9	.5561
#5	.7934	#10	.4019
Overall	.7348 $p < .01$		

Grandma Please Questionnaire - Callers:

Item	Corr. Coeff. (r)	Phi	CC**
#1		1.0, $p < .001$	
#2	.6686, $p < .05$		
#3			.76376, n.s.
#4		.83666, $p < .01$	
#5			.61804, n.s.
#6			.71311, n.s.
#7			.58188, n.s.
#8			.77898, n.s.
#9	.4069, n.s.		
#10			.26494, n.s.
#11	.2843, n.s.	1.0, $p < .00001$	
#13	.8333, $p < .05$		
#14	.8333, $p < .05$		
#15		.67612, $p < .001$	
#16		.45455, $p < .05$	
#17	.5602, n.s.		
#18		.34188, $p < .10$	
#19		1.0, $p < .00001$	
#20		.91830, $p < .001$	
#21		.89080, $p < .0001$	
#22	.5286, $p < .01$		
#23	.6960, $p < .01$		
#24	.8436, $p < .01$		
#25	.6256, $p < .05$		
#26		.81650, $p < .005$	

"Grandma Please Questionnaire" - Non-callers

Item	Corr.Coeff.(r)	Phi	CC**
#1	.3293, n.s.		
#2		.67612, p < .001	
#3		.45455, p < .05	
#4	.5602, n.s.		
#5		.34188, p < .10	
#6	.4069, n.s.		
#7	.5046, n.s.		
#8			.23863, n.s.
#9		1.0, p < .00001	
#10		.91830, p < .0001	
#11		.89080, p < .0001	
#12	.5286, p < .01		
#13	.6960, p < .01		
#14	.8436, p < .01		
#15	.6774, p < .05		
#16	N/A		
#17			.63951, p < .10

**Note: Qualitative questions were retested by looking at the number of categories or statements that the child made on the second testing.

APPENDIX H

Interrater Reliability

TABLE 1
QUANTITATIVE CODING

CRITERIA	CPAE	G.P.-Quant
Number of questionnaires coded independently	36 (1/3 of total)	36 (1/3 total)
Type of questions	Quantitative	Quantitative
Number of possible responses	360	555
Number of responses same between raters	360	551
Observed agreement between raters	100%	99.3%
Cohen's kappa	1.00	

TABLE 2
QUALITATIVE "GRANDMA PLEASE" CALLERS ONLY

CRITERIA	#5	#6	#7
Number of questionnaires coded independently	18	18	18
Type of questions	Qual	Qual	Qual
Number of possible responses	30	41	30
Number of responses same between raters	29	39	29
Observed agreement between raters	96.7%	95.0%	96.7%
Cohen's kappa	.9564	.9215	.9507

TABLE 3
"GRANDMA PLEASE" QUESTIONNAIRE NONCALLERS ONLY

CRITERIA	#1	#17
Number of questionnaires coded independently	18	18
Type of questions	Qual	Qual
Number of possible responses	31	32
Number of responses same between raters	30	30
Observed agreement between raters	96.0%	93.8%
Cohen's kappa	.9451	.9256

TABLE 4
"GRANDMA PLEASE" QUESTIONNAIRE-BOTH GROUPS

CRITERIA	#8/10	#11/7	#25/16
Number of questionnaires coded independently	36	36	36
Type of questions	Qual	Qual	Qual
Number of possible responses	77	64	15
Number of responses same between raters	74	60	15
Observed agreement between raters	89.6%	93.8%	100%
Cohen's kappa	.8313	.9060	1.00

VITA

The author, Elizabeth Nebeker Szendre, was born in Anaheim, California on March 7, 1970.

In August, 1988, Ms. Szendre entered Brigham Young University, where she graduated summa cum laude with the degree of Bachelor of Science in psychology in April, 1991. From 1989-1991, she was selected as an Edwin S. Hinckley Scholar. During her senior year, the psychology department at Brigham Young University selected her as the recipient of the Mark K. Allen Award for Outstanding Graduating Senior for 1991.

In August of 1991, Ms. Szendre was awarded a Jacob K. Javits Fellowship in developmental psychology to be used at Loyola University of Chicago, enabling her to complete the Master of Arts.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Elizabeth Szendre has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Paul E. Jose
Associate Professor of Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Jill N. Reich
Professor and Chairman, Department of Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_4/12/93_

Date

Paul E. Jose

Director's Signature